

# Methodists and Money in the Long Eighteenth Century<sup>1</sup>

*Clive Murray Norris*

## A. Introduction

John Wesley's Methodist Connexion began as a small and informal grouping of Anglican clergymen and 'lay brethren' sharing a vision of a revitalised Church of England.<sup>2</sup> Its first (1744) Conference gave detailed consideration to matters of theology but also to discipline and organisation, especially how the religious societies associated with the movement should be run. From the outset there was a concern that its preachers should lead exemplary lives, and in particular an anxiety to avoid any appearance that they were profiting from their ministry. The preachers were told: "Take no money of anyone. If they give you food when you are hungry, or clothes when you need them, it is good. But not silver or gold. Let there be no pretence to say, we 'grow rich by the gospel'."<sup>3</sup>

In the succeeding years and decades the movement grew. Its membership multiplied, exceeding 70,000 by the time of Wesley's death in 1791;<sup>4</sup> it spread across the British Isles and beyond; it acquired hundreds of staff, and hundreds too of chapels and other buildings; and it established foreign missions, and a flourishing commercial book publishing operation.<sup>5</sup> All of this required the raising and expenditure of funds on a large scale. A simple doctrine of apostolic simplicity of life was

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised version of a paper presented at the University of Tübingen workshop 'What Would Jesus Fund? Financing religious enterprises in the long eighteenth century', 9-10 February 2017. I am grateful to workshop participants, and to Dr. Peter Forsaith and Professor William Gibson of the Oxford Centre for Methodism and Church History, for comments on the original text.

<sup>2</sup> As recorded in the Minutes of their first Conference in 1744: H.D. Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition of the Works of John Wesley*, vol. 10: *The Methodist Societies. The Minutes of Conference*, Nashville, TN 2011, 120-46.

<sup>3</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 141.

<sup>4</sup> 71,568 members in the British Isles were reported to the July 1790 Conference: Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 728. Wesley died in March 1791.

<sup>5</sup> This financial history of Wesleyan Methodism is the subject of C.M. Norris, *The Financing of John Wesley's Methodism c.1740-1800*, Oxford 2017, on which this article draws.

no longer adequate to guide the many financial decisions which Wesley's Connexion now faced.

This article examines the attitudes towards money of eighteenth-century Wesleyan Methodists, and how these changed in response to both the financial challenges and the opportunities faced by the movement and its members. The general thrust of these changes is well-known. As Tyson comments: "The Methodists became less identified with the poor and increasingly aligned with the status quo as the 18<sup>th</sup> century wore on."<sup>6</sup>

I look first at the vision with which John Wesley (1703-91) started out, and then at the attitudes of the early Methodists towards money, before examining the key changes in Wesley's movement up to his death and beyond, and the shifting views of markets and money which resulted. His original ambition was to reform the Church of England from within, and his strategy reflected his views of the Primitive Church, as well as the influence of German Pietism, which he had experienced at first hand,<sup>7</sup> and other precursors. Indeed, one 1796 encyclopedia commented that Wesley: "[...] appears to have selected, with sagacity, his religious system from the Catholic, Geneva, Lutheran, and Moravian churches."<sup>8</sup> Over time, a series of key decisions transformed his movement into an active supporter of—and participant in—the vibrant market economy of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Britain.

## **B. The starting-point**

John Wesley's model of godly living comprised two dimensions, internal and external. The internal dimension—how Wesley organised his own life and sought to organise those of his followers—entailed strict personal austerity and discipline, the original 'method' of Methodism. This included, for example: "[...] attending upon all the ordinances of

---

<sup>6</sup> J.R. Tyson, 'Why did John Wesley 'fail'?' A reappraisal of Wesley's evangelical economics', in: *Methodist History*, 35 (1997), 176-87, here 176.

<sup>7</sup> See D.H. Shantz, *An Introduction to German Pietism: Protestant renewal at the dawn of modern Europe*, Baltimore 2013, especially chapter five. For a succinct account of contemporary German Pietism see T. Blanning, *Frederick the Great, King of Prussia*, London 2015, 15-17.

<sup>8</sup> Entry on 'Westley, John', in: J.W. Newman, *The Lounger's Common-Place Book*, London, Printed for the Editor, 1796 (ESTC / T127334), vol. 2, 257.

God: such as, the public worship of God, the supper of the Lord, private prayer, searching the Scriptures, and fasting or abstinence.”<sup>9</sup>

However, this regime was inseparable from a suite of more outward-looking practices, summarised in Wesley’s requirement that his members should be: “[...] doing good, by being in every kind merciful after their power; as they have opportunity doing good of every possible sort, and as far as it is possible to all men.”<sup>10</sup> These collective activities included mass evangelism, through preaching and cheap print, continual acts of charity, and—in everything—a privileged place for the poor.<sup>11</sup>

Both dimensions were evident in the three residential communities founded by Wesley in London, Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Bristol. Thus, in February 1744 Wesley spoke to Richard Viney about his plans for his London headquarters at the Foundery, which he had been leasing since 1739. He planned to establish what he called an ‘oeconomy’, to include a boarding school, a ‘working house’ for the poor.<sup>12</sup> It seems likely that this was intended to be financially self-supporting, as was the Moravian model.<sup>13</sup>

These communities hosted a range of charitable work. In 1740s London, for example, the programmes included an employment scheme for women, established in 1740, twelve of whom were employed during the winter ‘in carding and spinning of cotton’;<sup>14</sup> a collection of a weekly

---

<sup>9</sup> J. Wesley, *A Plain Account of the People called Methodists*, Bristol, Felix Farley, 1749 (ESTC / T005015), 7.

<sup>10</sup> Wesley, *Plain Account*, 6.

<sup>11</sup> Tyson, ‘Why did John Wesley ‘fail’?’, 180. See also R.P. Heitzenrater (ed.), *The Poor and the People Called Methodists*, Nashville, TN, 2002.

<sup>12</sup> Entry for 19 February 1744, Duke University, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Vol. 26, Richard Viney’s Diary (1744), Notebook 1.

<sup>13</sup> In 1767, for example, the Bristol Moravian oeconomy considered establishing an ironmongery business, but after drawing lots decided that “our Saviour [...] had given his negative to it”: see entry for 5 January 1767, Bristol Single Brethren Choir-House Diary, in M. Dresser, ‘The Moravians in Bristol’, in: J. Barry and K. Morgan (eds.), *Reformation and Revival in Eighteenth-Century Bristol*, Bristol 1994, 142. Wesley visited the Moravians at Halle and Herrnhut in Germany in 1738; see his admiring account of the Halle Orphan House and subsequent detailed report on Herrnhut in his journal entries for 24 July and 1-14 August 1738, in W.R. Ward and R.P. Heitzenrater (eds.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 18: *Journal and Diaries I*, Nashville, TN 1988, 263-64, 266-97.

<sup>14</sup> Journal entry for 25 November 1740 in W.R. Ward and R.P. Heitzenrater (eds.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 19: *Journal and Diaries II*, Nashville, TN 1990, 173. The scheme

penny amongst London society members ‘for the relief of the poor and sick’, launched in 1741;<sup>15</sup> and the 1743 establishment of a visiting society, comprising 46 visitors who visited the sick in pairs.<sup>16</sup>

The communities served also as bases for the re-evangelisation of the British Isles, and this raised quite different financial challenges. Wesley’s evangelistic plans were summarised at the first preachers’ Conference in 1744, and envisaged the gradual spread of the Gospel throughout the British Isles, from its then strongholds in London, Bristol, Cornwall, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.<sup>17</sup> From 1744, growing numbers of travelling preachers were deployed by Wesley and his associates, their postings being decided at annual conferences. Many of these preachers had part-time trades, but all expected local Wesleyan societies to provide food and lodging, and cover other expenses, as Wesley told his brother Charles (1707-88) in 1751: “The Societies both *must* and *shall* maintain the preachers *we send* among them, or I will preach among them no more.”<sup>18</sup> The Gospel message was promulgated also through a flood of Book Room publications, including Charles Wesley hymns, financed somewhat haphazardly—edition by edition—by friends and sympathisers as well as from sales revenue.

Wesley’s initial model, to summarise, comprised a small number of residential communities, which served as bases for the deployment of travelling evangelists and the mass distribution of cheap publications. The attitudes to money which underpinned the young movement were clear and inter-connected. There were four key concepts.

First, stewardship: as Wesley bluntly told the dying and immensely wealthy Sir James Lowther (1673-1755) in 1754: “As to yourself, you are not the proprietor of anything—no, not of one shilling

---

was lampooned by one contemporary critic; see *Weekly Miscellany* (1732), Issue CCCCXXXV, Saturday 25 April 1741, article by ‘Richard Hooker, of the Temple, Esq.’.

<sup>15</sup> Entry for 7 May 1741, Ward and Heitzenrater (eds.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 19, 193-194.

<sup>16</sup> See R.E. Davies (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 9: *The Methodist Societies: History, Nature and Design*, Nashville, TN 1989, 274-277; also R.M. Cameron, *Methodism and Society in Historical Perspective*, New York 1961, 58-65; and H.D. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast: John Wesley and the rise of Methodism*, London 1989, 361.

<sup>17</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 138.

<sup>18</sup> Letter of 20 July 1751 from John to Charles Wesley, F. Baker (ed.), *Oxford Edition of the Works of John Wesley*, vol. 26: *Letters II*, Oxford 1982, 471.

in the world. You are only a steward of what another entrusts you with, to be laid out not according to your will but His.”<sup>19</sup> The purest embodiment of this concept was of course the community of goods found in the early Church, which Wesley initially sought to re-establish, and to which he always retained an attachment even though its implementation proved impracticable, and was quietly abandoned.<sup>20</sup> This was a highly controversial concept in a society imbued with a belief in the sanctity of private property, and as Langford notes it horrified and alarmed his fellow clergy.<sup>21</sup> But in a less extreme form—the pooling of all the various funds raised for the movement—the approach set out by Wesley in his *Plain Account* of 1749 guided his Connexion’s management of money throughout his life and beyond:

All that is contributed or collected I every place, is both received and expended by others; [...]. For I look upon all this revenue, be what it may, as sacred to God and the poor: (out of which, if I want anything, I am relieved, even as another poor man.) So were originally all ecclesiastical revenues (as every man of learning knows) and the bishops and priests used them only, as such.<sup>22</sup>

A second key financial principle was that Methodists—especially the travelling preachers—were encouraged to rely on God’s Providence to meet their needs, rather than seeking financial security. Thus when John Jane died in 1750, following four years as a preacher, leaving a total of 1s.4d., Wesley commented that: “It was enough for any unmarried preacher of the gospel to leave to his executors.”<sup>23</sup> In the 1750s Wesley took pride in his own lack of personal financial provision, telling one critic

---

<sup>19</sup> Letter of 28 October 1754 from John Wesley to Sir James Lowther, Baker (ed.), *Oxford Edition*, vol. 26, 543-45, here 545.

<sup>20</sup> J. Walsh, ‘John Wesley and the Community of Goods’, in: K. Robbins (ed.), *Protestant Evangelicalism: Britain, Ireland, Germany and America, c.1750-1950*, Oxford 1990, 25-50. See also Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 365.

<sup>21</sup> P. Langford, *Public Life and the Propertied Englishman 1689-1798*, Oxford 1992, 35.

<sup>22</sup> Wesley, *Plain Account*, 33.

<sup>23</sup> W. Myles, *A Chronological History of the People Called Methodists*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., London 1813, 70-71. God’s Providence, to Wesley, often included supernatural occurrences: see Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 431-33.

in the 1750s that he had no savings and had to date never accumulated as much as £100 at any one time.<sup>24</sup>

A third key financial rule discernible from Wesley's own practice was that, if and when Methodists had surplus money, it should be disbursed as quickly as possible in acts of charity or in other good causes. In 1767, he inherited £1,000 and rapidly distributed it, leaving nothing for his sister, Martha Hall, as he explained to her the following year: "[...] money never stays with me: it would burn me if it did. I throw it out of my hands as soon as possible, lest it should find a way into my heart."<sup>25</sup> Around 1777, the then London Book Steward, John Atlay (b.1736), complained that Wesley gave away his money so fast that there was none left to finance printing or paper supplies, leading to operations being suspended for want of cash.<sup>26</sup> While the eighteenth-century economy was lubricated by a network of small debts, typically local and often informal,<sup>27</sup> Wesley himself lived in a world of cash transactions and personal credit, showing deep suspicion of financial markets, for example repeatedly condemning what he called the 'execrable bill trade' in the late 1780s.<sup>28</sup>

Finally, implicit in the above was the view that the acquisition of money should not be seen as an end in itself. Money was at best 'an unfortunate necessity to sustain life'<sup>29</sup>: it was morally neutral, as Wesley explained in his 1760 sermon on 'The Use of Money':

'The love of money', we know, 'is the root of all evil'; but not the thing itself. The fault does not lie in the money, but in them that use it. It may be used ill;

---

<sup>24</sup> Letter of 3 September 1756 to unknown correspondent. J. Telford (ed.), *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, 8 vols. London 1931, vol. III, 185.

<sup>25</sup> Letter of 6 October 1768 from John Wesley to Martha Hall, Telford, *Letters*, vol. V, 108-9. The story was recounted in T. Marriott, 'Wesley Papers. No. VII—Miss Lewen's Legacy and Liberality to the rev. John Wesley', in: *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*, 68 (1845), 1166-68, drawing on T. Olivers, *A Rod for a Reviler [...]*, London, J. Fry and Co., 1777 (ESTC / T131788), 19-20.

<sup>26</sup> Olivers, *Rod*, 20.

<sup>27</sup> On which see for example C. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England*, Basingstoke 1998.

<sup>28</sup> Letters from John Wesley to Thomas Wride (11 December 1787) and Thomas Taylor (7 June 1788): Telford, *Letters*, vol. VIII, 26, 64.

<sup>29</sup> S. Rogal, *The Financial Aspects of John Wesley's British Methodism*, Lewiston 2002, 16.

and what may not? But it may likewise be used well [...]. It is a most compendious instrument of transacting all manner of business [...] and of doing all manner of good.<sup>30</sup>

An ambivalence pervaded his attitude.<sup>31</sup> He claimed to prioritise the poor, but enjoyed the hospitality of the rich,<sup>32</sup> and relied on them for funds for many of his ventures.<sup>33</sup> In 1785, Wesley congratulated one leading Dublin layman, Arthur Keene, on his God-given prosperity, noting how often godliness was accompanied by temporal success: “You have great reason to bless God for the good state of your temporal affairs also. And, indeed, I have always observed whenever the work of God goes on He withholds no manner of thing that is good.”<sup>34</sup> A year later, he was assuring William Robarts, a pious Cornish bankrupt, that his financial ruin was a happy release: “In all probability you would now have been a wealthy man; and if so, your money would have paved your way to hell. God saw this, and prevented it.”<sup>35</sup> By the late 1740s, however, practical pressures were generating significant shifts of Wesleyan financial practice, and in some of the movement’s attitudes towards money.

### C. Wesleyan Methodists and money: a hidden history

So we will look now at the subsequent development of John Wesley’s movement and the changing financial practices and attitudes to which this gave rise.<sup>36</sup>

#### Circuits and stewards

---

<sup>30</sup> Sermon 50, in A.C. Outler (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 2: *Sermons II*, Nashville, TN 1985, 266-280, here 268.

<sup>31</sup> Discussed also in Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 365-67.

<sup>32</sup> As described in J. Rodell, “‘The best house by far in the town’: John Wesley’s personal circuit”, in: *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library, Manchester*, 85 (2003), 111-22.

<sup>33</sup> See below.

<sup>34</sup> Letter of 17 February 1785 from John Wesley to Arthur Keene, in Telford, *Letters*, vol. VII, 257.

<sup>35</sup> Letter of 9 December 1786 from John Wesley to William Robarts, in Telford, *Letters*, vol. VII, 356.

<sup>36</sup> See R.P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists*, Nashville, TN 1995. An excellent and highly readable general account.

The first moves away from the informal and personal financial arrangements which initially supported John Wesley's mission derived from the problem of scale. By the early 1740s his Connexion was becoming simply too big for him to organise by himself. One result was the appointment of stewards to manage property and other practical matters in London, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Bristol and progressively elsewhere. Another was the growing practice of collecting regular subscriptions—weekly and quarterly—from local members to finance the travelling preachers and facilitate charitable activities. A new administrative tier, that of the regional or sub-regional preaching circuit, was interposed between the local societies and the Connexional centre. All these systems were however quite simple, essentially involving the collection and disbursement of small sums of cash, and the new breed of lay officials were clearly subordinate to Wesley and his senior colleagues, known as 'assistants', as Wesley later explained: "Stewards are not to govern our societies; it is no part of their office. This belongs to the Assistant only, under *my* direction."<sup>37</sup> That said, local societies and circuits frequently fell into debt, and stewards therefore needed to be men of substance, if not wealthy.<sup>38</sup>

### Chapel debt

Alongside the logic of expansion, a second major driver of change in Wesleyan financial practice resulted from their construction or acquisition of chapels. Initially, local societies typically met in private houses or rented accommodation, for example in barns or taverns, but they soon began to rent or more often build chapels. Chapels offered security at a time when violence against Methodists was commonplace; gave shelter from inclement weather; provided space for book storage and for educational and charitable activity; and, most importantly, could accommodate the large numbers of non-members who often came to hear preaching on a Sunday evening. Most Wesleyan society members

---

<sup>37</sup> Letter to Robert Costerdine of 18 February 1769, in Telford, *Letters*, vol. V, 127.

<sup>38</sup> In 1783, for example, the Horncastle circuit owed its general steward, George Robinson, a total of £35.12s.0d.—see entry for Michaelmas 1783, in Duke University, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Frank Baker Collection of Wesleyana and British Methodism, vol. 12, Methodist Steward's Quarter Book, Horncastle Circuit (1782-98).

were of modest means, and though substantial sums were raised for chapel projects, some debt was usually also required, and over time the cumulative debt for which Wesley and his colleagues and supporters were personally liable grew inexorably. By the mid-1760s the Connexion was in crisis.

### The 1753 Book Room reorganisation

It was of course not the first religious organisation showing signs of financial overstretch. In 1753 the Moravian Brethren in England had undergone a spectacular financial collapse, at one point owing the astonishing sum of £132,000.<sup>39</sup> Both John Wesley and George Whitefield (1714-70), the leading Evangelical preachers of their day, were outraged by the epic financial mismanagement which they held responsible, Whitefield claiming that the Brethren had used ‘horrid equivocations, untruths and low artifices’ in their efforts to keep afloat.<sup>40</sup>

In February 1753 Wesley welcomed the proposal—which I would hypothesize was linked to the Moravian disaster—to delegate his financial responsibilities, and specifically the management of the Book Room, to a team of lay stewards.<sup>41</sup> The inadvertent but significant consequence was that over time the management of the Book Room became increasingly commercial. Wesley’s preachers were repeatedly urged to sell more books, and received ten per cent commission on sales, a practice which caused adverse comment. One 1780 critic, who characterised Wesley as a kind of Jesuit Superior General, described the typical Wesleyan itinerant preacher as: “[...] a travelling bookseller; as the holy fathers, the sons of Loyola, are not only the professed

---

<sup>39</sup> W.R. Ward, ‘Zinzendorf and Money’, in: W.J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds.), *The Church and Wealth*, Oxford 1987, 304. On the political and financial intrigues which led to this collapse see for example J. Taylor Hamilton, ‘A History of the Church Known as the Moravian Church [...]’, in: *Transactions of the Moravian Historical Society*, 6 (1900), i-xii, 1-632, here 146-53.

<sup>40</sup> G. Whitefield, *An Expostulatory Letter, Addressed to Nicholas Lewis, Count Zinzendorf, and Lord Advocate of the Unitas Fratrum*, London, G. Keith, 1753 (ESTC / T014116), 15-16. Wesley’s concerns about the financial problems of the Moravian community of Bedford were detailed in his journal entry for 8 October 1753: W.R. Ward and R.P. Heitzenrater (eds.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 20: *Journal and Diaries III*, Nashville, TN 1991, 476-79.

<sup>41</sup> Entry for 8 February 1753, Ward and Heitzenrater (eds.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 20, 445.

ambassadors of Christ, but to suit the purposes of the congregation, *de propaganda fide*, are encouraged to carry on all manner of business.”<sup>42</sup>

Alongside the promotion of Book Room publications, competition from others for sales within the Connexion was strongly discouraged. For example, in the 1780s Wesley was angered when Robert Spence, a Wesleyan bookseller in York, produced his highly successful pocket hymnal, partly because of its effect on Wesley’s own sales. He complained: “Does not every one, unless he shuts his eyes, see, that every shilling he gains by it, he takes out of my pocket?”<sup>43</sup> The Connexion largely withdrew from using commercial printers and publishers, bringing in-house almost every aspect of book production and distribution. As a result, both profit margins and overall profits grew substantially, such that when in 1791 Wesley died, bringing to an end his personal control of the profits, the Connexion’s central income doubled.

### 1763: The Preachers’ Fund

The reorganisation of the Book Room in 1753 was clearly a watershed; another came ten years later with the establishment of the Wesleyan preachers’ retirement scheme—the Preachers’ Fund. This reflected broader developments, such as increasing longevity, and the rise of actuarial science.<sup>44</sup> There was widespread concern about how best to provide for the families of retired or deceased clergymen, and the Church of Scotland introduced a highly successful widows and orphans scheme.<sup>45</sup> John Wesley disapproved of the establishment of this preachers’ retirement fund: the senior preacher John Pawson (1737-

---

<sup>42</sup> J. Macgowan, *The Foundry Budget Opened; or, the Arcanum of Wesleyanism Disclosed*, London, G. Keith, J. Johnson, and J. Macgowan, 1780 (ESTC / T012782), 50, unnumbered footnote.

<sup>43</sup> J. Wesley, *A Pocket Hymn Book, for the Use of Christians of all Denominations*, London, J. Paramore, 1787 (ESTC / T017838), Preface dated 15 November 1786, v. For the background to its publication see C.M. Norris, ““Riches Unsearchable”: The Profitability of Charles Wesley’s Hymns”, in: *Proceedings of the Charles Wesley Society*, 19 (2015), 72-73.

<sup>44</sup> See S.R. Ottaway, *The Decline of Life: Old Age in Eighteenth-Century England*, Cambridge 2004, 75-82; and P.H.J.H. Gosden, *Self-Help: Voluntary Associations in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century*, London 1973, 4-35.

<sup>45</sup> On which see for example A.I. Dunlop (ed.), *The Scottish Ministers’ Widows’ Fund 1743-1993*, Edinburgh 1992. The Church of England had long had its Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, and there were other local Anglican schemes.

1806) reported that he: “[...] did not approve as he always thought it worldly.”<sup>46</sup>

Although he came to accept it, he saw it primarily as a useful additional source of income for the movement—part of the Connexion’s ‘community of goods’—and while he lived neither the income nor the benefits paid were managed transparently. In 1783 the leading preacher Samuel Bradburn (1751-1816) attacked this lack of rigour,<sup>47</sup> and after a period of growing criticism, in 1798 a group of younger preachers broke away to form their own pension scheme, partly to secure the tax and other benefits recently made available under friendly societies legislation.<sup>48</sup> The creation in 1798 of a statutorily registered preachers’ pension scheme with defined contribution rates and benefits, partly financed by a £6,000 bond issued by the Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, was a clear rejection of the simple reliance upon Providence with which Wesley’s mission had begun.<sup>49</sup>

#### The restructuring of preaching and chapel finances in the 1760s

Another and even more significant suite of changes to that mission dates from the late 1760s. They concerned both the preachers and the chapels. The immediate context was Wesley’s realisation that his vision of a coalition of Evangelical clergy spearheading the reform of the Church of England could not be delivered, and the leadership’s consequent discussions of how best to advance their mission as a

---

<sup>46</sup> T. Jackson, *The Lives of Early Methodist Preachers [...]*, 6 vols., London 1871, vol. IV, 27, as quoted in J.H. Lenton, *John Wesley’s Preachers: A Social and Statistical Analysis*, Colorado Springs, CO 2009, 370.

<sup>47</sup> Letter of 3 February 1783 from Samuel Bradburn to John Pritchard, ‘Letters from Samuel Bradburn to John Pritchard’, in: *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, vol. X, Chester 1915, 108-11.

<sup>48</sup> See A.K. Lloyd, *The Labourer’s Hire: The Payment and Deployment of the Early Methodist Preachers 1744-1813*, Bunbury 1968. The foundation document was *Rules and Regulations, of an Institution called the Itinerant Methodist Preachers’ Annuity [...]*, Bristol 1799, R. Edwards (ESTC / T211862).

<sup>49</sup> The bond was issued in recognition of the fact that since the 1780s substantial sums of money had been diverted from the Fund by the leadership to subsidise other Connexional activities.

discrete movement.<sup>50</sup> Specifically, how were the growing numbers of preachers and chapels to be paid for?

Let us look first at the financing of Wesleyan preaching. The 1763 Conference had decided that one key aim should be to increase the number of itinerant preachers who could be deployed on a national basis. Many existing preachers were unable to travel widely because they had a secular trade; they relied on often informal local credit, and their creditors looked askance if they left the area, as the Conference noted with concern.<sup>51</sup>

A ‘yearly collection’ was established in an effort to free local preachers of such debts,<sup>52</sup> but in 1768 the Conference adopted a more drastic and definitive solution by creating a cadre of full-time preachers, reliant upon a quarterly stipend (originally introduced in 1752) and on a growing range of allowances and expenses financed by the membership. By the 1790s these preachers, many of them married with children, and enjoying benefits including stipends, pensions, family and travel allowances, and free accommodation and medical care, were increasingly seen as a professional clerical elite, remote from their flocks and lacking the ardour and commitment of their predecessors, as one former preacher observed bitterly in 1789: “May be the poor hard working people who keep but a bare table to begin with, may not see the necessity of going [...] once a week without supper to maintain such like gentlemen, but I leave things to be considered by time.”<sup>53</sup>

Meanwhile, the funding of the Connexion’s expanding network of chapels had accumulated debts which by 1766 exceeded £11,000, to the alarm of the Conference.<sup>54</sup> Measures taken to reduce the debt included the introduction of controls on chapel building, though these were never

---

<sup>50</sup> See Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 298; Journal entries for 16 March and 6 August 1764, *Works, Journal IV*, 445, 485; F. Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England*, London 1970, 81-197; and R.P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists*, Nashville, TN 1995, 214-215.

<sup>51</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, ‘Large Minutes 1753-1763’, 871, [§72] A.2.

<sup>52</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 297.

<sup>53</sup> M. Moorhouse, *The Defence of Mr. Michael Moorhouse [...]*, Leicester 1789, Ann Ireland and others (ESTC / T101934), 118. Moorhouse entered the itinerant ministry in 1773 but became disenchanted and left in 1786: see Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 415, 983n69. The ‘magazine’ refers to the Connexional *Arminian Magazine*.

<sup>54</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, Qs.[12]-[13], 322.

fully effective,<sup>55</sup> the establishment of the so-called London Committee of senior businessmen to advise on chapel funding and debt management,<sup>56</sup> and an intensive nationwide fund-raising campaign.<sup>57</sup> Three developments on chapel finance were particularly striking.

First, in 1768 the London Committee adopted the policy that debt raised to finance chapel construction should pay generous interest, at a time when rates were capped by usury legislation at 5 per cent.<sup>58</sup> In practice the evidence suggests that chapel debt typically paid 5 per cent, and with other benefits including inexpensive standardised legal documentation,<sup>59</sup> this made it highly attractive to wealthier Wesleyan members and supporters, who readily financed the expansion of a network which comprised almost a thousand chapels by 1800.<sup>60</sup> It also reduced the risk of a Moravian-style catastrophe. In 1780, for example, the debt on the Bath chapel—paying 5 per cent—was refinanced, incidentally with Wesley himself among the investors.<sup>61</sup>

A second key development was that Wesley's fund-raising campaign was carefully targeted, and included personal approaches to the richer members and supporters. Thus, he instructed one preacher in 1767 to send him a list of wealthy members and supporters to whom Wesley would then write personally.<sup>62</sup> There were misgivings about this, as this decision of the 1780 Conference revealed: "Let all preaching-

---

<sup>55</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 322, Q.12, A.1-2: there were many more such provisions in succeeding years.

<sup>56</sup> See Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, Introduction, 44-47; and University of Manchester, John Rylands University Library, Methodist Archives and Research Centre, Wesley Collection, AN1977/514: 'Joseph Sutcliffe (WM) (1762-1856) Ms. History of Methodism (1703-1824)', vol. II, 675-81.

<sup>57</sup> Led by Wesley, but including local efforts. See Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 322, Q.12, A.3.

<sup>58</sup> 'Joseph Sutcliffe', vol. II, 679. On usury see H. Roseveare, *The Financial Revolution 1660-1760*, London 1991, 70; P. Temin and H.-J. Voth, *Prometheus Shackled: Goldsmith Banks and England's Financial Revolution After 1700*, Oxford 2013, 74-75; and C.R. Geisst, *Beggar Thy Neighbor: A History of Usury and Debt*, Philadelphia, PA 2013.

<sup>59</sup> The so-called Model Deed: see Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, 'Large Minutes' for 1763, 868-70.

<sup>60</sup> Calculated from data in Myles, *History*, 427-45.

<sup>61</sup> For details see E.R. Bates, 'Wesley's Property Deed for Bath', in: *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, vol. XLIV, Chester 1983, 25-35.

<sup>62</sup> Letter of 2 December 1767 from John Wesley to Robert Costerdine: Telford, *Letters*, vol. V, 68.

houses be built plain and decent, but not more expensive than is absolutely unavoidable. Otherwise the necessity of raising money will make rich men necessary to us. But if so, we must be dependent upon them, yea, and governed by them. And then farewell to the Methodist discipline, if not doctrine too.”<sup>63</sup> But by then it was too late.

The third feature of this 1760s Wesleyan financial revolution is less well-documented, but it seems likely that the use of seat rents to finance debt interest payments dates from this period. While commonplace in Anglican churches, the renting of reserved seats challenged two central features of Wesley’s approach to mission: his insistence that men and women sat separately in chapel, and his desire that the Gospel should be equally available to all, rich and poor.<sup>64</sup> Seat rentals typically involved families sitting together, and marginalised the poor.<sup>65</sup> As one preacher wrote—surprisingly frankly—to a colleague in 1790: “I make no doubt but the letting of seats in the gallery [will] be a means of inducing some of the better sort to come [to] hear the word, as we know that it is by no means agreeable for decent and dirty people to be all blended together.”<sup>66</sup>

### The 1780s

From the 1780s, the range of programmes delivered by Wesley’s Connexion broadened significantly: in particular, it opened Sunday schools, often in collaboration with other religious organisations;<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Rack (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 10, ‘Large Minutes 1780-1789’, 930-31, Q.65.

<sup>64</sup> As he explained in his letter of 22 August 1744 to Mrs. [James] Hutton: “We have no 5s. or 2s.6d. places at the Foundery, nor ever had, nor ever will. If any one asks for a place in the gallery (we make no distinction but between men and women), he has it; I refuse none. And some hundreds have places who pay nothing at all. First come also is first served, at every time of preaching. And the poorest have frequently the best places, because they come first.” See Telford, *Letters*, vol. II, 25.

<sup>65</sup> Tyson, ‘Why did John Wesley ‘fail’?’, 185-86.

<sup>66</sup> Letter of 3 November 1790 from John Pawson to Charles Atmore, J.C. Bowmer and J.A. Vickers (eds.), *The Letters of Pawson, Methodist itinerant, 1762-1806*, Peterborough 1995, vol. 1, 93-94.

<sup>67</sup> For background on Sunday schools see T.W. Laqueur, *Religion and Respectability: Sunday Schools and Working Class Culture 1780-1850*, New Haven, CT 1976; and P.B. Cliff, *The Rise and Development of the Sunday School Movement in England 1780-1980*, Redhill 1986.

launched a series of overseas missions;<sup>68</sup> and sponsored a network of urban poor relief charities called Stranger's Friend Societies.<sup>69</sup> Though these new ventures were clearly Wesleyan in character and leadership, they were not funded from the membership dues of the rank and file, but by voluntary subscription, often following public appeals to members and non-members alike. Despite Wesley's concerns, the money raised came disproportionately from the better-off: thus, the minimum annual subscription to the Wesleyan Tract Society, founded in 1782 to distribute free literature to the poor, was half a guinea;<sup>70</sup> and in its first year (1800) 41 per cent of the funds raised for the Preachers' Friend Society, a charity for Wesleyan preachers, came from gifts of £10 or more.<sup>71</sup>

Two parallel developments reinforced the movement's dependence on the rich and the 'middling sort'. One was its increasing resort to congregational collections to help subsidise mainstream activities as well as new ventures. As John Pawson complained in 1799: "I think we undertake too much. Besides our common expenses we have the poor, the Benevolent Society, Sunday schools, the missions, the building new chapels, and I can hardly tell what besides. In this city [ie. London]<sup>72</sup> we have never done with collections, very seldom can a stranger attend our chapel but we are begging money of him."<sup>73</sup>

The second was a long-term trend for spontaneous acts of charity to be replaced by more formal—indeed bureaucratic—approaches to assessing and relieving poverty, for example through the Stranger's Friend Societies. Wesleyan Methodist welfare activities increasingly entailed the establishment and maintenance of rule-based financial

---

<sup>68</sup> On which see J. Pritchard, *Methodists and their Missionary Societies 1760-1800*, Farnham 2013.

<sup>69</sup> See T. Alexander-Macquiban, *British Methodism and the Poor: 1785-1840*, PhD, University of Birmingham, 2000.

<sup>70</sup> *A State of the Society for Distributing Religious Tracts Among the Poor, for the Year 1782, with an Alphabetical List of the Subscribers*, London, John Paramore, 1783. I am grateful to Drew University Library for making available a digital copy of this publication.

<sup>71</sup> 'Report of the Committee of the Preachers' Friend Society for 1800, List of Donations and Subscriptions dated 25 March 1801', in: *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*, 24 (1801), 369.

<sup>72</sup> *Minutes of the Methodist Conferences [...]*, vol. I, London 1862, 414.

<sup>73</sup> Letter of 25 February 1799 to Thomas Taylor, in Bowmer and Vickers (eds.), *The Letters of Pawson*, vol. 2, 146.

management and related systems, run by people who were comfortable with money and with the exercise of power, and characterised by formal criteria and process rather than reflexive responses to immediate need.

#### **D. Markets and Methodism c.1820**

The development of Wesley's Connexion reflected other shifts in contemporary British social attitudes and behaviour: the professionalisation of the ministry, for example, had obvious parallels in areas as diverse as medicine, law and construction;<sup>74</sup> and the bureaucratisation of poor relief was also part of a much broader trend.<sup>75</sup> As it acquired property and staff, it increasingly found itself standing with the 'haves' against the 'have-nots', as exemplified in 1794, when a junior employee of the Book Room was sentenced to seven years' transportation for a minor theft.<sup>76</sup> In entering a world of taxes, landholding, contracts, public subscriptions and financial planning, power shifted to those with the money, skills and personal contacts required. And inevitably, Wesleyans' attitudes to markets and money changed. Three examples of this are discussed below.

One was the increasing awareness amongst preachers that some postings offered better financial opportunities than others, that to an extent they themselves operated within a marketplace.<sup>77</sup> While there was broad standardisation of the basic stipend and key allowances, there was wide variation in terms for example of gifts from the richer members and supporters, and income from commission on book sales. James Rogers (1749-1807) noted regretfully of his three-year stay in Dublin in

---

<sup>74</sup> On the rise of the architectural profession see, for example, J. Ayres, *Building the Georgian City*, New Haven, CT 1998, 9, 19, 23.

<sup>75</sup> See, for example, Fissell's comment on medical charities in Bristol: "By the early nineteenth century, the personal relationships that had underlain charity and poor relief were beginning to erode; a poor person's worthiness had to be affirmed by inspection and surveillance, rather than by recommendation of his or her patron." M.E. Fissell, *Patients, Power, and the Poor in Eighteenth-Century Bristol*, Cambridge 1991, 125.

<sup>76</sup> 17 September 1794, Trial of Alexander Smith; *Old Bailey Proceedings, Accounts of Criminal Trials*, <http://www.oldbaileyonline.org>, accessed December 2016.

<sup>77</sup> An understanding which was not, of course, unique to Methodism: for another contemporary example of religious entrepreneurship see W. Gibson, 'John Trusler and the Culture of Sermons in Late Eighteenth-Century England', in: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 66 (2015), 302-19.

the 1780s that: “As to private presents we neither sought nor had many.”<sup>78</sup> A decade later John Pawson estimated that a preacher’s income from book sales commission in one of the ‘best circuits’ might reach £10 a year.<sup>79</sup> And in June 1800 Joseph Entwisle reflected in his journal: “I fear there is too much concern among us about having what is called ‘a good circuit’, which borders upon what the clergy call ‘a good living’.”<sup>80</sup>

A second aspect of the impact of market thinking on Wesley’s Connexion can be seen in discussions about proposed new chapels. By 1800, it was standard practice for larger chapels to be funded by a combination of donations and loans, the loan interest in turn being financed by seat rents. In this way chapels came increasingly to be seen as serving a specific local market for religious services. For example, in April 1815 the Great Queen Street Wesleyan Methodist society in London was considering building a new and larger chapel. The local leadership, including the society stewards, met first on 19 April, and supported the project on simple evangelistic grounds. The following day, the chapel trustees also endorsed the plans, but their primary interest was in the funds and fellowship foregone when existing members and supporters worshipped elsewhere: “[...] some of the members of our own society for want of seats are compelled to take sittings in dissenting meetings and in churches for their families who otherwise would greatly prefer to be regular in their attendance in this place if they could be comfortably accommodated [...]”<sup>81</sup>

A third and final example: in 1803, the senior Wesleyan minister Thomas Taylor (1738-1816) addressed a meeting of the local Annuity

---

<sup>78</sup> Entries for 1784-1786 in Methodist Archives and Research Centre, AN1977/294, ‘James Rogers (WM) (1749-1807) Diary and Notebooks (1784-1804): Item 4, account book (1784-1804)’.

<sup>79</sup> This would equate to annual sales of some 3s.0d. per member in a circuit of average size. See Duke University, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Frank Baker Papers, 1641-2002 and undated, Box 119, Folder 2, circular to ‘The Members of the Methodist Societies’ signed by John Pawson. Pawson’s circular is undated, but was probably issued in 1796 or 1797; it refers to the dissident preacher Alexander Kilham as being in stationed at Alnwick ‘last year’, as he was in 1795-1796.

<sup>80</sup> Journal entry for 21 June 1800, J. Entwisle, *Memoir of Joseph Entwisle*, Bristol 1848, 214.

<sup>81</sup> Entry for 20 April 1815, London Metropolitan Archives, N/M/007/17, ‘Great Queen Street Chapel Trustees’ Minutes’.

Society at Coleshill Street chapel, Birmingham. This had opened in 1789, and between August 1788 and November 1790 a total of some £1,400 was raised, including £400 capital provided by the Society, presumably to finance pensions for its members.<sup>82</sup> Taylor spoke on the ‘sermon on the mount’, especially Matthew 6:34: “Take therefore no thought for the morrow: For the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself.”<sup>83</sup> Wesley’s commentary on this passage, in his Sermon 29, had argued that reliance on God should not mean carelessness about worldly things.<sup>84</sup> Taylor went much further. His address was not merely a defence of the work ethic and a plea for self-reliance, but a paean of praise for trade and commerce—both ‘laudable’, he said; a justification of private property; and an endorsement of the complex and stratified contemporary market economy:

Property in some degree is necessary, for trade carried on without property is like building without a foundation, a sort of speculation which is little better than gambling [...] the merchant and the tradesman are as needful for the labourer and the man of ingenuity, as the latter are for them; they are all so many links in the extensive chain in human life. They are all so many wheels in the grand machine [...].<sup>85</sup>

He knew Birmingham well, and as a former president of Conference spoke with authority. And these were not rhetorical flourishes, but descriptions of a divinely inspired and integrated religious-economic system in which Wesleyan chapels’ needs for capital could be fulfilled through recycling the pension contributions paid by the ‘careful and industrious mechanic[s]’ who joined the Annuity Society.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Library of Birmingham, Wolfson Centre for Archival Research, MC6/B/3/1, ‘Belmont Row Chapel, Birmingham: Account Book (1788-1844)’.

<sup>83</sup> Thomas Taylor (1738-1816) became an itinerant Wesleyan preacher in 1761. He was president of Conference in 1796 and 1809: *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com>, accessed January 2017. The Bible quotation is taken from the King James Version.

<sup>84</sup> A.C. Outler (ed.), *Bicentennial Edition*, vol. 1: *Sermons I*, Nashville, TN 1984, 640.

<sup>85</sup> T. Taylor, *Domestic Piety Demonstrated in a Sermon, preached before the Annuity Society, in the Methodist Chapel, in Coleshill Street, Birmingham, 28 June 1803*, Birmingham 1803, 11, 21.

<sup>86</sup> More generally, Victorian Evangelicals tended to have positive views of business. See G. Searle, *Morality and the Market in Victorian Britain*, Oxford 1998, especially chapter two on ‘Capitalism and Christianity’.

By 1820, such thinking was well established within Wesleyan Methodism. In 1811, the London Methodist Chapel Amicable Society was founded, sponsored by prominent businessmen from the London membership, and the leading London preachers. Its prospectus was enticing, explaining that: “To promote the temporal interests of individuals, with the spread of the Gospel, appears to be a desirable object [...].”<sup>87</sup> It offered pension products tailored to people of different ages and financial circumstances, though in this case the minimum subscription was a substantial £100 lump sum. Again, the scheme demonstrated an integration of investment management and evangelical mission: the superintendents of Wesleyan Methodist preaching circuits, for example, were required to certify annually that the subscribers were still living, and ultimately to report their deaths.

## E. Conclusions

The shift in Wesleyan attitudes towards money and markets was neither tidy nor complete. The movement’s endorsement of capitalism was conditional: business dealings needed to be fair and honest, and any debt manageable, and the ‘real economy’ was preferred to the world of financial speculation, all points evident in the 1810 *Methodist Magazine* obituary of one Wesleyan businessman, the northern millowner John Middleton:

He was strictly *punctual* in all his dealings in trade. His word was sacred to him; and this was so well known, that his credit was unlimited. [...] He was a debtor to no man. [...] His industry and integrity had their merited consequences; he was esteemed by men, and blessed by God. Though he had losses [...] his worldly *prosperity* was on the whole continually on the increase. [...] His riches were not, like an exhalation, raised in an hour, the product of a fortunate speculation; but the due earnings of concurring probity, frugality, skill, and industry.<sup>88</sup>

The concept of stewardship remained central, reflected for example in this positive review of Jones’s *Annual Family Account-Book for 1823* in

---

<sup>87</sup> ‘Plan of the London Methodist Amicable Society, with the benefit of Survivorship’. The plan was dated 1811, and published the following year in the *Methodist Magazine*, 35 (1812), 71-72.

<sup>88</sup> Obituary of John Middleton (1724-1795), in: *Methodist Magazine*, 33 (1810), 209-17 (henceforth ‘Middleton obituary’), here 213.

that year's *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*: "[...] to keep exact and regular accounts, so as to know at all times how our affairs are proceeding, and whether we are living within our means, is, in our judgment, a duty of Christian morality."<sup>89</sup>

However, a simple reliance on God's Providence in financial matters became less common. Thus, the death knell of the view that preachers should take Matthew 6:31 literally: "[...] take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?"<sup>90</sup> was sounded in 1798, when as we have seen the younger preachers triggered the restructuring of the Connexional pension scheme, partly to improve its tax efficiency.

As noted earlier, there was a growing volume of criticism that Wesleyan preachers were becoming too prosperous and worldly, and as such insulated from the daily struggles experienced by many of their members. One 1819 critic attacked them by drawing a comparison with the penury of political radicals living modestly on the contributions of their working-class supporters: "Whereas *reverend* gentlemen like you, who also subsist by the small collections of the poor and needy, are admired by the men, and almost adored by the women. You mix amongst the wealthy and luxurious—you are invited to good men's feasts—you are treated with dainties [ie. fine food]—repose in ease and comfort, and grow fat and sleek."<sup>91</sup>

Wesley's aversion to financial planning and saving was overwhelmed by the movement's constant need for capital investment, as was evident in 1811 when no fewer than ten preachers—some eminent—signed the launch prospectus of the London Methodist Chapel Amicable Society.<sup>92</sup> And his antipathy to retaining surplus cash was supplanted by an increasing attention by both individuals and the collective leadership to the careful management of both income and expenditure.

---

<sup>89</sup> *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*, 2 (1823), 40.

<sup>90</sup> In the King James Version.

<sup>91</sup> Anon., *A Dialogue between a Methodist Preacher and a Reformer*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne 1819, 8.

<sup>92</sup> See 'Plan of the London Methodist Amicable Society'. The signatories included three past Presidents of Conference: John Barber (1807), Joseph Benson (1810) and Adam Clarke (1806) — as well as three future ones: Walter Griffith (1813), Richard Reece (1816), and John Stephens (1827).

This was reflected, notably, in the growing length and detail of the financial reports provided to the annual preachers' Conference after Wesley's death. The published *Minutes* of the 1820 Conference, for example, included some fifteen pages of financial reports on the various Connexional funds, followed by twenty pages of accounts.<sup>93</sup> And although the businessman John Middleton continued to practice unplanned giving to the poor, the writer of his 1810 obituary thought that this required a detailed explanation:

[...] not one who asked charity was turned away from his door unrelieved. This was not because he was unwilling to give himself the trouble of selecting the objects of his alms, and discriminating the truly needy from the lazy and the liar [...]. But it was thus generally diffusive, because (as he sometimes said) he would rather relieve two impostors, than leave one fit object of compassion unrelieved, and because he wished to have all his family accustomed to commiserate distress.<sup>94</sup>

While it is beyond question that many of the more prosperous Methodists were generous supporters of the cause, their motives were not always simple benevolence. Thus, James Norton, a builder and the newly-appointed steward of Filby chapel in Norfolk, which opened in 1811, made the following proud entry on the first page of the accounts: "I James Norton gave 23 thousand bricks 2 loads marl and about 8 loads paving stones—and also the Pulpit cushion—and my team carting—in all I consider I have given about £70—towards the Filby Chapel. May GOD prosper the work and grant that we may all live in peace and unity [...]."<sup>95</sup>

That said, Wesley's concern that a love of money might distract and divert remained widely shared. As the Methodist apologist Disney Alexander wrote in 1796: "The Scripture represents riches as a great obstacle to the kingdom of God, and the reason appears to be that they are apt to create in us too strong an attachment to the things of time and sense, and on this account render us less anxious about our spiritual

---

<sup>93</sup> *Minutes of the Methodist Conferences [...]*, vol. V, London 1825, 132-46, 179-98.

<sup>94</sup> 'Middleton obituary', 213.

<sup>95</sup> Norfolk Record Office, FC16/120, 'Filby Methodist Chapel Stewards' Accounts (1811-1838)'.

and eternal welfare. Riches are either a blessing or a curse, according to the use made of them.”<sup>96</sup>

One could see in this the inevitable mutation of the original close-knit Wesleyan *Gemeinschaft* into a larger-scale and monetised *Gesellschaft*.<sup>97</sup> Indeed, sometimes an explicit clash between ‘old’ and ‘new’ Methodist values surfaced, as in the dispute over the production of the first authorised biography of John Wesley. John Whitehead (1740-1804), the would-be author, suggested that this should be marketed on a profit-sharing arrangement, a proposal which shocked the leading preacher William Thompson (1733-99): “I abhorred and detested it, as being contrary to the Design and Will of our late Father Mr. Wesley. [...] Mr. Wesley left the profits of his Books and Manuscripts for the propagation of the Gospel. But this proposal would have divided the profit arising from the Life between the Preachers and Dr. Whitehead.”<sup>98</sup>

But by the early nineteenth century, and although there were local pockets of largely unchanged practice, in general Wesleyan Methodism had moved from a loose association of local religious societies, meeting in private houses, and linked by wandering mendicant preachers, to a highly regulated nationwide organisation with a large salaried staff and an estate of over 1,000 buildings, some quite splendid. These developments had been made possible by an increasingly intimate—though principled—engagement with the world of trade, commerce and finance, an approach found more widely amongst contemporary Evangelicals.<sup>99</sup> That engagement, as Milburn has noted, included even the format of the official Wesleyan diary: “Each week of the year [...] is allotted a double-page spread – on the left a diary page, headed by a biblical text and a verse of a hymn, and opposite a page

---

<sup>96</sup> D. Alexander, ‘Letter III: Reasons for Methodism’, in: *Arminian Magazine*, XIX (1796), 372-73.

<sup>97</sup> The terms were first defined in F. Tönnies, *Community and Civil Society*, Cambridge 2001 (first published 1887).

<sup>98</sup> W. Thompson, *An Exhortation Delivered to the Methodist Society, in the New-Chapel City-Road, London: By Mr. William Thompson, on Sunday Evening, Feb. 17 1793*, London 1793, 4.

<sup>99</sup> See, for example, M.A. Noll, ‘Protestant Reasoning about Money and the Economy, 1790-1860: A Preliminary Probe’, in: M.A. Noll (ed.), *God and Mammon*, Oxford 2002, 265-94.

ruled in columns for weekly cash accounting. Piety on the left, profit on the right!”<sup>100</sup>

In 1735, in the infancy of Methodism, Charles Wesley preached a sermon on I Kings 18 vs. 21: “And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God follow him: but if Baal, then follow him.”<sup>101</sup> Charles built on this text the familiar argument—as found in Matthew 6 vs. 24—that ‘no man can serve two masters’. He especially criticised the businessman or ‘man of the world’ who: “[...] taketh more pains to get an estate in the world, than to lay up for himself a treasure in heaven. Else how should we see the same man conscientious in church and knavish behind his counter?”<sup>102</sup>

I would argue, however, that the Wesleys’ Methodism flourished precisely because it did allow people to serve two masters, both God and Mammon. Neither John nor Charles Wesley practised apostolic poverty; John in particular embraced the market: he constantly solicited financial support from wealthy sympathisers, gave his preachers financial incentives to sell Book Room publications, and at the very least turned a blind eye to a commercial model for chapel construction which in several key respects directly challenged his professed core values. It was, in short, all rather messy; but perhaps, in accepting that messiness as the price for survival and for continuing to do good in the world for nigh on three centuries, John and Charles Wesley and their colleagues and successors chose well.

## Summary

This article discusses the attitudes towards money held by John Wesley and his Methodist colleagues. Their movement began with a model of apostolic simplicity of life, but although this proved unsustainable, the early Methodists remained cautious in their approach to money. They retained a strong sense of stewardship in handling money, a stated preference for reliance on God’s Providence rather than on financial planning or saving, eagerness to put surplus cash quickly to good use, and suspicion of the desire for material wealth. As the

---

<sup>100</sup> G.E. Milburn, ‘Piety, Profit and Paternalism: Methodists in business in the North-East of England, c.1760-1920’, in: *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, vol. XLIV, Chester 1983, 45-92, here 45-6.

<sup>101</sup> King James Version: the wording used in the sermon differs slightly. The sermon can be found in K.G.C. Newport, *The Sermons of Charles Wesley*, Oxford 2001, 110-22.

<sup>102</sup> Newport, *The Sermons of Charles Wesley*, 113.

movement expanded and acquired responsibilities for staff and their families, and for property, however, it was forced increasingly to engage with the financial and business world to finance its mission. For example, Methodists used debt to finance chapel construction, the movement's publishing operation became increasingly commercial, and preachers acquired salaries and pensions. Under such pressures, the movement's attitudes changed in some respects, and tensions between 'old' and 'new' values surfaced. While the leadership remained anxious to use money well and to dampen down individuals' desires for wealth, Wesley's Methodists adopted sophisticated systems of financial management, drew frequently upon the financial support of the rich and successful, and came increasingly to accept and indeed appreciate many aspects of the vibrant market economy of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Dr. Clive Murray Norris  
Research Fellow, Oxford Centre for Methodism and Church History, Oxford Brookes  
University  
[cnorris@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:cnorris@brookes.ac.uk)

## From Communal Economy to Economic Community

### Changes in Moravian Entrepreneurial Activities in the Eighteenth Century<sup>1</sup>

*Christina Petterson*

#### Introduction

One of the most entrepreneurial religious groups of the eighteenth century were the Moravian Brethren (Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine). From modest beginnings on Count Zinzendorf's estate in Herrnhut, Saxony where a group of religious refugees arrived in 1722, they rose to become a worldwide missionary movement with stations and outposts from Greenland to the Cape, and from North America to Australia. What they lacked in numbers, they made up for in willpower, mobility, and above all, an uncanny ability to anticipate and capitalise on global economic developments. This success of course did also not develop overnight but was in the making for decades.

In this article, I will focus on the Moravians' economic practices in three different locations; namely, in relation to their early mission to Greenland in 1733, to their beginnings in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania (1741), and in the foundation of one of their later settlements in Christiansfeld, Denmark in 1772. As the title indicates, a change takes place in Moravian economic practice, which I argue is connected to their respective local contexts. The change, or development, is thus both slow and experimental, which is a process that is sometimes lost in summaries of Moravian entrepreneurship, as in the following quote from Gisela Mettele's important work on the global nature of Moravian Protestantism:

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on a conference paper at the conference 'What Would Jesus Fund?: Financing Religious Enterprises in the Long Eighteenth Century', organized by Renate Dürr and Lionel Laborie, and held at Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, 9-10 February 2017. The paper has been revised for this journal issue. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer and the journal editors for constructive criticism which helped improve a rather untidy argument.

the economic development of the Moravian Brethren was subordinate the planning and governance of the community leadership. With the missionary spread of the Moravian Brethren from the 1730s, it was no longer only about ensuring the economic survival of the individual settlements, but also about the financing and organisation of a worldwide mission and evangelisation-campaign.<sup>2</sup>

One could get the impression that the worldwide mission was organised and centrally financed, which it eventually was, beginning in 1762. Before then, it was a much more ad hoc affair, with actual instructions for missionaries only produced by Zinzendorf in 1738 and 1740,<sup>3</sup> six and eight years after the first missions to the West Indies, and five and seven years after the first mission to Greenland. These are the years under scrutiny here in this article.

I will begin by looking at the early years in Greenland, and from there jumping 40 years ahead in time to the industrious nature of Christiansfeld. Then, I finish off in Bethlehem, since important developments took place there. The developments in Bethlehem can help clarify the extreme polarity between Greenland and Christiansfeld. My focus will be on the development of the choir-system as a mode of socio-economic organisation. Beginning in Herrnhut in the 1740s, the Moravian choir-structure became the main community organisation of the various congregations all over Europe and in some colonial settings, and was based on a segregation of the sexes, and subdivisions according to sexual maturity. One of the important effects of this structure and its dwellings was a significant workforce, which had an extraordinary effect of the productivity of the communities, and, I argue, was what gave them their economic edge and advantage in particular settings.

---

<sup>2</sup> “Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Brüdergemeine unterstand der Planung und Lenkung durch die Gemeinleitung. Mit der missionarischen Ausbreitung der Brüdergemeine ab den 1730er Jahren ging es dabei nicht mehr nur um die Sicherung des wirtschaftlichen Überlebens einzelner Siedlungen, sondern auch um die Finanzierung und Organisation einer weltweiten Missions- und Evangelisationskampagne.“ Gisela Mettele, *Weltbürgertum oder Gottesreich: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine als globale Gemeinschaft 1727-1857*, Göttingen 2009, 65, my translation.

<sup>3</sup> Jan Hüsken, *Mission und Sklaverei: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine und die Sklavenemanzipation in Britisch- Und Dänisch-Westindien*, Missiongeschichtliche Archiv 25, Stuttgart 2016, 32.

While Mettele argues for a trans-historical approach, which looks at the globalized network of the worldwide Moravian community, I want to balance this with a more local approach, by looking at a number of different communities. This local approach along with my focus on the Choir-structure, is part of my interest in the Moravians as participants in the transition to capitalism, and their shift to a more centralised and abstracted economy. The locations are chosen to highlight this shift in industry. The mission to Greenland was at an early stage, before the choirs, but also in a country with little scope for industrious development. Then in Christiansfeld, which was a settlement, not a mission, they raced ahead with tremendous zeal, establishing a host of industries within a very short time frame. To understand this transition, I turn to Bethlehem, which began as a mission, but became a settlement with the turn from communal to private economy.

I use both archival material and secondary material to present the argument here.<sup>4</sup> In the case of Greenland, very little work has been done on the Moravian mission, which necessitates making use of archival material. In the cases of Bethlehem and Christiansfeld, more work has been done with economic focus, thus enabling me to draw upon this work to present the argument. In short, I present the early attempts at Moravian entrepreneurship and labour in different settings to understand the conditions of the time before the Moravian church commenced centralised financial planning.

## Greenland<sup>5</sup>

The Moravian Mission to Greenland was, as was the case with the West Indian mission, the results of Zinzendorf's connections with the Danish

---

<sup>4</sup> The archival material is from the Moravian Archives in Herrnhut, prefaced by UA followed by the archival reference number. I mention the archival material from Bethlehem and Christiansfeld in footnotes 41 and 42 respectively. These collections have their own referencing system, as may be seen in the mentioned footnotes.

<sup>5</sup> There is not much material on the Moravians in Greenland, especially in regards to the eighteenth century. Exceptions include Heinz Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo im 18. Jahrhundert*, Abhandlungen Und Berichte Des Staatlichen Museums Für Völkerkunde Dresden, Berlin 1969; Inge Kleivan, 'Herrnhuterne eller Brødreminigheden i Grønland 1733-1900', in: *Tidsskriftet Grønland*, 8 (1983), 221-235; Henrik Wilhelm, "'Menneske først og kristen så?'" En vinkel på missionshistorien i Vestgrønland', in: *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 1 (2005), 1-20.

court. Through these connections, the Moravians gained access to the Danish colonies in the Caribbean and North Atlantic. Likewise, through Josef Spangenberg's connections in the Netherlands access was gained to Surinam, and Zinzendorf's cultivation of networks in England opened up possibilities in North America, first Georgia, and then Pennsylvania.<sup>6</sup>

Before the financing of a worldwide mission, the missionaries in the early eighteenth century were expected by the leadership in Herrnhut to enter into the forms of subsistence in various locations and to earn their bread through labour. This had different repercussions in the various locations in which they arrived. As Jan Hüsgen notes, "the economic activities in the missionary territory could develop quite differently depending on the respective geographical, climate-related, personal and political factors." In Labrador, this meant trade; in Surinam, bakery and agriculture.<sup>7</sup> It also depended on with whom they identified. In the West Indies, they entered into the plantation enterprise. Initially (1733) they managed plantations for Head Chamberlain von Plessen,<sup>8</sup> and later turned to using slaves to create an income in their own plantations.<sup>9</sup>

Hüsgen mentions that multiple problems faced the first missionaries in the West Indies, in that the social and political conditions impeded not only access to the slaves, but also their possibilities for subsistence survival.<sup>10</sup> The unrest among the enslaved population of the Caribbean meant that the colonial powers regarded the Moravian missionary activities among the slaves with suspicion. Walking this political tightrope was not the main issue in Greenland, however. Here, the possibilities for labour and subsistence were few. There was no wood to build houses,<sup>11</sup> no soil to till, no animals to herd. In the beginning, the

---

<sup>6</sup> Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, 31.

<sup>7</sup> "Die ökonomischen Aktivitäten im Missionsgebiet konnten sich abhängig von den jeweiligen geographischen, klimatischen personellen und politischen Faktoren ganz unterschiedlich entwickeln." Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, 44, my translation.

<sup>8</sup> Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, 44, n94.

<sup>9</sup> Apart from Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, see Jon F. Sensbach, *A Seperate Canaan: The Making of an Afro-Moravian World in North Carolina*, Chapel Hill 1998.

<sup>10</sup> Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, 41.

<sup>11</sup> However, there was driftwood, and we hear of many expeditions to collect wood. See the Greenland diary (UA.R.15.J.b.l.1a), 18 August 1733, 9 September 1733, and 3 June 1734. Also, the Danish missionary Hans Egede sent a small boat and some sailors to

missionaries relied on food gifts, such as reindeer and seal from the Danish missionaries and the Greenlanders,<sup>12</sup> supplies and the occasional gifts from benefactors in Europe, and whatever they could make as day-labourers, working as carpenters at the Danish colonies.<sup>13</sup> Also, they took up spinning,<sup>14</sup> and an account page from 1742 shows that they sold the products back to Herrnhut—certainly an extreme geographical expansion of the putting-out system.<sup>15</sup> Because most of the Moravian missionaries were peasants and artisans, the transition to hunting for food at sea in kayaks would have been brutal and dangerous.<sup>16</sup> Some of them did accompany the Danish missionary's son, Paul Egede, on

assist the brethren on a wood expedition on 23 August 1733, after their failed attempt a few days earlier, where they lost their boat and the wood they had collected in a storm. The boat was retrieved by some Greenlandic men from the colony. Finally, much wood was shipped from Europe to build their houses.

<sup>12</sup> The first year shows multiple food gifts from Hans Egede, the Danish missionary. See UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, 20 August 1733, reindeer meat and “kolkraut”; 5 and 20 September, 4 October, 19 December 1733, reindeer meat; 7 October 1733 he sent liver sausages, on 21 October 1733 some pork, 28 October 1733 and 20 December 1733 he sent beer, on the 21 and 30 December he sent ham. 30 January he sent a bit of milk and 2 birds, on 15 February he sent milk and fish and 1 May 1734 he sent a piece of fish. 12 April 1734 constitutes an exception in that it is mentioned that they bought food from Egede. He also sent a number of other things, coal and laths for their house (UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, 24 September 1733).

<sup>13</sup> On 5 August 1733 two of the brothers were hired to build the house for blubber storage at the Danish colony, a task they finished in 4 and a half days to everyone's astonishment, not least their own. On 21 June 1734 Christian David travelled with the Danish ship up north to help build the second Danish colony of Christianshaab in Disco Bay. UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, on 5 August 1733 and 21 June 1734.

<sup>14</sup> The first mention of spinning is made in November, when they complain about how weak and ill they are, and that they can't even spin. UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, 7 November 1733. Then, on 5 December 1733, they begin to spin, after feeling a bit better. In 1734, there are frequent mentions of quiet evenings with the distaffs “Spinrocken”. See UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 January, 18, 19, and 20 February 1734.

<sup>15</sup> UA.R.15. J.b.I. 32, 5. It is noted that in 1742 they had produced 13 pounds of flax, and 37 pounds of tow.

<sup>16</sup> The diarist notes that “no German can emulate this, since one cannot catch seals except in those boats that they have” (“das kan ihnen aber kein Teütscher ihnen nach thun, den die Seehunde kan nicht fangen ausser solchen botten wie sie haben”). UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, 7 August 1733. However, on 12 March 1734, two sailors from the colony offered to sell the brethren a kayak, or “*manßbot*”. UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, 12 March 1734.

hunting trips,<sup>17</sup> and in time, they did get better at fishing. When the second mission, Lichtenfels, was established in 1758, the missionaries there discovered how to trap and kill seals in a small bay near the station. They were then able to sell 3-4 barrels of seal-blubber to the merchant. Their satisfaction at this accomplishment in the diary was obvious. Not until 1770 was a fixed ration of food from Europe guaranteed. Thus 'financing the mission' meant sending provisions (food, wood, tools, clothes), gifts, and encouraging letters, but not providing salaries to the missionaries.

In Neuherrnhut (New Herrnhut), as they had named the mission station on the outskirts of the Danish colony of Godthaab, things changed after 1736, when the missionary group had grown. Christian David,<sup>18</sup> head of the Moravian mission to Greenland, returned to Europe, after two additional brothers had arrived in 1734, and in 1736, one brother and three sisters arrived. As Müller notes, this domestic reinforcement meant that the brethren were freer to attend to missionary activities.<sup>19</sup> This would be practiced at a far larger scale in Bethlehem. Another significant milestone was the conversion and baptism of the first convert, Samuel, formerly known as Qajarnaq along with his wife and two children on 30 March, 1739. After this, the native congregation steadily grew, and in 1743 counted 93 members, which in 1749 had grown to 268 members.<sup>20</sup>

One of these converts, the single sister Judith Issek, was one of a group of 5 Greenlanders who travelled to Europe in 1747. She, and two younger members of the group returned to Neuherrnhut in 1749. During her stay in Herrnhut, Judith had stayed in the house of the Single Sisters and been part of the Choir of the Single Sisters, and wanted to introduce these concepts to the Greenlandic congregation.

---

<sup>17</sup> See UA.R.15.J.b.I.1a, September 17 1733 and August 1 1734.

<sup>18</sup> Christian David, a carpenter, was one of the first group of refugees to land on Zinzendorf's doorstep. He was regarded as a strong spiritual leader within the ethnic Moravian fraction of the early community in Herrnhut. Because of his strong personality, he did not get along with Zinzendorf. For a fairly recent biography, see Edita Sterik, *Christian David 1692-1751: Ein Lebensbild des Gründers von Herrnhut und Mitbegründers der erneuerten Brüderunität*, Herrnhut 2012.

<sup>19</sup> Karl Müller, *200 Jahre Brüdermission: Das Erste Missionsjahrhundert*, vol. 1, Herrnhut 1931, 130.

<sup>20</sup> Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 179, appendix 1.

## The Choir System

### Greenland

In his book on the Herrnuter mission to Greenland, Heinz Israel notes that it would take 15 years from the institutionalisation of this choir-system in Herrnhut to reach Greenland.<sup>21</sup> This assertion contains a popular assumption that we need to dispel. Israel assumes that the choir system began 15 years earlier, that is, in 1730, when ‘the young women united together into a ‘choir’, the choir of the Single Sisters’.<sup>22</sup> Following Otto Uttendörfer’s study into the economic life of Herrnhut, Israel states that up until now (1744), the choir structure had ‘until now, not exercised any cataclysmic effect on the social relations of Herrnhut’,<sup>23</sup> but that the decision of the leadership to strengthen the gender segregation meant a more invasive community arrangement.

The problem with this narrative is, that it rests upon a number of misconceptions. First, the ‘*Banden*’ and ‘*Gesellschaften*’ (groups and associations) of early Herrnhut (1727-1740) were a completely different mode of organisation than the choirs, as Gottfried Schmidt has shown in his analysis.<sup>24</sup> One is voluntary and fluid (i.e. *Banden*) and the other is hierarchical and rigid (Choirs).<sup>25</sup> Schmidt argues that 1736 was a turning point in the role of the *Banden*, and that the use of the term declines from here, which is connected to the banishment of Zinzendorf from Saxony.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, as I have shown in my archival work of the

---

<sup>21</sup> “Nachdem die Gründung von „Chören“ in der Heimat der Brüdermissionare zur ständigen Einrichtung geworden war, vergingen fünfzehn Jahre, bis sich in Grönland der Chorgedanke durchsetzte”, Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 42-43.

<sup>22</sup> Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 41.

<sup>23</sup> “noch keinen umwälzenden Einfluß auf die sozialen Verhältnisse Herrnhuts ausgeübt”, Otto Uttendörfer, *Wirtschaftsgeist und Wirtschaftsorganisation Herrnhuts und der Brüdergemeine von 1743 bis zum Ende des Jahrhunderts*, Herrnhut 1926, 189, quoted in Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 41.

<sup>24</sup> Gottfried Schmidt, ‘Die Banden oder Gesellschaften in Alten Herrnhut’, in: *Zeitschrift für Brüdergeschichte* 3 (1909), 145-207.

<sup>25</sup> Schmidt, ‘Die Banden oder Gesellschaften in Alten Herrnhut’, 204.

<sup>26</sup> Schmidt, ‘Die Banden oder Gesellschaften in Alten Herrnhut’, 192. Israel cites Schmidt for the point on Zinzendorf’s banishment. But where Schmidt is saying that the banishment meant a decline in the use of the *Banden*, Israel interprets it to mean that

Herrnhut diaries, the use of choir in any “common” sense does not happen before 1742, and any consolidation in terms of overarching structure, symbolic value, and commemorative days, is not before 1744.<sup>27</sup>

The house that was built in Herrnhut for the single brothers in 1739 and taken into use in 1740, was expanded considerably in 1745 to make room for the various trades, which moved into separate rooms in October 1745. As Israel points out, one development of the choir-idea is the production of a trade enterprise within the Brothers’ house.<sup>28</sup> The choirs and their houses were thus economic structures as well as units of faith and gendered devotion. They also functioned as a way of breaking with traditional household and kinship structures, redefining both to a more communal and largescale concept. This is their socio-economic function, in that this breaking down of traditional structures and the development of alternatives, echoed the movement of the emerging state structure and its redefined ideas of gender relations and family.

So, to return to Greenland, the first time we find “choir” mentioned in the Greenlandic diary is on 14 August 1745, when the first choir-communion took place.<sup>29</sup> After Judith’s return to Greenland in 1749 the first choir-house was built there for the single sisters. The brothers’ house was built in 1753 and, several years later, the widows’

---

it meant the beginning of the use of the more common term Choir. Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 40.

<sup>27</sup> I argue this in a larger monograph on Herrnhut and the Choirs based on archival sources from 1740-60. The book is under contract for Brill’s Historical Materialism series and is near completion.

<sup>28</sup> Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 41.

<sup>29</sup> UA.R.15.J.b.I.1b, “14 August we further had a Lovefeast and our first choir communion” (“14ten [August] hatten wir wieder ein Liebesmal und unser Erstes Cor Abendmal”) It seems that this was only for the missionaries. In his article on the Moravians in Greenland, Preben Andersen notes that the first communion was in 1747 with three Greenlanders, Preben Andersen, ‘Herrnhuterne i Grønland’, in: *Tidsskriftet Grønland*, 2 (1969), 50-64, here 58. Upon further investigation, the diary tells that it was decided by lot on 25 October 1747, and then held on 28 October. Israel indicates that 3 August marks the first mention of the choirs, when it is noted that “Simon und Sarah bey einer künftigen Gemein ein richtung vorsteher sein sollen” (“Simon and Sarah were to be leaders in a future community arrangement”). Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 43.

house (and then also big girls and big boys houses).<sup>30</sup> The pattern of living overlapped to some extent with traditional Greenlandic ways, in that it was normal for extended families and larger groups to live together, in order to share maintenance of equipment, hunt and the subsequent sharing, consuming, and storage of game during winter.<sup>31</sup> However, in contrast to the Greenlanders' longhouses, the choir-houses were not seasonal, but permanent. They were also bigger than was the custom in Greenland. Finally, the segregation of sexes was unusual in a Greenlandic context. Both Wilhjelm and Kleivan note, in passing, that the Moravians attempted to implement European style choir houses in Greenland, but that these houses were quickly abandoned because of their massive disruption to the traditional way of life in Greenland (Kleivan) and problems relating to trade and sexual behaviour (Wihjelm).<sup>32</sup>

The choirs, then, replaced the traditional community structures in hunting, gathering and fishing, and as such could be seen as an extension of the subsistence shared economy of the traditional Greenlanders. Also, the gender relations in respect to work did not shift much in the eighteenth century.<sup>33</sup> What did change were the settlement practices, in that the tendency for the Moravian Greenlanders was to settle near the station. Before the advent of the Moravian missionaries, there had been arguments between the Danish missionaries from the Lutheran church, and the merchants. While the missionaries wanted to keep the Greenlanders close, to keep an eye on their converts, the merchants wanted them to carry on with their hunting, and thus wanted the Greenlanders dispersed, so that the profits would be bigger.<sup>34</sup> Because of the Danish mission's dependency on the trade, the

---

<sup>30</sup> Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 43-44.

<sup>31</sup> Robert Petersen, 'Some Considerations Concerning the Greenlandic Longhouse', in: *Folk*, 16-17 (1974), 171-188.

<sup>32</sup> Kleivan, 'Herrnhuterne eller Brødremenigheden i Grønland 1733-1900', 228-29. Wilhjelm, 'Menneske først og kristen så', 3. In another article on the surrender of the Moravian mission in Greenland in 1900, Wilhjelm more accurately notes that this practice was discontinued after 'some decades': 'Brødremissionens Overgivelse', in: *Tidsskriftet Grønland*, 6-7 (2000), 203-244, here 207.

<sup>33</sup> Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 73.

<sup>34</sup> Christina Petterson, *The Missionary, the Catechist and the Hunter: Foucault, Protestantism and Colonialism*, Warren Goldstein, Leiden 2014, 93-94.

missionaries had to yield. The Moravian missionaries, however, were not beholden to the trade for their own mission, and thus keenly kept their converts close, which meant a high concentration of people in one spot in wintertime. The Danish trading company was not entirely impressed with these close-knit communities and their internal distribution, which they saw as cutting in on their profits. They finally managed, in 1777, to get a royal decree which forced the Moravians to disperse the populations of Moravian Greenlanders. Even though they achieved this,<sup>35</sup> the Moravians maintained the choir houses. Due to other problems,<sup>36</sup> these were eventually discontinued in 1783, although the choirs as church groups continued until the general dissolution of the choir-structure in the course of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>37</sup> In the eighteenth century, then, the Choirs were never only dwelling patterns, but economic structures.

The choir-houses in Greenland did not have the same economic function as the choir houses in Europe did, since they did not contain industries, as the Single Brothers' House in Herrnhut mentioned above. Nor were they places for work as such. Nevertheless, they did serve as units of production, albeit production as understood on Greenlandic terms and bearing the character of subsistence survival. While these houses were not successful in implementing European labour standards among the Greenlandic population, they influenced the socio-economic pattern of life for the Greenlanders in that they contributed to the change in dwelling patterns by concentrating hitherto unseen quantities

---

<sup>35</sup> See Appendix in Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, where he lists the various outposts and their populations. See also UA. R.15.J.a.17, 7 which is the response to the royal order from the Unity on 12 May 1777, in which Johann Friedrich Koeber assures obedience to the order. He also signals that he knows that the order is made at the request of the merchants, but because it comes from the king, and the Moravians recognise the king's sovereignty over Greenland, they will obey.

<sup>36</sup> Israel mentions that the Unity board early had reservations regarding the choirhouses. The Greenlandic winterhouses, which provided the model for the Greenlandic choirhouse were built to make the most of body heat. They were thus not big, and the Greenlanders slept closely together. It was estimated that six to eight barrels of blubber was needed to heat the large brothers' house, and in the end, the brothers and boys moved out of the choirhouse and into the family houses instead. Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 46-47.

<sup>37</sup> Israel, *Kulturwandel Grönländischer Eskimo*, 47.

of people in several places, and by creating new forms of social relations, replacing the traditional Greenlandic ones.

### Christiansfeld<sup>38</sup>

In 1771, the Danish minister of finance, Carl August Struensee, approached the the Unity Board in Herrnhut and invited the board to build a settlement in the duchy of Schleswig. Struensee had been to a number of the Moravian towns in Europe, and had noted the entrepreneurial and industrious nature of the communities (especially Zeist). After negotiations between the Danish government and the unity, a concession was signed in December 1771. A couple of months earlier, the Unity Board had bought the estate of Tyrstrupgaard as the site on which to settle. The new government, on 13 August 1772, ratified the concession, and building commenced the following year.<sup>39</sup>

Christiansfeld was also built according to the Choir system, and still has well-preserved Brothers', Sisters', and Widows' Houses to this day.<sup>40</sup> The choir house pattern had two significant repercussions. First, this cohabitation of many single brothers and sisters in respective houses meant that it was possible to cultivate a gender-specific piety. Since the consolidation of the Choir structure in the early 1740s, choir-speeches had been a regular way of shaping the pious and gendered individuals. From the mid-1740s until his death in 1760, Zinzendorf used the more than 450 choir-speeches to articulate the relationship of the individual members to Jesus, as well as the relationship between Jesus and the

---

<sup>38</sup> There is not much scholarly literature on Christiansfeld. Exceptions include Jens Holdt, 'Brødrekolonien Christiansfeld Indtil Aar 1800', in: *Sønderjyske Årbøger*, 1 (1940), 54-186; Anders Pontoppidan-Thyssen, 'Brødremenigheden i Christiansfeld og Herrnhutismen i Jylland til o. 1815', in: *De Ældre Jyske Vækkelser*, Anders Pontoppidan-Thyssen (ed.), *Vækkelsernes Frembrud i Danmark i Første Halvdel Af Det 19. Århundrede*, Copenhagen 1967, 11-175. The most substantial work so far is the Danish anthology edited by Anders Pontoppidan Thyssen, *Herrnhuter-Samfundet i Christiansfeld*, 2 vols., Åbenrå 1984, and the most recent is Hanne Sanders, 'Herrnhutisme i Danmark-Et Religiøst Og Globalt Fænomen', in: Christer Ahlberger and Per von Wachenfeldt (eds.), *Den Glömda Kyrkan: Om Herrnhutismen i Skandinavien*, Skellefteå 2016, 29-59.

<sup>39</sup> Anders Pontoppidan Thyssen, 'Det store og det lille Herrnhutersamfund', in: idem, *Herrnhuter-Samfundet i Christiansfeld*, vol. 1, 11-101, here 42-43.

<sup>40</sup> Earning it a place on UNESCO's World Heritage List in 2015.

various choirs.<sup>41</sup> These speeches were (edited and) copied and sent out to various congregations.<sup>42</sup> Bundles of choir speeches from the 1750s and 60s are found in Christiansfeld's archives.<sup>43</sup>

The second reason why the choir-houses were important is that they provided innovative opportunities for production. Because of the size of the Choir-house, the community could, at a very early stage, make the most of the putting out-system *Verlagssystem* (for example spinning in individual households), turning cottage-industry into larger industries (relative to general economic development).<sup>44</sup> This enabled the Moravian communities to compete with the guilds and traditional workshop structures of masters and apprentices. After a series of start-up difficulties in Herrnhut, the brothers, and especially the sisters, learned to produce exquisite products. From the 1750s onward, entrepreneurship, product quality, and fixed prices became Moravian characteristics.<sup>45</sup> Also in Christiansfeld where the leadership had received a ten year tax exemption, a huge flourishing of production in the town took place, such as wool- and cotton spinning, linen-weaving, sewing workshop and silk production in the Sister House, and the bakery, tannery, blacksmith and glassworks in the Brother House.<sup>46</sup>

As Danish social historian, Thomas Bloch Ravn, has shown, the industrious nature of the Moravian community in Christiansfeld had a

---

<sup>41</sup> This is explored more fully in my forthcoming monograph on Herrnhut.

<sup>42</sup> See for example the Bethlehem diary records readings of Zinzendorf's speeches. See e.g. the diary of the Single Sisters' choir (BethSS) under 23 May 1758, which reads (in German): "Br Petrus read us a wonderful choir-speech of the dear Jünger". Also, on the 21 April 1761 we hear that they were read "our unforgettable Jünger's last choir-speech from the 24<sup>th</sup> April 1760".

<sup>43</sup> Brotherhouse Archive (BA.I.R6), Sisterhouse Archive (SA.I.R5), and in the Preachers' Archive (PA.II.R4.5). All from Christiansfeld.

<sup>44</sup> See for example, the entry from the communal diary from Herrnhut on 27 April 1742, where it is noted that "count Pomnitz sent a wagon with flax, which should be spun and prepared here", UA.R.A.b.15, 27 April.

<sup>45</sup> See Guntram Philipp, 'Wirtschaftsethik und Wirtschaftspraxis in der Geschichte der Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine', in: Mari P. van Buijtenen, Cornelis Dekker and Huib Leeuwenberg (eds.), *Unitas Fratrum: Herrnhuter Studien*, Utrecht 1975, 401-463, here 408-09.

<sup>46</sup> Hans Holck, *De Kongelige Danske Rigers og Fyrstendømmers Stats- og Handelsspejl for Aar 1780*, København 1780, 415, quoted in Thomas Bloch Ravn, 'Håndværk og Fabrikvirksomhed', in: Pontoppidan-Thyssen (ed), *Herrnhuter-Samfundet i Christiansfeld*, vol. 1, 143-273, here 155.

significant impact, not only in the area and the close townships, but in the entire kingdom up until 1864.<sup>47</sup> The invitation from Struensee to the Unity board had been an attempt at a different approach to encouraging industrial activity. Instead of the usual practice, which was to provide subsidies to aspiring entrepreneurs, Struensee decided to foster industry through privileges and concessions, and thus create the best conditions for industry in which to flourish, such as tax exemptions, freedom of trade (*Gewerbefreiheit*), ten percent reimbursement on all new building activity, exemption from tolls, and a license, not only to import raw materials from abroad, but also in their distribution from the duchy of Schleswig to Denmark and to other areas. Some of these privileges were rolled back after 10 or 15 years, others were subsequently granted by law to the tradespeople and merchant in the rest of the kingdom.<sup>48</sup>

This meant that at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Christiansfeld had the same level of trade and economic life as the bigger towns in the kingdom in terms of range of professions and size of its industries.

In the lists of the choirs, we see the variation in industry in Christiansfeld in the two big choirs. Of the 95 members of the Single Brothers' choir, we have 10 tailors, 10 shoemakers, 9 weavers, 6 carpenters, 5 soap boilers, 4 metalworkers, 3 tanners, 3 brewers, 2 potters, 2 bricklayers, 2 bakers, 2 tobacco workers, 2 dyers. Added to these the choir-specific tasks such as kitchen help, children workers etc. Of the 172 members of the Single Sisters' choir, 36 are in service, 19 spinners, 14 seamstresses, 10 dressmakers, 10 laundresses, 8 knitters, 7 weavers, 6 carders, 5 glovemakers, 4 ribbon makers, 2 corset makers, and then come the choir-related tasks.<sup>49</sup>

The reasons for their success were threefold, thus Ravn. First, at this time Christiansfeld had several professions represented that were not present in the neighbouring town of Haderslev, which had 4 times the inhabitants of Christiansfeld. The professions included linen weaving,

---

<sup>47</sup> The second Danish-Prussian war after which the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were cede by Denmark at the negotiations in Vienna. Mads Daugbjerg, *Borders of Belonging: Experiencing History, War and Nation at a Danish Heritage Site*, New York 2014, 17-24.

<sup>48</sup> Ravn, 'Håndværk og Fabrikvirksomhed', 147-48.

<sup>49</sup> These lists are reprinted in Pontoppidan-Thyssen, 'Brødremenigheden i Christiansfeld', 67.

stocking and ribbon weaving, starch production, soap- and candle production and confectionery (i.e. the famous Christiansfeld honey cakes). Turning to the size of the industries, and again in comparison with Haderslev, the average number of apprentices per master was 1.4, while in Christiansfeld it was 2.8 with considerable differences within the various trades. A master of carpentry in Christiansfeld would have had, on average, six apprentices, while in Haderslev he would have had only one.<sup>50</sup> Finally, Ravn notes the market-oriented production of the Moravians. The usual practice of the time was to produce for the local area, but the Moravians produced to quote Ravn “for a larger, more anonymous market, which in principle was insatiable, if one produced the right commodities, as the industries in Christiansfeld apparently did”.<sup>51</sup>

Ravn correctly relates the second point—that of the apprentice to master ratio—to the corrosion of the traditional guild order and its connection to the feudal estate system. With the rise of a market economy and the increase in production, this order was regarded (also by the Moravians) as an impediment to productivity and competition,<sup>52</sup> and was thus expanded and restructured as one of employer/employee.<sup>53</sup> Ravn notes that at levels of economic drive, organisation, and class, the economic life in Christiansfeld broke with the norms and traditions that had characterised tradesmanship, as well as “developed characteristics that clearly pointed towards the capitalist society, which arose in the duchies in the course of the second third of the 19. century”.<sup>54</sup>

I would like to make two additions to this observation. The first relates to Ravn’s observation concerning the anonymous market for which Christiansfeld produced. This is connected to the particular socio-economic situation in which the Moravian Brethren arose; namely, the structure of the Gutsherrschaft, characteristic of Europe east of the Elbe River. This socio-economic formation is distinct from that of Western Europe, in that while the feudal structures continued in form, i.e.

---

<sup>50</sup> Ravn, ‘Håndværk og Fabriksvirksomhed’, 211.

<sup>51</sup> Ravn, ‘Håndværk og Fabriksvirksomhed’, 211-12 (my translation).

<sup>52</sup> See also Philipp, ‘Wirtschaftsethik und Wirtschaftspraxis’, 408-9.

<sup>53</sup> Ravn, ‘Håndværk og Fabriksvirksomhed’, 215-16.

<sup>54</sup> Ravn, ‘Håndværk og Fabriksvirksomhed’, 217 (my translation).

enserved peasants, estates and feudal lords, the market to which the estates produced was the larger market of an emerging global economy.<sup>55</sup> Thus, when the Moravians arrived in Denmark, which at this time still was characterised by some variation of feudalism, they had the very precise know-how of these structures and how best to use them to their advantage, thus providing an unprecedented level of competition to local production.

My second point is to emphasise the role of the choirs in this process. Until 1803 the choir-houses were at the forefront of industry in Christiansfeld. This is an extremely interesting development, because in Herrnhut, in 1745 there was a significant conflict in the community because the elders wanted to move the workshops into the Single Brothers' house and give each trade a separate room, thus separating the apprentices from their masters. The Moravians in Herrnhut were already in conflict with the established guilds because of their practice of bypassing the guild system.<sup>56</sup> However, even though they were not part of the guild system, they had retained the workshop model of master/apprentice up to 1745. . This next level, of separating the apprentices from their masters was regarded as an attack on this structure, or form of traditional workmanship. However, as Gillian Lindt Gollin points out, there was a logic to tying work to the choir-house, in that it firmly binds the economy to the social and religious life of the household.<sup>57</sup>

However, as a description of the Single Brothers' choirhouse from 1748 shows, the move went ahead, and the leader of the Single Brothers' choir could show off the house to the government committee:

through the gallery of one house, where on both sides several large rooms full of skilled craftsmen, shoemakers, linenweavers, cabinetmakers, passementiers, each profession for itself, all fully occupied with work, the rooms incidentally, were very clean and in impeccable order. In the basement of this house is the single brothers' bakery and other arrangements belonging

---

<sup>55</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System 1: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*, Berkeley 2011 [1974], 95.

<sup>56</sup> Philipp, 'Wirtschaftsethik und Wirtschaftspraxis', 409 and 41, n57.

<sup>57</sup> Gillian L. Gollin, *Moravians in Two Worlds: A Study of Changing Communities* New York 1967, 168.

to the household. On the second floor was found several more rather spacious rooms, within which a fair amount of tailors were all fully occupied [... the committee was led through a covered walkway into the other building and gallery] where again on both sides, rooms in which craftsmen of all kinds such as watchmaker, seal-engraver, jeweller, coppersmith, wigmaker, whose cleanly work was especially noticed.<sup>58</sup>

In time, the rest of the world caught up with and overtook the Moravian enterprises. As Müller notes, “In the second half of the nineteenth century, the Brothers’ houses were brought down by the changes in modern economic life”.<sup>59</sup> But for a significant time, the Moravians were at the forefront of industry and manufacture. The most astonishing leap, however, took place in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, where the Brethren made the most of every opportunity that they had.

### Bethlehem

Perhaps due to earlier experiences of the missionaries, the mission of Bethlehem in Pennsylvania was conceptualised differently than that of the mission in the West Indies and in Greenland. Its community structure was entirely based on its missionary activity, divided into a “pilgrim congregation” (*Pilgergemeinde*), the members of which worked as missionaries, and a “house congregation,” which supported their material needs, as outlined in Josef Spangeberg’s “general plan” for

---

<sup>58</sup> “durch die Gallerie des eines Hauses, da auf beiden Seiten etliche große Stuben voll von Professionisten, Schustern, Leinwebern, Tischlern, Posamentieren, jegliche Profession für sich, alle in voller Arbeit sich befanden, die Stuben übrigens selbst ganz reinlich und in untadelhafter Ordnung waren. In dem Souterrain dieses Hauses ist die ledige Brüderbäckerei und andere zur Ökonomie gehörige Anstalten. In der zweiten Etage fanden sich abermals etliche ziemlich geräumige Stuben, darin eine ziemliche Anzahl Schneider, alle in voller Arbeit waren [...] in das andere gebäude und dessen Gallerie [...] da sich wieder auf beiden Seiten Stuben und in denselben Professionisten von allerlei Art als Uhrmacher, Petschierstecher, Juweliere, Kupferschmiede, Perückenmacher befanden, deren reinliche Arbeit besonders bemerkt wurde.” Uttendörfer, *Wirtschaftsgeist Herrnhuts*, 225-26. The archival document (minutes from the meeting of the Brothers’ house, 1748) which Uttendörfer is quoting, is no longer extant.

<sup>59</sup> “In der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts sind die Brüderhäuser den Wandlungen des modernen Wirtschaftslebens erlegen.” Müller, *200 Jahre Brüdermission*, 11, unnumbered footnote.

Bethlehem.<sup>60</sup> One of the points in Spangenberg's plan concerns the choir-structure. He states in point 4, that there shall never (*nie*) be a Sisters' house in Bethlehem, but probably (*wohl aber*) a Brothers' house. Indeed, the Brothers' house was commenced on 30 July, 1744, and dedicated on 6 December that year.<sup>61</sup> When the second Brothers' house was completed in November, 1748, the Sisters took over the former house, which then became the Sisters' house.<sup>62</sup>

This second choir house was built because more room was needed for "large accessions expected from Europe in the course of the following few years, not only for dwelling, dormitory, and chapel, but also for plying the various handicrafts associated with their establishment".<sup>63</sup> Thus we here see the expansion of the Brothers' house to make room for workshops within the house, as was the case in Herrnhut, and would become the case in Christiansfeld.

The five-hundred acres of land that the Moravians initially bought in 1740 had by 1761 been developed with over fifty buildings. Also, over two-thousand acres of land had been cleared and almost fifty smaller industries were up and running.

This scope of entrepreneurial activity is quite impressive. Compared to what was achieved in the first twenty years in Herrnhut and Greenland, this progress is almost staggering. One of the reasons for the dramatic escalation of production in Bethlehem could be that the community was not, as in Herrnhut, encumbered by the class structures and conflicts of the European socio-economic system and the feudal guild system.<sup>64</sup> Nevertheless, there were restrictions, namely English colonial law, which meant that no large-scale industry could take place. In 1752, Zinzendorf had to intercede on behalf of the Bethlehem congregation because of their cloth-factory, which exceeded the limits

---

<sup>60</sup> This 'General plan' for Bethlehem, drawn up on his trip from Europe to America in 1744. A printed summary is found in Joseph Mortimer Levering, *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1741-1892*, Bethlehem 1903, 178-79. The document is at the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem in Spangenberg Papers, Box II, 1a. I would like to thank Tom McCullough for finding, scanning, and sending it to me.

<sup>61</sup> Levering, *A History of Bethlehem*, 173.

<sup>62</sup> Levering, *A History of Bethlehem*, 199.

<sup>63</sup> Levering, *A History of Bethlehem*, 197.

<sup>64</sup> See also Gollin, *Moravians in two Worlds*, 177.

set by English laws.<sup>65</sup> Clearly, the colonial context of Pennsylvania and the nature of the environment provided opportunities not available to the missionaries in Greenland. Perhaps unfamiliarity with the climate, the expenses necessary for expansion, and the constant threat of the Danish Trade played a role, or even the particular personality and drive of missionaries themselves also contributed to the entrepreneurial inefficiency of the Greenlandic mission. In any case, the success of the Greenlandic mission was only in regard to its actual missionary activity, and not in its economic advances. This was different from both Europe and Pennsylvania.

### **To expand or not to expand? Questions in Herrnhut**

These years in Herrnhut are also very interesting, in that in the 1750s, the possibility of large-scale production was discussed intensively. To set the context, we will look at an entry from the Herrnhut Diary from 1741, where part of the entry from 21 August reads:

When we have paid Göbel the current debts, then all should be forgiven and he should be an example to others on debt, and be allowed to move to Berthelsdorf. We want to do something similar with the Hantzchens, as soon as he has sold his house, which is propositioned for Bruder Oertel and his factory.<sup>66</sup>

It turns out that this Bruder Oertel's life in the community provides an interesting insight into the economic practices of early industrialisation in the Moravian community.

According to his *Lebenslauf*, the personal memoir which all members were instructed to compose,<sup>67</sup> he was born in 1714 in Steinkunzendorf in Silesia and worked there as a clothmaker until his conversion experience and subsequent acceptance into the community

---

<sup>65</sup> Hellmuth Erbe, *Bethlehem, Pa: Eine Kommunistische Herrnhuter Kolonie des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1929, 70-71. See also Gollin, *Moravians in two Worlds*, 178.

<sup>66</sup> UA.R.6.Ab.14, 21 August: "Wenn wir dem Göbel die jetzigen Schulden vollige bezahlt haben, so soll ihm alles gelaßen werden v er soll anderen zum Exempel zur Warnung, sich vor dgl Schulden zu hüten, nach Berthelsdorf ziehen. Und so wollen wirs auch mit hantzchens machen, so bald er sein haus verkaufft, welches vor dem led. Br Oertel u seine Fabric in Vorschlage ist."

<sup>67</sup> UA.R.22.109.9 and then also amended and printed in *Nachrichten Aus Der Brüder-Gemeine*, Gnadau 1825, 771-80.

(16 July 1741). Oertel returned to his hometown, was released by his landlord, wrapped up his affairs within four weeks, and left for Herrnhut. He arrived in Herrnhut ready to serve the 'the Saviour' with body and soul, and moved into the Brothers' house immediately on the 16 August 1741. Note that the entry above from the diary mentions plans for him and a for a factory less than a week after his arrival in Herrnhut.

His own wish was to become a missionary, but the community leadership were more interested in his technical knowhow. After a series of events, he was called, in 1754 to Gnadenberg and was assigned the management of the Neusaltzer *fabrique*, which he did until 1759. He left with the rest of the community to Gnadenberg in 1759 (along with his wife, whom he married the previous year) and there established another factory, which prospered. But he did so reluctantly. In 1761 because of Russian expansion, they were all sent to Niesky, where he accompanied his wife and was allowed to stay with her. Then, at express orders, a "Manchester *Fabrik*" was to be established. This he did, but again, not with pleasure. This was to be the last factory that he established; he died in Gnadenberg in 1767 at 53 years old.

The German word for factory is *Fabrik*, which is derived from the French, *fabrique*, which is the spelling used in many of the documents from the Herrnhut archives.<sup>68</sup> At this time the word could be used to signify workshops at all scales, for example those in the Brothers' houses. On the other hand, there are examples of larger scale projects, such as the forty Brothers who work at the factory in Yorkshire, which was mentioned on the synod of the Single Brothers in 1752/3.<sup>69</sup> Also, a quote from Zinzendorf in 1753 shows an even larger scale of production:

That [contact with outsiders] is precisely not my main aversion to the factories, rather, 300 people could live off one factory today, and when the

---

<sup>68</sup> According to Brunner, Conze, and Koselleck's historical dictionary of concepts, the infrequent appearances of *Fabrik* in German in the transition from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century shows a consciousness of the connection to the mercantilist conceptualisation of trade and economic sphere. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur Politisch-Sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, Stuttgart 1997, vol. 2, 231.

<sup>69</sup> Quoted in Uttendörfer, *Wirtschaftsgeist Herrnhuts*, 40. The archival reference is UA.R.2A.32b. Even though this was part of the Brotherhouse archive which is no longer extant, a copy of this has been retrieved from Niesky.

factory is stopped tomorrow, then all the people are without work, and have no bread. The factories have, in my opinion, no golden ground. The brothers and sisters for example in the choirhouses could thereby come in great need.<sup>70</sup>

Zinzendorf was hesitant in regard to the implementation of factories, as the following discussion from the Synod conference in Autumn 1754 shows:

Johannes [von Watteville]: If there is no such factory in Herrnhut now, then the 1200 people who live there now will not easily endure, even Herrnhut could hardly have begun if there hadn't been any wool manufacture.

Jünger [i.e. Zinzendorf]: I have nothing against the manufacture in the hands of the peoples of the world which would rather give work to the brothers rather than others, but I am against manufacture in the hands of the Brothers, because I am afraid that our neighbours will suffer under this. [337]

Johannes [von Watteville]: The people in the land suffer no damage from the Moravian factories.<sup>71</sup>

There were then dissenting voices in regards to factory and work in the Moravian communities. One of these was Friedrich von Watteville, Zinzendorf's close friend and adopted father of the above-mentioned Johannes. In a long appendix to the minutes of the Oberlausitz Provincial Synod, he set forth his argument for removing the apprentices from the

---

<sup>70</sup> "Das just nicht meine Haupt-Aversion vor die Fabriquen; sondern es können heute 300 Menschen von einer Fabrique leben, und wenn die Fabrique morgen gestopt wird, so sind alle Leute ohne Arbeit, und haben kein Brod. Die Fabriquen haben, nach meinen Gedanken, keinen güldenenen Boden. Die Geschwister z.E. in den Chorhäusern können dabey leicht in grosse Noth kommen." UA.R.2.A.33, B2, p. 204. Quoted in Uttendörfer, *Wirtschaftsgeist Herrnhuts*, 40.

<sup>71</sup> UA.R.2.A.No.35.b, 336-337. "Johannes: Wenn jezt nicht eine solche Fabrique in Herrnhuth wäre, so würden die da wohnenden 1200 Menschen nicht leicht bestehen können; ja man hätte kaum Herrnhuth anfangen können, wenn die Wollen-Manufactur nicht gewesen wäre.

Jünger: Wieder die Manufactur in der Welt-Leute Hände, die den Brüdern lieber als andern Arbeit geben, habe ich nichts; aber wieder Manufacturen in Brüder-Händen; weil ich befürchte, die Nachbarn leiden drunter. [337] Johannes: Von der Herrnhuthischen Fabrique haben die Leute im Lande keinen Schaden."

Here it must be noted that in 1755 a number of Zinzendorf's speeches were published which were prefaced by an introduction which insisted that the Moravian enterprise had brought devastation for local trade in the Oberlausitz. Christina Petterson, "A Plague of the State and the Church': A Local Response to the Moravian Enterprise', in: *Journal of Moravian History* 16 (2016), 45-60.

choir-houses, advocates factories, and rallies against the communal household (*Diakonie*), which he believed was stripping the capital from the community.<sup>72</sup> It seems that we see the conflict between a conservative, aristocratic position, in which the lord saw it as his responsibility to ensure employment for all of his tenants and servants, and the position of liberalism, which operates with an economic rationality, in which the importance of the whole is downplayed, in favour of the individual.

Returning to Bethlehem, the General Economy, as the communal economy was known, was a massive enterprise, supporting a growing number of missionaries working among the Native Americans. In her analysis, Gillian Lindt Collin argues that the General Economy sustained around 1300 people in addition to the missionary enterprises among the Native Americans, and thus insists that the dissolution of the system cannot be because it failed in its purpose.<sup>73</sup>

The General Economy began to come under pressure in 1758, but Zinzendorf was adamant that it not be touched. And then, in 1760, he suddenly died. After his death followed a period of serious economic unrest because Zinzendorf's networks started calling in their debts. One fraction in Herrnhut eyed Bethlehem as not contributing as much to this as they could, and felt that if the economy were transformed to a private economy it would increase productivity and contribute to a larger community chest rather than to support missionaries and teachers.<sup>74</sup> The new economic system was introduced in April 1762, but the transition to a settlement proper was not really in place until 1771. But already by 1765, as Katherine Engel has shown, "Bethlehem's pilgrim congregation had been eliminated, the house congregation dissolved, and the town stripped of almost all its ties to missionary work".<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Partly cited and discussed in Uttendörfer, *Wirtschaftsgeist Herrnhuts*, 18-27. The archival reference is UA.R2.A.34.2.3.

<sup>73</sup> Gollin, *Moravians in two Worlds*, 198-99. She points to increasing prosperity, lack of social cohesion within the choirs, the profit motive, and conflicts between the missionaries and the house congregation, which undermined it from within.

<sup>74</sup> Beverly P. Smaby, *The Transformation of Moravian Bethlehem: From Communal Mission to Family Economy*, Philadelphia 1988, 32.

<sup>75</sup> Katherine Carté Engel, *Religion and Profit: Moravians in Early America*, Philadelphia 2009, 161-62.

Engel, who has done the fullest analysis of this transition from communal economy to private economy, argues that what the main shift accomplished, was that the inhabitants went from having donated their labour to the General Economy, to working for cash. This transition was smooth, because it slipped, like hand in a glove into the market-oriented behaviour in the surroundings. Working for cash could mean either working in one of the industries the church held on to, from which the labourer then received a percentage of the profits as a wage, or labouring as an independent artisan in one of the privatised trades. Suggestions as to which industries to keep were provided by Herrnhut, namely “the farms with the mills, taverns, and the processing of their products, be that mowing, brewing, baking, slaughtering, candle making, tanning and tawry work, distilling, and brickmaking, also linen weaving, the store, the apothecary, the bookstore, the pottery house, the dye house, and the farrier and blacksmith, also builders and carpenters.” The artisans who could be set up by themselves included “the glovemaker, cooper, hat maker, furniture maker, tinsmith, nail smith, locksmith, gun stocker, stocking weaver, cobbler, tailor, turner, wagoner, saddle maker, haberdasher, watchmaker, silversmith”. The newly independent artisans had to pay 6 percent interest on their tools and supplies, rent for the workshop, and wages. The church thus earned a steady income, without having to worry about liabilities. On the other hand, concerning labour in the church industries, the leaders now had to determine the worth of the labour of each of their employees, and after having made that decision, pay the labourers from the profits of the business.<sup>76</sup>

The single household of the General Economy was broken into many smaller households, which aligned more or less with nuclear families. The Single Brothers and Sisters’ choirs also had to be restructured into independent economic units, paying their own way, as was the mode of operation in Europe. As Engel notes, this was less of an issue for the Single Brothers’ choir. It did have serious consequences for the Single Sisters who, were more or less confined to their choir house because of the gender segregation and the limits this posed on what labour they could carry out. This had also been an ongoing problem in Herrnhut, and the leadership in Bethlehem shouldn’t have been surprised. As in Herrnhut, eventually it meant that the sisters’ labour was

---

<sup>76</sup> Engel, *Religion and Profit*, 173.

reduced to domestic tasks, such as cooking, cleaning, mending, laundry, and spinning.<sup>77</sup>

These were the first steps to incorporating market relations into the community fabric of Bethlehem. And once the community was separated from its missionary activity these forces of production contained in this small town could be unleashed and boom dramatically to the end of the century, by which time others had caught up with their industrial practices.

## Conclusion

In this article, I have looked at some of the economic aspects of the Moravian Brethren in several different contexts, with special focus on their choir-system. I sought to demonstrate that the choirs should be seen as units of production, which was a crucial feature of Moravian communities since their consolidation in the first half of the 1740s. I also aimed to show how the choirs worked as living laboratories of social change. Both of these points are relevant in relation to the mission in Greenland. However, the economic possibilities of the choirs and the community really took off at an unprecedented level in Bethlehem to the detriment of their social function. Their success was due to the level playing field that the colonial situation offered to industrious entrepreneurs, and as the case of Greenland showed, the natural and social environment of the colony. We may speculate to what extent Christiansfeld would have been that competitive and successful without ten years of tax exemptions and economic concessions, and in an arctic climate. And what the mission in Greenland would have looked like had it received financial support from the early days. In any case, the events in Bethlehem brought a change of direction for the Moravians in that the mission was abandoned in favour of a new economic practice, which was part of the New World. From then on, the Moravians would be dancing to someone else's tune while earning their own bread. In the meantime, the tight-knit choirs slowly unravelled, eventually being rolled over and surpassed by economic forces outside the control of anyone in Greenland, Herrnhut, Christiansfeld, or Bethlehem.

## Summary

---

<sup>77</sup> Engel, *Religion and Profit*, 178-79.

This article examines some of the economic aspects of the Moravian Brethren in several different contexts (Greenland, Christiansfeld, and Bethlehem), with special focus on their choir-system. I analyse some of the changes that took place in the economic practices of the communities and the development of the choirs as units of production, which were a crucial feature of Moravian communities and their entrepreneurial nature since the first half of the 1740s.

Dr. Christina Petterson  
Gerda Henkel Research Fellow, Australian National University  
[christina.petterson@anu.edu.au](mailto:christina.petterson@anu.edu.au)

Clifford B. Boone, *Puritan Evangelism. Preaching for Conversion in Late-Seventeenth Century English Puritanism as seen in the Works of John Flavel* (Studies in Christian History and Thought), Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2013; xviii + 278 pp.; ISBN 9781842277843; £ 29.99.

In addition to Puritanism as a whole having been intensively investigated over the past few decades, numerous studies of Puritan preaching have also come out. Nevertheless, none of these studies have investigated the Puritan view of the effectual call as it relates to the manner and matter of their preaching. Boone has remedied this deficiency, researching the works of the late seventeenth-century Puritan John Flavel (c. 1628–1691) to address this question. Boone rightly characterizes Flavel as an evangelistic preacher. We can say that all Puritans had this emphasis, but it was especially prominent in Flavel.

Flavel held a prominent place among the Puritan preachers of his days. The American theologian Jonathan Edwards was highly influenced by him, quoting him frequently. A century later, Archibald Alexander, the first professor of Princeton Theological Seminary, felt a great debt to Flavel. He once wrote: “To John Flavel I certainly owe more than to any uninspired author.”

The importance Puritans paid to the affections in the process of a person’s moving from an unconverted to a converted state is echoed in the writings of Flavel. Boone shows that the often-criticized distinction between intellect (conscience included), will and affections was used by the Puritans in a very practical way. For them, this was a means in seeking to understand how God would have them preach.

In effectual calling, the intellect is illuminated. Hence, the preaching must be informative; however, the imparting of information is not an aim in itself. The second step of effectual calling is conviction of sin: men must realize their sinfulness in the light of the holy majesty of God. No one arrives at saving faith without having first been convinced of his sin and misery. Faith takes place once the will is renewed, according to Flavel. The renewing of the will is the final step of effectual calling. Although the will is the primary seat of faith, this does not exclude a role for the mind and the affections.

Flavel did wish to inform the head, or intellect, in his sermons. In informing his hearers of the holiness of God and the vileness of sin, he sought to stir their emotions or affections to compunction of their sins and that they would desire Christ as their Savior. This appeal to the affections was made in the context of the aim of renewing the will. The ultimate aim was that the hearer would consent to accepting Christ as his only Savior. It is important to note that neither Flavel nor the other Puritans saw the appeal to the sinner as inconsistent with their predestinarian theology. I consider this study of Boone’s a highly valuable contribution. It highlights how the Puritan interest in theology

was very practical in nature. Their great aim was to win souls and edify saints. Boone's study pays most attention to the former aspect, and this is precisely because he focusses on the effectual call.

Dr. Pieter de Vries  
 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
[dspdevries@solcon.nl](mailto:dspdevries@solcon.nl)

**J.V. Fesko, *The Theology of the Westminster Standards. Historical Context and Theological Insights*, Wheaton, IL.: Crossway, 2014; 441 pp.; ISBN 9781433533112; \$28.00.**

Surprisingly, there have been few historical commentaries on the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Westminster Standards are contemporary documents because churches still subscribe to them, but they also developed in a historical context. It is important to grasp this context in order to understand and evaluate the theology of these Standards. While Fesko's *Theology of the Westminster Standards* does not cover the entire Westminster Confession, it treats most of its major subjects with a heavy emphasis on citations from contemporary authors. This book provides a gripping historical companion that both pastors and scholars will not want to be without. However, there are some shortcomings in Fesko's analysis of various issues that require further research.

Fesko's historical introduction is a concise and clear treatment of the English Reformation with special emphasis on the seventeenth century development of politics, British society, and Reformed theology. In this reviewer's estimation, his chapters on sanctification and on the law of God are some of his clearest and most profound work. In particular, his treatment of the habits and acts of sanctification helps navigate a vital issue that is foreign to contemporary readers. Fesko gives the added benefit of comparing and contrasting this historic formulation with more recent constructions of sanctification, such as what are now called definitive and progressive sanctification. The chapter on the law of God is valuable as it sets the topic in the context of a developing Reformed covenant theology, as includes an able discussion of the different uses of the law. Additionally, explanation of the *ordo salutis* as grounded in union with Christ is very helpful both for historical and contemporary discussions (252-253).

The book includes a number of sections that require further refinement and nuance. For instance, under the "sufficiency" of Scripture, Fesko treats hermeneutical principles, such as the perspicuity of Scripture and the analogy of Scripture (81-86). This is a serious deficiency because Scripture sufficiency

was very practical in nature. Their great aim was to win souls and edify saints. Boone's study pays most attention to the former aspect, and this is precisely because he focusses on the effectual call.

Dr. Pieter de Vries  
 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
[dspdevries@solcon.nl](mailto:dspdevries@solcon.nl)

**J.V. Fesko, *The Theology of the Westminster Standards. Historical Context and Theological Insights*, Wheaton, IL.: Crossway, 2014; 441 pp.; ISBN 9781433533112; \$28.00.**

Surprisingly, there have been few historical commentaries on the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Westminster Standards are contemporary documents because churches still subscribe to them, but they also developed in a historical context. It is important to grasp this context in order to understand and evaluate the theology of these Standards. While Fesko's *Theology of the Westminster Standards* does not cover the entire Westminster Confession, it treats most of its major subjects with a heavy emphasis on citations from contemporary authors. This book provides a gripping historical companion that both pastors and scholars will not want to be without. However, there are some shortcomings in Fesko's analysis of various issues that require further research.

Fesko's historical introduction is a concise and clear treatment of the English Reformation with special emphasis on the seventeenth century development of politics, British society, and Reformed theology. In this reviewer's estimation, his chapters on sanctification and on the law of God are some of his clearest and most profound work. In particular, his treatment of the habits and acts of sanctification helps navigate a vital issue that is foreign to contemporary readers. Fesko gives the added benefit of comparing and contrasting this historic formulation with more recent constructions of sanctification, such as what are now called definitive and progressive sanctification. The chapter on the law of God is valuable as it sets the topic in the context of a developing Reformed covenant theology, as includes an able discussion of the different uses of the law. Additionally, explanation of the *ordo salutis* as grounded in union with Christ is very helpful both for historical and contemporary discussions (252-253).

The book includes a number of sections that require further refinement and nuance. For instance, under the "sufficiency" of Scripture, Fesko treats hermeneutical principles, such as the perspicuity of Scripture and the analogy of Scripture (81-86). This is a serious deficiency because Scripture sufficiency

was one of the primary distinctive features of Reformed theology. Fesko confuses the function of Scripture in faith and practice (sufficiency) with the interpretation of Scripture (hermeneutics).

Fesko also repeatedly uses the term, “natural law” (e.g., 133, 144, 166, etc.) without defining the term. The meaning of natural law is debated hotly in contemporary theology. It often refers to a moral standard that binds mankind that is distinct from the Decalogue and the Mosaic covenant. However, Emidio Campi has argued recently that Reformed orthodox views of natural law were very different from some modern versions. In his recent work on Francis Turretin, James Bruce shows that natural law referred to natural rights that reflected God’s nature and harmonized with man’s nature. The moral law was the external expression of natural law, meaning that the content of the moral law was always an exact replica of natural law. It is important to avoid potential equivocation by using terms that are common both to the past and to and to the present without defining them carefully.

In describing the thorny issue of the aseity of the Son and his personhood in relation to the Father, Fesko misappropriates historic trinitarian terminology. Most Reformed orthodox taught that Christ was God *a se*, but that eternal generation referred both to Christ’s personal subsistence and to eternal communication of the divine essence to him from the Father. Eternal communication of the divine essence was not equivalent to treating the Father as the source or origin of the Son’s being, since deity is self-existent by definition. Calvin held to a slightly different view. Fesko states that for Calvin, eternal generation referred to “communication of Sonship” while for others it also entailed communication of deity (181). However, Calvin, Polanus, and most others defined personhood in the Godhead as a certain “incommunicable quality.” The divine essence is communicable from Father to Son, but a “communication of Sonship” would have been a contradiction in terms in the seventeenth century, since personhood is incommunicable by definition.

The above examples are not exhaustive. They illustrate how difficult it is for one author to master the entire system of seventeenth century Reformed orthodox theology in its historical context. However, Fesko’s historical work on the Westminster Standards is one of the first works of its kind. It is an outstanding introduction to the main theologians and the primary theological works of the time. He leads readers on the right path by filling a vital gap in the secondary literature. This reviewer hopes that his painstaking labors will bear much fruit, both in church and school alike.

Prof. Dr. Ryan M. McGraw  
Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Taylors, SC  
[rmcgraw@gpts.edu](mailto:rmcgraw@gpts.edu)

was very practical in nature. Their great aim was to win souls and edify saints. Boone's study pays most attention to the former aspect, and this is precisely because he focusses on the effectual call.

Dr. Pieter de Vries  
 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
[dspdevries@solcon.nl](mailto:dspdevries@solcon.nl)

**J.V. Fesko, *The Theology of the Westminster Standards. Historical Context and Theological Insights*, Wheaton, IL.: Crossway, 2014; 441 pp.; ISBN 9781433533112; \$28.00.**

Surprisingly, there have been few historical commentaries on the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Westminster Standards are contemporary documents because churches still subscribe to them, but they also developed in a historical context. It is important to grasp this context in order to understand and evaluate the theology of these Standards. While Fesko's *Theology of the Westminster Standards* does not cover the entire Westminster Confession, it treats most of its major subjects with a heavy emphasis on citations from contemporary authors. This book provides a gripping historical companion that both pastors and scholars will not want to be without. However, there are some shortcomings in Fesko's analysis of various issues that require further research.

Fesko's historical introduction is a concise and clear treatment of the English Reformation with special emphasis on the seventeenth century development of politics, British society, and Reformed theology. In this reviewer's estimation, his chapters on sanctification and on the law of God are some of his clearest and most profound work. In particular, his treatment of the habits and acts of sanctification helps navigate a vital issue that is foreign to contemporary readers. Fesko gives the added benefit of comparing and contrasting this historic formulation with more recent constructions of sanctification, such as what are now called definitive and progressive sanctification. The chapter on the law of God is valuable as it sets the topic in the context of a developing Reformed covenant theology, as includes an able discussion of the different uses of the law. Additionally, explanation of the *ordo salutis* as grounded in union with Christ is very helpful both for historical and contemporary discussions (252-253).

The book includes a number of sections that require further refinement and nuance. For instance, under the "sufficiency" of Scripture, Fesko treats hermeneutical principles, such as the perspicuity of Scripture and the analogy of Scripture (81-86). This is a serious deficiency because Scripture sufficiency

was one of the primary distinctive features of Reformed theology. Fesko confuses the function of Scripture in faith and practice (sufficiency) with the interpretation of Scripture (hermeneutics).

Fesko also repeatedly uses the term, “natural law” (e.g., 133, 144, 166, etc.) without defining the term. The meaning of natural law is debated hotly in contemporary theology. It often refers to a moral standard that binds mankind that is distinct from the Decalogue and the Mosaic covenant. However, Emidio Campi has argued recently that Reformed orthodox views of natural law were very different from some modern versions. In his recent work on Francis Turretin, James Bruce shows that natural law referred to natural rights that reflected God’s nature and harmonized with man’s nature. The moral law was the external expression of natural law, meaning that the content of the moral law was always an exact replica of natural law. It is important to avoid potential equivocation by using terms that are common both to the past and to and to the present without defining them carefully.

In describing the thorny issue of the aseity of the Son and his personhood in relation to the Father, Fesko misappropriates historic trinitarian terminology. Most Reformed orthodox taught that Christ was God *a se*, but that eternal generation referred both to Christ’s personal subsistence and to eternal communication of the divine essence to him from the Father. Eternal communication of the divine essence was not equivalent to treating the Father as the source or origin of the Son’s being, since deity is self-existent by definition. Calvin held to a slightly different view. Fesko states that for Calvin, eternal generation referred to “communication of Sonship” while for others it also entailed communication of deity (181). However, Calvin, Polanus, and most others defined personhood in the Godhead as a certain “incommunicable quality.” The divine essence is communicable from Father to Son, but a “communication of Sonship” would have been a contradiction in terms in the seventeenth century, since personhood is incommunicable by definition.

The above examples are not exhaustive. They illustrate how difficult it is for one author to master the entire system of seventeenth century Reformed orthodox theology in its historical context. However, Fesko’s historical work on the Westminster Standards is one of the first works of its kind. It is an outstanding introduction to the main theologians and the primary theological works of the time. He leads readers on the right path by filling a vital gap in the secondary literature. This reviewer hopes that his painstaking labors will bear much fruit, both in church and school alike.

Prof. Dr. Ryan M. McGraw  
Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Taylors, SC  
[rmcgraw@gpts.edu](mailto:rmcgraw@gpts.edu)

**Peter Zimmerling, *Die Losungen. Eine Erfolgsgeschichte durch die Jahrhunderte*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2014; 198 pp.; ISBN 9783525630532; € 17,00.**

Already in 1739 the so-called 'Daily Watchwords' (Losungen) of the Moravians (Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine) were being read out in 'Herrnhut, Herrenhaag, Herendyk, Pilgerruh, Ebersdorf, Jena, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, London, Oxford, Berlin, Greenland, Sainte-Croix, Saint-Thomas, Saint-Jean, Barbados, Palestine, Surinam, Savanna in Georgia, amongst the Moors in Carolina, amongst the savages in Irene, in Pennsylvania, amongst the Hottentots, in Guinea, in Lettland and Estonia, Lithuania, Russia, on the White Sea, in Lapland, Norway and Switzerland, the Isle of Man, Hitland, in prison, on pilgrimage to Ceylon, Ethiopia, Persia, on mission with the emissaries to the heathens and elsewhere on land and sea '(161). In all these places there were Moravian settlements or missions. Presently disseminated in more than fifty languages ([www.losungen.de](http://www.losungen.de)), the Watchwords are a 'mark of living ecumenism' (162), crossing all denominational boundaries.

Professor of Practical Theology in Leipzig, Peter Zimmerling has published numerous studies, in particular on Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760). In the present book he traces the history of the calendars with biblical texts which have come to be called Watchwords, from 1728 to the present day. Through a procedure of drawing lots - hence the name - a prepared selection of Bible verses was used both for divine guidance and comfort in communities and for individual decision-making amongst the early Moravians. Their founder, Zinzendorf, played a crucial role. The Watchword texts were intended to enable one to live each day with the Word of God. Even today these biblical texts chosen by lot are taken solely from the Old Testament; in addition, a didactic text from the New Testament and a prayer or hymn-verse are selected encompassing the broad tradition of Christian piety. Zimmerling calls this triad 'a condensed liturgy of worship for each day' (144). In it he sees one of the reasons for the success of the Watchwords. Zinzendorf, whom he describes as the 'inventor' (11) of this applied Bible piety, conceived the individual verses as a guide to a better understanding of all Scripture. The passages chosen for a given day, person or group, or for special occasions, were not to take the place of the Bible, but rather to lead one to it. The fact that the text of the Old and the New Testament illuminate each other and are supplemented by the voice of tradition, emphasises the 'self-efficiency of Scripture' (142). From the beginning to the present day all further exegesis in published form is rejected. The importance of the Daily Watchwords in prayer and various forms of worship must not be underestimated. Their omission from meetings in many Protestant churches today would be unimaginable.

Zimmerling's book gives us a vivid picture of the two hundred fifty year history of this booklet which has become the epitome of Evangelical Bible piety. In eleven chapters the author reflects on the past, present and future of the Watchwords. There is also a foreword by the Chairperson of the Provincial Board and, by way of 'conclusion', an article by the hymn-writer Detlef Block, as well as a concise bibliography. Two chapters illustrate the history of Zinzendorf and the early Moravians settled in and around Herrnhut, a little village east of Dresden. In explaining Zinzendorf's conception of the Bible, Zimmerling outlines a 'mini-theology of Watchwords' (123-38). Four chapters are devoted to the 'history of the impact of the Watchwords'. Here, by way of survey, the author introduces selected individuals and episodes from the early 18th to the 20th centuries. Johann Christoph Blumhardt (1805-1880) and Count Hans von Lehndorff (1910-1987) are portrayed in some detail.

Three other persons are presented in separate chapters, each in terms of their relationship to the Watchwords: Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898), Jochen Klepper (1903-1942), and Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945). The latter two are widely known as authoritative figures in the time of National Socialism; their respective relationship to the Watchwords gives the reader a view into other aspects of their personal beliefs.

As Zimmerling has worked out in other chapters, the period of *Kirchenkampf* was decisive in the diffusion of the Watchwords. On the basis of thorough research he shows that the German Chancellor Bismarck made personal notes in editions of the Watchwords over many years. Zimmerling's conclusions, however, from which he constructs a profile of Bismarck's 'spirituality' (81) seem far-fetched. Zimmerling stresses the 'authenticity' of Bismarck's conversion (64, 67) and proceeds to his 'turn to personal faith in God' (59), which he presents as proven fact. On the basis of the notes in the Watchword booklets Zimmerling draws far-reaching conclusions with regard to the chancellor's person: 'Thus, he was no ruthless power seeker' (73). Whilst the extant sources attest beyond doubt to Bismarck's reading of the Watchwords, Zimmerling's conclusions are in some cases unsustainable. Likewise his attempt to put Kleppers's conception of Prussia in as favourable a light as possible.

In the chapter 'Reasons for the success of the Watchwords', Zimmerling gives basic information in condensed form concerning the procedure of the selection by lot and the emergence of other texts; and two further chapters (147-158; 159-166) offer various perspectives on the current and future significance of the Daily Watchwords. Here, amongst others, politicians of various parties are cited. In another chapter, 'The Book of Watchwords - a trusty companion from school days' (167-170), the author shares his own experiences with Watchword texts at decisive points in his life.

Zimmerling strives to give an overview in plain language of the history and significance of the Watchwords. However, aside from the points already mentioned, further questions arise regarding the conception of his book. The order of the chapters is somewhat haphazard, and the choice of examples often eclectic. In his attempt to write clearly the author occasionally shoots beyond his goal, as when the Watchwords are compared to a 'Maggi cube' containing, as it were, the 'quintessence' of Scripture (129). Even if Zimmerling's book is intended for the wide public rather than a specialised audience, still, it is regrettable that the author did not pick up on the exciting research of the historian Shirley Brückner (Lösen, Däumeln, Nadeln, Würfeln. Praktiken der Kontingenz als Offenbarung im Pietismus. In: Ulrich Schädler u.a. (eds.): *Spiel und Bürgerlichkeit. Passagen des Spiels I*. Wien u. a. 2010, 247-272; Die Providenz im Zettelkasten. *Divinatorische Lospraktiken in der pietistischen Frömmigkeit*. In: Wolfgang Breul / Jan Carsten Schnurr (eds.): *Geschichtsbewusstsein und Zukunftserwartung in Pietismus und Erweckungsbewegung*. Göttingen 2013, 351-366). These findings help to contextualise the lot drawing of the Moravian Brotherhood. The Watchwords are unique in their own way, but they are nevertheless part of a long history of appropriation of the Bible.

Prof. Dr. Ruth Albrecht  
University of Hamburg  
[ruth.albrecht@uni-hamburg.de](mailto:ruth.albrecht@uni-hamburg.de)

**Matthias Meinhardt, Ulrike Gleixner, Martin H. Jung and Siegrid Westphal (eds.), *Religion Macht Politik. Hofgeistlichkeit im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit (1500 – 1800)* (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 137), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014; 472 pp.; ISBN 9783447100151; € 88,00.**

'Religion shapes politics' – this is one way of reading the title of an exciting volume gathering more than twenty richly illustrated chapters researching the position of clerics at court in the early modern period in Europe ('Religion Power Politics. Court Clerics in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800'). Between 2009 and 2013, a project devoted to this subject has generated new insights that inscribe themselves consciously or unconsciously into a larger revision of the secularization paradigm that increasingly has been questioned in early modern studies.

Since J.C.D. Clark's ground-breaking 2012 essay "Secularization and modernization: the failure of a 'grand narrative'" (*The Historical Journal* 55, 1 2012: 161-94) more and scholars have arrived to the understanding that

based scholarship sometimes presented from new and refreshing vantage points. The volume represents a solid contribution to significant aspects of the intellectual history of the early modern period and its confessional dimensions, evidence that religion indeed shapes politics.

Dr. Andreas Önnersfors  
University of Gothenburg  
[andreas.onnerfors@gu.se](mailto:andreas.onnerfors@gu.se)

**Donald John Maclean, *James Durham (1622-1658) and the Gospel Offer in its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Reformed Historical Theology, 31), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 2015, 317 pp.; ISBN 9783525550878; € 85,00.**

“A glorious display of the banner of free grace, holding forth the riches of it very clearly and convincingly, and bringing the offers of it very low, wonderfully low... some of his hearers were made to think, that the cord of the offer of salvation was let down and hung so low to sinners, that those of the lowest stature among them all, might have caught hold of it, who, through grace had any mind to do so.”

These words were written by John Gillies (1712-1796), a Presbyterian minister at Glasgow, Scotland, in his book *Historical Collections of Accounts of Revival Relating to Remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel* (enlarged edition, Kelso, 1845, 185). Thus Gillies characterized the gospel ministry of his predecessor at Glasgow in the seventeenth century, James Durham (1622-1658). It may be there is some exaggeration in this ‘testimony’. But a recent study on James Durham on the place and function of the gospel offer in his ministry evidences the thesis. It shows that the free and well-meant offer of salvation to all hearers of the gospel was in the forefront of Durham’s preaching. The author, the Scottish Free Church minister, Donald John Maclean, deals with Durham’s view on the gospel offer in its seventeenth-century context.

James Durham was a representative theologian of the Second Reformation in Scotland. This turbulent period in Scottish church history succeeded the restoration of Presbyterian church order and establishment of a covenanted (theocratic) nation. This movement was not only ecclesiological, but had a strong pietistic warmth. It had strong links with the Puritan movement in England. Books which were published in both countries contain significant parallels in theological and practical divinity. Generally Scottish Second Reformation books give more attention to the proclamation of God’s

salvation, which is expressed in a free and unconditional offer of the gospel to all hearers.

This emphasis on the outward calling to all hearers in preaching did not disregard the need for an inner, experimental relationship with God. These two elements of gospel ministry were not paradoxical and tense subjects, but they formed a balanced discourse of dealing of God with fallen men.

The Arminian criticism of Calvinistic soteriology denied the harmony of unconditional predestination, irresistible grace and the free offer of the gospel. In the Arminian view it leads to the supposition that God is hypocritical in his well-meant offer (p. 11). Richard Baxter, who was not an Arminian, was of the opinion that there is no starting point to link particular redemption with free offer. In this sense the Scottish theologian John Cameron and his French disciple Moise Amyraut designed a doctrinal covenanted framework in which there is the harmony of the extent of redemption to the whole world (general redemption) with an application of redemption which is not controlled by free will.

Both assemblies of Calvinistic theologians, the Synod of Dort (1618-19) and the Westminster Assembly (1643-48), had a minority who defended the 'broad view' of the extent of atonement. In the synod of Dort those were the delegates of Bremen and John Davenant of England. They emphasized God's general love to mankind as a base for Gospel ministry. It is noteworthy that Scottish theologians like Samuel Rutherford and George Gillespie strongly opposed the 'broad view', which was defended by English puritans such as Edmund Calamy. Both mentioned Scottish theologians were exponents of the Scottish Second Reformation. They were of the opinion that a free, unconditional offer of Christ is compatible with a supralapsarian view of predestination. It is remarkable that the Canons of Dort give room for both views – general or particular atonement – without making an explicit choice. In contrast, the Westminster Confession is in the line of the doctrine of particular atonement.

Maclean provides a clear explanation of the view of the particulars as well as those who have chosen for the hypothetical universalism. He disagreed with the view of Jonathan Moore who noticed parallels between the Scottish Marrowmen in the eighteenth century and the 'middle way' of Saumur (hypothetical universalism). Moore tried to prove his view with citations from books of the English Puritans Ezekiel Culverwell and John Preston, which are found in the English Puritan book *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*. The controversial fragments in *The Marrow*, which were condemned during the so called 'Marrow Controversy' in the Scottish Church in the 1720's, are no arguments for this thesis. But a better proof for it is the known correspondence between Culverwell and James Ussher on the extent of atonement. Usher

followed the double reference theory of the essence and extent of the atonement, as did John Davenant at the Synod of Dort.

James Durham and his contemporaries, Rutherford and David Dickson, based the offer of grace not on the extent of atonement in which the whole world is involved, but on the sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ. The Saviour's merits are sufficient for the reconciliation of the sins of the whole world, but did not *effectually* make reconciliation for the sins of whole mankind. Thus Thomas Boston explained the quotations of Culverwell and Preston in his annotations of *The Marrow*. But we cannot deny that Culverwell in his correspondence with Usher inclined to the double reference view of English hypothetical universalism.

Another problem which is raised by the author is the functionality of 'conditions' in the free offer. Durham and other theologians view faith as a condition in order to enter into the covenant of grace. This may be inconsistent with the free and unconditional offer. This is a weak point in the *ordo salutis* which may perplex a seeking sinner. The later Marrowmen tried to solve this problem by involving conditions as well as promises of the covenant with Christ. For them, faith was not a condition but an instrument. Dickson and Rutherford, for example, certainly speak about conditions for believing.

Chapter Three, 'James Durham and the Free Offer of the Gospel', is helpful in understanding Durham's view of the free offer in the context of his soteriology. He was a 'particularist' and 'predestinarian', but this is consistent with a free and unhindered proclamation of the gospel. The other movement is 'high Calvinism' in the eighteenth century, which led to hyper-calvinism; it limited the free offer to the elect. We find this tendency more in England than in Scotland. It is a pity that the author did not treat hyper-calvinistic influences in Scotland among the opponents of the opponents of the Marrowmen. Maclean fails to mention the critical pamphlet of the Scot Alexander Leighton (c.1568-1649) who, against Culverwell, defended a limited *offer* of salvation only to the elect! It should be evaluated whether this is an exception in the history of Scottish dogmatic theology.

Maclean gives prominent attention to theological developments in the United States, such as the view of Herman Hoeksema (1886-1965) in the Christian Reformed Church. As Hoeksema was a neo-Calvinist and Sandemanian in his doctrine of faith, he had other starting points than Scottish and English Puritan theologians in the seventeenth century and their 'successors' in the Age of Reason. A better evaluation of changing views found in English hyper-calvinism is made in Peter Toon's *Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism*. Attention to this movement in Maclean's book could be enhanced.

Another point of criticism is the omission of the view of the nineteenth-century Scottish minister John McLeod Campbell (1800-72) on preaching the universality of the atonement, and the 'double reference' doctrine defended by

the Secession theologians John Brown of Edinburgh (1754-1858) and Robert Balmer (1787-1844). In this sense ‘Rabbi’ Duncan was correct about the Brown and Balmer position in saying: “Oh, since the days of ‘the Marrow’ they have elaborated, and elaborated, and elaborated the free offer of the Gospel, and perhaps rather neglected other things” (D. Brown (Ed.), *The late Rev. John Duncan, LL.D. In the Pulpit and at the Communion Table* (Edinburgh, 1874), 46-7. How the balance could tip!

Of course the Dutch Reformed tradition falls outside the focus of this study. In the Netherlands the same discussion took place in the eighteenth century as the Marrow conflict in Scotland. The lay preacher Theodorus Avinck (1740-82) wrote a book of 378 pages *Het Eerste en Voornaamste Deel der Uitwendige Roeping* [The First and Most Important Part of the Outward Calling] (Utrecht, 1779), with many quotations of Dutch and foreign theologians who defended the free offer of grace. It is a proof of similarities in the logical development of Calvinistic soteriology in different countries. There is no new thing under the sun! (Eccles. 1:9).

Leen J. van Valen

PhD-student at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

[ljvanvalen@solcon.nl](mailto:ljvanvalen@solcon.nl)

**Jonathan Willis (ed.), *Sin and Salvation in Reformation England* (St Andrews Studies in Reformation History), Farnham: Ashgate, 2015, 282 pp.; ISBN 9781472437365; £ 65.00.**

Sin and salvation were the two central religious preoccupations of men and women in Reformation England. According to Jonathan Willis, the editor of this collection of articles, this book is the first to address in a sustained and rounded form the transformations and permutations that the concepts of sin and salvation underwent over the course of the reformation in England, as well as the practical consequences of these changes in the lives of believers. This volume contains fourteen essays, divided into four parts: ‘Defining Sin and Salvation’; ‘Contesting Sin and Salvation’; ‘Reforming Sin and Salvation’, and ‘Living with Sin and Salvation’.

Ralph S. Werrell, who has published several studies on the first English reformer and biblical translator, William Tyndale, makes clear that the blood of Christ (referenced 441 times in Tyndale’s writings) affects every aspect of God’s plan to undo the effects of the fall. Just as remarkable is his emphasis on the newness of life which depends solely on the Holy Spirit applying the blood of Christ to the elect. He applies the blood of Christ to every aspect of life, bringing forth new life and the liberty to respond to the gospel, to love God’s law, to worship God, and to do good works. By focusing on spiritual renewal,

the Secession theologians John Brown of Edinburgh (1754-1858) and Robert Balmer (1787-1844). In this sense ‘Rabbi’ Duncan was correct about the Brown and Balmer position in saying: “Oh, since the days of ‘the Marrow’ they have elaborated, and elaborated, and elaborated the free offer of the Gospel, and perhaps rather neglected other things” (D. Brown (Ed.), *The late Rev. John Duncan, LL.D. In the Pulpit and at the Communion Table* (Edinburgh, 1874), 46-7. How the balance could tip!

Of course the Dutch Reformed tradition falls outside the focus of this study. In the Netherlands the same discussion took place in the eighteenth century as the Marrow conflict in Scotland. The lay preacher Theodorus Avinck (1740-82) wrote a book of 378 pages *Het Eerste en Voornaamste Deel der Uitwendige Roeping* [The First and Most Important Part of the Outward Calling] (Utrecht, 1779), with many quotations of Dutch and foreign theologians who defended the free offer of grace. It is a proof of similarities in the logical development of Calvinistic soteriology in different countries. There is no new thing under the sun! (Eccles. 1:9).

Leen J. van Valen

PhD-student at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

[ljvanvalen@solcon.nl](mailto:ljvanvalen@solcon.nl)

**Jonathan Willis (ed.), *Sin and Salvation in Reformation England* (St Andrews Studies in Reformation History), Farnham: Ashgate, 2015, 282 pp.; ISBN 9781472437365; £ 65.00.**

Sin and salvation were the two central religious preoccupations of men and women in Reformation England. According to Jonathan Willis, the editor of this collection of articles, this book is the first to address in a sustained and rounded form the transformations and permutations that the concepts of sin and salvation underwent over the course of the reformation in England, as well as the practical consequences of these changes in the lives of believers. This volume contains fourteen essays, divided into four parts: ‘Defining Sin and Salvation’; ‘Contesting Sin and Salvation’; ‘Reforming Sin and Salvation’, and ‘Living with Sin and Salvation’.

Ralph S. Werrell, who has published several studies on the first English reformer and biblical translator, William Tyndale, makes clear that the blood of Christ (referenced 441 times in Tyndale’s writings) affects every aspect of God’s plan to undo the effects of the fall. Just as remarkable is his emphasis on the newness of life which depends solely on the Holy Spirit applying the blood of Christ to the elect. He applies the blood of Christ to every aspect of life, bringing forth new life and the liberty to respond to the gospel, to love God’s law, to worship God, and to do good works. By focusing on spiritual renewal,

Tyndale has influenced the Puritan tradition, which not only emphasized regeneration, but also sanctification. Several times Werrell distinguishes between Tyndale and his fellow Reformers. For example, on p. 27, he suggests that “unlike his fellow reformers, Tyndale wrote that fallen man was powerless to hear the gospel, and therefore he could not respond to it without the Holy Spirit bringing forth the new birth in him by virtue of Christ’s blood.” However, both Tyndale and other reformers emphasized that God’s grace is solely responsible for spiritual renewal, so that the notion of a difference between Tyndale and others is too far-fetched.

Jonathan Willis focuses on the redefinition of sin in light of the Ten Commandments in Protestant theological and pedagogical works. The Seven Deadly (or Capital/ Cardinal) Sins as the chief moral system taught by the Western Church was replaced by the Decalogue. During the English Reformation, the Ten Commandments came to be widely understood as not merely the primary, but rather as the only religious framework for defining the very concept of sin, and for moral instruction. The reformers therefore needed to subject the Decalogue to rather creative hermeneutics to render them fit for practical use, because theologically speaking the commandments were a reflection of the eternal law of God, encompassing all possible sinful behaviors and their converse virtues. In practice, however, that list proved to be but partial and limited. Therefore the brevity of the commandments required extensive exposition and explanation. The Decalogue was viewed as a set of ten categories, within which all manner of sinful behavior could be included. However, the nature of these ten categories was such that one could not ascribe a fixed or specific group of sinful behaviors to them. Rather, the new interpretative framework that Protestant divines were constructing in reference to the Ten Commandments did not simply yield a redefining of sin, but rather it established a framework within which concepts of sin could be formulated, modified, appropriated, or rejected whenever an individual would reflect upon his behavior.

The third part, ‘Reforming Sin and Salvation,’ looks at ongoing attempts to redefine beliefs and behaviors regarding sin and salvation within a broader societal context by means of instructional, liturgical, and devotional texts. The article of Maria Devlin on ‘Generic Damnation and Rhetorical Salvation in Reformation Preaching and Plays’ is captivating. She describes a trend in historical and literary treatments of the English reformation that emphasizes the Calvinist, predestinarian character of Reformation theology and its inevitable result: despair. However, the narrative of despair tends to rely on the content of this theology –the systematic articulation of Calvinist doctrines. Devlin wants to focus on the modes and genres governing the teaching of this theology, such as the sermon, catechetical instruction, morality plays,

dialogues, and the spiritual handbook, referring to these as “rhetorical theology”.

According to Devlin, the rhetorical forms of Reformation theology carried implications that ran contrary to the predestinarian doctrines they were meant to teach. The dominant assumption in Reformation preaching and catechizing was that everyone addressed might be saved, the logical assumption being that it was possible for everyone to be saved. She questions whether it was systematic propositions of religion, or rather the dramatic, grammatical, and rhetorical modes in which they heard and articulated their religion that primarily affected their experience. Thus she argues that if believers were to internalize the implications of rhetorical rather than systematic theology, their primary response could have been hope rather than despair. I certainly agree with Devlin’s argument that rhetorical theology affirmed the possibility and hope that grace could be secured. However, I would question her rather sharp distinction between systematic and rhetorical theology, when she suggests that there was a “wide gap between official Calvinist theology and what was emphasized in its practical dissemination.” I believe that there is merely a distinction being made between both theologies. In systematic theology, internal calling as the link between predestination and regeneration meant that in pastoral theology human responsibility was taken seriously, and by way of the offer of the gospel the door to salvation was opened to all. And thus rather than this being a wide divide, we are dealing with a measure of logical inconsistency.

A similar wide divide is identified in Elizabeth Clarke’s essay on ‘Lady Hutchinson’s Principles of the Christian Religion’. In her theological treatise, Lucy Hutchinson devotes some time thinking and writing about what she calls “a preparatory worke”, the chief of which are conviction and humiliation for sin. However, for some strict Calvinists, it seemed to smack too much of Arminianism, requiring a human element in conversion, rather than the strict supernatural intervention of God. According to Clarke, there is a tension in the “Principles” between the Calvinistic scheme of grace and her authorship of rhetoric and imagery. Although as a Calvinist she sees salvation as being entirely the product of divine grace, as a poet she recognizes the nature and even the need of preparatory emotions. But this is not a real tension. Hutchinson wanted to make two things clear: first, that divine grace engages our human existence specifically by way of preparatory humiliation, and second, that humans are involved in this divine transformation from sin to grace. Systematic and pastoral theology were thus two ways of describing the encounter between God and men – an encounter in which divine grace has the preeminence, but which also includes human activity.

Part IV: “Living with Sin and Salvation,” contains essays on the sermons of Edwin Sandys, archbishop of York as well as on the Puritan notion of a “book

of conscience". This cultural practice during the first half of the seventeenth century of writing and reading a "book of conscience" that chronicled sin and salvation by way of journaling can be seen as the cause of the radical growth of Puritan journaling that burgeoned in the 1650s and beyond. Puritans regarded the writing of their experiences as a record of God's work within their lives, and of their lives as a record of work towards God. They used their journaling to better understand sin and salvation and their personal involvement in this. In a postscript, Alexandra Walsham concludes that this volume "delineates some of the complex and delicate ways in which clergy and laity negotiated the theological ruptures wrought by the reformation, but inevitably it cannot address many others." This collection of essays is a very welcome contribution to a growing corpus of studies that researches core religious preoccupations of men and women in early modern England.

Dr. Reinier W. de Koeijer  
Minister Protestant Church Bilthoven  
[rwdkoeyer@filtnet.nl](mailto:rwdkoeyer@filtnet.nl)

**Crawford Gribben, *John Owen and English Puritanism. Experiences of Defeat*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016; xiv + 401 pp.; ISBN 9780199798155; £ 62.00.**

The theologian John Owen looms large in the history of Puritanism, Dissent, and Reformed Orthodoxy. Between the 1640s and 1680s, he published eighty books containing eight and a half million words. His commentary on the book of Hebrews alone was a mammoth undertaking comprising over two million words in 2000 folio pages. And he did much more than just write. During the two decades of the English Revolution, he was an Essex pastor, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, Dean of Christ Church, Vice Chancellor of Oxford University, and the 'Atlas of Independency'. After the Restoration, he was (with Richard Baxter) the nation's leading nonconformist divine. At his funeral in 1683, one participant observed the presence of the carriages of sixty-seven nobles and gentlemen.

Crawford Gribben admits to approaching his subject with 'trepidation' and modestly confesses that 'Owen has defeated me' (ix, xiii). Yet this book is a landmark in the study of Owen and seventeenth-century Puritanism, not least because its author displays an impressive command of theology, history, and literary studies (the back cover carries commendations from an eminent theologian, an eminent literary scholar, and an eminent historian). The book's success also owes much to the wealth of research and writing since W.H. Goold's 24-volume Victorian edition of *The Works of John Owen* was republished by the Banner of Truth Trust in 1965. The Goold edition was

of conscience". This cultural practice during the first half of the seventeenth century of writing and reading a "book of conscience" that chronicled sin and salvation by way of journaling can be seen as the cause of the radical growth of Puritan journaling that burgeoned in the 1650s and beyond. Puritans regarded the writing of their experiences as a record of God's work within their lives, and of their lives as a record of work towards God. They used their journaling to better understand sin and salvation and their personal involvement in this. In a postscript, Alexandra Walsham concludes that this volume "delineates some of the complex and delicate ways in which clergy and laity negotiated the theological ruptures wrought by the reformation, but inevitably it cannot address many others." This collection of essays is a very welcome contribution to a growing corpus of studies that researches core religious preoccupations of men and women in early modern England.

Dr. Reinier W. de Koeijer  
Minister Protestant Church Bilthoven  
[rwdkoeijer@filtnet.nl](mailto:rwdkoeijer@filtnet.nl)

**Crawford Gribben, *John Owen and English Puritanism. Experiences of Defeat*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016; xiv + 401 pp.; ISBN 9780199798155; £ 62.00.**

The theologian John Owen looms large in the history of Puritanism, Dissent, and Reformed Orthodoxy. Between the 1640s and 1680s, he published eighty books containing eight and a half million words. His commentary on the book of Hebrews alone was a mammoth undertaking comprising over two million words in 2000 folio pages. And he did much more than just write. During the two decades of the English Revolution, he was an Essex pastor, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, Dean of Christ Church, Vice Chancellor of Oxford University, and the 'Atlas of Independency'. After the Restoration, he was (with Richard Baxter) the nation's leading nonconformist divine. At his funeral in 1683, one participant observed the presence of the carriages of sixty-seven nobles and gentlemen.

Crawford Gribben admits to approaching his subject with 'trepidation' and modestly confesses that 'Owen has defeated me' (ix, xiii). Yet this book is a landmark in the study of Owen and seventeenth-century Puritanism, not least because its author displays an impressive command of theology, history, and literary studies (the back cover carries commendations from an eminent theologian, an eminent literary scholar, and an eminent historian). The book's success also owes much to the wealth of research and writing since W.H. Goold's 24-volume Victorian edition of *The Works of John Owen* was republished by the Banner of Truth Trust in 1965. The Goold edition was

arranged in thematic rather than chronological order, giving the impression of a majestic architectonic intellectual structure. It has contributed to the rather ahistorical nature of Owen studies, a field dominated by theologians most of whom have relatively little interest in the specific contexts in which Owen operated in Essex, Oxford or London. Although the theologians have done much to illuminate Owen's thought, Gribben is rightly critical of their "'freeze-frame" approach' and 'static view' (10). By contrast, this biography reveals Owen to be a theologian on the move, reacting in sometimes startling ways to a series of dramatic shifts in political and ecclesiastical affairs. In this respect, Gribben is indebted to the pioneering historical research by Peter Toon and Sarah Cook, and cites the inspiration of Tim Cooper's 2011 study of Owen, *Baxter and Nonconformity*, a work which did much to historicise and humanise Owen.

Gribben's book is arranged in nine chapters whose titles trace the arc of Owen's ecclesiastical career: Apprentice Puritan, Emerging Theologian, Frustrated Pastor, Army Preacher, Oxford Reformer, Cromwellian Courtier, Defeated Revolutionary, Restoration *Politique*, Nonconformist Divine. There are unifying themes. One is how Owen changed his mind. The first set of changes occurred in the 1640s, when he embraced a high Calvinist doctrine of limited or definite atonement and a Congregationalist ecclesiology. This is well known, but more surprising is another shift in intellectual positions that Gribben detects in the early 1660s, when Owen rejected the scholastic method that had hitherto dominated Reformed orthodoxy, eulogised 'our late king of glorious memory', and dismissed confessions of faith as 'a Procrustes' bed' (10). Indeed, one of the book's startling assertions is that by 'abandon[ing] his early sacramentalism' and prioritising 'the subjective over the objective', Owen 'was subverting, not epitomizing, the Reformed theological tradition that he is often believed to personify' (271).

A second theme is announced in the subtitle: *Experiences of Defeat* (with its nod to the late Christopher Hill). Even in the 1650s, Owen was outmanoeuvred in Oxford and marginalised at the Cromwellian court. In 1660, he was devastated by the collapse of the revolution, and the restoration of monarchy and episcopal hierarchy. He lived to see Puritanism scorned, Nonconformity persecuted, and Calvinism repudiated. By his death, he felt that his life's work had failed. However, a final theme is Owen's enduring legacy. The book begins by noting that Owen is 'attracting a wider readership than ever before' (4) and ends by arguing that Owen 'did more than most historians have realized to lay the theoretical foundation' for the evangelicalism that emerged in the 1730s (273). This arguably overplays Owen's role and his readership, though if Owen is seen as a significant influence on Isaac Watts, the case looks stronger. In any case, it is clear that what survived of Owen, at least until the revival of interest among theologians over the past generation, was his

practical divinity, with its stress on the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the believer. He was, in other words, a significant shaper of Reformed Pietism.

If the book has a weakness, it lies in the relative lack of space given to the two decades after the Restoration, when Owen wrote and published more than in the first half of his career. Part of the problem, of course, is that Owen was often working in the shadows after 1660, in contrast to his very public career in the 1650s. Even here, though, Gribben's account has much to add to what was previously known. This review has only been able to sketch the broad outlines of *John Owen and English Puritanism*, but readers will find every chapter contains powerful insights.

Prof. Dr. John Coffey  
University of Leicester  
[jrdc1@le.ac.uk](mailto:jrdc1@le.ac.uk)

**Geordan Hammond and David Ceri Jones (eds.), *George Whitefield. Life, Context, Legacy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, 329 pp.; ISBN 9780198747079; £ 65.00.**

George Whitefield was one of the best-known and most widely travelled evangelical revivalists of the eighteenth-century. However, whereas the life and legacy of John Wesley, Whitefield's fellow evangelist and antagonist, has been analyzed regularly, the significance of Whitefield has received considerably less attention. Therefore, this collection of articles is a welcome contribution to a steady stream of publications regarding this remarkable evangelist.

The first article, Boyd Schlenter's original research of Whitefield's life and character, shows that his personal relationships were often tumultuous and that his character was complex. Important is Mark Olsen's study regarding Whitefield's conversion and his early theological development. It shows that the evangelist began as an Oxford Methodist and only later came to a Calvinistic understanding of the evangelical gospel, especially with regard to justification by faith alone. His theological journey towards Calvinism began in the months following his new birth experience, when he read literature that reflected a moderate Calvinism. Whitefield embraced his Calvinism incrementally during the next several years, although it was not until a season of deep spiritual crisis in the autumn of 1739 that he was fully convinced of Calvinistic principles. William Gibson writes about Whitefield and the Church of

practical divinity, with its stress on the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the believer. He was, in other words, a significant shaper of Reformed Pietism.

If the book has a weakness, it lies in the relative lack of space given to the two decades after the Restoration, when Owen wrote and published more than in the first half of his career. Part of the problem, of course, is that Owen was often working in the shadows after 1660, in contrast to his very public career in the 1650s. Even here, though, Gribben's account has much to add to what was previously known. This review has only been able to sketch the broad outlines of *John Owen and English Puritanism*, but readers will find every chapter contains powerful insights.

Prof. Dr. John Coffey  
University of Leicester  
[jrdc1@le.ac.uk](mailto:jrdc1@le.ac.uk)

**Geordan Hammond and David Ceri Jones (eds.), *George Whitefield. Life, Context, Legacy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, 329 pp.; ISBN 9780198747079; £ 65.00.**

George Whitefield was one of the best-known and most widely travelled evangelical revivalists of the eighteenth-century. However, whereas the life and legacy of John Wesley, Whitefield's fellow evangelist and antagonist, has been analyzed regularly, the significance of Whitefield has received considerably less attention. Therefore, this collection of articles is a welcome contribution to a steady stream of publications regarding this remarkable evangelist.

The first article, Boyd Schlenter's original research of Whitefield's life and character, shows that his personal relationships were often tumultuous and that his character was complex. Important is Mark Olsen's study regarding Whitefield's conversion and his early theological development. It shows that the evangelist began as an Oxford Methodist and only later came to a Calvinistic understanding of the evangelical gospel, especially with regard to justification by faith alone. His theological journey towards Calvinism began in the months following his new birth experience, when he read literature that reflected a moderate Calvinism. Whitefield embraced his Calvinism incrementally during the next several years, although it was not until a season of deep spiritual crisis in the autumn of 1739 that he was fully convinced of Calvinistic principles. William Gibson writes about Whitefield and the Church of

England, whereas Frank Lambert's article addresses Whitefield and the Enlightenment.

An intriguing part of Whitefield life and evangelistic work is his relationship with John Wesley. George Hammond describes the transformation of their relationship between 1735 and 1739 from being a close friendship to a relationship significantly impacted by personal and doctrinal tensions. Though Whitefield initially declared himself to be Wesley's humble servant, during the period of 1736 until 1739 he would refer to himself as Wesley's 'son and servant', and subsequent to 1739 as 'brother and servant'. This shift of language is suggestive, since it closely coincided with the breakdown of his relationship with Wesley in mid-1739. Despite their passion to propagate the gospel, they did not manage to work closely together, and the conflict between the two great evangelists remained unresolved. Consequently, the Methodist revival was permanently split into a separate Calvinist and Wesleyan stream. Kenneth P. Minkema's chapter provides an account of the interactions between Whitefield and the famous American preacher Jonathan Edwards, showing that there were initial frictions between the two. However, Whitefield's views gradually moderated, and Edward's adjusted assessment of the revivals he had experienced resolved the friction to a large extent. Both men reached a consensus regarding the nature of the subjectivity of spiritual experience.

Articles on 'Whitefield and the Celtic Revivals', 'Whitefield and his critics', 'Whitefield's voice', and 'Whitefield and the Atlantic', highlight several aspects of his life and career. In her contribution, 'Whitefield and Literary Affect', Emma Salgard Cunha states that it is important to take a closer look at Whitefield's published sermons. His smaller corpus has been negatively impacted by being perceived as a deficient textual representation of his remarkable and fascinating preaching ministry. However, like his journals, Whitefield's sermons were intended to engage the imaginations, the souls, and particularly the affections of his readers. In his sermon on Genesis 22: 1-12, Whitefield tried to evoke an emotional response, not accepting tears as acceptable and pious evidence of Christian affections, but rather as empty signs of an unconverted state. Not a mere emotional transformation, but rather a truly religious transformation remained the singular goal of his preaching.

Studying his *Collection of Hymns for Social Worship*, Mark Noll regards Whitefield's hymnbook not only as an enduring contribution to evangelical hymnody, but also as a resource from which one can extract his theology and spirituality. Soteriologically the hymns focus and refocus on two main subjects: the character and work of Christ the Redeemer, and the believer's response to the redeeming transaction between a loving Trinity and a sinful humanity. Whitefield's asserts his high Christology by having forty references to Jesus as the Lamb, and the themes of the atonement and justification by grace are therefore prominent.

Isabel Rivers writes about Whitefield's reception in England, beginning at his death in 1770 to the centenary celebrations of 1839. The majority of his followers were Dissenters, whereas his opponents increasingly came to include Anglican evangelicals, who regarded his influence as detrimental to the Church. In the concluding chapter, Andrew Atherstone makes clear that after Whitefield's death many local communities on both sides of the Atlantic reclaimed their connection with him. In both regions, he was recast as a man for the contemporary age who could assume numerous roles: a Calvinist, an open-air preacher and revivalist, an evangelical ecumenist, or a loyal and committed Anglican.

This book is not only a good introduction to the life and thought of the great evangelist, but also a stimulus to further research. My criticism regards the comparatively minimal attention given to Whitefield's theology and spirituality. Only two of the sixteen chapters are dedicated to these central issues in Whitefield's life and thought, and then the focus is only on a specific period of his life, or on a specific work, his hymnbook. I am hopeful that future Whitefield-research will give a more prominent place to the study of his preaching, theology, and spirituality.

Dr. Reinier W. de Koeijer  
Minister Protestant Church Bilthoven  
[rwdkoeijer@filternet.nl](mailto:rwdkoeijer@filternet.nl)

**Tom Schwanda, *The Emergence of Evangelical Spirituality. The Age of Edwards, Newton and Whitefield* (The Classics of Western Spirituality), New York: Paulist Press 2016; 306 + xxi p.; ISBN 9780809106219; \$26.12.**

In the 'Classics of Western Spirituality' series, Tom Schwanda has edited a volume with the title: *The Emergence of Evangelical Spirituality. The Age of Edwards, Newton and Whitefield*. In choosing the theme of this volume, both editor and publisher make very clear that they understand Evangelical spirituality as a specific stream in the protestant movement – one that is closely related to Lutheran, Calvin's and Wesley's spirituality.

The Evangelical stream is rooted in Puritanism and pietism, with some characteristics of the high church Anglican tradition, the Scottish-Irish Presbyterianism and the Welsh revival. It is characterized by its advocacy for leading an intense spiritual life; a religion of the heart which emphasizes the need for personal responsibility. While this stream is not uninterested in confessional truth, its central focus is on the experience of the power of the truth in the heart.

Isabel Rivers writes about Whitefield's reception in England, beginning at his death in 1770 to the centenary celebrations of 1839. The majority of his followers were Dissenters, whereas his opponents increasingly came to include Anglican evangelicals, who regarded his influence as detrimental to the Church. In the concluding chapter, Andrew Atherstone makes clear that after Whitefield's death many local communities on both sides of the Atlantic reclaimed their connection with him. In both regions, he was recast as a man for the contemporary age who could assume numerous roles: a Calvinist, an open-air preacher and revivalist, an evangelical ecumenist, or a loyal and committed Anglican.

This book is not only a good introduction to the life and thought of the great evangelist, but also a stimulus to further research. My criticism regards the comparatively minimal attention given to Whitefield's theology and spirituality. Only two of the sixteen chapters are dedicated to these central issues in Whitefield's life and thought, and then the focus is only on a specific period of his life, or on a specific work, his hymnbook. I am hopeful that future Whitefield-research will give a more prominent place to the study of his preaching, theology, and spirituality.

Dr. Reinier W. de Koeijer  
Minister Protestant Church Bilthoven  
[rwdkoeijer@filternet.nl](mailto:rwdkoeijer@filternet.nl)

**Tom Schwanda, *The Emergence of Evangelical Spirituality. The Age of Edwards, Newton and Whitefield* (The Classics of Western Spirituality), New York: Paulist Press 2016; 306 + xxi p.; ISBN 9780809106219; \$26.12.**

In the 'Classics of Western Spirituality' series, Tom Schwanda has edited a volume with the title: *The Emergence of Evangelical Spirituality. The Age of Edwards, Newton and Whitefield*. In choosing the theme of this volume, both editor and publisher make very clear that they understand Evangelical spirituality as a specific stream in the protestant movement – one that is closely related to Lutheran, Calvin's and Wesley's spirituality.

The Evangelical stream is rooted in Puritanism and pietism, with some characteristics of the high church Anglican tradition, the Scottish-Irish Presbyterianism and the Welsh revival. It is characterized by its advocacy for leading an intense spiritual life; a religion of the heart which emphasizes the need for personal responsibility. While this stream is not uninterested in confessional truth, its central focus is on the experience of the power of the truth in the heart.

This focus also appears in each of the six sections that this book is divided into, the first of which is titled 'New life in Christ.' This section deals especially with writings around the theme of the new birth and starts with a poem by Isaac Watts: 'When I survey the wondrous cross.' This is followed by a fragment of Gilbert Tennent's well known sermon on 'The Danger of an Unconverted Ministry', a sermon that stresses that the individual cannot be a good minister of the Word without being led by the Spirit, because we do not really know the reality of the soul and the eternal truths of the gospel from our own experience.

In the first section, poems by Samuel Davies, Augustus Toplady, John Newton, Anne Steel and Nicholas Ludwig Zinzendorf are also included. The choice of this last poet is particularly indicative of the broadness of the Evangelical stream in the protestant movement; Zinzendorf's spirituality is certainly not that of Tennent. While Tennent can be called a 'son of thunder', Zinzendorf's work is characterized by its absence of the holy law and strong focus on the Lamb of God.

A letter written by Mary Fletcher about the love for Jesus is also included in the first section, as is an extract of a sermon by Samson Occom about God's repentance related to the creation of human beings. We can then read a letter by Henry Alline in which he describes the experience of the light of the gospel coming into his heart when he was at his greatest distance from experiencing God's salvation. A striking detail that stands out in this first section is the letter written by the slave Richard Allen, who honors his white masters as good masters, whilst describing the sale of his mother and three siblings. We also get an insight into his journey to freedom and his subsequent role as a preacher. Another letter is that of Selina Hastings, of Huntingdon, in which we read about the compassion she feels for the millions of souls without Christ.

The second section covers the Holy Spirit and his indwelling. A sermon by Whitefield and Edwards' appendix to Brainerd's diary are representative of the power of the Holy Spirit in the spiritual life, a position for which the stream was accused of enthusiasm.

The third section is dedicated to the functioning and understanding of Holy Scripture in Evangelical Spirituality. The fourth looks at spiritual practices such as prayer, worship, the use of a diary, fasting, meditation, the Lord's Supper, self-examination, friendship and the house-altar. It is impressive to read how McCulloch served the Lord's Supper from early in the morning right through to the evening in the midst of the summer; (there were 24 tables, each with 120 attendants, with sermons by Whitefield in-between).

The next section deals with the love for God, covering subjects such as backsliding, the spiritual journey and the intimate communion with Jesus. The final section is dedicated to the love of one's neighbor and looks at the active

Christian life in protest against slavery on the one hand and in mission work on the other hand.

The advantage of having a collection of texts in this series of 'Classics of Western Spirituality' is that the reader experiences a wide diversity of genres and messages around certain themes. However, it did occasionally seem that a certain text could also be matched to those in other sections, or that the link with the theme of the section was very thin or arbitrary. Another issue concerns the way spirituality is practiced. In this volume, spirituality exists outside the daily life of marriage, family, profession, politics, science and economics. I interpret this as an indication of the particular spirituality of this stream of Evangelical Christianity, or does it also betray something about the interest of the compiler or this volume? A comparable question could also be raised about the lack of a section about the church. These questions indicate that this volume raises interests, questions and ideas for further research, which confirms its value.

Prof. Dr. Willem van Vlastuin  
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam  
[info@wvanvastuin.nl](mailto:info@wvanvastuin.nl)