Josef Köstlbauer

4 "I Have No Shortage of Moors": Mission, Representation, and the Elusive Semantics of Slavery in Eighteenth-Century Moravian Sources

In a letter written in apparent haste to request the expeditious transfer of an enslaved young woman named Cecilia, Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf assured the recipient, Danish plantation owner Johan Lorentz Carstens, that his only concern was for the woman's soul. "After all," he added, "I have no shortage of Moors."[1]

Committed to paper as a thoughtless aside seemingly bespeaking aristocratic self-confidence and sense of entitlement, this statement is remarkable. Not only does it attest to the extension of slavery and the slave trade to Northern and Central Europe, it also provides an insight into how Moravians perceived enslaved men and women living among them in Germany, as well as the motivations for bringing them there. What is more, it represents a small breach of the peculiar silence encountered in the sources when researching the presence of enslaved persons in the Moravian communal settlements (*Gemeinorte*). Typically, Moravian archives remain mute as far as the ambiguous status and slavery background of Africans or West Indian Creoles living in the communities is concerned. On the surface, they appear as brothers and sisters who ideally provided edifying examples of missionary achievement and spiritual awakening. The experience of slavery – shared in different ways by slaves and enslavers – and its confrontation with Moravian life in Europe stay hidden beneath this surface. Therefore, research on non-Europeans in the *Gemeinorte* is especially concerned with things left unsaid: It has to contend with the lacunae and omissions in the written discourse.

1 Unity Archives Herrnhut (UA), R.15.B.a.1.IV.2.g, Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf to Johan Lorentz Carstens, March 15, 1741. The case is discussed in more detail below. In the original German, Zinzendorf used the female term *Mohrinnen*. Indeed, there were four women or girls and one boy from St. Thomas living in Marienborn and Herrnhaag in 1740.

Notes: Publication was made possible by funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement no. 641110, "The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation and Its Slaves," 2015–2022). However, this text reflects the author's views exclusively. The ERC is neither responsible for the content nor for its use. The text of this contribution was much improved thanks to the insightful and immensely helpful comments of Rebekka von Mallinckrodt, Sarah Lentz, Annika Bärwald, Julia Holzmann, and Jasper Hagedorn. Special thanks go to Julia Holzmann for kindly sharing her intimate knowledge of Dutch sources and archives.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110748833-005

The Moravian Brethren – also known as the Moravian Church or the (renewed) *Unitas Fratrum* – were a radical pietistic community formed in Upper Lusatia in the 1720s by the charismatic Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf together with adherents of the old Protestant church of the Bohemian Brethren who had fled from prosecution in their Moravian homeland.[2] Even within the highly dynamic world of early modern Protestantism, the Moravian Church was extraordinary in many ways, not least because of its rapid growth and global expansion. As unlikely as it may seem, for a certain time this religious community emerging from the eastern fringes of the Empire formed a small but remarkable entryway into Germany for enslaved people. Thirty-seven individuals of non-European origin, mostly converts from colonial areas, are documented to have lived in or visited German *Gemeinorte*. Among them were thirteen individuals who evidently or very likely came as slaves or captives, of which twelve were of African or Creole extraction and came to Europe from the West Indies or North America. Others were former slaves or appear to have been in positions of uncategorized but nevertheless significant dependency.[3]

I argue that the Moravians are significant for historical research on traces of the slave trade in two respects: Firstly, the enslaved and formerly enslaved individuals they brought to Europe are evidence of the inevitable – though often obscure – extension of colonial slaveries into Europe. Secondly, the Moravian example poignantly demonstrates the difficulties encountered when researching slavery in Europe. The lives of slaves usually left only scant traces in the archives owing to their subaltern position. In addition, their status often remained ambiguous, with slavery hidden beneath other forms of service or dependency.[4] This is true for the Moravian cases as well: It is difficult to ascertain whether an individual was acquired as a slave and/or remained a slave, and what this meant to the involved parties.

The first part of this article briefly introduces the eighteenth-century Moravian stance regarding slavery. The second part investigates Moravian motivations for transferring individuals from colonial slavery contexts to Europe and the representative function assigned to them within Moravian social and spiritual contexts. In the third part, the cases of two enslaved individuals in Germany document how Moravians were willing to claim proprietorial rights rooted in slavery. Analyzing the

2 The community's statutes were formulated in 1727. On the beginnings, see Hanns-Joachim Wollstadt, *Geordnetes Dienen in der christlichen Gemeinde* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 24–48; Paul Peucker, "The 1727 Statutes of Herrnhut," *Journal of Moravian History* 20, no. 1 (2020).

3 Paul Peucker has written an important article assembling information on almost all non-European brothers and sisters coming to Germany. See Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen: Nichteuropäer in den deutschen Brüdergemeinden des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Unitas Fratrum* 59/60 (2007).

4 Rebekka v. Mallinckrodt, "There are no Slaves in Prussia?" in *Slavery Hinterland: Transatlantic Slavery and Continental Europe, 1680–1850*, ed. Felix Brahm and Eve Rosenhaft (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016); Anne Kuhlmann, "Ambiguous Duty: Black Servants at German Ancien Régime Courts," in *Germany and the Black Diaspora: Points of Contact, 1250–1914*, ed. Mischa Honeck, Martin Klimke, and Anne Kuhlmann-Smirnov (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013).

ambiguous and at times contradictory terminology of these and additional sources, I will explore what they can tell us about perceptions, meanings, and practices involving enslaved individuals in Moravian Germany.

Moravians and Slavery

The Moravians' involvement with slavery goes back to the very beginnings of their missionary endeavors in the West Indies in 1732. Within just a few years, the Brethren not only established a successful mission among the slave population in the Danish colonies of St. Thomas, Saint John, and St. Croix, but also became slave owners themselves. Until the nineteenth century, slavery remained a part of Moravian economy in many parts of the Atlantic world, from Suriname and Berbice to Antigua, Jamaica, or North Carolina.[5]

Evidently, the Moravians did not oppose slavery as an institution. Since slave owners on St. Thomas initially opposed missionary activities among the enslaved fiercely and often violently, a position of compliance was deemed advisable, and the Moravians were quick to express their acceptance of colonial slavery. Upon leaving St. Thomas after a short visit in 1738–39, Count Zinzendorf delivered a famous farewell speech to an assembly of slaves in which he explained the slaves' position to be God-given. "King, lord, and slave" all had to adhere to the places assigned to them by the Lord.

5 On early Moravian missionary endeavors, see Peter Vogt, "Die Mission der Herrnhuter Brüdergemeinde und ihre Bedeutung für den Neubeginn der protestantischen Missionen am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 35 (2009). An essential account of the mission in the Danish West Indies is Christian Georg Andreas Oldendorp, *Historie der caribischen Inseln Sanct Thomas, Sanct Crux und Sanct Jan: Kommentierte Ausgabe des vollständigen Manuskripts aus dem Archiv der Evangelischen Brüder-Unität*, ed. Gudrun Meier et al., 2 vols. (Berlin: VWB, 2000). This work was originally published by the Moravian Church in 1777 in a massively revised and abridged version by editor Johann Jakob Bossart. For a critique of Bossart's work, see Ingeborg Baldauf, "Christan Georg Andreas Oldendorp als Historiker: Freiheit und Grenzen eines Autors in der Brüderkirche," in *Christan Georg Andreas Oldendorp: Historie der caraibischen Inseln Sanct Thomas, Sanct Crux und Sanct Jan. Kommentarband, ed.* Gudrun Meier et. al. (Herrnhut: Herrnhuter Verlag, 2010).

The involvement of the Moravians with Atlantic slavery has received a fair share of scholarly attention. To name but a few works: Jon F. Sensbach, *A Separate Canaan: The Making of an Afro-Moravian World in North Carolina, 1763–1840* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Jon F. Sensbach, *Rebecca's Revival: Creating Black Christianity in the Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006); Jan Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine und die Sklavenemanzipation in Britisch- und Dänisch-Westindien* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2016); Louise Sebro, "Mellem afrikaner og kreol: etnisk identitet og social navigation i Dansk Vestindien 1730–1770" (PhD Diss, Lund University, 2010); Richard S. Dunn, *A Tale of Two Plantations: Slave Life and Labor in Jamaica and Virginia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014); Katharine Gerbner, *Christian Slavery: Conversion and Race in the Protestant Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018).

Apparently, God had punished the "first Negroes [. . .], turning their entire lineage into slaves."[6] What the enslaved men and women made of Zinzendorf's reasoning remains unknown.[7]

Even though the Moravians defended slavery and owned slaves themselves, they did not aspire to become part of planter society. For their mission to succeed, they had to carve out a unique position for themselves. Obviously, they could not eschew the color divide that formed the foundation of racialized slavery in the colonies – but they did distance themselves from planter society in order to gain access to the prospective converts' hearts and minds. This is manifest in Moravian rhetoric in that the missionaries spoke to the enslaved of an "internal slavery" trapping all sinners regardless of skin color. Compared to this, "external slavery" seemed ephemeral.[8] Today, such a position might be construed as cynical or exhibiting indifference to the everyday plight of slaves in the plantation economy. But in eighteenth-century St. Thomas, it transmitted a message of empowerment: The pious slave rose far above the sinful master. What was more, in the 1740s, many Moravians including Zinzendorf considered the second arrival of Christ to be imminent.[9] Such eschatological anticipations might have added considerably to the urgency of the Moravian message.

In addition, there was an ostensible equality pervading life in the Moravian mission congregations that stood in stark contrast to the colonial practices of slavery surrounding them. Everyone was addressed as brother or sister regardless of their class or skin color.[10] Free as well as enslaved converts could attain positions within

6 UA, R.15.B.a.3.64, Zinzendorf's farewell address, February 15, 1739, 21–22. In interpreting slavery as godly punishment, Zinzendorf alluded to the Curse of Ham, Genesis 9, 18–27, a well-established legitimation of slavery. On the origins of this interpretation, see M. Lindsay Kaplan, *Figuring Racism in Medieval Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 135–165. Referencing pertinent passages from the Pauline epistles (Eph 6,5–9; Kol 3,22; 1 Tim 6,1–2, Philemon) some decades later, August Gottlieb Spangenberg basically expounded on the same motif used by Zinzendorf in 1739. See Spangenberg, *Idea fidei Fratrum, od. kurzer Begriff der christl. Lehre in den evangelischen Brüdergemeinen* (Barby: Unitas Fratrum, 1779), 78–79, 396; Spangenberg, *Von der Arbeit der evangelischen Brüder unter den Heiden* (Barby: Christian Friedrich Laux, 1782), 65–66. See also Craig D. Atwood, "Apologizing for the Moravians: Spangenberg's Idea fidei fratrum," *Journal of Moravian History* 8, no. 1 (2010).

7 Zinzendorf read a Creole translation to the crowd. Oldendorp, *Historie*, 2: 349.

8 Katherine Gerbner has emphasized this dichotomy of external and internal slavery. See Gerbner, *Christian Slavery*, 147–163.

9 Dietrich Meyer, "Chiliastische Hoffnung und eschatologische Erwartung innerhalb der Brüdergemeine und der Mission bei Zinzendorf und Spangenberg," in *Geschichtsbewusstsein und Zukunftserwartung in Pietismus und Erweckungsbewegung,* ed. Wolfgang Breul and Jan Carsten Schnurr (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Erich Beyreuther, "Mission und Kirche," in *Studien zur Theologie Zinzendorfs: Gesammelte Aufsätze,* ed. Erich Beyreuther, 2nd ed. (Hildesheim: Olms, 2000), 168–170; Vogt, "Mission der Herrnhuter Brüdergemeinde," 218–219.

10 This has recently been emphasized by Heike Raphael-Hernandez, "The Right to Freedom: Eighteenth-Century Slave Resistance and Early Moravian Missions in the Danish West Indies and Dutch Suriname," *Atlantic Studies* 14, no. 4 (2017): 459.

the church's hierarchy and become *Helpers* and *Elders* of their congregations.[11] Nevertheless, the actual practices in the missions were not necessarily on par with the equality expressed in Moravian rhetoric: Slaves owned by the mission were expected to perform slave work in the fields, households, and workshops, and they were supervised and punished "according to the custom of the country" by the European brothers and sisters.[12]

Obedience was also expected of the European Moravians, for example when they were assigned a new occupation or ordered to a new place of residence. Such decisions were often made by casting lots, with the result regarded as Christ's will.[13] But still, these European men and women were no slaves, and the ideal of obedience they followed was an integral part of the Moravian commitment to communal life and labor. There was always the possibility of leaving the community if one was dissatisfied, as indeed a number of members did.[14]

Tellingly, there is no indication that the Moravians ever felt obliged to manumit even fully integrated congregation members. Oldendorp reports that, in 1745, the missionaries on St. Thomas exchanged one of their slaves for Abraham, an Elder of the mission congregation who belonged to a neighboring plantation, so that he could concentrate exclusively on his pastoral duties.[15] Remarkably, in his extensive revision of Oldendorp's original manuscript, editor Johann Jakob Bossart made a point of emphasizing that being acquired by his fellow Moravians did not mean that Abraham had been manumitted.[16]

11 For example, Rebecca Freundlichin/Protten or Maria Andressen. See Sensbach, *Rebecca's Revival*; Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 1–4.

12 Cf. UA, R.2.B.45.1.d, Minutes of the Marienborn synod, August 5, 1769; R.15.B.a.21.b. Memorandum regarding the plantations of the Brothers on St. Thomas, August 16, 1769, 6–11. This has also been explored by Jan Hüsgen and Jon Sensbach: Cf. Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, 113–118; Sensbach, *A Separate Canaan*, 90–91.

13 Elisabeth W. Sommer, *Serving Two Masters: Moravian Brethren in Germany and North Carolina, 1727–1801* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2015), 53–54, 65–68, 91–99; Stephanie Böß, *Gottesacker-Geschichten als Gedächtnis: Eine Ethnographie zur Herrnhuter Erinnerungskultur am Beispiel von Neudietendorfer Lebensläufen* (Münster: Waxmann, 2015), 177–181.

14 Obviously, both social and financial pressures might be brought to bear on alienated members. This was alleged in the (somewhat vitriolic) criticism of the Moravians by Jean Francois Reynier. See Reynier, "Das Geheimnis der Zinzendorfischen Secte Oder eine Lebens-Beschreibung Johann Franz Regnier, woraus zu ersehen was vor ein schädlich Ding es sey, sich von Menschen führen zu lassen," in *Bewährte Nachrichten von Herrnhutischen Sachen*, ed. Johann Philipp Fresenius, (Frankfurt: Buchner, 1747), 363–364.

15 Oldendorp, *Historie*, 2: 678–679.

16 Of course, Bossart may have been wrong (as he was in other cases); unfortunately, he provided no sources for this interesting apposition, nor did he explain why he considered it necessary. For Bossart's work, see footnote 4.

Representation

The dominant motivation for assembling a gathering of "Moors", as implied in Zinzendorf's statement, was the need for representation. Be they slaves from the West Indies, Inuit from Greenland, or Arawak from Suriname – upon arrival in Europe, they were all assigned a specific role in the enactment of Moravian (self-)representation.[17] They became potent symbols of the success of the Moravian mission, and as such could effectively assist in securing outside support. Furthermore, their presence held an eschatological promise: It was a sign of the imminent return of Christ and a humanity united in Christendom. The symbolic value attached to these individuals also led to their portrayal in Moravian works of art (see Fig. 4.1). It almost seems as though the Moravians were trying to instigate events by simulating them.

Especially the men, women, and children designated as "Moors" (*Mohren* – a German term usually applied to dark-skinned individuals of African or East Asian descent) were performing a vital service: They produced status for the Moravian community and represented a distinct Moravian vision, both to the brothers and sisters they interacted with and to outside visitors. The significance of this labor also served to increase the ambivalence of their status: Highly visible and highly regarded, their position depended on how well they knew to fulfil this role. And while the term "labor" is usually not applied to representative functions in early modern contexts, I employ it here to underline the fact that in baroque culture, one had to *perform* in a very literal sense.

Using a non-European convert to represent missionary success was by no means novel. During his time as a student in Halle (1710–1716), Zinzendorf himself met the Tamils Timotheus and Peter Maleiappen from the Tranquebar mission.[18] As a young man, he witnessed the visit of the Greenlanders Pooq and Qiperoq to Copenhagen.[19] In general, dark-skinned servants were a common element of the baroque culture of representation that was not restricted to aristocratic courts; merchants, investors, mariners, and many others with access to Atlantic or East Asian slave trading networks acquired slave servants.[20] Zinzendorf was eager to buy slaves while travelling

17 On Inuit, see Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 11–12, 27–28, 30–31, 34.

18 Kurt Liebau, "Die ersten Tamilen aus der Dänisch-Halleschen Mission in Europa: Vom Objekt zum Subjekt kultureller Interaktion," in *Fremde Erfahrungen: Asiaten und Afrikaner in Deutschland, Österreich und in der Schweiz bis 1945*, ed. Gerhard Höpp (Berlin: Verlag Das Arabische Buch, 1996), 15–20.

19 Michael Harbsmeier, "Invented Explorations: Inuit Experiences of Denmark (1605–1932)," in *Cross-Cultural Encounters and Constructions of Knowledge in the 18th and 19th Century: Non-European and European Travel of Exploration in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Philippe Despoix and Justus Fetscher (Kassel: Kassel University Press, 2004), 88, 96–98.

20 Rebekka v. Mallinckrodt, "Verschleppte Kinder im Heiligen Römischen Reich," in *Transkulturelle Mehrfachzugehörigkeit als kulturhistorisches Phänomen: Räume – Materialitäten – Erinnerungen*, ed. Dagmar Freist, Sabine Kyora, and Melanie Unseld (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 19–27; Anne Kuhlmann-Smirnov, *Schwarze Europäer im Alten Reich: Handel, Migration, Hof* (Göttingen: V & R Unipress, 2013), 170–183, 219–224.

to St. Thomas in 1738–1739.[21] His and other Moravians' purchases of slaves in this early period satisfied different but mutually reinforcing desires: The ambition for aristocratic representation, the wish to demonstrate missionary success, and the longing for a direct and personal connection to the evangelization of the "heathens" by incorporating converts (or prospective converts) into one's household. Sending a slave to Europe might have seemed much easier than sending a (free) servant or convert: Where an Inuit would perhaps need to be convinced or cajoled, a slave could simply be ordered.

The transfer of converts from the mission areas to European communal settlements largely ceased after 1750, with Zinzendorf and the Brethren having apparently lost their zeal for this practice of representing their missionary endeavors. The reasons may have been manifold; Paul Peucker has hypothesized that it was due to the sad fact that many of the individuals brought to Germany died within a few years after their arrival.[22] This is supported by a statement by August Gottlieb Spangenberg in a memorandum from 1752.[23] Furthermore, the high-flying expectations of the Moravians may have been disappointed when none of the "Moors" brought to Europe developed into the type of global indigenous missionary envisioned by Zinzendorf. Financial considerations may have been a motivation as well: None of the men and women brought from the West Indies had been trained in a trade, so they had to be provided for or, if they were unmarried, help in the choir houses for single brothers or sisters.[24] Non-European children received schooling and training in crafts like European children.

Of Things Unsaid: Semantics of Slavery and Dependency in Moravian Sources

In the colonial setting of the Danish West Indies, British North America, or Suriname, slaves were clearly classified as such by the Moravians. Their names appear on lists of slaves or on bills of sale, and they are frequently mentioned in correspondences and congregational diaries. As has been pointed out, once enslaved individuals left the colonial context and entered Europe, they acquired a new significance and function by becoming representatives of missionary success and playing a part in Moravian eschatological imagery. Since slavery was not a prerequisite for this function, it

21 UA, R.15.B.a.2.a.3, Zinzendorf's diary of his journey to St. Thomas and back 1738–1739, 39.
22 Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 16–17.
23 UA, R.14.A.19.18, Memorandum by Spangenberg, February 2, 1752.
24 Moravian communal settlements were organized into so-called choirs: one for married couples, one each for the single sisters and brothers, and one for children. Cf. Katherine M. Faull (ed.), *Speaking to Body and Soul: Instructions for the Moravian Choir Helper 1785–1785* (University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 4–6, 171.

was apparently elided in the records. Source types like slave lists or sale receipts do not exist for European congregations. Instead, the traces of enslaved individuals are dispersed across different sources like communal diaries, correspondences, memoirs, letters and reports, conference protocols, or church registers. There is only the most circumstantial information on whether and how a possible slave status or slave past was perceived within the community, and conclusions on how the affected individuals perceived it themselves can only be drawn by inference.

This leads to a fundamental methodological problem posed by eighteenth-century Moravian records: They were produced within a media system communicating narratives of community, spirituality, and missionary success.[25] Communal diaries, for instance, meticulously reported the coming and going of brothers and sisters and informed about meetings and festivities. They were sent to congregations around the globe and read aloud during meetings, thus fostering a sense of community and intimacy that transcended space and time. But biographical information and reflections on personal experience and emotion were only of interest as far as they related to a person's spiritual awakening or communal life. Essentially, the story offered by the Moravian archives is one of movement, work, and spirituality; it tells little of subjection or dependency, especially as far as non-Europeans are concerned. Where voices of the enslaved are present in sources, they are transformed by the rhetoric and topoi of Moravian discourse.

The religious bias pervading Moravian records thus served to obscure slavery in European contexts. Never is anyone explicitly referred to as a slave, though individuals from Africa, the Americas, or Asia are unfailingly singled out using the adjective "Black" or labels like "Moor," or by way of more specific geographic and ethnic designations like "from St. Thomas." And never is the (from our perspective) fundamental ambiguity of communal religious equality and slave status reflected upon. As a result, the enslaved persons living in Europe remain mere shadows to us, rendered two-dimensional in the narrow perspective afforded by the sources.

This silence in the records should not be construed as evidence that the shackles of slavery somehow fell off a person when they set foot on European soil. Neither was there any form of German "free soil principle" at work, nor did membership in the Moravian church translate into automatic manumission. Therefore, in the cases where records report that a person was bought or was a slave in a colonial slaving zone, one can sensibly assume this status to have remained with them.[26] And although life in the close-knit community of Moravian settlements along with the symbolic prestige accorded to converts may have rendered this legal relationship dormant (for lack of a better word), it was by no means resolved.

---

25 Gisela Mettele, *Weltbürgertum oder Gottesreich: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine als globale Gemeinschaft 1727–1857* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

26 This view is shared by Paul Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 17, and Hüsgen, *Mission und Sklaverei*, 96.

Consequently, researching the traces of slavery in Moravian communities in eighteenth-century Germany is very much concerned with things left unsaid. It is a description of lacunae and a matter of informed speculation or conjecture. One approach to resolving this conundrum lies in careful semantic analysis of the language employed by the Moravians in individual cases and connecting it to the available historical details on the specific circumstances.

Case Studies

To exemplify this approach, I will delve into the only two cases in which individuals already in Germany were explicitly labeled as slaves and proprietorial rights were claimed by Moravians. They serve to prove that community members were willing to claim authority over individuals that went beyond church discipline, domestic servitude, or serfdom and was in fact rooted in slavery. Both cases also show slavery assuming multiple forms and changing significance as a result of chance and circumstance. Having thus established that while the slave status of individuals may have been concealed, it was not necessarily rescinded, I will look at the remaining cases of enslaved individuals whose slave status has to be deduced from a more oblique terminology used in the records.

Cecilia: Slavery, Gender, Age, and Representation

A young woman referred to simply as Cecilia in the sources was part of the small retinue of servants accompanying eminent Danish Creole planter Johan Lorentz Carstens and his pregnant wife Jacoba, née van Holten, when they left St. Thomas to resettle in Denmark in the summer of 1739. As it is the only identification available, I am forced to use this name as well. But it must be kept in mind that like other enslaved people, Cecilia probably identified with several names, each tied to specific contexts and/or stages of her life. Her story also provided the citation in the introduction to this article.[27]

The company arrived in the Netherlands in July 1739 and travelled on to Copenhagen after a short visit to Marienborn. Carstens brought with him a group of slaves who had been bought by Count Zinzendorf a few months earlier during his visit to St. Thomas.[28] They are mentioned in Carstens' letters ("three blacks for the dear brother Count Sinsendorff [sic],"[29] but there is no reference to Cecilia, which makes it very likely that she was a regular part of the Carstens household and there was no

27 An overview over the case is also provided in Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 8–10.
28 UA, R.15.B.a.2.a.3, Zinzendorf's diary, 39.
29 UA, R.15.B.a.11.39, Carstens to LeLong, July 5, 1739.

intention at the time to send or sell her to the Moravians. A 1740 census entry for the Carstens household in Copenhagen lists (among others) three maids and one "Negresse [sic] without pay."[30] One may assume the latter was Cecilia. Why was she not listed as a slave? Presumably because what was of interest in the census was taxes, and taxes had to be paid for servants. The designation may thus have been a qualifying statement resulting from an uncertainty whether Cecilia, who was not party to a service contract, classified as a taxable servant or not. The Carstens family's entourage included at least one other slave: Carstens' trusted servant and Moravian helper Domingo Gesoe.[31]

The first mention of Cecilia by name appears in a letter dated April 11, 1740 – although judging from its content, other letters had been exchanged before.[32] Zinzendorf wrote of the wish of his wife, Countess Erdmuthe Dorothea, to have Cecilia. How this came about remains unknown. Perhaps the Countess had met Cecilia and resolved to obtain her when the Carstens family had visited Marienborn. It also seems plausible that Zinzendorf himself wanted to add Cecilia to the circle of recently acquired young women, men, and children from St. Thomas. In this case, the Countess may have come into play only because Cecilia was to be provided for in her household.

Whatever the specific circumstances, Carstens initially agreed to sell Cecilia, placing her price at 250 *Rigsdaler*.[33] But shortly thereafter, his relationship with the Moravians began to deteriorate. Zinzendorf had ordered a Moravian couple named Peter to Carstens with the intention of sister Peter taking over Cecilia's position as nurse to the children.[34] This emphasizes that Cecilia held the position of a trusted servant. After a falling-out between Carstens and brother Peter, however, the latter left in a huff taking his wife with him. Carstens subsequently retracted his consent to the sale, citing his wife's need for Cecilia's continued service as she had just given birth to a son.[35] This may have been a stopgap measure at first, as a further slave woman was scheduled to arrive from St. Thomas.[36] But it soon became evident that Jacoba Carstens had decided to completely renege on the deal and keep Cecilia in her service. A bitter dispute ensued during which Erdmuthe Dorothea von Zinzendorf unsuccessfully tried to present the case to the Danish king and the Count issued

30 Cited according to Thorkild Hansen, *Islands of Slaves* (Accra: Sub-Saharan Publishers, 2005), (Slavernes øer), 82.

31 Gesoe remained in Copenhagen until the end of May UA, R.15.B.a.11.89, Carstens to Zinzendorf, May 31, 1740.

32 UA, R.15.B.a.1.IV.2.d, Zinzendorf to Carstens, April 11, 1740. I would like to thank Julia Holzman for kindly helping me with the translation of correspondence written in Dutch.

33 UA, R.11.A.9.2, Carstens to Zinzendorf, April 23, 1740.

34 I was unable to identify the first names.

35 UA, R.15.B.a.11.89, Carstens to Zinzendorf, May 31, 1740; UA, R.11.a.9.6.b, Böhner to Zinzendorf, July 9, 1740.

36 UA, R.11.a.9.6.h, Böhner to Zinzendorf, September 13, 1740.

empty ultimatums.[37] It was all to no avail, however, and Cecilia ultimately remained with the Carstens. Even sister Peter's return to her position did not change the situation. Visiting Moravians were no longer allowed to speak with Cecilia, and to their chagrin she received religious instruction at Copenhagen's Lutheran Church.[38]

The correspondence generated in this case distinctly illustrates perceptions and practices of slavery. Significantly, the status of the young woman seems to have been clear to all involved parties: She was a slave imported from the colonies, and her stay in the Netherlands, Germany, or Denmark did not change that fact in any way. The straightforward financial character of the intended transaction makes this quite evident. Even more to the point, when confronted with reports that Cecilia herself did not want to live in Marienborn, Zinzendorf outright refuted her having a say in the matter: "What sort of will does an unconverted girl and slave have" ("ein unbekehrtes Mensch und eine Sclavin")?[39] The Count was obviously very much aware of the young woman's slave status and expected her to readily and unquestioningly obey her masters' orders.

But it was not solely about slavery. An additional three aspects that profoundly affected Cecilia's position intersected in Zinzendorf's curt statement: She was a heathen, a woman, and a young one at that. The patriarchal sentiment exhibited by Zinzendorf associated a marked inferiority of rank, limited autonomy of action, and an obligation of obedience with each of these qualities.

Furthermore, the Count's desire to obtain Cecilia must also be seen in the context of his strategy for representing his missionary and eschatological vision. In a letter from 1742, Zinzendorf wrote that Cecilia had been considered as a wife for "Andreas, the Moor," a brother from St. Thomas living in Marienborn and Herrnhaag. Undoubtedly, two "Moorish" converts, united with each other according to Moravian custom as a missionary couple, promised significant representational value.[40]

Cecilia's case also offers glimpses of how position and personal relationships framed actual practices of slavery and influenced the scope of action of enslaved individuals. It is evident from the letters that the young woman was asked by her master

37 UA, R.11.a.9.4, Erdmuthe Dorothea Zinzendorf to the King of Denmark, August 11, 1740; UA, R.15.B.a.1.IV,2.i, Zinzendorf to Carstens, June 30, 1741; UA, R.11.a.9.10, Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf to the King of Denmark, June 30, 1741.

38 UA, R.11.a.9.6.k, Böhner to Zinzendorf, Sept. 24, 1740; UA, R.11.a.9.6.l, Böhner to Zinzendorf, October 1, 1740; UA, R.11.a.9.6.o, Böhner to Erdmuthe Dorothea von Zinzendorf, November 5, 1740.

39 UA, R.15.B.a.1.IV.2.c, Zinzendorf to Br. Peter, June 27, 1740. Peucker also presents this as significant evidence.

40 Andreas was eventually married to Maria, a vice-elder of the St. Thomas congregation, in 1743. See Josef Köstlbauer, "Ambiguous Passages: Non-Europeans Brought to Europe by the Moravian Brethren during the Eighteenth Century," in *Globalized Peripheries: Central Europe and the Atlantic World, 1680–1860*, ed. Jutta Wimmler and Klaus Weber (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2020), 176–178; Paul Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen: Nichteuropäer in den deutschen Brüdergemeinden des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Unitas Fratrum* 59/60 (2007): 1–2.

and mistress whether she wanted to move to Marienborn, and that she apparently agreed to do so at first.[41] Perhaps she wanted to become part of the religious community there, or she was attracted by the fact that there was a small group of people from St. Thomas living in Marienborn and Herrnhaag, at least some of whom she already knew. Soon thereafter, however, Cecilia reversed her position – at least according to what Johan Lorentz Carstens' letters tell us – and decided to remain in his wife's service. It is unclear whether her wish was the sole determining factor for Carstens' refusal to sell her. Undoubtedly, Jacoba Carstens' wishes were of central importance in the matter: Having just given birth to a child in a newly established home in a new country, she attached great importance to having a trusted female servant and nurse for her children. After the trouble with the Peters, and the overbearing demeanor of Zinzendorf and his envoys, she had had enough. Furthermore, while sister Peter was apparently regarded favorably, Cecilia had been with the family much longer – and she was the sole remaining servant from Jacoba Carstens' former household on St. Thomas.[42] This placed the young woman in a position of trust and intimacy not easily replicated by someone else. Moravian reports also indicate that Cecilia had asked to be allowed to return to St. Thomas, probably after her service was deemed fulfilled. This was likely tied to an agreement regarding her manumission.[43] Again, this points to a special position held by Cecilia as a valued member of the household and a resultant ability to negotiate certain aspects of her situation.

Cecilia remained a slave even though her masters were willing to listen to her wishes and valued her according to a patriarchal sense of mutual obligation between higher and lower rank. To Zinzendorf, on the other hand, Cecilia's slave status seems to have primarily meant increased availability. There was no need to convince her – though this could perhaps be achieved later – as she could simply be bought. And since she was already in Europe, she could be acquired with much less effort than other individuals from the West Indies, who had to be purchased overseas and sent on a costly journey across the Atlantic.

Samuel Johannes: Runaway, Slave, Serf, or Servant

The second case of an individual explicitly labelled a slave involved a young man described as being of Malabar origin.[44] He had been bought in 1739 as a twelve-year-old by VOC employee Christian Dober in the Southern Indian port of Tuticoryn

41 UA, R.11.A.9.2, Carstens to Zinzendorf, April 23, 1740.

42 Carstens said as much: UA, R.15.B.a.11.89, Carstens to Zinzendorf, May 31, 1740.

43 This is mentioned in two letters from Moravian envoy Böhner to Zinzendorf: UA, R.11.a.9.6.h, Böhner to Zinzendorf, September 13, 1740; UA, R.11.a.9.6.l, Böhner to Zinzendorf, October 1, 1740.

44 The case is also detailed in Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 21–23, 33–34.

(Thoothukudi).[45] Years later, former Moravian Johan Jacob Sutor reported that Samuel Johannes had told him personally that he had been abducted from his father.[46] The document certifying the sale gives his name as Maden of the Sanas family. Dober renamed him Felix, and on January 10, 1746 in Marienborn, he was baptized Samuel Johannes by Zinzendorf himself.[47]

Dober returned to Europe in 1742 because he wanted to join the Moravian Church and live in the Moravian community. He took young Maden/Felix with him, and Moravian missionary David Nitschman wrote in his travel diary that Dober had promised him the child as a gift.[48] It remains unclear, however, whether Dober brought the boy along with the intention of handing him over to the Brethren or whether he actually planned to present him as a prestigious gift to Zinzendorf. As we will see, Countess Erdmuthe Dorothea von Zinzendorf later claimed that Dober had given Maden/Felix to her immediately after his arrival. While no written records of this transaction can be identified (and may have never existed), it would seem a viable strategy for Dober to facilitate his own admission into the Moravian community and increase his reputation with church leaders. Countess Zinzendorf probably became the recipient of this peculiar present because her husband was travelling through British North America at the time.

Dober left Maden/Felix with the Moravians in s'Heerendiek after arriving in the Netherlands on July 20, 1742.[49] From there the boy was sent to the children's home in Marienborn together with another boy named Andrew from South Carolina.[50] Maden/Felix was formally admitted into the community and baptized Samuel Johannes in 1746. He received training as a tailor and later attended the seminary in Barby.[51]

45 UA, R.21.A.28.47, Certificate of sale of the slave boy Maden to Christian Dober, June 1, 1739. The age of twelve is given in Samuel Johannes' obituary in the Bethlehem diary. Cf. Moravian Archives Bethlehem (MAB), Diary of the Bethlehem congregation, vol. 26, 1763–1764, 93–95. Acquiring slave servants was quite common for Europeans in East India. Cf. Linda Mbeki and Matthias van Rossum, "Private Slave Trade in the Dutch Indian Ocean World: A Study into the Networks and Backgrounds of the Slavers and the Enslaved in South Asia and South Africa," *Slavery & Abolition* 38, no. 1 (2017): 95–116; Marina Carter and Nira Wickramasinghe, "Forcing the Archive: Involuntary Migrants 'of Ceylon' in the Indian Ocean World of the 18–19th Centuries," *South Asian History and Culture* 9, no. 2 (2017): 194–206; Richard B. Allen, "Children and the European Slave Trading in the Indian Ocean during the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries," in *Children in Slavery through the Ages*, ed. Gwyn Campbell et al. (2009), 35–54; Gerhard Koch, ed., *Imhoff Indienfahrer: Ein Reisebericht aus dem 18. Jahrhundert in Briefen und Bildern* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001).

46 Alexander Volck, *Das entdeckte Geheimniss der Bosheit der Herrnhutischen Secte zu Errettung vieler unschuldigen Seelen [. . .] in sechs Gesprächen dargelegt* (Frankfurt: Heinrich Ludwig Brönner, 1750), 561.

47 Peucker, "*Aus allen Nationen*," 33.

48 UA, R.15.S.2, Diary of David Nitschmann's (the Syndic) and August Christian Friedrich Ellert's journey to Ceylon. Vol. 2. August 17, 1740–November 24, 1741.

49 Dutch National Archives, 1.04.02 Dutch East India Company (VOC), 6035, fol. 31, Christiaan Tober.

50 UA, R.8.33.b.3, Wetterau diary, August 2, 1742; UA, R.4.B.V.b.3.8., Catalog Lindheim 1744.

51 UA, R.27.291.13, Register of seminarists, Barby 1750.

In March 1754, he was suddenly ordered to Herrnhut. While there are no sources detailing the reasons for this summons, Paul Peucker has pointed to some evidence for growing dissatisfaction with the young man's conduct.[52] Once in Herrnhut, Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes was placed in the service of Baron von Schell, from where he fled after fourteen days. The Berthelsdorf seigniorial court immediately ordered his apprehension.[53]

On the first leg of his flight, Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes found refuge on the nearby estate Unwürde of Chamberlain Karl Gotthelf von Hund and Altengrotkau, an active Freemason, who refused to hand him over to the Moravian search parties. Upon hearing of his whereabouts, Countess Zinzendorf had a letter sent to von Hund requesting Samuel Johannes' return.[54] This document contains the semantic ambiguities and intersecting concepts of societal hierarchy and servitude in condensed form. Its terminology hints at a significant uncertainty regarding the legal status of Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes. To the Countess and the Berthelsdorf seigniorial court, everything in the absconded man's biography indicated that he was not free, but this knowledge had to be translated into a legally applicable category. In the very first sentence he is designated a "runaway black Malabar" and "born slave" who had been "gifted" to the Countess. Mentioning his slave origin emphasized a condition of legal subordination, though he was not directly specified as a slave belonging to the Countess. Instead, the document attempts to assert the fundamental rightfulness of her claim by piling on a multitude of mutually reinforcing categories of dependence and servitude.

In the same vein, the letter relates how Christian Dober consigned the youth to Countess Zinzendorf's care and "free disposition," and proceeds to justify her authority over "the runaway black Malabar" through the obligations she assumed as a Christian and patron. This is further emphasized by detailing the sums she spent on the Christian education, baptism, and training of the "wild slave." In short, she did everything a "master, parent, guardian could do for a serf (*Leibeigener*) and ward." Here the mutually related positions of the Countess and the runaway are construed on two separate levels: mistress and slave/serf as well as guardian and ward. From the former arises an obligation of obedience and deference, from the latter an obligation of loyalty and gratitude. Therefore, the Countess had the sole right "besides God" to claim "possession" and "usage" of the described man. Samuel Johannes, on the other hand, was not "suis iuris" since he was a "a true born serf" ("würklich leibeigen gebohrener")

52 Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 21.

53 UA, R.6.a.A.74.4, Requisition for the apprehension of a Black Malabar named Samuel Johannes, March 27, 1754.

54 UA, R.6.a.A.74.4, Erdmuthe Dorothea von Zinzendorf to Chamberlain von Hund at Unwürde, March 27, 1754; Heike Raphael-Hernandez has used this document to illustrate the importance of class in Moravian attitudes regarding slavery. Cf. Raphael-Hernandez, "The Right to Freedom," 463.

to the Countess, and as such was bound to remain in subservience until he received a letter of release.

Equating slavery with serfdom (*Leibeigenschaft*) was common in German language usage of the era and tied to polemic debates about serfdom.[55] Yet the various (and diverging) legal relationships labelled *Leibeigenschaft* in Central Europe were hardly slavery.[56] In Upper Lusatia, for example, a form of serfdom officially called *Erbuntertänigkeit* and colloquially referred to as *Leibeigenschaft* by contemporaries was common. But the *Erbuntertanen* were bound to the land they lived and worked on, not to a lord.[57] Such serfs were also part of the Countess' estate at Berthelsdorf. Since the Moravians were well-informed about West Indian slavery as well as feudal labor regimes, they would not have confused the status of Lusatian serfs with that of slaves. Instead, the synonymous use of slavery and serfdom conforms to an abstract usage of the terms employed by contemporaries to denote a condition of marked dependency and subservience.

Interestingly enough, in the Countess' letter to Hund, the term slave is in fact used solely in connection with the colonial origins of Samuel Johannes, while later on he is designated a serf. The document refrains from explicitly claiming that he was being held in perpetual slavery since arriving in Germany based on the laws of the colonies. This hints at doubts regarding the legal applicability in a German principality.

Other documents produced in the context of this case exhibit an equally carefree synonymous use of the terms "serf" and "slave." After remaining hidden on the estates of Chamberlain von Hund for some time, Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes made his way to Barby in April 1754 and surrendered himself. An order to keep him under arrest sent on behalf of Countess Zinzendorf to the court at Barby speaks of a "serf bought in East India."[58] At the same time, the royal superintendent and the bailiff in Barby laconically claimed that there were no serfs in Germany. This seems an unlikely statement, since serfdom was obviously known to exist in German

55 Cf. David M. Luebke, "Erfahrungen von Leibeigenschaft: Konturen eines Diskurses im Südschwarzwald, 1660–1745," in *Leibeigenschaft: Bäuerliche Unfreiheit in der frühen Neuzeit,* ed. Jan Klussmann (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003), 187–197. Research on Southern Germany has demonstrated that after 1660, *Leibeigenschaft* turned into a common synonym for arbitrary tyranny. Cf. Renate Blickle, "Frei von fremder Willkür: Zu den gesellschaftlichen Ursprüngen der frühen Menschenrechte. Das Beispiel Altbayern," in *Leibeigenschaft: Bäuerliche Unfreiheit in der frühen Neuzeit,* ed. Jan Klussmann (Cologne: Böhlau, 2003), 157–174. Especially in debates about the injustices of demesne lordship, such as excessive labour obligations, the equation to slavery was used with obvious polemical intent.

56 Markus Cerman, *Villagers and Lords in Eastern Europe, 1300–1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).

57 Hermann Knothe, "Die Stellung der Gutsunterthanen in der Oberlausitz zu ihren Gutsherrschaften von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Ablösung der Zinsen und Dienste," *Neues lausitzisches Magazin* 61 (1885).

58 UA, R.6.a.A.74, Order by Siegmund August von Gersdorf on behalf of Countess Zinzendorf, Herrnhut, May 4, 1754.

principalities. Either both of these officials had very limited judicial knowledge, or – more likely – they were actually referring to slavery, using the term in the abstract sense described above.[59]

Part of the uncertainty regarding Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes' status may have been due to a lack of documentation. The letters written by the Countess or at her behest repeatedly specify the wrong year for his arrival in Europe (1740 instead of 1742). This indicates that the circumstances of his arrival were reported from memory and not after consultation of relevant documents – which may not even have been available in Berthelsdorf.

Samuel Johannes was eventually transported from Barby to Herrnhut based on legal provisions pertaining to servants.[60] As if to prove the Countess' authority, he was then sent to the Moravian town of Bethlehem in Pennsylvania within a few months, where he spent the remainder of his life.[61] Nothing in the sources tells us whether he was considered a slave there and if so, how it influenced his position. By crossing the Atlantic, he entered a colonial slaving zone where slavery was widespread and obvious. This included Bethlehem, where several enslaved Africans were employed at the time. In contrast to them, however, Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes was not designated a slave in the Bethlehem records, nor was he labeled a "Negro," a term used synonymously with slave in the colonies. Instead, he is repeatedly referenced as a "Malabar."[62] This specific ethnic label suggests that he was regarded to be in a separate category of sorts. Furthermore, his childhood and education in Marienborn and Barby may have trumped the stigma of his slavery background – an assumption reinforced by his marriage to Magdalena Mingo, a free woman of African Creole and Danish ancestry who had likewise lived in Marienborn and Herrnhaag for several years. Marriages among Moravians were mostly arranged, and the two "Moors" from Germany were perhaps considered an obvious match.[63]

Given the constant communication and movement between Bethlehem and Germany, it seems likely that Countess Zinzendorf's claim to Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes was known. But since she was far away, this may not have impacted his daily

59 UA, R.6.a.A.74, Pro nota regarding the extradition request from May 11, 1754.

60 UA, R.6.a.A.74, Pro nota regarding the extradition request from May 11, 1754; UA, R.6.a.A.74, Passport by the bailiff of Barby, May 18, 1754.

61 He died on May 24, 1763. MAB, Diary of the Bethlehem congregation, vol. 26, 93–95; MAB, ChReg 11, Bethlehem church register, May 24, 1763, 283.

62 Cf. MAB, Diary of the Bethlehem congregation, vol. 26, 93.

63 They were married in a mass ceremony together with thirteen other couples (all of them European). Cf. MAB, Diary of the Bethlehem congregation, vol. 17, April 20, 1757, 99–101. I would like to thank Paul Peucker and Tom McCullough for kindly aiding me in my research on Magdalena Mingo. Her father was the abovementioned Domingo Gesoe. Cf. Louise Sebro, "Freedom, Autonomy, and Independence: Exceptional African Caribbean Life Experiences in St. Thomas, the Danish West Indies, in the Middle of the 18th Century," in *Ports of Globalisation, Places of Creolisation: Nordic Possessions in the Atlantic World during the Era of the Slave Trade*, ed. Holger Weiss (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 226–229.

life in Bethlehem. Absconding from Bethlehem like he did from Herrnhut might have been a different matter, however: Outside Bethlehem, most colonists would have readily regarded the color of his skin as a marker of slavery.[64]

The case of Maden/Felix/Samuel Johannes is especially striking because it shows slavery changing from a dormant state into an actively invoked claim of legal proprietorship, thereby fraying into several and partly overlapping categories of dependency. Both his and Cecilia's case are relatively well-documented owing to the conflicts they were involved in, which led to several unusual statements in the context of Moravian sources that reveal mundane perceptions of slavery. Nevertheless, both cases also evidence the persistent difficulty of pinning down the meanings and consequences of slavery in specific circumstances and for different participants. This assessment is reinforced by examining sources pertaining to the remaining verifiably enslaved individuals.

Bought: Oly/Carmel/Josua, Jupiter/Immanuel, Gratia/Anna, Andres/David, Anna Maria, Bartel/Immanuel/Andreas, Mientje/Hanna, Fortune/Johann Friedrich

There were seven other verifiably enslaved individuals brought to Germany, all but one of whom came from St. Thomas. Their slave status is evident from sources confirming that they were, in fact, bought. Typically, enslaved individuals were purchased in the colonies – Cecilia would have been the only slave acquired by Moravians in Europe. It is noticeable that buying slaves in the colonies was reported quite unabashedly in the Moravian records, suggesting that this was regarded a trivial matter.

The very first individual ever brought to Germany from St. Thomas in 1735 was an enslaved child known as Oly or Carmel.[65] A year later, Bishop Nitschmann happily reported that he had purchased "a little Moor, a bright boy of eight years" named Jupiter in New York and taken him along to Herrnhut.[66] Similarly, the minutes of the Ebersdorf synod of 1739 stated matter-of-factly that Zinzendorf had bought six individuals during his journey to St. Thomas: "Two little Moors" as well as "2 bought from St. Jan. 1 wild

64 On provisions regarding slaves, see "An Act for the Better Regulating of Negroes in this Province, March 25, 1725," in *The Statutes At Large of Pennsylvania From 1682–1801*, vol. 4. (Philadelphia: Clarence M. Busch, 1897), 59–64.

65 C. G. Marche, ed., *Der freywilligen Nachlese, bey den bißherigen gelehrten und erbaulichen Monaths-Schrifften* (Frankfurt: Marche, 1740), 579–580. Oly/Carmel was baptized Josua in 1735 and died in Herrnhut on March 23, 1736. He was buried in the God's Acre there. For more information, see Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 29–30; for sources regarding the baptism of Oly/Carmel/Josua, see Kröger, *Johann Leonhard Dober*, 99–106.

66 MAB, David Nitschmann Papers 11, Letter by David Nitschmann [the Bishop], August 3, 1736. Jupiter, baptized Immanuel, died in 1739; see Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 27.

man from New England, who is totally red [sic]. 1 man-eater. Together they did cost 700 thalers."[67] Remarkably, it was not buying human beings but rather New World clichés that seemed worth noting here: wild men, red skin, and cannibalism.

The "two little Moors" were five-year-old Gratia and two-year-old Andres, who were intended as representative companions/servants for Zinzendorf's children.[68] They were brought to Europe by Johann Lorentz Carstens together with Cecilia and Anna Maria, a "maiden helper" of the St. Thomas congregation who had been bought by its members in 1738.[69] The "wild man" was a Native American known as Sam, an "Anakunkas Indian from Boston" according to a receipt.[70] The "man-eater" was a Native American boy whose name is unknown; he is also described as a "garcon indien insulaire."[71] Apparently, Zinzendorf originally wanted the latter two brought to Europe, but they were taken to St. Thomas instead, where both of them died within a year.[72]

The two persons "from St. Jan" were the abovementioned Andreas "the Moor" and his brother Johannes, both congregation members who had been sold off by their master from St. Thomas to neighboring St. John in 1738. Zinzendorf himself initiated their purchase to return them to the congregation, and Andreas eventually accompanied the Count to Europe. At first, he was intended as a sort of envoy of the slaves of St. Thomas to the King of Denmark, but instead he became a permanent member of Zinzendorf's retinue.[73] Like Anna Maria, he is an example of enslaved adult brothers or sisters sent to Europe to represent the mission. This group also includes Mientje, later baptized Hanna, who had been acquired by the Brethren on St. Thomas in 1739 or 1740. She is named in a list of slave baptisms from St. Thomas[74]

67 UA, R.2.A.2, Ebersdorf synod, June 1739.

68 UA, R.15.B.a.2.a.3, Zinzendorf's diary, 39. Gratia, baptized Anna, died on October 22, 1742; Andres, baptized David, died on September 8, 1741.

69 UA, R.15.B.a.3.31, Relation of the purchase of the first plantation. Copy of the original from 1738. 1755. Before her baptism Anna Maria was known as Anna.

70 UA, R.15.B.a.11.19, Money order for purchase of Indian Sam (copy), February 27, 1739; UA, Zinzendorf's diary, 39. A Native American nation named Anakunkas cannot be verified. UA, R.15.b.a.3.79, letter by Jan Meyer regarding the purchase of the "wild Indian Sam," June 2, 1739.

71 UA, R.15.B.a.11.18, Money order for purchase of a "garcon indien insulaire," February 27, 1739. For a discussion of both Native Americans' origins, see Köstlbauer, "Ambiguous Passages," 180.

72 Christian Georg Andreas Oldendorp, *Geschichte der Mission der evangelischen Brüder auf den caraibischen Inseln S. Thomas, S. Croix und S. Jan*, ed. Johann Jakob Bossart, 2 vols. (Barby: Christian Friedrich Laur, 1777), 600. Both cases are discussed in Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 8.

73 Oldendorp, *Historie*, 2: 272–277, 376; UA, R.15.B.a.2.a.3, Zinzendorf's diary 21, 39. Prior to his baptism, Andreas was known as Bartel or as Immanuel; UA, R.15.B.a.11.3, Receipt for sale of the enslaved men Bertel and Peter (copy), February 10, 1739; Rigsarkivet, 446, The West India and Guinea Company. Accounts from St. Thomas and St. Jan: The Bookkeeper. Land lists for St. Thomas, 1738, fol. 125; see also Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 23–24.

74 UA, R.15.B.b.24.2, Catalog of congregation on St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John, 1736–1759, 6.

and mentioned in a letter by Friedrich Martin.[75] She was sent to Germany in 1741, where she lived and worked in Lindheim and Herrnhaag until her death in 1747.[76]

The final case of an enslaved individual taken to Europe was that of a nine-year-old African boy called Fortune. Nicholas Garrison, a prominent Moravian ship captain, brought him to Herrnhut from Suriname in 1757. According to Fortune's memoir, Garrison had bought him because "he recognized his pleasant, cheerful, and honest character, which was very different from the character of the other Negroes, and thought he might come to love the Savior; and therefore, he felt a great affection for him."[77] Again we can infer the same convergence of missionary motivation and the availability of enslaved persons that also characterized Zinzendorf's purchases of "Moors." And here too, the act of buying a slave seems to have been considered trivial enough to merit no further comment. Fortune was eventually sent to nearby Niesky, where he died in 1763 after having been baptized Johann Friedrich.

Given or Gifted: Guley, Christian Zedmann, Quaquu/Coffe/Peter/Johannes, Andrew/Johannes, Jupiter/Johannes, Janke/Johannes Renatus

There are an additional six individuals reported to have been given or gifted to Moravians. Such terminology is obviously rife with ambiguity, and it therefore makes sense to look closely at the semantics employed in describing how these persons came into the European congregations.

A Persian woman named Guley and an Armenian named Christian Zedmann had been sent to or given to Zinzendorf in Riga in 1737 ("geschickt,"[78] "bekommen"[79]). They were presumably captives taken in the conflicts playing out in the Black Sea region at the time. In Guley's case, this assumption is corroborated by the report that she had been forcibly baptized in the Orthodox faith. Such forced baptisms were practiced in Russia at the time since they allowed repatriation laws for captives to be circumvented.[80] Little is known about Zedmann except that he died in Pilgerruh in 1739; it is possible that he had no slavery background.

75 "Hanna, the negress, who was bought with the gifted money." UA, R.15.B.a.11.195, Friedrich Martin to Isaac Le Long, February 23, 1742.

76 UA, KB032, Herrnhaag church register, May 1, 1747; Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 27–28.

77 Gemeinarchiv Niesky, Memoir Fortune, 1763.

78 UA, R.15.A.2.1, Explanation of the painting of the first fruits, 1747.

79 UA, Congregational accounts, June 26, 1748, 379.

80 Alessandro Stanziani, "Serfs, Slaves, or Wage Earners? The Legal Status of Labour in Russia from a Comparative Perspective, from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Global History* 3, no. 2 (2008): 187. Paul Peucker has pointed out the theological dispute caused by Zinzendorf's wish to have her baptized a second time: Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 10, 26.

There were also four children "given" ("gegeben") or "gifted" ("geschenkt") to Moravians. In 1742, missionary Friedrich Martin reported in a letter that a boy named Coffe had been "given to him as a present by the child's mother to keep as my own child" six years earlier.[81] Coffe was a widely used slave name. According to the Herrnhaag church register, the boy's original name was Quaquu; the Moravians renamed him Peter.[82] His parents' names are known, but neither seems to have been among the men and women baptized by the missionaries respectively among the church members proper.[83] Quaquu/Coffe/Peter was sent to Marienborn in 1742 in the same group as Mientje/Hanna.[84] Shortly before his death on December 18, 1743, he was baptized, thus acquiring a fourth name: Johannes.[85]

Since slaves were usually not in a position to freely dispose of their own children, there are several possibilities for how Quaquu/Coffe/Peter/Johannes could have arrived in the Moravian community. Firstly, his mother may have been manumitted. This seems unlikely, however, since the number of free people of color on St. Thomas was small.[86] Secondly, his mother may have been a slave owned by the Brethren and could therefore give her son into Martin's care. Thirdly, the mother could have given her son to the Moravians with her master's consent.

The "giving" of children was presumably a strategy employed by parents to ensure their children were provided for. In 1738, the missionaries were already running an active school on St. Thomas. According to Oldendorp, they were asked to take on many more children than they could accept – not only African children but European ones as well.[87] This makes it likely that some sort of understanding regarding the tutoring of slave children (and the children of freedmen) existed between the missionaries and planters.

A further child, the South Carolinian Andrew (later baptized Johannes), was given to the Moravians in London. He had been brought to the British capital from

81 UA, Friedrich Martin to Isaac Le Long, Feb. 23, 1742. Oldendorp seems to have relied on the same source, cf. Oldendorp, *Historie*, 2: 195.

82 Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 28–29.

83 The parents' names were Aba and Jem. Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 28, citing UA, R.8.33.b, Wetterau diary, June 3, 1742. I have searched in vain for the parents in the various catalogs contained in UA, R.15.B.b.24 and in MAB, West Indies Papers, General, Papers Regarding Membership, 179, 180, 181, 185.

84 UA, R.8.33.b.2.b, Herrnhaag diary, June 3 and June 5, 1742. The group was led by the free African Creole woman Rebecca Freundlichin and her husband Matthäus Freundlich.

85 UA, R.22.12.15, Memoir Johannes, "sonst Peter genannt." Remarkably, the memoir contains no information on his African origins.

86 Neville A. T. Hall, *Slave Society in the Danish West Indies: St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix*, ed. B. W. Higman (Mona: University of the West Indies Press, 1992), 139–156.

87 Oldendorp, *Historie*, 2: 274–275.

North America by George Whitefield.[88] Whitefield had a close relationship with the Moravians at the time, and in May 1742 he gave Andrew to them "to bring him up for the Lord and dispose of him as they shall find fit."[89] How Whitefield had acquired the child remains unknown; his journals contain no mention of it.[90] In the register of the children's home in Lindheim, Andrew's father is listed as a slave and his mother – somewhat cryptically – as baptized.[91] This provides no valuable information on how Andrew came into Whitefield's possession, but it is notable that the Moravians in Germany documented his roots in slavery. Whether they felt this gave them more authority over the boy remains a matter of speculation.

While Quaquu/Coffe/Peter/Johannes and Andrew clearly came from a slavery context, the last two examples from Berbice highlight the fact that "being given" did not necessarily relate to slavery. "Gifted" by an "Indian woman" are the words used to describe how a barely one-year old boy named Jupiter (baptized Johannes) came to the missionaries, with no further details provided.[92] Interpreting the status of this Arawak child is complicated by the fact that enslavement of the indigenous population was not generally practiced by the Dutch in Berbice in the mid-eighteenth century. Nevertheless, so-called "red slaves" did exist, as Caribs and Arawak would sometimes bring captives taken from other indigenous nations to Paramaribo.[93]

Janke (baptized Johannes Renatus) was the son of an Arawak mother and a European father. After his mother's death, he was initially raised by his maternal family, but in 1741 his father "gifted" the five-year-old child "to the Brothers to do with him as they saw fit."[94] Considering these circumstances, Jancke/Johannes Renatus would hardly have been a slave. Nevertheless, the phrasing of the memoir and other sources shows that Moravians assumed far-reaching authority over him.[95] Its scope and possible expiration remain indeterminate, as the boy died in Hennersdorf in 1751.

---

88 David Bentham, *Memoirs of James Hutton: Comprising the Annals of his Life, and Connection with the United Brethren* (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1856); Stephen J. Stein, "George Whitefield on Slavery: Some New Evidence," *Church History* 42, no. 2 (1973).

89 Cited in Colin Podmore, *The Moravian Church in England, 1728–1760* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1998), 83.

90 George Whitefield, *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal, after his Arrival at Georgia, to a Few Days After His Second Return Thither from Philadelphia* (London: James Hutton, 1741).

91 UA, R.4.B.V.b.3.8., Register of children's home at Lindheim, 1744. Both Andrew and Quaquu/Coffe/Peter/Johannes died in Marienborn in 1743. Cf. Peucker, "Aus allen Nationen," 28–29.

92 He was brought to Herrnhaag in 1747, UA, R.22.01.a.69, Memoir Ludwig Christoph Dehne, 1769; UA, Congregational accounts, July 19 and August 12, 1747, 287 and 365–366. He died around a month after his arrival, UA, KB032, Herrnhaag church register, September 18, 1747.

93 Wim S. Hoogbergen, *The Boni Maroon Wars in Suriname* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 24.

94 Cf. UA, SHAHt 162.210, Memoir Johannes Renatus, 1751.

95 MAB, Bethlehem diary, vol. 7, April 16, 1748, 228; UA, R.22.05.28, Memoir Johannes Renatus, 1751.

Conclusion

Slavery is one of the major undercurrents integrating the histories of Africa, America, Asia, and Europe. To this day, its repercussions are felt on the societal as well as the individual level. This article assembles documentary evidence for the fact that the trade in humans reached far into territories of the Holy Roman Empire during the eighteenth century. Both enslaved and formerly enslaved individuals were brought into German principalities; orders for human beings intended for service in Europe were placed; human beings were held in bondage, fled, and were searched for, found, and returned. What is more, the conceptual frame of colonial slavery entered German discourse during the eighteenth century as well. Intermingling with established concepts of serfdom and servitude, it produced heterogenous and sometimes contradictory terminology. The Moravians of the Zinzendorf era, with their global reach but strong German element, are in many ways exemplary for this period of discursive change, when old and new semantics were used side by side and the colonial discourse with its emergent racist foundation had not yet established itself in German societies. The Brethren bought West Indian "Negroes" to bring them to Germany, where they designated them as "Moors" and assigned them positions as symbols of missionary success, as eschatological signs of a world about to witness the savior revealed, and as prestigious servants in aristocratic households – in short, they employed these men, women, and children in the labor of representation.

On the preceding pages, I have discussed slavery in Moravian Germany by analyzing the semantics used in the records – especially the terminology used to describe how these men, women, and children came into the German congregations. Nevertheless, much remains opaque to the gaze of the inquiring historian: We can still only guess, for example, what the knowledge of slavery meant to the enslaved or formerly enslaved individuals living in Moravian settlements in Germany. Their European brothers and sisters seem to have regarded the matter as unimportant once a "Moor" had been integrated into the community. Furthermore, as buyers of enslaved individuals, Zinzendorf and the Brethren maneuvered within well-established practices, which goes some way towards explaining the lack of attention accorded to the actual acts of purchasing slaves. But the individuals concerned would have had a different and very distinct knowledge of bondage. How did their slavery past inform the way they regarded their positions and options within the community? Did they fear alienating the Brethren because of the specter of being relegated back to the slavery they had known in the West Indies? What message did the case of Samuel Johannes and his apprehension and exile to America send to them? We do not know, since Moravian media practices did not provide a means of communicating such concerns. Then again, the status of slavery may have been less important in early Moravian thinking than the mobility and obedience expected from all congregation members. The multiple forms or practices of power and hierarchy intersecting in such cases may effectively be impossible to disentangle.

Paul Peucker has suggested a model of two spheres inhabited by eighteenth-century Moravians: one worldly, the other the religious community.[96] Existing side by side, the former knew social hierarchy including masters and servants, while the latter knew neither rank nor race, only brothers and sisters. Peucker questions whether Moravians could reliably separate these two worlds. Slightly off-centering this heuristic model, I would argue that the power asymmetries and

Fig. 4.1: The First Fruits, oil on canvas by Johann Valentin Haidt, Bethlehem, probably soon after 1754. Courtesy of The Moravian Archives, Bethlehem, PA, Painting Collection 19. The painting depicts a group of Moravian converts from different nations, known as the “first fruits,” gathered around the throne of Christ (Rev. 7:9, Rev. 14:4). Some of the portrayed individuals are mentioned in the text: Guley, first from left; Sam, “an Anakunkas,” fourth from left; Christian Zedmann, fifth from left; Gratia/Anna Gratia, sixth from left; Oly/Carmel/Josua and Jupiter/Immanuel, center in runners’ liveries; Mientje/Hanna, center, kissing the feet of Christ; Bartel/Immanuel/Andreas, “the Moor,” ninth from right in blue coat; Anna/Anna Maria, seventh from right, sitting; Andrew/Johannes, sixth from right, kneeling in the background; Maria Andressen, fifth from right; Jupiter/Johannes, third from right (on the arm of an Arawak man); for further information, see Rüdiger Kröger, “Die Erstlingsbilder in der Brüdergemeine,” *Unitas Fratrum* 67/68 (2012): 135–163.

96 Peucker, “Aus allen Nationen,” 19.

societal hierarchy remained ever-present in Moravian life, even if this fact may have been partly obscured by communal rhetoric and organization. The examples of Cecilia and Samuel Johannes show that slavery was part of the practices of governing and disciplining that existed in Moravian communities in eighteenth-century Germany. Whether it was invoked was not a matter of principle but rather of context and circumstance – and the Brethren's egalitarian rhetoric notwithstanding, power was distributed very unequally in such situations.

References

Archival Sources

Danish National Archives (Rigsarkivet)
446. The West India and Guinea Company. Accounts from St. Thomas and St. Jan: The Bookkeeper. Land lists for St. Thomas.
Dutch National Archives
1.04.02 Dutch East India Company (VOC), 6035.
Gemeinarchiv Niesky
Memoir Fortune. March 27, 1763.
Moravian Archives Bethlehem
Bethlehem church register. 1756–1789.
Diary of the Bethlehem congregation. Vols. 7, 17, 26.
David Nitschman Papers 11.
West Indies Papers.
Unity Archives Herrnhut
Collection of memoirs.
Congregational accounts (*Gemeinnachrichten*).
KB032. Herrnhaag church register.
R.4.B. Children's homes and schools.
R.6.a.A.74. Personnel files from Herrnhut.
R.8.33.b. Diaries of the Herrnhaag congregation.
R.11.a.9. Acta Publica Danica.
R.15.A.2.1. Explanation of the painting of the first fruits. 1747.
R.15.B.a.1.IV. Miscellanea St. Thomas.
R.15.B.a.2.a. Varia concerning the beginnings of the mission on St. Thomas.
R.15.B.a.3–4. Acta Publica St. Thomas, St. Croix, St. John.
R.15.B.a.11. Reports and letters from St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John.
R.15.B.b.24. Catalogs of congregations on St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John.
R.15.S.1–2, Diary of David Nitschmann's and August Christian Friedrich Ellert's journey to Ceylon.
R.21.A.28 Estate Christian Dober.

Printed Sources

“An Act for the Better Regulating of Negroes in this Province, March 25, 1725.” In *The Statutes At Large of Pennsylvania From 1682–1801*. Vol. 4. 59–64. Philadelphia: Clarence M. Busch, 1897.

“Bericht David Nitschmanns über seine Reise mit Dober. Ca. 1733.” In *Johann Leonhard Dober und der Beginn der Herrnhuter Mission*, edited by Rüdiger Kröger, 62–63. Herrnhut: Comenius-Buchhandlung, 2006.

Koch, Gerhard, ed. *Imhoff Indienfahrer: Ein Reisebericht aus dem 18. Jahrhundert in Briefen und Bildern*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001.

Kröger, Rüdiger, ed. *Johann Leonhard Dober und der Beginn der Herrnhuter Mission*. Herrnhut: Comenius-Buchhandlung, 2006.

Marche, C. G., ed. *Der freywilligen Nachlese, bey den bißherigen gelehrten und erbaulichen Monaths-Schrifften*. Vol. 13. Frankfurt: Marche, 1740.

Oldendorp, Christian Georg Andreas. *Geschichte der Mission der evangelischen Brüder auf den caraibischen Inseln S. Thomas, S. Croix und S. Jan*, edited by Johann Jakob Bossart. Barby: Christian Friedrich Laur, 1777.

Oldendorp, Christian Georg Andreas. *Historie der caribischen Inseln Sanct Thomas, Sanct Crux und Sanct Jan: Kommentierte Ausgabe des vollständigen Manuskripts aus dem Archiv der Evangelischen Brüder-Unität*, edited by Gudrun Meier, Hartmut Beck, Stephan Palmié, Aart H. van Soest, Peter Setin, and Horst Ulbricht. 2 vols. Berlin: VWB, 2000.

Reynier, Jean Francois. “Das Geheimnis der Zinzendorfischen Secte Oder eine Lebens-Beschreibung Johann Franz Regnier, woraus zu ersehen was vor ein schädlich Ding es sey, sich von Menschen führen zu lassen.” In *Bewährte Nachrichten von Herrnhutischen Sachen. Worin die erste und zweyte Samlung, nebst einem Register enthalten, Nebst einem nöthigen Vorbericht von den Prüfungs-Regeln welche die Herrnhuter in der Untersuchung ihrer Secte müssen gelten lassen*, edited by Johann Philipp Fresenius, 327–479. Frankfurt: Buchner, 1747.

Spangenberg, August Gottlieb. *Idea fidei Fratrum, od. kurzer Begriff der christl. Lehre in den evangelischen Brüdergemeinen*. Barby, Unitas Fratrum, 1779.

Spangenberg, August Gottlieb. *Von der Arbeit der evangelischen Brüder unter den Heiden*. Barby: Christian Friedrich Laux, 1782.

Volck, Alexander. *Das entdeckte Geheimniss der Bosheit der Herrnhutischen Secte zu Errettung vieler unschuldigen Seelen [. . .] in sechs Gesprächen dargelegt*. Frankfurt: Heinrich Ludwig Brönner, 1750.

Whitefield, George. *A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield’s Journal, After His Arrival at Georgia, to a Few Days After His Second Return Thither From Philadelphia*. London: James Hutton, 1741.

Literature

Allen, Richard B. “Children and the European Slave Trading in the Indian Ocean during the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries.” In *Children in Slavery through the Ages*, edited by Gwyn Campbell, Suzanne Miers, and Joseph C. Miller, 35–54. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009.

Atwood, Craig D. “Apologizing for the Moravians: Spangenberg’s Idea fidei fratrum.” *Journal of Moravian History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 53–88.

Baldauf, Ingeborg. “Christan Georg Andreas Oldendorp als Historiker: Freiheit und Grenzen eines Autors in der Brüderkirche.” In *Christan Georg Andreas Oldendorp: Historie der caraibischen Inseln Sanct Thomas, Sanct Crux und Sanct Jan. Kommentarband*, edited by Gudrun Meier, Peter Stein, Stephan Palmié, and Horst Ulbricht, 53–142. Herrnhut: Herrnhuter Verlag, 2010.

Bentham, David. *Memoirs of James Hutton: Comprising the Annals of his Life, and Connection with the United Brethren*. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1856.

Beyreuther, Erich, “Mission und Kirche,” in *Studien zur Theologie Zinzendorfs: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, edited by Erich Beyreuther, 2nd ed. Hildesheim: Olms, 2000.

Blickle, Renate. “Frei von fremder Willkür: Zu den gesellschaftlichen Ursprüngen der frühen Menschenrechte. Das Beispiel Altbayern.” In *Leibeigenschaft: Bäuerliche Unfreiheit in der frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Jan Klussmann, 157–174. Cologne: Böhlau, 2003.

Böß, Stephanie. *Gottesacker-Geschichten als Gedächtnis, Eine Ethnographie zur Herrnhuter Erinnerungskultur am Beispiel von Neudietendorfer Lebensläufen*. Münster: Waxmann, 2015.

Carter, Marina, and Nira Wickramasinghe. “Forcing the Archive: Involuntary Migrants ‘of Ceylon’ in the Indian Ocean World of the 18–19th Centuries.” *South Asian History and Culture* 9, no. 2 (2017): 194–206.

Cerman, Markus. *Villagers and Lords in Eastern Europe, 1300–1800*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.

Dunn, Richard S. *A Tale of Two Plantations: Slave Life and Labor in Jamaica and Virginia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Faull, Katherine M., ed. *Speaking to Body and Soul: Instructions for the Moravian Choir Helper 1785–1785*. University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.

Gerbner, Katharine. *Christian Slavery: Conversion and Race in the Protestant Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.

Hall, Neville A. T. *Slave Society in the Danish West Indies: St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix*, edited by B. W. Higman. Mona: University of the West Indies Press, 1992.

Harbsmeier, Michael. “Invented Explorations: Inuit Experiences of Denmark (1605–1932).” In *Cross-Cultural Encounters and Constructions of Knowledge in the 18th and 19th Century: Non-European and European Travel of Exploration in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Philippe Despoix and Justus Fetscher, 77–106. Kassel: Kassel University Press, 2004.

Hoogbergen, Wim S. *The Boni Maroon Wars in Suriname*. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Hüsgen, Jan. *Mission und Sklaverei: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine und die Sklavenemanzipation in Britisch- und Dänisch-Westindien*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2016.

Kaplan, M. Lindsay, *Figuring Racism in Medieval Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Klussmann, Jan, ed. *Leibeigenschaft: Bäuerliche Unfreiheit in der frühen Neuzeit*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2003.

Knothe, Hermann. “Die Stellung der Gutsunterthanen in der Oberlausitz zu ihren Gutsherrschaften von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Ablösung der Zinsen und Dienste.” *Neues lausitzisches Magazin* 61 (1885): 159–308.

Köstlbauer, Josef. “Ambiguous Passages: Non-Europeans Brought to Europe by the Moravian Brethren during the Eighteenth Century.” In *Globalized Peripheries: Central Europe and the Atlantic World, 1680–1860*, edited by Jutta Wimmler and Klaus Weber, 214–236. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2020.

Kuhlmann, Anne. “Ambiguous Duty: Black Servants at German Ancien Régime Courts.” In *Germany and the Black Diaspora: Points of Contact, 1250–1914*, edited by Mischa Honeck, Martin Klimke, and Anne Kuhlmann-Smirnov, 57–73. New York: Berghahn Books, 2013.

Kuhlmann-Smirnov, Anne. *Schwarze Europäer im Alten Reich: Handel, Migration, Hof*. Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2013.

Liebau, Kurt. “Die ersten Tamilen aus der Dänisch-Halleschen Mission in Europa: Vom Objekt zum Subjekt kultureller Interaktion.” In *Fremde Erfahrungen: Asiaten und Afrikaner in Deutschland, Österreich und in der Schweiz bis 1945*, edited by Gerhard Höpp, 9–28. Berlin: Verlag Das Arabische Buch, 1996.

Luebke, David M. “Erfahrungen von Leibeigenschaft: Konturen eines Diskurses im Südschwarzwald, 1660–1745.” In *Leibeigenschaft: Bäuerliche Unfreiheit in der frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Jan Klussmann, 175–198. Cologne: Böhlau, 2003.

Mallinckrodt, Rebekka von. “There are no Slaves in Prussia?” In *Slavery Hinterland: Transatlantic Slavery and Continental Europe, 1680–1850*, edited by Felix Brahm and Eve Rosenhaft, 109–131. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016.

Mallinckrodt, Rebekka von. “Trafficked Children in the Holy Roman Empire/ Verschleppte Kinder im Heiligen Römischen Reich.” In *Transkulturelle Mehrfachzugehörigkeit als kulturhistorisches Phänomen: Räume – Materialitäten – Erinnerungen*, edited by Dagmar Freist, Sabine Kyora, and Melanie Unseld, 15–36. Bielefeld: transcript, 2019.

Mbeki, Linda, and Matthias van Rossum. “Private Slave Trade in the Dutch Indian Ocean World: A Study into the Networks and Backgrounds of the Slavers and the Enslaved in South Asia and South Africa.” *Slavery & Abolition* 38, no. 1 (2017): 95–116.

Mettele, Gisela. *Weltbürgertum oder Gottesreich: Die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine als globale Gemeinschaft 1727–1857*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Meyer, Dietrich. “Chiliastische Hoffnung und eschatologische Erwartung innerhalb der Brüdergemeine und der Mission bei Zinzendorf und Spangenberg.” In *Geschichtsbewusstsein und Zukunftserwartung in Pietismus und Erweckungsbewegung*, edited by Wolfgang Breul and Jan Carsten Schnurr, 129–140. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Meyer, Dietrich. *Zinzendorf und die Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine: 1700–2000*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Peucker, Paul. “Aus allen Nationen: Nichteuropäer in den deutschen Brüdergemeinden des 18. Jahrhunderts.” *Unitas Fratrum* 59/60 (2007): 1–35.

Peucker, Paul. “The 1727 Statutes of Herrnhut.” *Journal of Moravian History* 20, no. 1 (2020): 73–113.

Podmore, Colin. *The Moravian Church in England, 1728–1760*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1998.

Raphael-Hernandez, Heike. “The Right to Freedom: Eighteenth-Century Slave Resistance and Early Moravian Missions in the Danish West Indies and Dutch Suriname.” *Atlantic Studies* 14, no. 4 (2017): 457–475.

Sebro, Louise. “Mellem afrikaner og kreol: etnisk identitet og social navigation i Dansk Vestindien 1730–1770.” PhD Diss, Lund University, 2010.

Sebro, Louise. “Freedom, Autonomy, and Independence: Exceptional African Caribbean Life Experiences in St. Thomas, the Danish West Indies, in the Middle of the 18th Century.” In *Ports of Globalisation, Places of Creolisation: Nordic Possessions in the Atlantic World during the Era of the Slave Trade*, edited by Holger Weiss. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Sensbach, Jon F. *A Separate Canaan: The Making of an Afro-Moravian World in North Carolina, 1763–1840*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Sensbach, Jon F. *Rebecca’s Revival: Creating Black Christianity in the Atlantic World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Sommer Elisabeth W. *Serving Two Masters: Moravian Brethren in Germany and North Carolina, 1727–1801*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2015.

Stanziani, Alessandro. “Serfs, Slaves, or Wage Earners? The Legal Status of Labour in Russia from a Comparative Perspective, from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century.” *Journal of Global History* 3, no. 2 (2008): 183–202.

Stein, Stephen J. “George Whitefield on Slavery: Some New Evidence.” *Church History* 42, no. 2 (1973): 243–256.

Vogt, Peter. “Die Mission der Herrnhuter Brüdergemeinde und ihre Bedeutung für den Neubeginn der protestantischen Missionen am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts.” *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 35 (2009): 204–236.

Wollstadt, Hanns-Joachim. *Geordnetes Dienen in der christlichen Gemeinde*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

Rebekka von Mallinckrodt

5 Slavery and the Law in Eighteenth-Century Germany

Among the many definitions of slavery, the legal definition is neither the only one nor even the one most commonly encountered in current research. As stated by Orlando Patterson in his classic *Slavery and Social Death*, legally defined systems of slavery represent exceptions in global history, and the legal situation is insufficient to describe the social, cultural, and mental dimensions of the state of enslavement adequately and without contradictions.[1] Instead, Patterson cites violent domination, natal alienation, and dishonor as the three defining elements of slavery that differentiate it clearly from other forms of unfreedom.[2] Michael Zeuske, on the other hand, uses the term "capitalization of bodies" to emphasize the aspect of economic exploitation even without legally existing slavery.[3] According to Zeuske, focusing on the legally established institution obstructs the view onto the many concealed and smaller-scale forms of abduction and exploitation as well as onto the mutability and thus the continuity of enslavement practices from prehistory to the present. Other researchers highlight the transformation and overlapping of the status of enslavement with other forms of unfreedom and dependence such as war captivity, bondage, or servantship – but also aspects such as young age, female gender, extraneous religion, or dark skin color. They stress that only interdependent consideration of all these factors enables a thorough evaluation of the historical situation.[4]

All of these approaches highlight important facets. Against the background of the state of research on the Old Empire, however, which is characterized by noticeable restraint in employing the term "slavery" in connection with early modern Germany,

1 Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), especially 21–22. According to Patterson, slaves were regularly legally called to account and punished for offenses even though they were assumed to have no legal capacity (ibid.).
2 Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death*, 10.
3 Michael Zeuske, *Handbuch Geschichte der Sklaverei: Eine Globalgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), especially 1–26.
4 Cf. the contribution by Josef Köstlbauer in this volume as well as Stefan Hanß and Juliane Schiel, "Semantiken, Praktiken und transkulturelle Perspektiven," in *Mediterranean Slavery Revisited 500–1800*, ed. Stefan Hanß and Juliane Schiel (Zurich: Chronos, 2014), 25–43, here 29, 31–32, 36.

Notes: This project is funded by the European Research Council (ERC) within the framework of the EU research and innovation program "Horizon 2020" (ERC Consolidator Grant Agreement No. 641110: "The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation and Its Slaves," 2015–2022). Nevertheless, this contribution exclusively expresses the author's opinion, and the ERC is not responsible for its contents or use.

Translation: Stephan Stockinger

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110748833-006