INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**FROM HEBRON TO SARON:
THE RELIGIOUS TRANSFORMATION OF AN EPHRATA CONVENT**

by
Ann Kirschner

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Early American
Culture

Spring 1995

©Ann Kirschner
All Rights Reserved

UMI Number: 1375143

UMI Microform 1375143

Copyright 1995, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

FROM HEBRON TO SARON:
THE RELIGIOUS TRANSFORMATION OF AN EPHRATA CONVENT

by

Ann Kirschner

Approved:
Bernard L. Herman, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of thesis on behalf of the Advisory Committee

Approved:
James C. Curtis, Ph.D.
Director of the Winterthur Program in Early American Culture

Approved:
Carol E. Hoffercker, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Graduate Studies

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks are due to the many individuals who contributed to the creation and completion of this thesis. At the Ephrata Cloister, I am deeply indebted to the staff and especially to Nadine A. Steinmetz, Director, and Clarence Spohn, Museum Educator; they expressed enthusiasm in my project from the outset, arranged for me to spend many hours in Hebron-Saron, and opened every corner of the archives to my perusal. Early on in my research, Jeffrey Bach, Assistant Professor of the Bethany Theological Seminary, generously shared his ideas on Ephrata Pietism and provided a concise and useful bibliography. Mary Elise Haug and Iris Snyder (formerly) of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera at the Winterthur Museum ensured that I saw every possible related paper or photograph in the G. Edwin Brumbaugh collection. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania gave me access to the Abraham Cassel Collection, which holds the manuscript of the 1745 chronicle of the Ephrata Sisterhood. Ultimately, the luxury of time to study these materials and to write this thesis was thanks to a Lois F. McNeil Fellowship.

Several of my professors at the University of Delaware have significantly influenced my thinking over the last two years. I am particularly grateful to Bernie Herman, my adviser, who shared my enthusiasm for the Ephrata story and

expressed confidence in my ability to tell it; his creativity, insight, and energy continue to inspire and challenge me. Charles Hummel and Anne Boylan, by example, reminded me of the pleasure of holding oneself to high standards. Finally, stimulating conversations with Gretchen Townsend Buggeln about religion and architecture stoked my intellectual fire at the very moments when the embers were burning low.

Great appreciation goes to Cindy Dickinson, who, in the name of friendship, took time away from her own Master's thesis to take photographs at Ephrata and to provide a meticulous reading of a draft of this thesis; the final version is the better for her photographic and editorial expertise. I am also grateful to the following individuals, who have given to me in many different ways: Mary Cheek, Jim Curtis, Bert Denker, Pat Elliott, Don Fennimore, Ritchie Garrison, Jill Haley, Felice Jo Lamden, Gail Stanislow, Neville Thompson, Yolanda Van de Krol, Margaret Vetare, Sue Westmoreland and Peter Wisbey.

Support from my sisters, Susan and Helen Kirschner, and from my parents, Mary and Peter Kirschner, was crucial in motivating me to completion. I am particularly grateful to my parents for instilling in me the joy of learning.

This thesis is dedicated to my husband, Tom Korman, whose unwavering encouragement and love have sustained me.

-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	ix
 Chapter	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 THE BUILDING OF HEBRON: CONSTRUCTION AND INTERIOR PLAN.....	14
3 HEBRON IN CONTEXT: EPHRATA'S OTHER COMMUNAL ARCHITECTURE.....	58
4 HEBRON AND THE TRANSFORMATION TO SARON.....	77
APPENDIX A. EPHRATA ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, 1743-45.....	107
APPENDIX B. CHRONOLOGY OF PRINCIPAL EPHRATA ARCHITECTURE.....	108
APPENDIX C. THE ROSES OF SARON: CLASSES OF THE SISTERHOOD, 1745.....	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	111

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Rear view of Saron and adjoining Saal from "God's Acre" graveyard.....	8
Figure 1.2	Front facade of Saron prior to restoration	9
Figure 1.3	Saron and adjoining Saal after restoration, 1966.....	10
Figure 2.1	Rear view of Saron (right) and Saal.....	17
Figure 2.2	Exposed timber facade of Saron during restoration.....	19
Figure 2.3	Builder's mark on timber, third floor of Saron.....	21
Figure 2.4	Wedges nailed to upper sides of roof beams to produce "kicked" roof.....	23
Figure 2.5	Iron window hook (bottom center).....	25
Figure 2.6	Original window sash.....	26
Figure 2.7	South facade of Saron during restoration showing Hebron's second doorway in center.....	28
Figure 2.8	Pre-restoration view of north facade of Saron.....	29
Figure 2.9	Lath, straw and clay insulating layer applied to interior wall on first floor of Saron.....	31
Figure 2.10	"1743" inscription on lintel of window on north facade, representing Hebron's second doorway.....	36
Figure 2.11	East hearth, first floor of Saron.....	37
Figure 2.12	Plan of second floor of Hebron.....	39
Figure 2.13	Plan of third floor of Hebron.....	41

Figure 2.14	Plan of first floor of Hebron.....	43
Figure 2.15	North-south beam marking central division of Hebron on first floor, prior to 1964 restoration.....	44
Figure 2.16	Chamfered beam supporting summer beam, east side of kitchen on first floor.....	45
Figure 2.17	West hearth on second floor.....	47
Figure 2.18	East hearth on third floor.....	48
Figure 2.19	West hearth on third floor.....	49
Figure 2.20	Stone sink in kitchen on second floor, installed after 1745.....	50
Figure 2.21	East hearth with suppenherd on second floor.....	51
Figure 2.22	Stoveplate dated 1742 depicting the Biblical story of the Pharisee and the publican, excavated 1966.....	54
Figure 2.23	West common room on third floor with built-in benches and evidence of original stove position.....	55
Figure 2.24	View of sleeping cells from west common room on third floor.....	56
Figure 3.1	Section of frontispiece, <u>Der Christen ABC</u> , 1750.....	63
Figure 3.2	Printer's emblem used by the Ephrata Brotherhood.....	64
Figure 3.3	Pen-and-ink depiction of Sister in Ephrata garb.....	68
Figure 3.4	Top side of hand-sewn linen shoe believed to have been worn by a Solitary Sister or Brother.....	69
Figure 4.1	Original iron door knocker and wooden door handle on rear door of Saron.....	82
Figure 4.2	Sleeping cell on third floor.....	83
Figure 4.3	Closet in sleeping cell on second floor.....	84
Figure 4.4	Floorplan of Moravian Gemeinhaus completed in 1743 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.....	87

Figure 4.5	Plan of first floor of Saron.....	92
Figure 4.6	Plan of second floor of Saron.....	93
Figure 4.7	Plan of third floor of Saron.....	94
Figure 4.8	Pen-and-ink wall chart hung over first floor door of Saal leading into Saron.....	96
Figure 4.9	Pen-and-ink illumination from <u>Der Christen ABC</u> , 1750.....	101

ABSTRACT

Since the eighteenth century, visitors to the Ephrata Cloister in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania have marveled at the strange, medieval appearance of the Cloister's architecture. Established in 1732, the Ephrata community was a religious settlement founded by Conrad Beissel, a German immigrant. From 1734 to 1746, the community built four convents to house its single celibate Brothers and Sisters in sex-segregated quarters. Only one convent has survived, built in 1743 to house Ephrata's married members [Householders], thereby allowing them to dissolve their marriages and practice celibacy, a spiritual ideal. This experiment was the brainchild of Israel Eckerlin, the administrative head of the community, who saw it as a means to control the Householders' farmland. During his tenure, Eckerlin promoted Ephrata's economic growth and in the process steered the members in a worldly direction that was at odds with Beissel's endorsement of a separatist, ascetic Pietism. This opposition manifested itself tangibly in Ephrata's architecture, which was seen as a metaphor for the misguided ascendancy of rational thought over divine inspiration. The struggle between Beissel and Eckerlin ended in 1745 when Eckerlin was ousted from the community in 1745. The social and religious experiment in Hebron was concurrently dissolved and the building was remodeled, renamed "Saron," and turned over to the single Sisters of the community.

To date, analysis of the construction and style of Hebron-Saron has been limited to detailed descriptions; the lack of community documentation, such as building plans or notes, has hindered explication. The focus of this thesis is an interpretation of the building that relates it to contemporary community events and religious beliefs. A comparison of the building's construction and floorplan to eighteenth century Pennsylvania-German techniques and designs exposes the building's conventionality. Analysis of the relationship of Hebron-Saron to the convents that preceded it reveals the building's physical and symbolic position in the community landscape. Finally, the story of Israel Eckerlin's conflict with Beissel and subsequent fall from grace unlocks the symbolic and religious content of the building. The outcome of this approach is a contextualized interpretation of the community's only surviving convent.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Israel Eckerlin stood alone on Zion Hill, gazing up at the Zion convent where he had been Prior of the Zionitic Brotherhood of the Ephrata settlement for four years. He knew that he would not see the completion of his plan for a one-hundred-room addition to this three-story convent, which already housed over thirty Solitary Brothers. He turned to look at the orchard "of 1,000 trees" that he and his brothers--Samuel, Gabriel, and Emmanuel--had planted that bore fruit not only for the Ephrata settlement, but also for the surrounding country.¹ Beyond the orchards Israel saw the rooflines of the other communal buildings he had helped to erect--Hebron, Peniel and Kedar. Admiring their large and stately proportions, he walked down the hill toward them, and lingered before Hebron, another three-and-a-half story convent that had been occupied so briefly by the married Householders. At seventy-two by thirty feet, it was one of the largest buildings in the

¹Lamech and Agrippa, Chronicon Ephratense: A History of the Community of Seventh Day Baptists at Ephrata, Lancaster County, Penn'a, trans. J. Max Hark (Lancaster, Pa.: S.H. Zahm & Co., 1889), 193. Brother Lamech was a Householder who recorded the community events until his death in 1763; Brother Agrippa has been identified as Peter Miller, the successor to the community's founder, Conrad Beissel. Miller edited and co-authored the Chronicon, which was printed on the press of the Ephrata Brotherhood in 1786. Although somewhat biased in its portrayal of events, the Chronicon remains the best history available. Several histories have been compiled in the twentieth century, including James Ernst's "Ephrata, A History" and Gordon Alderfer's The Ephrata Commune (see Bibliography), but readers should be cautioned that these contain undocumented material.

Commonwealth. Israel reflected with satisfaction that although the Moravian settlement in Bethlehem had an even larger *Gemeinhaus*, it could not boast of having three convents, several craft houses, a bakehouse, printing operation, and several mills. So distinctive were the Ephrata buildings--indeed, the whole thriving community--that the Governors of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland paid a joint visit to Ephrata in 1744, having "heard so much about [the community] that [they] could not pass by without seeing them and their work." The Geschicht-Schreiber further reported that "they enjoyed their stay very much and left with many compliments."² Israel had reason to cherish these memories: it was 4 September 1745, the day he was forced to leave Ephrata, which had been his home for twelve years.

The banishment of Israel Eckerlin represented a turning point in the history of Ephrata, a Pennsylvania-German religious settlement established in 1732. By the early 1740s, Ephrata found itself caught in a conflict between Eckerlin, its administrative head, and Conrad Beissel, its spiritual leader and founder (see Appendix A). Although Eckerlin's departure in 1745 resolved this struggle, the effects of the conflict left a lasting impression on the community that was tangibly expressed in Ephrata's communal architecture.

Israel had no desire to leave, but events of the last few months had left him with little alternative. In early August, ten or twelve Brothers had assembled

²Felix Reichmann and Eugene Doll, eds. "Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries," in Pennsylvania German Folklore Society Yearbook, vol. 17 (Allentown, Pa.: The Society, 1952): 38-39.

in the Zion prayerhouse and deliberated until daybreak over Israel's position as Prior. They had reached a resolution only after seeking the advice of their spiritual leader, Conrad Beissel, who had declared Israel to be a man "ruined by the spirit of the world" and pronounced that "the Brothers that were on his side were also ruined"; even Israel's own brother Gabriel had turned against him. On August 7, the Brotherhood had stripped Israel of his office as Prior and that day, "in the open air," had burned Israel's book, a treatise against the Moravians that was estimated to have been worth fifty pounds sterling. Three days later the Sisters, thirty-nine in number, had burned his songs and his tracts, "The Behavior of a Solitary" and "Rules and Principles of a Soldier of Jesus Christ." Finally, all the Brothers had gathered again in the Zion prayerhouse to burn all of Israel's writings that remained in their possession.³

Mortified by these events, Israel realized that his humiliation had begun even a few months earlier, when Beissel had released the married Householders from their residence in Hebron. According to Israel's plan, Hebron was to have secured the community's economic self-sufficiency by housing the married members, who would have had all their earthly needs met by the community and therefore would have donated their farmland to the Settlement. Instead, Beissel had directed the building to be remodeled and turned it over to the Sisterhood in July,

³Ezechiel Sangmeister, Life and Conduct of the Late Ezechiel Sangmeister, trans. Barbara M. Schindler (Ephrata, Pa.: Historical Society of the Cocalico Valley, 1986), 46. Sangmeister was a Solitary Brother in the community from 1748 to 1752 and from 1764 until his death in 1784. He kept a diary beginning in 1754, which was partially published in 1825: Life and Conduct is a translation from the 1825 printing. Unfortunately the original manuscript was lost in the early nineteenth century.

even renaming it "Saron." The dismantling of Hebron, Israel now understood, was an early link in a chain of events designed by Beissel to chasten and humble him.

Finally, in September 1745, the council of the Brotherhood had agreed to banish Israel to the fulling-mill. After a time he might be allowed to return to Zion convent or to another small house in the Settlement, but only as a common Brother, not as Prior. "I beg of you for God's sake, Brethren, to receive me again," Israel grieved in his last appearance before them, "for I cannot be separated from you in time and eternity."⁴ With the pronouncement of his expulsion, even if seemingly a temporary one, Israel felt his humiliation by the community to be complete.

Israel had initially thought of accepting the condition of temporary local exile. Brother Ezechiel later suggested in his diary that the Brethren's offer was a sham, that "the old wicked Vorsteher [Beissel] managed it so that Brother Onesimus [Israel] could not stay...Neither [work], nor living quarters, nor even a seat at the table would he allow him, and so, of course he had to go."⁵

Israel's elder brother, Samuel, on whom he had always relied, persuaded Israel to leave altogether, "to turn to a hermit's life." Israel would not be fleeing alone, for both Samuel and Brother Timotheus "would escape with him into the desert and leave misfortune to the Brethren."⁶ Their departure, though, would leave Israel with the pain of being torn away from his achievements; the buildings and

⁴Lamech, Chronicon, 183-84.

⁵Ezechiel Sangmeister, 47.

⁶Lamech, Chronicon, 184. Brother Timotheus has been identified as Alexander Mack, Jr.

thriving economy were his legacy to a community that now shunned him.

On the day of Israel's expulsion, the bustle of the community was nowhere to be seen; the ban had begun. Israel turned his back to Saron, Kedar, and Zion. Still, he felt the gaze of his Brothers and Sisters upon him as he walked slowly towards Samuel and Brother Timotheus, who stood waiting for him at the turnpike just outside the Settlement. Together they were headed into the "wilderness"-- "toward the setting of the sun," a journey of four hundred miles, to a fresh start on the New River in Virginia.⁷ They still wore the garments that marked them to the world as members of the Zionitic Brotherhood of Ephrata, but five years would pass before they could and would return to the community.

In 1786, when the Chronicon Ephratense, the official history of Ephrata, was published, the authors, Brothers Lamech and Agrippa, devoted the equivalent of nearly four chapters to the story of Israel Eckerlin. By that account, the events surrounding Eckerlin caused "such a winnowing [to] be brought about in the Settlement that it almost ended in a complete disruption of the same."⁸ The "taint" left by Israel Eckerlin, as the remaining Brethren perceived it, incited the Solitary Brethren to rip out the huge orchard and to build a new convent for themselves, abandoning the Zion convent and prayerhouse to the poor and widowed members.

⁷Ibid. Their destination is now located in West Virginia.

⁸Lamech, Chronicon, 170.

By the spring of 1746, the Brethren also expelled Israel's other brothers, Gabriel and Emmanuel.

On the surface, to the twentieth-century reader, this narrative presents a straightforward power struggle, with its "origin in the dissensions which arose between the Superintendent [Conrad Beissel] and his first-born spiritual son, Onesimus [Israel Eckerlin]."⁹ The conflict was dramatic, protracted over two years, and indicative of Beissel's shrewd manipulative skills. However, for Ephrathites, Israel's eviction carried no less import than Adam's removal from the Garden of Eden and, indeed, bore "a great resemblance to the fall of the angel of envy [Lucifer] and of the first man."¹⁰ The likening of Eckerlin to the Biblical Adam begins to explain both the emphasis given to his story in the Chronicon Ephratense as well as the Brethren's apparent need to alter or abandon the buildings that had strong associations with Israel Eckerlin.

The extent to which the community was to interact with the outside world lay at the heart of the struggle between Eckerlin and Beissel. During his tenure as Prior, Eckerlin promoted Ephrata's economic growth and in the process steered the members in a worldly direction that was at odds with Beissel's endorsement of a separatist, ascetic lifestyle with its roots in European Pietism. This opposition between Eckerlin and Beissel manifested itself most concretely in Ephrata's communal architecture.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

Although buried in the Chronicon's recounting of the community's history, the remodeling and renaming of the convent Hebron, which took place as early as the spring of 1745, clearly resulted from Israel's fall from influence. The failure of Hebron, as Israel Eckerlin had conceived it, seems in hindsight to have been an early warning of Eckerlin's imminent fall from grace. Designed and built in 1743 under Israel's direction, on the surface Hebron was intended to provide sex-segregated housing to Ephrata's married members ["Householders"], thereby allowing them to dissolve their marriages in favor of celibacy; after virginity, celibacy was considered the highest spiritual state at Ephrata. Beneath this intention was Eckerlin's economic ambition: to control the Householders' farmland. This social and religious experiment in Hebron failed, partly because of practical considerations, but also because it represented, as the Chronicon described it, one of Israel Eckerlin's "unnatural" ideas. However, rather than being demolished upon the Householders' departure, the building was altered for its new occupants, the Order of the Spiritual Virgins, and renamed "Saron." In the process, the building was symbolically transformed.

Hebron-Saron is the only surviving Ephrata convent of the four built from 1734 to 1746 (Appendix B). To date, analysis of its construction and style has been limited to detailed descriptions that have done little to contextualize what seem today to be its unique and peculiar qualities (Figures 1.1-1.3). Moreover, the lack of community documentation, such as building plans or notes, has hindered

Figure 1.1 Rear view of Saron and adjoining Saal from "God's Acre" graveyard. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Figure 1.2 Front facade of Saron prior to restoration. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 1.3 Saron and adjoining Saal after restoration, 1966. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

explication of Hebron-Saron. The primary goal of this thesis is to offer an interpretation of Hebron-Saron that relates the building to contemporary community events and religious beliefs.

This interpretation begins with an assemblage of the details of the Hebron-Saron's construction, based on the papers of the restoration architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh, the 1988 Historic Structures Report, and personal observation. Since the current floorplan is believed to nearly represent the Saron or post-Israel phase, I deduced the floorplan of Hebron from remaining physical evidence largely found on the second and third floors of the building. This physical analysis of the building also fulfills another goal--to provide future scholars of the Ephrata architecture with a comprehensive, single source that describes the materials and techniques employed in Hebron-Saron's construction. A comparison of Hebron-Saron's construction and floorplan to Pennsylvania-German techniques and designs in common use in Lancaster County exposes the building's conventionality. Finally, analysis of the relationship of Hebron-Saron's design and function to what is known of the Zion and Kedar convents that preceded it begins to reveal the building's physical and symbolic position in the community landscape.

Extraction of the social and religious meaning encoded in Hebron-Saron is central to the building's interpretation. The community's religious and social values expressed in the Hebron phase emerge from the story of Israel Eckerlin's influence in the community and the events leading to his banishment. How these values change in the remodeled Saron are clarified through an examination of the Biblical

account of Adam's fall, from which many of the community's principal beliefs derived. Conrad Beissel explicated this story in numerous writings, including Mystische Abhandlung ueber die Schoepfung und von des Menschens Fall und Wiederbringung durch Weibes Saamen [Mystical Dissertation on the Creation and Man's Fall] published in 1745 and translated into English in 1765. In particular, Beissel's interpretation of the Adam story reveals the community's spiritual conceptions of male and female that emerged in the change from Hebron to Saron. Together with the Mystical Dissertation, a chronicle written in 1745 by the Sisterhood illuminates the functional, architectural, and religious significance of the transformation from Hebron to Saron.

The architecture of Hebron-Saron, studied in combination with the written record--the Chronicon Ephratense, Beissel's religious writings, and the Sisters' chronicle--provides the basis for deciphering the transformation in the community's social and religious structure from 1743 to 1745. The story of Israel Eckerlin's fall, with its comparison to Adam's fall, furnishes particular insight into the building's design and function in its phases as Hebron and Saron, and helps to unlock its symbolic content. This examination is further amplified by viewing the transformation of Hebron to Saron in the context of Beissel and Eckerlin's conflict as it manifested itself as a religious struggle. The outcome of this approach is a contextualized interpretation of the community's only surviving convent. So, in the

words of Ephrata Brothers Lamech and Agrippa, "let us go back to the source from which this evil flowed."¹¹

¹¹Ibid.

Chapter 2

THE BUILDING OF HEBRON: CONSTRUCTION AND INTERIOR PLAN

Eighteenth-century visitors to Ephrata stressed in their travel accounts the sheer size of the community's buildings, depicting them as "great communal buildings" and "spacious and rambling," but these travellers made no particular notation of their style other than to comment that they were "wooden."¹² In the 1940s, restoration architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh labelled the architecture "medieval," noting its "frontier crudity" and "deliberate ascetic plainness" in contrast to the "symmetry and architectural quality" of Moravian construction.¹³ Today, the architecture of the Ephrata Cloister seems austere and foreign.

How peculiar or singular was the architecture at Ephrata? Were the building techniques rudimentary or crude? A detailed examination of the construction techniques as well as of the interior finish and plan begins to answer these questions. An understanding of how the building was made and reconstruction of its original floorplan will not only test the long-held assumption of the building's

¹²Reichmann, "Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries," 35, 45, 50, 78.

¹³G. Edwin Brumbaugh, "Medieval Construction at Ephrata," The Magazine Antiques July 1944, 20; G. Edwin Brumbaugh to Mr. Donald A. Shelley, 7 August 1939, G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware (hereafter cited as "Brumbaugh Collection").

uniqueness, but also provide the basis for interpreting the functional and cultural meaning of the building in its first phase as Hebron, the convent for the Householders.

The building methods and plan of Hebron-Saron reflect planning, skill, and choice found in other Ephrata buildings: By 1743, the community had already built two large convents (Kedar and Zion), three prayerhouses, and an unknown number of smaller craft buildings. According to the Chronicon Ephratense, the Solitary Brethren and Householders took responsibility from the outset for the community's building projects, including the construction of houses for the poor, viewing the work as following in Christ the carpenter's footsteps. Beissel himself participated in these projects in the early days of the community, but he gave up carpentering to "devote himself more wholly to the spiritual welfare of mankind."¹⁴ All construction appears to have been completed from within the community's membership; the Chronicon prompts readers to "be astonished and marvel whence [the community] received the strength and courage to accomplish such great things."¹⁵ Several members possessed the necessary construction skills, including Israel Eckerlin, who was trained as a mason, and Sigmund Landert, a Householder who, as a "skilled mechanic" and an "experienced carpenter," appears to have been involved in most of the major construction projects.¹⁶ One of Ephrata's builders,

¹⁴Lamech, Chronicon, 53-54.

¹⁵Ibid., 127.

¹⁶Ibid., 80, 194.

Gottlieb Haberecht, was lured away by the Moravian community, perhaps on account of his skills, and became one of the master builders in the construction of the first Gemeinhaus in Bethlehem in 1741.¹⁷

The varied techniques demonstrated in the few remaining buildings also suggest the extent of skill resident in the Ephrata community. The Almonry (c. 1736) was constructed of stone, and the prayerhouse ["Peniel" or "Saal"] adjoining Hebron-Saron was built (c. 1741) using a timber framing method different from the one employed on Hebron-Saron. Neither the architectural styles nor the plans of these buildings duplicate one another.

In contrast to the Almonry and Peniel, Hebron-Saron is rectangular, measuring 71 feet 6 inches long by 29 feet 6 inches wide and 68 feet to the peak of the gable.¹⁸ Its long axis runs east to west and the gable roof lies perpendicular to the roofline of the adjacent Saal [prayerhouse] (Figure 2.1). The foundation is of limestone rubble masonry, with some brown sandstone.¹⁹ The building was made in the sturdiest variety of timber construction, which consisted of horizontally-laid

¹⁷Kenneth G. Hamilton, ed. and trans., The Bethlehem Diary, 1743-1744 (Bethlehem, Pa.: The Archives of the Moravian Church, 1971), 99.

¹⁸Unpublished manuscript, p. 292, Miscellaneous File, Box 4, Brumbaugh Collection. For structural details of Saron, my discussion relies on the drawings, papers and photographs of Edwin Brumbaugh, the architect directing restoration at Ephrata in the 1940s and 1950s, as well as on the 1988 Historic Structures Report completed by Patrick O'Bannon, Kenneth F. Jacobs, Jeffrey C. Bourke and George Cress of John Milner Associates, Philadelphia, PA. These sources agree as to major components but differ in several details. Discrepancies include the question of whether full or half dovetail joints were used to join the timber walls, whether the timbers were sawn or hewn. Where possible, I have personally examined the structural detail in question and drawn conclusions based on my observations.

¹⁹Patrick O'Bannon and others. Historic Structures Report, vol. II (Philadelphia: John Milner Associates, 1988), 36.

Figure 2.1 Rear view of Saron (right) and Saal. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

timbers, chinked with stones and mortar, for two and a half stories (Figure 2.2). The massive roof area as well as the building's three-section design probably compelled this choice. Hewn flat on all four sides, the timbers for Hebron-Saron vary in size, from thirteen to seventeen inches in height and four to six inches in width. The logs were joined at the corners by full-dovetail joints, creating a box corner with no overhang of the timbers and resulting in narrow interstices of one and a half to four inches. Although this joinery represented the best of Pennsylvania-German log construction, it was not the most prevalent type because it was more difficult to execute, requiring exact cuts on the dovetails.²⁰ The large size, and therefore weight, of the timbers used in Hebron-Saron must have presented the additional challenge of hoisting them into place. "Fachwerk" or "half-timbering" completes the remaining half-wall of the third floor; in fachwerk, vertical or diagonal posts stand between the plate and a sill, with the spaces between the posts filled with another material, in this case panels of straw and mud daubing.

Timber construction of this variety was neither crude nor uncommon. Moreover, it expresses permanency rather than frontier expediency. Housing descriptions in the records of the United States Direct Tax of 1798 and in the returns of the 1815 Direct Tax, indicate that log construction continued to be a popular technique in predominantly Pennsylvania-German townships of Lancaster County into the nineteenth century. Fifty-five to sixty percent of all Pennsylvania-

²⁰Fred Kniffen and Henry Glassie, "Building in Wood in the Eastern United States," The Geographical Review LVI, no. 1 (1966): 57-59.

Figure 2.2 Exposed timber facade of Saron during restoration. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

German housing in the county's rural areas consisted of one-and-a-half-story log houses. These tended to be about 32 feet long and 28 feet wide, roughly half the size of Hebron-Saron. Squared logs, as seen on Saron, were more prevalent for domestic buildings, whereas round logs were more typically associated with houses of inferior quality or farm outbuildings. Evidence of half-timbering also survives in photographic and documentary records.²¹

The final timber of the knee wall on Hebron-Saron's third floor serves as the sill on which the roof rafters rest. The slightly tapering rafters, spanning fifteen feet, are lapped at the peak and pinned with large wooden pegs. This method of roofing, representing both Continental and English practice, predominated in America in the eighteenth century.²² The same technique joined the collar support beams to the rafters; an additional set of collars and purlins are located at the attic floor level. Individual beams were incised with Roman numerals and triangular carpenter's marks in order to identify their placement in the frame; these marks are still visible on the rafter timbers and on the third floor wall timbers of the central section (Figure 2.3). These markings also suggest that Saron's timbers were seasoned and prefabricated away from the site.²³ Although the Chronicon is silent

²¹Scott C. Swank, "The Architectural Landscape" in The Arts of the Pennsylvania Germans, ed. Catherine E. Hutchins (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1983), 25-32. Dimensions are based on 1798 Direct Tax returns for Manor Township; no compilation across the county has been completed.

²²Henry Glassie, "A Central Chimney Continental Log House," Pennsylvania Folklife 18, no. 2 (Winter, 1968/69): 35.

²³William H. Tishler, "Fachwerk Construction in the German Settlements of Wisconsin," Winterthur Portfolio 21 (1986): 279, 281.

Figure 2.3 Builder's mark on timber, third floor of Saron. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

on how long it took to erect Hebron-Saron, the Zion convent was completed in two months, "in which time it neither snowed nor rained", whereas the Saal was built in ten months, including the time spent gathering and preparing the lumber during the previous winter.²⁴

The roof slope, at forty-eight degrees, was comparable to that on the adjoining Saal [prayerhouse]. Hebron-Saron's roofline was given a characteristic German "kick" or flare at the eaves by wedges nailed to the upper sides of each rafter (Figure 2.4). This method, adopted in Pennsylvania-German construction, differed somewhat from Continental technique, in which a short partial rafter ("Aufschifter") reached to extended joists.²⁵ Hand-shaved, double-tapered red oak wood shingles, side-lapped and butt-nailed, are thought to have served as the original roofing material on both Hebron-Saron and the Saal. In planning the building's restoration, Edwin Brumbaugh estimated that 44,000 reproduction shakes and 35,000 hand-wrought nails would be required to cover the combined 6,300 square foot roof area of the Saal and Saron. This modern materials estimate amply illustrates the manual labor that was necessary to build Hebron-Saron.²⁶

The timber and fachwerk exterior of Hebron-Saron is covered with modern clapboarding. This restoration decision was based on wide tulip poplar clapboards,

²⁴Lamech, Chronicon, 119, 157.

²⁵O'Bannon, Historic Structures Report, vol. II, 40.

²⁶Unpublished manuscript, 277, Brumbaugh Collection. See also "Minutes of the Ephrata Cloister Advisory Board, October 1, 1941, Preliminary Report," p. 12, Brumbaugh Collection.

Figure 2.4 Wedges nailed to upper sides of roof beams to produce "kicked" roof. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

thought to be original, that were found just below the eaves on the south side.²⁷

The discovery of oak clapboarding on the Saal in the seven-inch space where Hebron-Saron overlapped the Saal gable also justified the use of clapboarding in the restoration. At Saron's attic level, instead of the vertical gable boarding found on most Pennsylvania-German log houses, horizontal clapboarding was nailed directly to the studs, with no additional insulation.²⁸ While not unusual, the use of clapboarding over exposed timbers probably elevated Hebron-Saron's quality relative to other timber buildings.

The "medieval" spirit often ascribed to Hebron-Saron has been based not only on the steep, kicked roof but also on the flat-topped shed dormers and the "great blank walls with little windows," which have been perceived as "irregularly spaced."²⁹ These small casement windows open outward, held in that position by long wrought-iron hooks, which hang down on the outside when the windows are closed (Figure 2.5). All of the windows were replaced in the restoration, but a surviving sash revealed that the muntins were simply strips of wood with grooves cut in two opposite corners to receive the glass. No putty was used; the glass was held in place by wooden pegs at the corners (Figure 2.6).³⁰ This technique may have represented a bit of economizing since window frames and sashes could have

²⁷Ibid., 293.

²⁸G. Edwin Brumbaugh, "Colonial Architecture of the Pennsylvania Germans," in The Pennsylvania German Society Proceedings and Addresses, 1930, XLI (1933): 23-24.

²⁹Ibid., 24, 48.

³⁰"Abandoned early copies," p. 86, Miscellaneous file, Box 4, Brumbaugh Collection.

Figure 2.5 Iron window hook (bottom center). G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 2.6 Original window sash. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

been purchased from Philadelphia--from carpenter John Boyd, for example, who advertised such wares in the Pennsylvania Gazette in 1741; on the other hand, the purchase of goods may have contradicted the sense of spiritual investment represented in the building process.³¹

From the exterior, the windows appear small, but the interior casing flares outward, thereby maximizing the light emitted from the window while also protecting against heat loss during the winter. Whereas the common rooms have several windows, each individual "kammer" or cell is lit by only one small window; this practice was common in the southwestern German-speaking areas where it evolved from the concept of the kammer as the most secure and least accessible room, in which valuables would be stored.³² Surviving hardware on the interior casing of one window on the second floor raises the possibility of interior shutters.³³

In terms of placement, the fenestration appears to correspond more closely to the requirements of the interior plan, giving the facade an asymmetrical look. However, Hebron's north and south facades originally each had an additional entrance, which would have given greater exterior balance to the fenestration (Figures 2.7 and 2.8). In addition, the central shed dormer on the third floor, which

³¹Brumbaugh, "Colonial Architecture," 38.

³²William Woys Weaver, "The Pennsylvania German House: European Antecedents and New World Forms," Winterthur Portfolio 21 (1986): 259.

³³Neither Brumbaugh's papers nor the Historic Structures Report offer any discussion of shutters.

Figure 2.7 South facade of Saron during restoration showing Hebron's second doorway in center. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 2.8 Pre-restoration view of north facade of Saron. Large window in center represents Hebron's second rear doorway. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

skews the otherwise balanced look, is now thought to be an error of the restoration process.³⁴ Correcting the facade for these elements, the exterior is symmetrical and balanced.

Hebron-Saron related in appearance and construction to another religious structure, the Moravian Gemeinhaus in Bethlehem, which was built in three sections over three years; finished in 1743, it was 92 by 32 feet. Together these structures represented two of the largest institutional buildings then standing in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The exterior timber walls of the Gemeinhaus, dovetailed at the corners as in Hebron-Saron, were left exposed and the kicked roof was truncated into a gambrel roof, but otherwise, the overall construction and exterior appearance was consistent with Hebron.

The treatment of timber walls, partitions, and ceilings throughout Hebron-Saron reveals the builders' concern with insulation. Timber walls at ground level were treated on the interior with mud and straw, nailed under horizontal wooden laths and then plastered, presumably also to reduce leakage (Figure 2.9). Interior partitions and flat ceilings were constructed in panels by inserting woven horizontal wooden laths into grooves cut into the length of each vertical post and then wrapping the laths with straw and mud. Historic documentation suggests that the walls were finished with a lime whitewash, perhaps leaving the posts exposed, as they are today. The posts themselves were mortised directly into ceiling beams and floorboards. This lath, straw and mud panel construction was often used in

³⁴O'Bannon, Historic Structures Report, vol. II, 41-42.

Figure 2.9 Lath, straw, and clay insulating layer applied to interior wall on first floor of Saron. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Pennsylvania-German houses to insulate basements, but was rarely used above the ground floor level; insulation on upper floors was of lesser concern because wood for heating stoves was considered plentiful.³⁵ The widespread use of panels in Hebron-Saron, as well as an insulating layer applied to timber walls, may have expressed a special concern for heat retention that the building's size would have warranted.³⁶

The chimney flues were similarly constructed of lath, straw, and clay. A single efficient flue system carried the smoke from the first floor fireplaces up a shaft-like flue that emerged on the upper floors at one side of each fireplace, dumping the smoke into the throat of the hearth. At the attic level, the two chimney flues are no longer extant, but Brumbaugh described their probable construction:

Chimnies were made by setting hewn posts into the corners of a timber pad on the attic floor. These posts sloped slightly inward as they went up, thus "choking" the flue. This increased the speed of smoke. Their facing sides were given continuous "V" shaped grooves. Split lath, pointed at each end, were wrapped with ropes of rye straw, soaked in wet clay, and inserted into the grooves (diagonally at first, then pressed down tightly into horizontal position). As the placement of the lath proceeded upward, the inside was smoothed with clay, rounding all corners. Above the roof the

³⁵Charles Lang Bergengren, "The Cycle of Transformation in the Houses of Schaefferstown, Pennsylvania" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1988), 129.

³⁶The only known exception to this technique was the use of a stone and mud panel on the first floor, which replaced part of the west transverse timber wall in the 1745 remodeling or a later one. See "Summary of Saron Restoration, October-November 1965," Archives, Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

chimney was covered with nailed horizontal boards, and the whole capped with a board roof, protected with clay.³⁷

The lack of insulation in the cellar ceilings contrasts with the treatment of timber walls, partitions and ceilings throughout Hebron-Saron, but was appropriate to the function of these spaces. Two cellars, in the northeast and northwest corners, were most likely intended for cold food storage. Saron is sited on a slight hill, sloping downward at the north side to allow exterior access to both cellars through an enclosed short set of stairs. This site placement is typical of Pennsylvania-German housing in America.³⁸ The northwest cellar measures 10' 3" wide by 11'4" deep, thus locating it directly under the kammer in the northwest corner. The other cellar is somewhat larger--15'3" by 12'2"--but still primarily placed under the northeast kammer.

The cellars' stone walls, small rectangular wall niches, and small window openings with tapering wells are also distinctively Pennsylvania-German in origin. The niches, which measure fifteen to nineteen inches wide by fifteen inches high, with a depth of eleven to fifteen inches, may have been used for cooling as similar

³⁷Unpublished manuscript, 89, Brumbaugh Collection. This description may not have been based on first-hand observation at Ephrata, but on other contemporary Pennsylvania German construction. Brumbaugh noted that he based the restoration of the chimney's open-ended shingle roof and siding on an 1886 photo by Julius Sachse of "an ancient Ephrata cabin." In a 1766 diary entry, Brother Ezechiel Sangmeister recounted a story in which the "wooden chimney" of Bethany caught fire, suggesting that Brumbaugh's reconstruction was appropriate (Vol. X, p. 27).

³⁸Edward A. Chappell, "Acculturation in the Shenandoah Valley: Rhenish Houses of the Massanutten Settlement," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 124, no. 1 (1980): 60.

recesses were used in Anglo-American New England cellars.³⁹ The niches contain no flues, nor do they bear any signs of having been used to burn lighting material as has been documented in Rhenish houses in the Shenandoah Valley. European precedent called for either straw and mud infilling between the ceiling joists or for a vaulted rubble stone ceiling. Instead, the cellar ceilings in Hebron consisted only of the floorboards of the rooms above. Such construction would not have conflicted, however, with the cellar's primary function as cold storage.⁴⁰

With the exception of the attic and the first floor kitchen, flooring throughout Hebron-Saron consisted of random-width unfinished softwood boarding, nailed to joists laid on top of the straw and mud panels. The attic floor is unfinished above the panels. In contrast, a 1965 excavation in the first floor kitchen revealed four historic layers beneath a concrete capping done in 1950. These layers consisted of a clay base; construction debris containing field stone rubble, broken clay roof tiles, burned limestone, and brick; a hand-laid field stone layer; and a top layer of lime, sand and pebble mortar. This top layer, as well as the layer of construction debris, was consistent with findings from excavations of the Zion and Bethany convent sites in the 1960s.

Hebron's framing and other structural details, both interior and exterior, demonstrate the builders' knowledge of traditional Pennsylvania-German building techniques and customs. Where the structural elements departed from European

³⁹J. Frederick Kelly, The Early Domestic Architecture of Connecticut (New York: Dover Publications, 1924), 69-70, quoted in Edward A. Chappell, "Acculturation," 60.

⁴⁰Chappell, "Acculturation," 60.

precedent, more often than not the divergence represented a reinterpretation widely adopted in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania-German construction. Further, the exterior appearance of Hebron, although executed on a massive scale, replicated the style of traditional Pennsylvania-German houses.

How then did the interior layout of Hebron relate to its exterior?

Brumbaugh's restoration of the building's interior generally tried to preserve what remained of Saron's floorplan with little consideration of Hebron's interior design. Reconstruction of Hebron's plan, however, is essential to the analysis of the building's transformation to Saron and therefore to discovery of its social and religious meaning.

In the building's first phase, as Hebron, the Chronicon described the building as "divided into two parts."⁴¹ On the first floor, another doorway discovered during the restoration mirrored the existing entrance on south facade. The date "1743" inscribed on the wood lintel of this second doorway is still visible, half chopped away when the door was altered to a window; below the sill is the original door rebate on each side (Figure 2.10). These two doorways also marked the outer corners of the building's central section, which currently contains a refectory and two opposing kitchen hearths (Figure 2.11). Discontinuous ceiling joists in the northwest corner of the bay and an oversized window at door height suggest the probability of a second set of winding stairs and additional rear doorway opposing the second front entrance. The east and west sections of the building repeated each

⁴¹Lamech, Chronicon, 158.

Figure 2.10 "1743" inscription on lintel of window on north facade, representing Hebron's second doorway. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

Figure 2.11 East hearth, first floor of Saron. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

other in plan: a common room was placed behind each hearth while individual sleeping cells ["kammers"] lined the gable ends and south wall, separated by a hallway from the common room. The evident symmetry of these sections is marred in the central section, where restoration has obscured or obliterated much of the physical evidence.

The second and third floors were stabilized rather than restored, leaving intact most of the physical evidence of the original plan in the central section. On the second floor, the central section was divided into two kitchens by a center wall that extended to the north wall (Figure 2.12).⁴² The continuation of this central wall to the south facade divided the space south of the two kitchens into two rooms of roughly equal size; both were several square feet larger than the individual kammers. The east kitchen, like its counterpart, appears to have ended at the south end of the hearth; empty nail holes in the flooring mark the outlines of a partition base. The west hall likely extended to the central wall, thus mirroring the length of the east hall (see also Figures 4.5-4.7). The rest of the second floor is identical to the first floor: two common rooms behind the kitchens, kammers on the south and gable walls, and a hallway in the southeast corner leading to the gallery of Saal meeting room. Discontinuous ceiling beams in the northwest corner of the central section confirm the evidence found on the first floor of a second flight of stairs.

On the third floor, the middle section was similarly divided into two

⁴²Evidence consists of posts grooved for partitions, empty mortises and a flooring change.

Figure 2.12 Plan of second floor of Hebron.

kitchens by a central wall (Figure 2.13).⁴³ The wood closet currently found on the east side of the wall was evidently a later addition. A wooden column, gracefully chamfered on its four corners, was probably installed in the 1745 remodeling to provide the support for the overhead summer beam originally supplied by the partition.

The south wall of the western kitchen on the third floor appears to have been originally contiguous with that of the eastern kitchen. If so, the existing straight run of stairs leading from the third floor to the attic was a product of the 1745 remodeling. The ceiling level joists that frame the opening of the stair at the top are grooved to accept a ceiling partition. The vertical post opposite the stair, framing the left side of the hearth, is similarly channeled for a wall partition. Together with a lack of finish in the attic, this evidence suggests that in the Hebron phase, the attic was not intended for human occupancy or other use. In the prevailing European tradition, attic space was used for additional bedchambers or for storing grain; both practices were also followed in Pennsylvania-German households. By the time that Hebron-Saron was built, however, the Ephrata community had its own grist mill where excess grain conceivably was stored.⁴⁴

Based on the plan of the second floor, Rooms 301 and 302 were probably

⁴³Evidence consists of empty mortises, grooved partition posts and a flooring change.

⁴⁴Robert C. Bucher, "Grain in the Attic," *Pennsylvania Folklife* 12, no. 2 (Winter 1962/63): 7-15.

Figure 2.13 Plan of third floor of Hebron.

divided as they are presently, but whether the doorway providing access between the rooms was a product of the original plan or of the 1745 remodeling cannot be determined.⁴⁵ The remainder of the third floor plan repeats the first and second floor plans, but lacks a connecting entrance into the Saal.

The consistency of the plans on the upper floors allows the central section of the first floor plan to be inferred (Figure 2.14). The section was probably also divided in two halves, each with front and rear doors. The double-wide window placed equidistant between the two doorways on the south facade--the only such window in the building--reinforces the likelihood of a central division (Figure 2.15). As on the third floor, the later removal of the central partition may have prompted the installation of the two chamfered columns to support the summer beam (Figure 2.16).

The configuration of the interior plan of Hebron--executed back-to-back and replicated on each floor--conformed to the most common room arrangement used in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania-German domestic housing: the two-room "flurkuchen" or hall/kitchen plan, consisting of a long, relatively narrow kitchen with a "Stube" or great room behind the kitchen. First labeled the "Continental German" house-type, referring to its common use in middle and southern Germany, the flurkuchen plan is relatively square with an off-center front door and opposing rear door. Other characteristics of the plan include a central chimney with a deep

⁴⁵This doorway was uncovered during restoration and remains exposed in room 302.

Figure 2.14 Plan of first floor of Hebron.

Figure 2.15 North-south beam marking central division of Hebron on first floor, prior to 1964 restoration. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Figure 2.16 Chamfered beam supporting summer beam, east side of kitchen on first floor. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

fireplace opening into the kitchen, which often connected to a stove in the "Stube."⁴⁶

The particulars of Hebron's floor plan convey the sense of a conventional domestic setting. Following the typical Pennsylvania German form, the hearths are framed by two upright timbers and a plain hewn wooden beam set horizontally to support the top of the opening. This open hearth design could function both for cooking and heating (Figures 2.17-2.20).⁴⁷ All of the hearths are laid with hand-shaped brick and raised approximately six inches above the floor level.⁴⁸ The east hearth on the second floor includes a raised "suppenherd" or soup hearth (Figure 2.21). The suppenherd is a square, box-like structure with a round aperture at the top in which a cooking vessel would be placed and fueled by hot coals through an opening below. Besides soupmaking, which was a staple of Southern German cooking, "suppenherds" were used for slowly stewing meats or simmering cornmeal mush and porridge.⁴⁹ Hebron-Saron evidently did not contain a "rauchkammer" or smoke chamber, a small room into which smoke from the central chimney stack would be diverted in order to cure meats. Meats could also have been smoked by hanging them in the chimney flue. Although salted and smoked meats were a

⁴⁶Weaver, "The Pennsylvania German House," 253; Robert C. Bucher, "The Continental Log House," *Pennsylvania Folklife* 12, no. 4 (Summer 1962):14-19; Glassie, "A Central Chimney," 38.

⁴⁷Weaver, "The Pennsylvania German House," 254-57.

⁴⁸The small warming hearth on the exterior of the first floor refectory's west wall was the product of a later remodeling.

⁴⁹Weaver, "The Pennsylvania German House," 257.

Figure 2.17 West hearth on second floor. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 2.18 East hearth on third floor. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 2.19 West hearth on third floor. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 2.20 Stone sink in kitchen on second floor, installed after 1745.
Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

Figure 2.21 East hearth with suppenherd on second floor. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

common component of the Pennsylvania-German diet, Conrad Beissel discouraged Ephrathites from eating meat.⁵⁰ He believed that animal products harmed the singing voice, which was an important means of praising God in the Ephrata community. However, pork and beef bones found in the archeological excavation of the Kedar site suggest that practice occasionally diverged from belief.⁵¹ None of the hearths show any evidence of a specific capacity for baking; the residents of Hebron-Saron may have used the outdoor bakeoven behind the Almonry or baked in the common room stoves.

In the Germanic tradition, stoves were considered a fundamental component of the Stube: "Ohne Ofen, keine Stube, ohne Stube, keine Hauslichkeit" [No stove, no Stube; no Stube, no home].⁵² Stovepipe holes in the chimneys in Hebron-Saron and brick hearths beneath later flooring indicate that stoves were used to heat Hebron-Saron's common rooms. Although no complete stoves survive, archeological digs on Zion Hill uncovered both a fragment of a redware ceramic stove tile as well as plates from cast iron stoves. The ceramic tile's intaglio panel design and monochrome manganese glaze are rather simple compared to the wide spectrum of designs that were available in Pennsylvania. In contrast, the stove plates bear more elaborate Biblical designs. One of the plates, dated c. 1742,

⁵⁰Ibid., 254.

⁵¹Stephen Warfel, state archeologist, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, telephone conversation with author, 10 February, 1995.

⁵²Weaver, "The Pennsylvania German House," 257.

depicts the story of the Pharisee and the publican told in the eighteenth chapter of Luke (Figure 2.22).⁵³ Although iron stoves were widely used in many European countries, transmission of tile stoves to the New World appears to have been limited to immigrants from Germany.⁵⁴ Like the stoves, simple benches lining the walls of the common rooms of Hebron-Saron also allude to the domestic Stube, in which built-in benches were a typical fixture (Figures 2.23 and 2.24).⁵⁵

The conventionality evident in the interior plan of Hebron corresponded to its external appearance, which itself strongly recalled the prevalent log styling of architecture in the Pennsylvania-German townships of Lancaster County. The construction and materials employed in Hebron, from the timber framing to the fenestration, were also far from unusual; rather, traditional Pennsylvania-German fabrication techniques were employed throughout the building. Planning and extensive labor are evident in both the exterior details and the interior structural components, suggesting that considerable attention was given to constructing a durable, permanent structure; the Ephrata builders refrained from taking the easiest path. Finally, from the standpoint of style, Hebron presented a symmetrical, balanced facade that was consistent with its ethnicity.

Not only was Hebron conventionally built, but in all of its details, Hebron

⁵³Left and right stoveplates, Accession # EC93.04.2 and .4, Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

⁵⁴Jessie McNab Dennis, "The Art of Keeping Warm," *The Magazine Antiques*, March 1966, 374, 377.

⁵⁵Weaver, "The Pennsylvania German House," 258.

Figure 2.22 Stoveplate dated 1742 depicting the Biblical story of the Pharisee and the publican, excavated 1966. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

Figure 2.23 West common room on third floor with built-in benches and evidence of original stove position. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

Figure 2.24 View of sleeping cells from west common room on third floor.
Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.
Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

replicated the style and construction of the most common of Pennsylvania-Germanhouses. Only its massive size--double the typical size and elevation--truly distinguished Hebron from ordinary houses. The familiar hall-kitchen floorplan echoed the sense of Hebron as a house as did the use of stoves and built-in benches in the common rooms, which recalled the form and familial tone of the domestic Stube. In short, Hebron with its houselike qualities appears to have been a fitting residence for the community's married Householders.

Chapter 3

HEBRON IN CONTEXT: EPHRATA'S OTHER COMMUNAL ARCHITECTURE

Hebron's style and construction, in the context of the Pennsylvania-German settlement of Lancaster County, expressed the ethnic conventionality of an ordinary house. Although built on a monumental scale, Hebron's unassuming appearance may have caused outside visitors to dismiss it and the community's other structures as simply "wooden."⁵⁶ Yet, the narrators of the Chronicon appraised the Kedar and Zion Saals, which were built before Hebron, as "sightly." What elements of style could have elicited this description and how did the architecture of Hebron and Peniel vary from that of the Kedar and Zion Saals? Together with depictions in the Chronicon, surviving physical and visual evidence of Kedar and Zion provides the basis for comparing these structures to Hebron. Such a comparison forms the background for understanding the nature of the Eckerlin-Beissel conflict and its expression in the architecture.

Although the exterior construction and plans of Kedar and Zion shared conventional elements, the variation in these buildings signals the firm rejection of the option to replicate design from building to building. Moreover, in their

⁵⁶Lamech, Chronicon, 195.

differentiation, the communal complexes revealed a hierarchy based on the relative rank, both spiritual and social, of the buildings' occupants. The hierarchy expressed in the architecture of Kedar and Zion directly contributed to the conflict between Beissel and Eckerlin. Reaching its full embodiment in Hebron, this struggle was between "essence" and "reason", and, on another level, reflected differing interpretations of how the pious life was to be led.

The interior plans and function of Kedar and Zion, expressing both secular and religious considerations, are thought to have differed from those of Hebron.⁵⁷ Kedar, the first official community building constructed in 1735 to accommodate growth in Beissel's following, was intended primarily as a meeting-house, with a hall dominating the first floor. Sleeping cells were constructed on the first and second floors in which three sisters of the newly-established Order of the Spiritual Virgins and four Solitary Brethren lived.⁵⁸ As the community's first attempt at housing celibate men and women in communal quarters, Kedar's arrangement met with suspicion:

"No one believed that matters could go on properly thus. [Beissel], however, cared more to have an essential [inward or spiritual] separateness than that there should be an outward appearance thereof that might not be real...he went further than some before him in the

⁵⁷The Kedar prayerhouse was demolished in 1740. The remaining Kedar convent and the Zion convent and prayerhouse were burned at some point after the Revolutionary War; both had been used as hospitals during the war and were believed to have been infected with typhus. Their sites were never recorded, but archeological excavations uncovered the footings of the Zion prayerhouse in the 1960s. An excavation begun in the summer of 1994, located southwest of Hebron-Saron, may have uncovered a portion of the footings of the Kedar complex.

⁵⁸Lamech, Chronicon, 76.

conventual or celibate life; for where others went out of the way of danger, he plunged his followers into the midst of it."⁵⁹

The dual purpose of Kedar, as both a dwelling and community meeting place, was subsequently altered when a prayer-house was built adjoining Kedar in 1736-37.

Kedar began to be used solely as the residence of the Sisterhood in 1740.

Zion was erected in 1738 to provide a convent for the Solitary Brethren, thereafter known as the Order of the Zionitic Brotherhood. Constructed three stories high, the building's plan and function expressed domestic and religious concerns in a form different from that seen in Kedar. The lower floor of the Zion convent consisted of one large room, which served as a refectory, and three connected anterooms used for storage of provisions and religious paraphernalia. Constructed without windows or interior walls, the second floor functioned as a large sleeping chamber in which beds were arranged in a circle. The third floor, accessed through a trapdoor, was used for special religious rituals. Windows on the third floor, and therefore the building itself, were oriented to the four cardinal points of the compass. This orientation may have related to the religious rituals practiced there.⁶⁰ The religious devotion and austerity implicit in this description of Zion convent are somewhat diminished by the fact that the Brethren brought their

⁵⁹Ibid., 78.

⁶⁰Julius Friedrich Sachse, *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: By the author, 1899), 359. Sachse's work on Ephrata has been criticized by recent scholars for its "broad brush" and more particularly for its projection of Rosicrucian and Masonic beliefs--Sachse's own affiliations--onto the Ephrata community. Sachse's description of the interior of the Zion convent is the only one extant, but its specific source is as yet unknown. Sachse took an early interest in the community, collecting many documents and artifacts, some of which are thought to remain in his family's possession.

"household furniture" with them to Zion so that they were "furnished in every detail."⁶¹

At the outset, the Zion convent was, with a few exceptions, occupied by male novices. The committed Brethren remained in their individual hermit cabins until 1740 when they moved to Zion under the direction of the newly-named Prior, Israel Eckerlin. Like Kedar, the Zion convent was designed to be used not only as a residence but also for religious rituals in which only the Solitary Brethren participated. The community as a whole continued to hold its prayer meetings in the Kedar Saal until 1739, when a separate prayerhouse was constructed adjoining Zion, supplanting the Kedar Saal as community prayerhouse. Following the precedent set by the Kedar complex, the two buildings on Zion Hill formed a right angle, overlapping each other by approximately two feet; the relationship of Hebron-Saron to its Saal ["Peniel"] would later replicate this pattern. This configuration created direct access from the convent into the prayerhouse, as can also be seen today on the first and second floors of Saron.

Archeological evidence supports a description of the Zion Saal, like Hebron-Saron's Saal ["Peniel"], as forty-foot square. The obvious religious symbolism of using the number forty to govern the Saal's proportions reinforces its religious function and also promotes a sense of spiritual harmony.⁶² Similar to Peniel, the Zion Saal was at least partially half-timbered, but had a central doorway and

⁶¹Lamech, Chronicon, 110.

⁶²For example, see Gen. 7, Acts 1, Matt. 4, Mark 1, Luke 4.

external tower with belfry on the east side.⁶³ The convent and prayerhouse's location on a hill was consonant with its name, "Zion", meaning "fortress," and emblematic of the hill on which the city of Jerusalem was built.⁶⁴ The bell was rung each day at midnight to call the Solitary Brethren and Sisters to worship, but "not only did all the Settlement arise, but as one could hear it for four English miles around the Settlement, all the families also rose and held their home worship at the same time."⁶⁵ Although by the 1740s bells were commonly rung to signal the start of services in Philadelphia churches, few were found in the rural regions of Pennsylvania.⁶⁶ Thus, the structures on Zion Hill physically and symbolically presented themselves as a dominant and explicitly religious presence on the community and regional landscape.

The only-known rendering of Kedar and Zion, a pen and ink drawing found in an illuminated book produced in 1750, clearly depicts Zion and its Saal as architecturally different from the other communal complexes (Figure 3.1-3.2).⁶⁷

⁶³Dale E. Biever, "A Report of the Archeological Investigations at the Ephrata Cloister, 1963-66," in Four Pennsylvania German Studies, Publications of the Pennsylvania German Society, Vol. III (Breinigsville, Pa.: Pennsylvania German Society, 1970), 16-23.

⁶⁴Madeleine S. Miller and J. Lane Miller, Harper's Bible Dictionary (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 841-42.

⁶⁵Lamech, Chronicon, 121.

⁶⁶Jon Butler, Awash in a Sea of Faith (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 111-12.

⁶⁷Der Christen ABC is Leiden, Dulden, Hoffen, wer dieses hat gelernt, der hat Ziel getroffen. [The Christian ABC is suffering, endurance, hope; whoever has learned this has attained his goal] (Ephrata, 1750), frontispiece. Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission..

Figure 3.1 Section of frontispiece, Der Christen ABC, 1750. Above right, Zion; left, Kedar; below right, Bethany; left, Saron. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Figure 3.2 Printer's emblem used by the Brotherhood. Note steeple on building to right of central figure. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Through its steeple-like tower, incorporating both a clock and bell, Zion's style seemed to allude to traditional ecclesiastical buildings of Continental Europe. Its architectural style enhanced its religious identification and also signified its relative importance in the Ephrata community.⁶⁸ In contrast, the Hebron-Peniel complex and Kedar convent, depicted in the same drawing, bear little sign of architectural distinction. Yet the Chronicon described the Kedar Saal as "sightly" and "beautiful," which suggests that it too had architectural style equivalent in the community's eyes to the distinctive features of the Zion Saal.⁶⁹ In Peniel, architectural importance was expressed through its four-and-a-half-story vertical elevation, a rather subtle distinction compared to the effect created by the belltower on the Zion Saal, but nonetheless sufficient to distinguish the structure from its convent. In the Kedar, Zion, and Hebron complexes, architectural emphasis was given to the prayerhouses, in keeping with the importance of their explicitly religious function within the community.

The architectural dominance of the Saals echoed a consistent practice in European monastic architecture in which the church was the largest, richest and most dominant building in the composition of the cloister; this emphasis was

⁶⁸The works of a tower clock dated 1735 are in the collection of the Ephrata Cloister (Acc. #EC 14.65.1080). There is some confusion over whether this clock was the one mounted on Zion's tower. Julius Sachse suggests that the Zion bell and clock were both given in 1739 by Peter Miller's father in Germany. As suggested by its date, this clock may have been mounted on Kedar when it was built. This possibility augments the evidence of a hierarchy among the communal buildings.

⁶⁹Lamech, Chronicon, 80.

intended to link the functional status of the church with its appearance.⁷⁰ As an extension of this principle, the proportions of the church, often based on forty foot multiples, expressed its religious significance.⁷¹ As was also seen in the communal complexes at Ephrata, the position of the monks' chapter-house typically adjoined the transept of the church in order to allow discreet access.⁷² These parallels to conventional monastic architecture seem consistent with the Chronicon's description of Kedar's sleeping cells as being "after the manner of the old Greek church," a possible reference to monastic life under the Rule of St. Basil in the fourth century.⁷³ In addition, the Ephrata community perceived that "the cloister-life is older than the Papacy; as also that the Christian church, whilst still in its state of innocence, had within it certain flocks that chose a life of celibacy, and had all things in common."⁷⁴ Like the institution of celibacy and the communal order at Ephrata, the emulation of monastic architecture may have represented an effort to replicate the state of the early Christian church, which constituted one of the primary goals of Pietism, the community's belief system.

In spite of the Saals' shared characteristics, the architectural variation among

⁷⁰Wolfgang Braunsfels, Monasteries of Western Europe (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 11.

⁷¹Ibid., 45-46.

⁷²Ibid., 58.

⁷³Lamech, Chronicon, 76. The monastic influence was also present in the special garments of the Solitary Orders, which "without knowing it, [were] borrowed from the style of the Order of Capuchins" (p. 88).

⁷⁴Reichmann, "Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries," 68.

the buildings pointed to an emerging hierarchy among the different groups in the community. From 1740 to 1745, Zion was symbolically and physically the most significant structure in the community. Peniel offered much less visual impact, not even warranting the "sightly" or "beautiful" adjectives used to describe the Kedar and Zion Saals.

The individual merit of the buildings sprang not only from their architectural features, but also from the relative ranking of their users in the community. Peniel was built in 1741 to appease the Householders by providing them with their own prayerhouse. Their dependency on using the Zion Saal for worship "had been a cause of offense to several families, who left the Community."⁷⁵ More importantly, Peniel was intended to elevate the Householders' status in the community to a level equal with the Brotherhood in Zion. The Householders sought full incorporation into the religious structure of the community, but from the outset had been relegated to an emulative position. For example, the Householders copied the Solitary Brothers and Sisters in the special garb adopted after the establishment of the Order of the Zionitic Brotherhood (Figures 3.3 and 3.4):

...as the Solitary followed the Superintendent, so the domestic household ordered themselves according to the Solitary. Accordingly the households at that time also laid aside the worldly dress of their members, and both sexes adopted a new garb, which differed from that of the Solitary...only in this that the Solitary appeared at divine services in white garments, but the married in gray ones....⁷⁶

But the color gray lacked the symbolic import of the color white. Moreover, the

⁷⁵Lamech, Chronicon, 157.

⁷⁶Ibid., 89.

Figure 3.3 Pen-and-ink depiction of Sister in Ephrata garb. From Der Christen ABC, 1750. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Figure 3.4 Top side of hand-sewn linen shoe believed to have been worn by a Solitary Sister or Brother. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Orders apparently did not want to equalize the Householders' status: they instituted tonsuring as an emblem of the Orders' pledge to perpetual chastity in order to further differentiate themselves from the Householders.⁷⁷ Just as the Householders' grey clothing could never confer the status of the Solitary's white garments, Peniel's comparatively plain architecture could never express the religious and material authority embodied in the Zion convent and Saal.

Whether reproduced intentionally by the builders or representing collective memory, a rational framework of style emerges from this comparison. The architectural and social awareness visible in the buildings ran counter, however, to the community's spiritual beliefs. Pietism, the European sect that served as model to the Ephrata community, grew in opposition to the organized Protestant churches with their emphasis on set doctrines. Instead, Pietism offered an experientially-based approach to Christianity that focused on the practice of moral living; the Bible was considered the most important doctrinal text, but even more so, divine inspiration was expected to reveal the ways to the pious life.⁷⁸ To that end, at Ephrata, "one lived without plans for the future, but allowed oneself to be governed by the Spirit of the Community, without knowing what would be the outcome of

⁷⁷Ibid., 125. In tonsuring, part or all of the head is shaved, typically as a form of religious ritual for newly committed priests or monks. At Ephrata, a circle of hair was shaved at the crown of the head; Ephrathites may have viewed this ritual as another link to the early Christian church.

⁷⁸Peter C. Erb, Pietists, Protestants and Mysticism: The Use of Late Medieval Spiritual Texts in the Work of Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) (Metuchen, N.J. and London: The Scarecrow Press, 1989), 13, 17, 29-30.

the matter."⁷⁹ Ephrata itself was believed to have sprung "entirely from a providential occurrence, and not from the premeditated will of man."⁸⁰ Further, Pietism specifically reacted against an overemphasis on rationality: Beissel's "whole leading and teaching implies that human wisdom and reason have been made foolishness, which foolishness, however, is wiser than the wisdom of this world."⁸¹

The emphasis given to holy inspiration over human reason may also account for the demolition of the Kedar Saal, which was ordered by Beissel:

This beautiful building, after having stood about four years, was razed to the ground again, the cause of which can scarcely be comprehended by human reason. . . The Superintendent's followers were confounded in him, and knew not whether the erection or the destruction of this house, or both were from God. . . It is probable that a hidden Hand made use of him, in this wise symbolically to represent the wonders of eternity, after which the veil was again drawn over the affair; for there is a likeness in its history to that of Jerusalem, which, after it was scarcely finished, was plundered by the king of Egypt.⁸²

Through this action, Beissel reinforced a belief in the value of divine inspiration while asserting his own authority in the community. This passage also underscores the important role of the Bible in providing spiritual guidance to the Ephrata Pietists, offering them the means to interpret contemporary earthly events. By 1740 Zion Saal had become the community meeting-house, making the Kedar Saal

⁷⁹Ibid., 127.

⁸⁰Ibid., 64.

⁸¹Ibid., xv.

⁸²Ibid., 80.

functionally redundant. In light of his commitment to asceticism, Beissel may have perceived the Kedar Saal as an excessive display of materialism. He may also have been motivated to raze the building because of its "beautiful" quality, which may not have suitably expressed "God's glory" but rather a worldly architectural style. Early in the community's development, Beissel had warned the Solitary against the "outward church."⁸³ The Pietist tradition called for meetings in small groups, often in homes, rather than establishing outward structures of the congregation:

The saint has his church in himself where he hears and teaches internally. Babel has the stone-heap in which it goes with hypocrisy and flattery, permitting itself to be seen with beautiful clothes, pretending to be devout and pious. The stone church is its god in which it puts its trust.⁸⁴

Distinctive architecture thus was seen as a metaphor for the misguided ascendancy of rational thought over heavenly wisdom or, stated a little differently, as the embodiment of the organized church and its perceived descent into secular values. The narrators of the Chronicon, in describing the building of Zion, reported that "the Brotherhood would first build its structure on the heights of reason, and thus soar aloft, until at length by a great storm they would be cast down into the valley."⁸⁵ Here, "structure" may be understood on two levels, as the organization of

⁸³Ibid., 61.

⁸⁴Ibid., 61; Johannes Wallmann, Der Pietismus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990): 8-10 ; Jacob Boehm, The Way to Christ, trans. Peter Erb (New York: The Paulist Press), 162. The author thanks Jeffrey Bach for the Wallmann citation. The writings of Jacob Boehm (1575-1624) were influential in the formation of Ephrata Pietism.

⁸⁵Lamech, Chronicon, 108.

the Zionitic Brotherhood and as a physical place. In either interpretation, this description of Zion alludes to the downfall of Israel Eckerlin and intimates that the conflict between Beissel and Eckerlin centered on their ideological and architectural interpretations of Pietism.

Eckerlin promoted what were thought to be less than pious values through the architecture of Zion and also in his financial management of the settlement, which, as Prior, became his responsibility after 1740. Israel Eckerlin's government was very intertwined with the Householders' role in the community. Although their status in the community was considered spiritually inferior, from the early 1730s the Householders appear to have provided much of the financial support necessary to maintain the community:

"The domestic households at that time still had a high regard for the work of God in the Settlement. Their daily offerings were the main sustenance of the Solitary; yes they brought tithes of their crops into the Settlement..."⁸⁶

In addition to daily support, the Householders provided financial support and labor in the building of the communal structures. The Householders began to withhold their daily tithes, however, when Prior Israel Eckerlin directed that the Householders' crops be used in trade outside the community; the Bible dictated that tithes be an offering to God, used within the community.⁸⁷ About 1740, Eckerlin sought to reduce the economic dependency of the Solitary Orders on the "favor of the domestic households" by introducing a communal economy in which all private

⁸⁶Ibid., 139.

⁸⁷Deut.14:22-23.

ownership of material goods by the Solitary was declared to be a sin. The concept of community-held goods also stemmed from Biblical teachings.⁸⁸

While tithes and a communal order were consistent with the Pietist emphasis on following Biblical practices, Eckerlin began to promote activities that were perceived as secular, including a "worldly economy." The Brotherhood "set up various mechanical trades, which brought in great profits, and which they handed over to the Prior, so that in short time the treasury became so rich that money began to be loaned out."⁸⁹ Representing the "seat of their worldly realm," the Brotherhood purchased a grist mill in October 1741 on Cocalico Creek and soon expanded it to include flour grinding, cloth fulling, linseed oil pressing, and paper production."⁹⁰ The Brotherhood also organized a printing operation on the Cloister grounds. In addition to these economic pursuits, Eckerlin intended, in 1745, to add a 100-room wing to Zion convent and had accumulated the lumber for it.⁹¹

Eckerlin thus subverted the communal order, converting it to an authoritative, hierarchical government in which he controlled the treasury and directed the Orders into activities designed to ensure the economic stability of the community. At least once, Eckerlin ordered Brethren to work for him directly: two

⁸⁸Acts 5:32-37.

⁸⁹The negative inference in his passage derives from Matt. 21:12-19 in which Jesus cast out the moneylenders from the temple.

⁹⁰Lamech, *Chronicon*, 138-40.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, 171.

Brothers were employed to transcribe his writings.⁹² To maintain his authority, Eckerlin also "hedged the Brethren in against any approach to intimacy with [Beissel], for fear that they might become too exalted."⁹³

Just as Zion was viewed as the product of reason, the economic development of the community after 1740 far exceeded the scope of a communal order and therefore was perceived as "artificial, rather than being inspired in the Spirit."⁹⁴ For the community to be guided by economic interests directly conflicted with Beissel's interpretation of Pietism with its emphasis on asceticism. Whereas Israel was "of the civil world," intent on introducing secular practices, Beissel was "ever solicitous that the things of this world might not find entrance in the Settlement."⁹⁵

By the time that Hebron was built, the community's growth in material wealth had created serious dissension in the community. One of the community's earliest members, Conrad Weiser, denounced the community's activities and resigned his membership in a letter dated 3 September 1743:

It cannot be denied at Ephrata that I and several other members of the community. . .were compelled to protest for a considerable time... against the prevailing pomp and luxury, both in dress and magnificent buildings; but we achieved about as much as nothing; on the contrary, in spite of all protests, this practice was still more eagerly continued, and following the manner of the world, the

⁹²Ibid., 135.

⁹³Ibid., 137.

⁹⁴Ibid., 138.

⁹⁵Ibid., 139, 190.

attempt was made to cover such pride and luxury with the man of God. It was most zealously defended, so that for years nothing has been heard in public assemblies but the boast, "There the work stands; it is the work of God," as if it were the first Babylonian masterpiece. Whole assemblies were held in honor of the loathsome idolatry, while the leaders have indulged in the most fulsome self-praise by all kinds of fictitious stories.⁹⁶

As this letter indicated, the communal buildings at Ephrata began to be perceived as symbols of pride and luxury that collided with the spiritual beliefs of the community. Further, these buildings were viewed as a misguided attempt to sacralize the community's economic pursuits.

The communal buildings antecedent to Hebron reflected an emergent hierarchy in the community. Led by Israel Eckerlin, the Zionitic Brotherhood wielded the highest degree of influence while the Householders struggled to be recognized. Zion convent and prayerhouse, high on its hill, dominated the community landscape, both symbolically and physically. These distinctive structures, however, demonstrated an architectural and social awareness that was strongly associated with "reason" and therefore conflicted with the Pietist belief in divine inspiration. Further, the community's accumulation of large and "sightly" buildings ran dangerously close to the establishment of an "outward church." The descent into worldly architecture and other secular activities, including the establishment of an externally oriented trade economy, is specifically attributed to Israel Eckerlin and formed the heart of his conflict with Conrad Beissel.

⁹⁶Reichmann, "Ephrata as Seen By Contemporaries," 35-36.

Chapter 4

HEBRON AND THE TRANSFORMATION TO SARON

Hebron was built when Israel Eckerlin had reached his highest standing in the community and marked the beginning of his struggle to depose Beissel as Superintendent of the community. For Eckerlin, Hebron was intended to assure the community's economic stability and to bring the Householders into submission. For the Householders, the building held the hope of their full integration into the religious structure of the community. Beissel, on the other hand, appears to have viewed Hebron as a future convent for the Sisters. While Hebron embodied these three divergent interests, the remodeled Saron reflected a singular focus on Pietism, which stressed the solitary, interior life.

The building of Hebron offered the Householders an opportunity to rectify their weak spiritual position and to become more fully incorporated into the community by emulating the material and spiritual life of the Orders. Even the building's name, Hebron, meaning "association" or "union" in Hebrew, speaks to the attempt at assimilation.⁹⁷ The married state was believed to have "originated in the fall of man" and so by virtue of their marital status, the Householders were

⁹⁷Miller, Hayden's Bible Dictionary, 252.

considered the "weaker part" of the groups in the Settlement.⁹⁸ To integrate themselves, the Householders decided to abandon their farms for Hebron and to renounce their marriages in favor of celibacy, the closest that they might come to spiritual virginity. The concept of "spiritual" marriage derived from Biblical teachings and had been attempted for a few years in European Pietist circles in the early 1700s.⁹⁹ To provide the proper setting for celibacy, Hebron was divided into two halves, "of which one was arranged for the fathers and the other for the mothers."¹⁰⁰ The sexes were separated on every floor; the women probably occupied the eastern half of the building in order to have access to the second floor gallery of Peniel, where they were assigned to sit during prayer meetings.

The building itself, however, worked against the achievement of the Householders' spiritual aspirations and subtly reinforced their lesser rank in the community's hierarchy. The floorplan, derived from domestic sources, may have partially mitigated the solitary, ascetic tenor of the celibate life through its familiar layout and its division into six "family" units. Yet it may also have subverted the Householders' commitment by subtly reminding them of the farmhouses and possessions they had left behind. The strict division into two parts also appears to conflict with the sense ascribed to the Orders that they behaved "as though all were

⁹⁸Lamech, *Chronicon*, 152, 115.

⁹⁹Ibid., 2.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 158

of the same sex."¹⁰¹ The installation of six kitchens, seemingly unique to Hebron, certainly suggests a domestic rather than religious function to the building. In addition, the intertwining of the sacred and secular in terms of functional spaces does not appear to have been incorporated into Hebron's plan. As in the other complexes, Hebron was outfitted with space for love-feasts--the religious service that included foot-washing, communion and a meal--but no rooms were designated for special religious rituals as there were in Zion nor was the Hebron-Peniel complex physically oriented to conform with spiritual principles, as Zion was.¹⁰²

Further, "in order that the house might be thoroughly incorporated into the Community of the Solitary, some Brethren of Zion moved into [Hebron], and administered their divine service."¹⁰³ That the Householders would require such spiritual supervision reinforces the notion of the Householders as spiritually unequal and suggests the futility of their thinking that celibacy alone would change their position in the community. Even more important, although one of the Householders was officially appointed as steward of the building, the presence of the Brethren may have countered the Householders' sense of "ownership" of Hebron.

Not surprisingly, the Householders, upon moving into Hebron, do not seem

¹⁰¹Ibid., 77.

¹⁰²James Ernst in "Ephrata, A History" described Peniel as being oriented at a "mystic angle" to Kedar, but cited no primary evidence for his claim (p. 191). His description is otherwise nearly word for word derived from Sachse (Vol.1, p. 389). Sachse suggested that Peniel's forty-foot dimensions symbolized religious perfection, but made no comment on the building's physical location.

¹⁰³Lamech, Chronicon, 158.

to have adopted the modes of the solitary life, other than asceticism, or to have entered into additional religious activities in accord with their new spiritual state. The male Householders undoubtedly had to leave the Cloister grounds daily to work their farms. In addition, the Householders' activities within Hebron were outwardly directed and contained an economic element: "They were also benevolent and harbored many poor widows whom they maintained out of their own means, so that their household resembled a hospital more than a convent."¹⁰⁴ Consistent with this role, Hebron bore a secondary name with economic undertones: "Das Haus der Gemeinschaft" [the house of the community]. In contrast, the Sisters' Kedar bore a secondary name that explicitly referred to their pious life: "Das Haus der Traurigkeit" [the house of sorrow].¹⁰⁵ Thus, despite the original spiritual intent and its ascetic finish, Hebron functioned for the Householders as a secular, domestic household, failing to achieve the full community solidarity implied by its name.

Hebron's design, however, strongly related to the tenets of Pietism. For example, the common rooms, while recalling the domestic Stube by virtue of their position in the floorplan, functioned as small meeting rooms where small groups could spontaneously meet to read and discuss the Bible (Figures 2.24 and 2.25). Pietism promoted these small meetings rather than organized church meetings with

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 158. It is not until the 1790s that the first large public hospital or almshouse in Lancaster County was built.

¹⁰⁵Sachse, German Sectarians, vol. 1, 469, 249.

their emphasis on liturgy.¹⁰⁶ The moral code of Pietism was most strongly expressed in Hebron through the austerity of the interior finish, which was left completely plain, with no decorative moldings or ironwork to relieve it (Figure 4.1). The cells measured six by ten feet on average and were outfitted only with wooden benches and a closet in which the Household members hung their gray garments (Figures 4.2 and 4.3). The lack of material comfort echoed Beissel's maxim, "Happy is the man who early in his vocation becomes spiritually and physically poor."¹⁰⁷ However, the Household members may have been subjected to a higher standard of asceticism than even the Brethren themselves, who were permitted to live with their household goods in Zion. When the Household members finally left Hebron, Beissel threatened the Brethren with this fact, declaring that they were "too well supplied in Zion and should move into Hebron."¹⁰⁸

Residence in Hebron failed to incorporate the Household members into the religious structure of the Solitary orders. From the Household members' standpoint, their household in Hebron broke up because they were "being excluded from creature comfort" and because their children "remained on the farms in a neglected state, and drew the hearts of the mothers towards them."¹⁰⁹ The failure of the Hebron experiment must have created extreme discontent, for the Household members even

¹⁰⁶Erb, Pietists, 14.

¹⁰⁷Georg Conrad Beissel, Some Theosophical Maxims or Rules of the Solitary Life, trans. Michelle S. Long, ed. Nadine A. Steinmetz (Ephrata, PA: Ephrata Cloister Associates and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1991), 26.

¹⁰⁸Ezechiele Sangmeister, 45.

¹⁰⁹Lamech, Chronicon, 159.

Figure 4.1 Original iron door knocker and wooden door handle on rear door of Saron. Similar handles are seen on common room doors throughout Saron. G. Edwin Brumbaugh Collection, courtesy of the Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Figure 4.2 Sleeping cell on third floor. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

Figure 4.3 Closet in sleeping cell on second floor. Constructed without doors, garments were hung from pegs on a board at rear of closet. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photograph by Cindy Dickinson.

demanded recompense:

The expenses which the household had incurred were partly refunded, as much as possible. For instance, one house-father was paid with 100 acres of land; besides the Zion's Church was handed over to them. In return, they renounced all claim on [Hebron].¹¹⁰

Hebron was apparently perceived as being outside of the rules of the communal order regulating the Solitary Orders, in which "it was resolved that anyone who should leave it, should forfeit whatever he had contributed."¹¹¹ The Householders' departure from Hebron contained a sense of finality even though they would continue to be involved in the Ephrata community: "The households, however, afterwards. . .conformed themselves to the world in dress as in other respects."¹¹²

Although supported by Beissel, Hebron was the brain-child of Eckerlin and his brothers who "intended to turn the farms of the household into convent-land."¹¹³ Possession of the Householders' land, estimated to encompass "all the plantations for about two miles around the Settlement," would add considerably to the financial well-being of the community. Hebron's secular rather than religious qualities were thus consistent with Israel Eckerlin's intention that the building further his economic goals for the community. Its sheer size was ostentatious, strongly alluding to the community's wealth. The plain interior finish, seemingly in contrast with the

¹¹⁰Ibid., 159.

¹¹¹Ibid., 121.

¹¹²Ibid., 89.

¹¹³Ibid., 158. See p. 200 for similar attribution of concept and motive behind Hebron to Israel Eckerlin.

exterior allusion to prosperity, may have been a concession to Beissel. Together with the building's proportions, the "1743" inscription on the door lintel reinforced the sense of the building as a house, where such inscriptions were common, rather than a sacred convent. The building would also have tended, by association, to elevate Eckerlin's status. The residence in Hebron of several Brothers clearly placed the building within Eckerlin's sphere of influence as Prior.

The Moravian Gemeinhaus in Bethlehem may have provided Eckerlin with a conceptual and physical model for Hebron. Visitation between the Bethlehem and Ephrata communities was especially frequent in 1742-43, the period in which the final addition to the Gemeinhaus was completed and Hebron was built. The official diarist of the Moravian community recorded seven visits from June 1742 to October 1743, including a two-day stay by Emmanuel Eckerlin on November 3, 1742:

It was impossible to tell what his real purpose and intention or that of his congregation was in his making this visit...Some of our brethren regarded his visit as spying out the inner structure of our congregation and its organization.¹¹⁴

By this time, the final addition to the Gemeinhaus was well underway, suggesting that Emmanuel Eckerlin became aware of its design and function during his visit. The interior plan of the completed Gemeinhaus also conformed to the flurkuchen plan, consisting of two entrances into hall-kitchens with staircases and two rooms behind forming a Kammer-Stube arrangement (Figure 4.4). As was probably the arrangement in Hebron, upon completion in August 1743, the Moravian women

¹¹⁴Hamilton, *The Bethlehem Diary*, 102. See also pp. 16, 37, 40, 124, 125, 134, 135, 144, 165.

Figure 4.4 Floorplan of Moravian Gemeinhaus completed in 1743 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

relocated to the building's east side, using the east entrance, staircase, and chambers above while the men used the west side of the building.¹¹⁵ Ironically, given the similarity in design and function, the Moravian and Ephrata communities fell into a permanent disagreement over the issue of marriage in October 1743 and ended their contact.

Concurrent with the building of Hebron, Eckerlin saw that "only two ways were open for him, either to lay down his office voluntarily, or to try to bring the Superintendent under his feet," for he "did not possess sufficient righteousness to humble himself before [Beissel] nor sufficient boldness to withdraw from his subordination."¹¹⁶ By 1744, Eckerlin's fall from grace was predicted:

"Everybody could see that the Brethren's household in Zion was not founded on the rock Jesus Christ, since you heard no other talk but about buying, selling, taking in or lending out money, dissolving marriages, acquiring land, keeping servants, wagons, horses, oxen, cows etc...Therefore [Beissel] prophesied several times that the Brotherhood in Zion would yet have a great fall. And of the Prior in particular, he said, he resembled one, who climbed too high, and the ladder was taken away from under him."¹¹⁷

Beissel made no attempt to hinder Eckerlin's actions "because the whole of Ephrata was built on the foundation of [Beissel's] self-denial and the sacrifice of his will to the will of God." Instead he withdrew into isolation, temporarily giving Eckerlin full leadership of the community "so that everything now was in his hands, and

¹¹⁵Vernon H. Nelson, The Bethlehem Gemeinhaus (Bethlehem, PA: The Moravian Congregation of Bethlehem, 1990), 6-12.

¹¹⁶Lamech, Chronicon, 171-72.

¹¹⁷Ibid., 173.

nothing in those of the Superintendent."¹¹⁸ Beissel's temporary withdrawal did not satisfy Eckerlin, who "at last came to the determination to act as the tempter had insinuated, and make himself independent of the Superintendent."¹¹⁹ In keeping with the symbolic importance given to buildings, Israel sought to bring Beissel into submission by forcing him to change residences five times in six months, while Eckerlin himself lived in Beissel's house. After nearly two years spent in this power struggle, Beissel prevailed, having manipulated Israel's own brother, Gabriel, to lead the Brotherhood into denouncing Israel.

The dissolution of the celibate experiment in Hebron took place as Israel Eckerlin was struggling to maintain his position in the community and thus marked the beginning of Israel's "fall." By July 1745, Hebron had been fully remodeled and the Sisterhood installed as its new occupants. The transformative nature of the alterations made in Hebron assumed three principal forms: the renaming of the building, its physical alteration, and a change in function and symbolic meaning by virtue of its new occupants.

The significance to the community of building names has already been evident. The name "Hebron," meaning "association" or "union," denoted the attempt made through the building to integrate the Householders into the religious structure of the Solitary Orders. In addition, however, the name subtly alluded to Israel's attempt to depose Beissel: in 2 Sam. 15: 10, the rebellious Absalom

¹¹⁸Ibid., 175.

¹¹⁹Ibid., 178.

declared his intention to seize the throne of his father, King David; the location of David's reign was in Hebron. This allusion was not lost on the narrators of the Chronicon, who, in recounting the Eckerlin story, called Israel "wicked son Absalom."¹²⁰ The Biblical parallel also suggests a sense of preordainment, since, like Absalom, Israel ultimately failed in his struggle with Beissel, his spiritual father ("Father Peaceful"); Beissel may have had a hand in the naming of the building. When the Householders left Hebron, at the point that Israel's influence was weakening, the building was renamed "Saron" to represent the building's new occupants, the virginal Solitary Sisters. The name Saron referred to the Biblical Plain of Sharon where plentiful water and lavish fertility produced a garden of roses and lilies. Further, the Plain of Sharon was emblematic of Messianic hope and thus, at Ephrata, signaled the reinstatement of Beissel's leadership in the community.¹²¹

A sense of change in the Order itself accompanied the transformation in the architecture. The Sisterhood renamed themselves "The Spiritual Order of the Roses of Saron" and commemorated these events with a chronicle dated July 13, 1745 and titled "The Rose/or/The Spiritual Betrothal of the Pleasing Flower of Saron to her Heavenly Bridegroom/to Whom as Her Leader, King, Spouse, Lord/and Bridegroom

¹²⁰Ibid., 191.

¹²¹Miller, Harper's Bible Dictionary, 669. See also Song of Sol. 2:1 and Isa. 35:2.

She Promised Herself/Eternally...."¹²² The chronicle confirmed existing practices of the Order, such as the wearing of uniform clothing, but also delineated new organizational rules.

Although the physical remodeling of Hebron, which produced only one additional kammer, may at first appear superficial and unnecessary, it in fact signaled symbolic changes in the building. The removal of all or part of the central wall on each floor made these kitchen spaces conducive to communal use, increasing their spiritual function and contrasting with the familial quality of the Hebron floorplan (Figures 4.5-4.7). The communal quality of the remodeled Saron was reinforced by the elimination of the west stairs and second set of doors on the north and south facades. These alterations also subtly repudiated the building's former identity as Hebron, by eliminating the details that identified the building as a conventional houselike structure. The facade and interior plan lost their symmetry and sense of familiarity in the process.

The transformation of the building's original symbolic intent--to create an ostentatiously massive house--is demonstrated in the decision to eliminate the doorway with the "1743" lintel inscription. The lintel was not simply removed to accommodate the new window frame, but cut in half, as if to sever the secular association, while leaving a small, harsh reminder of Hebron (Figure 2.10). For the

¹²²Die Rose, oder der angenehmen Blumen zu Saron geistliche Eheverlobnis[Schwester Chronic], 1745, Abraham Cassel Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. Partial translations are available in Peter Erb's Johann Conrad Beissel and the Ephrata Community: Mystical and Historical Texts. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1985, pp. 267-292 and Julius F. Sachse's German Sectarians, vol. 2, pp. 176-206.

Figure 4.5 Plan of first floor of Saron.

Figure 4.6 Plan of second floor of Saron.

Figure 4.7 Plan of third floor of Saron.

Householders, this doorway marked the point of transition between a familial world and the external world, acting as an emblem of their secular, external focus. In contrast, the Sisters in Saron marked the doorway leading from the Saal into Saron with a pen-and-ink wall chart, which reads "The door to the entrance into the house/where the united souls live/lets no more from there escape/for God Himself among them now is reigning/their joy blooms in united flames of love/because from God and his own love they came" (Figure 4.8).¹²³ The verse emphasizes a unity within Saron that was consistent with the physical alterations that created communal space. Moreover, Saron's interior acquired an insular, spiritual quality, with its principal point of entrance and egress at the doorway to the Saal.

The new insular quality of Saron was amply illustrated in the Rose of Saron chronicle. First, the Order referred to itself as a "Gesellschaft" or "society," conveying both a sense of wholeness and separation from the Brotherhood and community at large. As the chronicle records, the Order was very concerned that "all unseeming going and coming may be stopped," as such activity was "contrary to our virginal discipline."¹²⁴ The Sisters were particularly discouraged from "all unnecessary goings out to visit natural friends or acquaintances" since "whosoever doth not give up father, mother, brother and sister, yea even his own life, cannot be

¹²³Wall chart, Accession #EC14.65.743, Ephrata Cloister.

¹²⁴Peter C. Erb, ed., Johann Conrad Beissel and the Ephrata Community: Mystical and Historical Texts, Studies in American Religion, vol. 14 (Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellen Press), 285, 281.

Figure 4.8 Pen-and-ink wall chart hung over first floor door of Saal leading into Saron. Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

[Christ's] student nor follower."¹²⁵ The chronicle outlined a daily schedule that reinforced the importance of the interior life by specifying twelve hours in which the doors of Saron were to be locked: from seven in the morning until noon and again from nine in the evening to five in the morning. The chronicle also contained a schedule of approved activities:

6 P.M. - 7 P.M.: Meal shared by entire Order.
 7 P.M. - 9 P.M.: "School exercises", consisting of writing, reading and singing.
 9 P.M. - 12 A.M.: Sleep
 12 A.M. - 2 A.M.: Religious services.
 2 A.M. - 5 A.M.: Sleep
 5 A.M. - 6 A.M.: Awakening, ablutions, prayer
 6 A.M. - 9 A.M.: Individually assigned work
 9 A.M. - 10 A.M.: Contemplation and snack
 10 A.M. - 5 P.M.: Individually assigned work
 5 P.M. - 6 P.M.: Spiritual contemplation¹²⁶

These activities appear to have taken place almost exclusively indoors, including at least part of the individually assigned work, which, although unspecified, occurred when the doors were locked. A visitor to Saron in 1753 confirmed this inference, describing the sisters as "engaged in spinning, sewing, writing, drawing, singing, and other things."¹²⁷ As for external activities, seven sisters, who were appointed as overseers and perceived as spiritual role models, were given the responsibility for "outside trifles, such as the carrying of wood, kindling of the fires, drawing

¹²⁵Ibid., 285.

¹²⁶Ibid., 271-72. "School exercises" should be understood as a form of spiritual rather than intellectual edification. The Sisters refer to Beissel and themselves as students in the "Leidenschul" [school of suffering] in their chronicle. The Sisters' highly regulated daily schedule was also a component of European monastic orders.

¹²⁷Reichmann, "Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries," 53.

water...."¹²⁸ For most of the Sisters, who presumably were deemed more susceptible to the temptations of the external world, the door to the Saal represented Saron's central doorway; the new life within Saron was truly cloistered.

In addition to limiting their comings and goings, the Sisterhood regulated itself internally in numerous other ways. The chronicle recorded the division of the avowed celibate Sisters into seven classes, named the individual members of each class, and listed the novices still in their probational year (Appendix C). Their number totaled thirty-nine, which explains the creation of the additional kammer. That the remodeling would allow the Order to fit neatly into the physical confines of Saron speaks again to their sense of wholeness as a society. The purpose of and distinction between the classes, whether based on occupation, age, or on other characteristics, are unclear.¹²⁹ The Order was organized with Mother Maria as prioress, Eugenia as sub-prioress, and seven sisters as overseers. Each class lived as a group with its overseer; the first and third classes, who were charged with the responsibility of locking and unlocking the doors, lived on the first floor, as did Mother Maria. On a rotating basis by class, one sister was assigned to wake the entire Order by lighting the candles and lamps in every room at five o'clock in the morning. As the daily schedule reflected, the entire day was ordered but for "the

¹²⁸Erb, Johann Conrad Beissel, 285.

¹²⁹The sixth class, consisting of Sisters Paulina and Athanasia, may have been responsible for leading the Sisters' singing activity. Athanasia was described in the Chronicon (p. 164) as an accomplished singer, who helped Beissel to lead the Solitary in a singing-school that had dissolved by 1745. The Sisters' chronicle suggested a similar vocation for Paulina. The Sisters' chronicle otherwise offers no explicit indication that the classes were occupational in nature.

six hours of rest [that] can be passed by each soul as she pleases. They can either sleep or stay awake, for they are given over to her welfare."¹³⁰

In effect, these rules combined to limit the level of physical movement inside Saron. The rules also intended to evoke a sense that "in all our actions both outward and inward the unity of the Spirit [is] felt and perceived."¹³¹ The emphasis on unity, expressed in uniform dress and regulated activities, implies the containment of movement on another level--movement in unison. In keeping with the restraint of movement, the Sisters were counseled to wear knit socks for daily use rather than shoes "so that our walk may be quiet and silent."¹³² Neither was Saron's interior broken by the sounds of social interaction: "all levity and needless gossip with one another or light laughter are not to be thought of, nor shall occur in this spiritual society."¹³³ Such a high degree of order was considered pious ("God is a God of order") and served to eliminate any distractions from the spiritual life within Saron.¹³⁴ For the Householders, Hebron-Saron's ascetic interior finish represented denial without purpose, whereas the plain whitewashed walls contributed to the Sisters' spiritual focus: "When you pray, then let there be no images in your mind, and empty yourself of all created things."¹³⁵

¹³⁰Erb, Johann Conrad Beissel, 281, 285.

¹³¹*Ibid.*, 277.

¹³²*Ibid.*, 278.

¹³³*Ibid.*, 281.

¹³⁴*Ibid.*, 279.

¹³⁵Beissel, Some Theosophical Maxims, 7.

In this austere setting and seemingly contrary to the spiritual importance of visual emptiness, members of the Sisterhood produced beautiful pen-and-ink illuminated hymnals and wall-charts in "ornamental Gothic text" (Figure 4.9). Such activity was endorsed as "a means of sanctification to crucify their flesh" and so, unlike the concept of stylish architecture, fell within the Pietist dictates.¹³⁶ Saron became a setting in which the Sisters could adhere to the maxim:

Commune within and be still. In everything you do, work at, and intend to do, let yourself not be moved by anything, other than by that which you come out of the quiet chamber of your inner essence...Therefore always be still, and hear what God is saying within you.¹³⁷

The insularity, the stillness and silence within Saron, and the emphasis on spiritual contemplation contrast sharply with the level and quality of activity implied by the description of Hebron as more of a hospital than a convent.

Saron became the embodiment of Beissel's separatist version of Pietism in which one belonged neither to the secular world nor fully to the sacred world, but instead existed in transition between earth and heaven. Beissel, acting as spiritual leader, described himself as "one who possesses nothing," and declared that he "is and remains a wandering pilgrim on the journey to a blessed eternity."¹³⁸ The order

¹³⁶Lamech, *Chronicon*, 168-69. This manuscript material is now principally to be found in the collections of the Ephrata Cloister, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.

¹³⁷Beissel, *Some Theosophical Maxims*, 2.

¹³⁸Conrad Beissel, *Deliciae Ephratenses, Pars II*, in *Early American Imprints, 1639-1800*, ed. Charles Evans (New York: Readex Film Products, a division of Readex Microprint Corporation, 1983) 276, 291. "Ein nichts-Besitzender auf dieser Erden" and "Ich bin und bleibe ein auf der Reise nach der seligen Ewigkeit wallender Pilger."

Figure 4.9 Pen-and-ink illumination from Der Christen ABC, 1750.
Courtesy of Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

created in Saron specifically sought to reinforce this concept of probational life:

"We will begin by limiting to the utmost our eating and drink, sleep and waking, so that our whole life and conduct show forth that of a suffering and dying pilgrim upon earth."¹³⁹ The physical and spiritual travail of the pious life would be relieved in heaven:

I will bear my wretchedness because I live in this world. Because after the days of tribulation, something better is prepared for me there. The injuries which I suffer and the many difficult pressures often bring me songs of praise. Therefore, I will gladly bear my wretchedness in this life, because there, after the days of tribulation pass, I will forget all grief.¹⁴⁰

Just as pain endured in life was thought to produce the joys of paradise, elevation in God's eyes flowed from the relinquishing of status:

Be glad to be of low station, yet do not be too badly off, but also genuine so that you do not fall into hypocrisy. For just as it is necessary for you to be poor in spirit, you must also learn to extol your greatness therein, else you rob God of that which is his. Whoever has ascended the heights in his lowliness will never lie below in eternity.¹⁴¹

Spiritual stature, whether in heaven or on earth, could only be attained through humility, for "he is great and learned, who at all times steps into the lowliest place."¹⁴² As the Sisters described it, "Before we can be brought into the perfect, open, free will of God we must be practiced in working and labouring on the

¹³⁹Erb, Johann Conrad Beissel, 280.

¹⁴⁰Beissel, Some Theosophical Maxims, 21-22.

¹⁴¹Ibid., 5-7.

¹⁴²Ibid., 32. See also pp. 16, 18, and 26 for similar maxims.

lowest rungs of the resigned will."¹⁴³

Saron offered the Sisterhood an insular existence that allowed them to fulfill the tenets of the pious life, as interpreted by Beissel. Not to be forgotten, the building's metamorphosis also signaled Israel Eckerlin's imminent fall from influence in the community; he was deposed as Prior only a month after the Sisters' chronicle was written. Eckerlin's failure was specifically equated with the spiritual stumbling of Lucifer and Adam. The Biblical parallel clearly expressed the conflict between divine inspiration and innocence (sacred values), and enlightened knowledge (secular values) that was embodied in the communal architecture and personified in the struggle between Beissel and Eckerlin for the community's leadership. Moreover, Beissel's interpretation of the Adam story also revealed spiritual definitions of male and female that became embodied in the transformation of Hebron to Saron. Through its association with femaleness, the order in Saron can be viewed as an inevitable outcome of Beissel's version of Pietism.

The fall of Lucifer and Adam, as elaborated by Beissel in A Dissertation on Man's Fall, is attributed to their subtle and deceitful rebellion against God and to their self-promotion. Above all, Lucifer's and Adam's descent was thought to have resulted from their "fiery self-will." The struggle with one's willfulness appeared later as a central theme in Beissel's theosophical maxims on the attainment of the solitary life and was believed to be an expressly male trait. Lucifer and Adam were charged with breaking the unity of heaven--the perfect balance of male and female--

¹⁴³Erb, Johann Conrad Beissel, 284.

because they allowed their maleness to dominate ("self-elevation in their fire-will"). Moreover, they revelled in their maleness by acting in "continual opposition against the celestial femalety" which was the power of light, water, love and harmony, capable of tempering the fire of maleness. Rebellion and willfulness were male traits, whereas subjection and obedience characterized the female constitution. Maleness was further likened in the Dissertation to being external, femaleness to being internal.¹⁴⁴

These gendered traits characterize the story of Israel Eckerlin as well as the transformation of Hebron to Saron. The alteration of Hebron symbolized the destruction of Israel Eckerlin's (male) hierarchical leadership and "self-will" and the elevation of (female) order, harmony and submission. Hebron and Saron respectively also communicated the external-internal dichotomy of male and female. The idealized, insular order in Saron implicitly allowed the Sisters the setting in which to fulfill their innate femaleness.

By implication, being female in the Ephrata community carried an ascendant association, whereas maleness nearly guaranteed a struggle with self-will. As one expression of this positive correlation, the name of the Sisters's Prioress, "Mother Maria," suggests a spiritual status equal with that of Beissel, who was known as "Father Peaceful [Vater Friedsam]. The Sisters' gender did not, however, completely eliminate their struggle to holiness: "And ye virgins! be not

¹⁴⁴Conrad Beissel, A Dissertation on Mans [sic] Fall, in Early American Imprints, 1639-1800, ed. Charles Evans (New York: Readex Film Products, a division of Readex Microprint Corporation, 1983), 1, 2, 17, 26.

arrogant...be quick in all your doings, quiet and erected in all things, let your behaviour be decent, observing a medium between extreams [sic] both in yourselves and towards others."¹⁴⁵ Rather, fulfillment of the female nature required submission and obedience; women were "not to oppose the magistracy of man."¹⁴⁶ On the title page of the Sisters' chronicle, the Sisterhood implicitly reaffirmed their servility to Beissel by acknowledging him as their "Spiritual Father and Founder."¹⁴⁷ Thus, the new order in Saron was no less hierarchical than the one found in Hebron.

"In the future the brethren will be more careful to consult the father, as all human societies must depend upon their leader, otherwise they cannot endure."¹⁴⁸ Thus, the Hoch-Deutsch Pensylvanische Berichte newspaper concluded its May 1746 report on the eviction of Eckerlin and his brothers. The transformation of Hebron to Saron was an affirmation of Beissel's leadership and his radical interpretation of Pietist tenets. Hebron's architectural failure symbolized Eckerlin's fall and the destruction of secular values whereas Saron signaled Beissel's ascendancy and the survival of the community's separatist and ascetic spiritual focus. Thus, Hebron shifted from a domestic, familial and houselike structure expressive of an outward, secular focus to a spiritual, cloistered convent. This

¹⁴⁵Ibid., 14-15.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., 12.

¹⁴⁷Erb, Johann Conrad Beissel, 247.

¹⁴⁸Reichmann, "Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries," 41.

symbolic transformation was mirrored in the building's physical conversion, which eliminated Hebron's conventional architectural details, and thus its association with reason and affluence. Saron's remodeled interior reflected greater consistency with the communal ideal and, through its ascetic finish, reinforced the pious activities taking place within its walls. In combination, the changes in Saron fulfilled the community's spiritual gender definitions and embodied a female order and harmony. "Thus God secretly carried out his counsel, and helped [the Sisters] to a house, and the households unknowingly had to assist him in it, which God at the judgment may remember to their benefit."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁹Lamech, Chronicon, 159.

APPENDIX A

EPHRATA ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, 1743-45

Conrad Beissel

b. 1691, founder of Ephrata community

Also known as "Superintendent," "Vorsteher," and "Father Peaceful"

Israel Eckerlin
Prior of Zion convent
"Onesimus"
b. 1711

Johann Senseman
Steward in Hebron**

Maria Eicher
Prioress of Kedar
"Mother Maria"
b. 1710

Order of the Zionitic
Brotherhood
Celibate single men

Householders***
Married members

Order of Spiritual
Virgins
Celibate single women

**From March 1744, Israel Eckerlin was Superintendent of services for the Householders in Peniel. Senseman was himself a Householder.

***Widowed members were also considered Householders. No longer virginal, neither they nor married members could belong to either Solitary order. Hebron was designed to allow Householders to divorce and live celibately in an simulation of the Solitary life.

APPENDIX B

CHRONOLOGY OF PRINCIPAL EPHRATA CLOISTER ARCHITECTURE

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>FUNCTION/NOTES</u>
Bakehouse	1734	For community use; extant.
Almonry	1734	Community food storage; extant.
Kedar	1735	Community meeting house with cells for seven Solitary Brethren and Sisters; converted to Sisters' convent c. 1738 until 1745; used as hospital during Revolutionary War; razed 1778.
Kedar Saal	1736-7	Community prayerhouse built adjoining Kedar. Razed at Beissel's orders c. 1740.
Zion	1738	Convent for the Zionitic Brotherhood located on Zion Hill; vacated in 1745 and converted to residence for poor and widowed members; used as hospital during Revolutionary War; razed 1778.
Zion Saal	1739-40	Prayerhouse with belltower built adjoining the Zion convent; vacated in 1745 and thereafter used by the Householders; used as a hospital during Revolutionary War; razed 1778.
Peniel	1741	Prayerhouse for the Householders; converted for use by the Sisterhood in 1745 and thereafter known as "Saal"; extant.
Hebron	1743	Convent for the celibate, divorced Householders; remodeled for use by Sisterhood in 1745 and renamed "Saron"; extant.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>FUNCTION/NOTES</u>
Bethany	1746	Convent for the Brotherhood; razed 1908.
Bethany Saal	1746	Prayerhouse for the Brotherhood built adjoining the Bethany convent; razed 1844-45.

APPENDIX C

THE ROSES OF SARON: CLASSES OF THE SISTERHOOD, 1745

Mother Maria, Prioress (35)
Sister Eugenia, Sub-Prioress (30)
Sister Jael (33)
Sister Sincretica (43)

Class One

Ketura (27)
Foeben (27)
Efigenia (28)

Class Two

Flavia (33)
Sevoram (33)
Joseba (25)
Augusta (29)

Class Three

Eufrasina (36)
Eufrasia
Hanna (32)
Blandina
Petronella

Class Four

Rahel (22)
Persida (25)
Melonia (20)
Armella (23)
Catherina

Class Five

Naemy (21)
Basilla (24)
Maecha
Lucia

Class Six

Paulina (23)
Athanasia (21)

Class Seven

Zenobia (20)
Eufemia
Serah
Constantia
Sophia (19)

Novices

Theckla (28)
Rebecca (33)
Eunicke (65)
Drusiana (26)
Priscam (24)
Theresia (25)
Genovefa (18)

Notes: Parenthetical numbers indicate age in 1745, if known. Novices had to undergo a probational year and be at least 18 and a half years old.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives. Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Beissel, Conrad. Deliciae Ephratenses, Pars II. In Early American Imprints, 1639-1800, ed. Charles Evans. New York: Readex Film Products, a division of Readex Microprint Corporation, 1983.

_____. A Dissertation on Mans [sic] Fall. In Early American Imprints, 1639-1800, ed. Charles Evans. New York: Readex Film Products, a division of Readex Microprint Corporation, 1983.

_____. Mysterion Anomias. Ephrata, 1729. Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Photocopy.

_____. Some Theosophical Maxims or Rules of the Solitary Life. Translated by Michelle S. Long and edited by Nadine A. Steinmetz. Ephrata, PA: Ephrata Cloister Associates and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1991.

The Bethlehem Diary, 1743-44. Edited and translated by Kenneth G. Hamilton. Bethlehem, Pa.: The Archives of the Moravian Church, 1971.

Boehme, Jacob. Dialogues on the Supersensual Life. Translated by William Law. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1959.

Boehme, Jacob. Six Theosophical Points and Other Writings. Translated by Nicolas Berdyaev. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Boehme, Jacob. The Way to Christ. Translated by Peter Erb. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.

Brumbaugh, G. Edwin. Papers. The Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware.

Der Christen ABC ist Leiden, Dulden, Hoffen, wer dieses hat gelernt, der hat Ziel getroffen. [The Christian ABC is suffering, endurance, hope; whoever has learned this, has attained his goal] Ephrata, 1750. Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Chronicle of the Ephrata Sisterhood. Transcribed by Julius F. Sachse. Abraham Cassel Collection. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Erster Theil der Theosophischen Lectionen, Betreffende die Schulen des einsamen Lebens [First Part of the Theosophical Lectures Concerning the Rules of the Solitary Life]. Ephrata, 1752. Ephrata Cloister, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Lamech and Agrippa. Chronicon Ephratense; A History of the Community of Seventh Day Baptists at Ephrata, Lancaster County, Penn'a. trans. J. Max Hark. Lancaster, Pa.: S.H. Zahm & Co., 1889.

Die Rose, oder der angenehmen Blumen zu Saron geistliche Eheverlobnis [Schwester Chronic], 1745. Abraham Cassel Collection. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Sangmeister, Ezechiel. Life and Conduct of the late Brother Ezechiel Sangmeister. Translated by Barbara M. Schindler. Ephrata, Pa.: The Historical Society of the Cocalico Valley, 1986.

Secondary Sources

Alderfer, E. Gordon. The Ephrata Commune: An Early American Commune. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985.

Altick, Richard D., ed. "The Ephrata Cloisters in 1759." Pennsylvania History VI (1939): 240-45.

Aymar, Embury. "Pennsylvania Farmhouses: Examples of a Hundred Years Ago." Architectural Record 30, no. 5 (November 1911): 475-85.

Barakat, Robert. "The Herr and Zeller Houses." Pennsylvania Folklife 21, no. 4 (Summer 1972): 2-22.

Beahm, William M. The Brethren Love Feast. Elgin, Ill.: The Brethren Press, n.d.

- Bergengren, Charles Lang. "The Cycle of Transformation in the Houses of Schaefferstown, Pennsylvania." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1988.
- Biever, Dale E. "A Report of Archeological Investigations at the Ephrata Cloister, 1963-1966." In Four Pennsylvania German Studies, Publications of the Pennsylvania German Society. Vol III. Breinigsville, PA: The Pennsylvania German Society, 1970: 1-53.
- _____. "Salvage Operations on Zion Hill--1967." Typescript on file at State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa., n.d.
- Braunfels, Wolfgang. Monasteries of Western Europe: The Architecture of the Orders. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Brumbaugh, G. Edwin. "Colonial Architecture of the Pennsylvania Germans." In The Pennsylvania German Society Proceedings and Addresses, 1930, XLI (1933): 1-60.
- _____. "Medieval Construction at Ephrata." The Magazine Antiques, July 1944, 18-20.
- Brunes, Tons. The Secrets of Ancient Geometry--And its Use. 2 vols. Copenhagen: Rhodos, 1967.
- Bucher, Robert C. "The Continental Log House." Pennsylvania Folklife 12, no. 4 (Summer 1962): 14-19.
- _____. "Grain in the Attic." Pennsylvania Folklife 12, no. 2 (Winter 1962/63): 7-15.
- _____. "Steep Roofs and Red Tiles." Pennsylvania Folklife 12, no. 2 (Summer 1961): 18-24.
- _____. "The Swiss Bank House in Pennsylvania." Pennsylvania Folklife 18, no. 2 (Winter 1968/69): 2-11.
- Butler, Jon. Awash in a Sea of Faith. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Chappell, Edward A. "Acculturation in the Shenandoah Valley: Rhenish Houses of the Massanutten Settlement." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society vol. 124, no. 1 (1980): 55-89.

- Dennis, Jessie McNab. "The Art of Keeping Warm." The Magazine Antiques, March 1966, 374-79.
- Doll, Eugene E. "Social and Economic Organization in Two PA German Religious Communities." American Journal of Sociology LVII, no. 2 (September, 1951): 168-77.
- Doll, Eugene E., and Anneliese M. Funke. The Ephrata Cloisters: An Annotated Bibliography. Philadelphia: The Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, Inc., 1944.
- Durnbaugh, Donald F., ed. The Brethren in Colonial America: A Source Book on the Transplantation and Development of the Church of the Brethren in the Eighteenth Century. Elgin, Ill: The Brethren Press, 1967.
- Ellis, Franklin, and Samuel Evans. History of Lancaster County. Philadelphia: Everts and Peck, 1883.
- Erb, Peter C., ed. Johann Conrad Beissel and the Ephrata Community Mystical and Historical Texts. Studies in American Religion, Vol. 14. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1985.
- _____. Pietists, Protestants and Mysticism: The Use of Late Medieval Spiritual Texts in the Work of Gottfried Arnold, 1664-1714. Metuchen, N.J. and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1989.
- Ernst, James E. "Ephrata, A History." In The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society Yearbook, vol. 25 (Allentown, Pa.: The Society, 1961): 1-343.
- Glassie, Henry. "A Central Chimney Continental Log House." Pennsylvania Folklife 18, no. 2 (Winter 1968/69): 33-39.
- _____. "Eighteenth-Century Cultural Process in Delaware Valley Folk Building." Winterthur Portfolio 7 (1972): 29-59.
- _____. "The Types of the Southern Mountain Cabin." In The Study of American Folklore, edited by Jan Harold Brunvand. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1968.
- Hayden, Dolores. Seven American Utopias: The Architecture of Communitarian Socialism, 1790-1975. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1976.

- Hollyday, Guy Tilghman. "Ephrata Cloister Wills." Pennsylvania Folklife 22, no. 4 (Summer 1973): 11-21.
- _____. "The Ephrata Codex: Relationships between Text and Illustration." Pennsylvania Folklife 20, no. 1 (Autumn 1970): 28-43.
- _____. "The Ephrata Wall Charts and their Inscriptions." Pennsylvania Folklife (Spring 1970): 34-46.
- Jenkins, J. Marshall. "Ground-rules of Welsh Houses: A Primary Analysis." Folklife 5 (1967): 65-91.
- Jordan, Terry G. "Alpine, Alemannic and American Log Architecture." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 70, no. 2 (June 1980): 154-80.
- _____. "Moravian, Schwenkfelder and American Log Construction." Pennsylvania Folklife 33, no. 3 (Spring 1984): 98-124.
- Kimball, Fiske. Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic. New York: Dover Press, 1966.
- Kniffen, Fred. "Folk Housing: The Key to Diffusion." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 55, no. 4 (1965): 549-77.
- Kniffen, Fred, and Henry Glassie. "Building in Wood in the Eastern United States." The Geographical Review LVI, no. 1 (1966): 48-66.
- Kocher, A. Lawrence. "The Early Architecture of Pennsylvania, Part II." Architectural Record 49 (January 1921): 30-47.
- Kraft, John L. "Ephrata Cloister, an Eighteenth-Century Religious Commune." The Magazine Antiques, October 1980, 724-37.
- Kuhns, Oscar. The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania. New York, 1901.
- Landis, Henry Knizer. "Early Kitchens of the Pennsylvania Germans." Pennsylvania German Society 47 (1939): 1-130.
- Lawton, Arthur J. "The Ground Rules of Folk Architecture." Pennsylvania Folklife 23, no. 1 (Autumn 1973): 13-19.
- _____. "The Pre-Metric Foot and its Use in Pennsylvania German Architecture." Pennsylvania Folklife 19, no. 1 (Autumn 1969): 37-45.

- Loose, Jack Ward Willson. "A Study of Two Distinct Periods of Ephrata Cloister History." Papers of the Lancaster County Historical Society LV, no. 6 (1951): 145-179.
- Mercer, Henry C. The Bible in Iron. Third edition. Doylestown, PA: The Bucks County Historical Society, 1961.
- Miller, Donald. "An Eighteenth Century German House in Pennsylvania." Architectural Record LXIII (1928): 161-68.
- Miller, Madeleine S. and J. Lane Miller. Harper's Bible Dictionary. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Murtaugh, William J. "Half-Timbering in American Architecture." Pennsylvania Folklife 9, no. 1 (Winter 1957/58): 3-5.
- Murtaugh, William J. Moravian Architecture and Town Planning. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1967.
- Nelson, Vernon H. The Bethlehem Gemeinhaus. Bethlehem, PA: The Moravian Congregation of Bethlehem, 1990.
- Perrin, Richard W.E. The Architecture of Wisconsin. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1967.
- O'Bannon, Patrick and others. Ephrata Cloister: An Historic Structures Report. 3 vols. Philadelphia: John Milner Associates, Inc., 1988.
- Price, Lorna. The Plan of St. Gall in Brief. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Raymond, Eleanor. Early Domestic Architecture of Pennsylvania. Exton, PA: Schiffer Limited, 1977.
- Reichmann, Felix and Eugene E. Doll, eds. "Ephrata as Seen by Contemporaries." In The Pennsylvania German Folklore Society Yearbook, vol. 17 (Allentown, Pa.: The Society, 1952): 1-207.
- Sachse, Julius F. German Sectarians of Pennsylvania. 2 vols. Lancaster, Pa.: published by the author, 1899-1900.
- Seidensticker, Oswald. "A Colonial Monastery." The Century Magazine, December 1881, 209-33.

- Stoudt, John Joseph. Early Pennsylvania Arts and Crafts. New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, Inc., 1964.
- Swank, Scott T. and others. Arts of the Pennsylvania Germans. ed. Catherine E. Hutchins. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1983.
- Tischler, William H. "Fachwerk Construction in the German Settlements of Wisconsin." Winterthur Portfolio 21 (1986): 275-92.
- Turner, Victor W. The Ritual Process. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.
- Upton, Dell. Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia. New York: The Architectural History Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1986.
- van Gennep, Arnold. Rites of Passage. Trans. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Warfel, Stephen G. Historical Archeology at Ephrata Cloister: A Report on 1993 Investigations. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1994.
- _____. "Historical and Archeological Investigations Associated with the Ephrata Cloister Fire Detection and Supression Systems Project." Typescript on file at the State Museum of Pennsylvania, October, 1990.
- Watts, Carol Martin, and Donald J. Watts. "Geometrical Ordering of the Garden Houses at Ostia." Journal of Architectural Historians 46 (1987): 265-76.
- Weaver, William Woys. "The Pennsylvania German House: European Antecedents and New World Forms." Winterthur Portfolio 21 (1986): 243-64.
- _____. "Weizenthal and the Early Architecture of Neu-Strasburge: Swiss Plantations in the Province of Pennsylvania." M.A. thesis, University of Virginia, 1973.
- Weiss, Richard. Hauser und Landschaften der Schweiz. Zurich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1959.
- _____. Volkskunde der Schweiz. Zurich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1946.