

# Moravian Mission Education in the Nineteenth Century: Global Patterns and Local Manifestations at New Fairfield, Upper Canada

FELICITY JENSZ

*Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster*

*The renewed Moravian Church has placed great emphasis upon education, both for members of European background and members of the global Moravian mission. However, the research that has been undertaken on Moravian education has tended to focus upon eighteenth-century education at the expense of the nineteenth century, and European education at the expense of that in the mission field. This paper provides an overview of nineteenth-century missionary education and charts some similarities and differences both within the mission field and between these fields and European situations. It then examines the re-establishment of the New Fairfield mission school in Canada under the guidance of Adolf Hartmann in light of general patterns of Moravian schooling. Schooling on the New Fairfield reserve was a source of tension between missionaries, mission inhabitants, governmental agents, and other religious denominations. The Lenape amongst whom the Moravians worked were not passive recipients of missionary education, rather they took an active role in providing an alternative to the Moravian mission school, much to the chagrin of the missionaries involved. The re-establishment of a mission school was therefore a difficult task. This paper concludes that although education was a universally important aspect of the Moravian Church, the provision of education was not a simple process, rather it was contingent upon numerous factors that missionaries in the field were not always able to control.*

In February 1873, Adolf Hartmann (1831-1906) accepted a call from the Moravian Provincial Elders' Conference (PEC) in North America to become a missionary along with his wife Mary (née Hines, 1838-1916) "to the Indian Mission in Canada."<sup>1</sup> Hartmann was born of missionary parents in

1 R. de Schweinitz (Bethlehem) to A. Hartmann, February 8, 1873, Adolf Hartmann Papers (hereafter cited as PP HJAH), no. 8, Moravian Archives Bethlehem (hereafter cited as MAB). From 1873 until his retirement in 1896, Hartmann and his wife Mary (Polly) worked as missionaries at New Fairfield.

Charlottenburg in Suriname, South America, and, after teaching in Moravian schools in both Germany and England, had followed his parents' footsteps as a missionary in Australia before his wife's poor health had required them to return to England.<sup>2</sup> As an experienced teacher, it may have been expected that his services would have found use at the New Fairfield mission. However, his letter of call noted that: "There is no school at all connected with our mission station at this time—hence Br Hartmann will of course be exempted from all teaching. It is very desirable that our missionary should have control of the school, but, at present, it is not kept on our premises & is under the charge of the Council of the tribe."<sup>3</sup>

It was unusual for a Moravian mission not to have a school because providing Christian schooling to non-European children had been a major duty for missionaries all around the globe from the beginnings of the Moravian mission endeavor. This paper examines Moravian mission education in the nineteenth century, and uses the case study of the education of the Lenape (also known as the Delaware Indians) on the New Fairfield site in Upper Canada (current-day Ontario, Canada) to demonstrate how local manifestations affected global generalities. The article begins by providing a short overview of Moravian formal education in the eighteenth century, with a second section placing particular emphasis on the provision of education to non-Europeans living on Moravian mission stations. The third section examines the Canadian experience in the nineteenth century in light of the global educational work of the Moravians. Within the Canadian context particular attention will be given to the different expectations placed upon mission education for the Lenape and how the Lenape responded to such expectations. By placing this work both in a geographical and temporal comparative framework the similarities and differences will be illustrated between the education of Lenape children on the Moravian Reserve at New Fairfield and children in other Moravian schools across the globe. This paper will thus provide an understanding as to whether there were common traits or practices that connected Moravian pupils in the nineteenth century, and how the Canadian experience compared to the global norm.

## **Moravian education from the eighteenth into the nineteenth century**

Historically, Moravians have placed great importance on education.<sup>4</sup> Moravian historians have drawn attention to the foundations of Moravian educational

2 Memoir of Bro. A. Hartmann, PP HJAH, no. 16, MAB.

3 Ibid.

4 Mabel Haller, *Early Moravian Education in Pennsylvania* (Nazareth, Pa.: Moravian Historical Society, 1953), 213.

practices in the teachings of the seventeenth-century Bishop, John Amos Comenius (1592-1670), who was known for humanistic ideals that helped shape modern educational practices. These ideals included the notion that education should be available to all, and that education should have practical uses. The later Moravian Church believed itself to be a continuation of the Unity of the Brethren of which Comenius was a bishop. Drawing upon this tradition, they claimed Comenius as the definitive Moravian pedagogue, despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that he was a seventeenth-century Moravian that lived in the time before the renewed Moravian Church. In this sense Comenius may be seen as analogous to Jan Hus; that is, he serves as a necessary historical figure for providing legitimacy to the dominant Moravian historical narrative that claims a centuries-long historical tradition. The renewed Moravian Church maintained a focus on education under the leadership of Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760). Zinzendorf incorporated some of Comenius's ideals into his own educational philosophy and was further influenced by his own schooling under August Hermann Francke (1663-1727).<sup>5</sup> Zinzendorf, as Mabel Haller has noted, took an active role in the education of children by producing many books for children, which, in turn, revealed his educational philosophy.<sup>6</sup> However, as Pia Schmid has argued, one cannot talk of a "Herrnhut pedagogy" *per se*, rather one must glean Moravian pedagogic ideas from Zinzendorf's writings as well as from other Moravian writings, such as in the "Jüngerhausdiarium."<sup>7</sup> Zinzendorf was deeply interested in the practice of education and, according to Heikki Lempa and Paul Peucker, "Zinzendorf, Spangenberg, and their followers only rarely resorted to systematic exploration of education. Their domain was practice, not theory."<sup>8</sup> Zinzendorf, as Peter Vogt and Alexander Schunka have independently argued, was also anti-intellectual in his educational philosophy, preferring to focus on education for the heart as opposed to engaging in the rational argumentation of the Enlightenment.<sup>9</sup> Although Moravians were engaged in scientific, rational pursuits in the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century—with their ethnographical collections being a pertinent

5 Ibid., 286-94.

6 Ibid., 292-4.

7 Pia Schmid, "Orte für Kinder: Zur Architektur pädagogischer Räume in der Herrnhuter Brüdergemeine des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Unitas Fratrum: Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Gegenwartsfragen der Brüdergemeine*, no. 51/52 (2003): 81-86, here 82.

8 Heikki Lempa and Paul Peucker, introduction to *Self, Community, World: Moravian Education in a Transatlantic World*, ed. Heikki Lempa and Paul Peucker (Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University Press, 2010), 17.

9 Alexander Schunka, "A Missing Link: Daniel Ernst Jablonski as the Connection between Comenius and Zinzendorf," in *Self, Community, World*, 55-77; Peter Vogt, "'Headless and Un-Erudite': Anti-Intellectual Tendencies in Zinzendorf's Approach to Education," in *Self, Community, World*, 107-26.

example of their engagement with the “new” disciplines of ethnology and anthropology<sup>10</sup>—the educational philosophy of the church in the nineteenth century did not change much from Zinzendorf’s notions of education, which simultaneously focused on the three broad areas of religious activities, secular subjects, and vocational training. Such a tri-focal agenda was intended to ensure the “symmetrical development through soul, mind and body.”<sup>11</sup> The focus on vocational training for both Moravian children as well as those children on mission stations was to fill the practical needs both of the community (that needed artisans to be self-supporting) and the individual (who would be able to earn a living from their trade).

When surveying the material pertaining to Moravian education it is evident that the majority of scholarly attention has been placed upon the eighteenth century, with a particular emphasis on the Moravian’s education of Europeans or people of European heritage. Moravian historians have examined Moravian schools in Germany (such as in Herrnhut, Königsfeld and Neuwied),<sup>12</sup> or in England (such as Fairfield),<sup>13</sup> and in the United States.<sup>14</sup> Some work has been undertaken on larger geographical scales, such as Schmid’s study of the Moravians’ “modern” pedagogical approach and concepts of childhood in Europe.<sup>15</sup> On a transatlantic scale, Peucker and Lempa’s aforementioned 2010 edited volume on Moravian education brought together scholars interested in probing the Moravian contribution to education in Germany and North America, and the interplay between Moravian educational philosophies and European enlightenment and modernity in the eighteenth century.<sup>16</sup> Despite the recent focus upon eighteenth-century Moravian education and the growing scholarship in this field there has been little published pertaining to the education of indigenous and non-European students upon the various Moravian missions

- 10 See for example: Annegret Nippa, *Ethnographie und Herrnhuter Mission: Völkerkundemuseum Herrnhut* (Dresden: Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde Dresden, 2003).
- 11 Haller, *Early Moravian Education in Pennsylvania*, 215.
- 12 Marianne Doerfel, “Die Brüderischen Schulen in Neuwied,” *Unitas Fratrum*, no. 57/58 (2006): 81–168; Klaus Künzel, “Die Brüdergemeine Neuwied in Siedlungsgeschichtlicher Sicht,” *Unitas Fratrum*, no. 12 (1982): 89–102, here 93–94; Hans-Jürgen Kunick, “Die Königsfelder Zinzendorfschulen in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus: Geschichte der Schulen 1933/1944,” special issue, *Unitas Fratrum*, no. 43 (1998): 15–22, 89–96; Boris Uher, “Schulwesen und Erziehung in den Anfängen Herrnhuts,” *Unitas Fratrum*, no. 16 (1984): 14–29.
- 13 W. T. Waugh, *A History of Fulneck School* (Leeds: Richard Jackson, 1909); Ruth Strong, *A History of Fulneck Girls’ School* (Pudsey: Fulneck School, 1995).
- 14 Haller, *Early Moravian Education in Pennsylvania*.
- 15 Pia Schmid, “Die Entdeckung der Kindheit Sub Specie Religionis,” *Unitas Fratrum*, no. 57/58 (2006): 37–56; Schmid, “Orte für Kinder.”
- 16 Lempa and Peucker, eds., *Self, Community, World*.

across the globe. Amy Schutt's 1998 article on eighteenth-century Moravian education of the Lenape in North America and Cornelia Klink's 2006 article on multi-lingual schooling on Moravian schools in Suriname providing two notable exceptions.<sup>17</sup> The present study thus strives to contribute to two understudied areas of Moravian history, those of nineteenth-century Moravian education and missions.

## Education on mission stations

The schooling of children on the mission stations was considered a vital duty. The 1840 English version of the *Instructions for Missionaries of the Church of the Unitas Fratrum (Instructions)* underscored the centrality of education when it noted: "The Missionary will feel it to be one of his most important duties, to care for the Christian instruction of these little ones."<sup>18</sup> This instruction was both formal, through schooling, and informal, through good role models and a supportive Christian environment. Within Moravian mission schools, children were to be "imbued with the principles of the Christian religion, that, through the Divine blessing, they may not only retain them in their memories, but feel and enjoy them in their hearts."<sup>19</sup> The Moravians believed that all children were best taught about the Christian message while young, thus the *Instructions* proposed that infant schools ought to be established as soon as practicable after opening a mission station, and that schools for older children also ought to be established.<sup>20</sup> Infant schools were open to children from the ages of four years, and, depending on the local conditions, this schooling was offered for a further four to ten years. Within Euro-Moravian communities, there were analogous infant schools and schools for older children as part of the church's perceived responsibility for the all-encompassing care and education of its children.<sup>21</sup> Within Moravian missions, the focus upon infants and children was not only seen to be of potential benefit for the instilling of Christian love and principles at the youngest practicable age, but was also deemed to be an effective method of gaining "the hearts even of heathen parents" as they observed the "faithful

17 Amy C. Schutt, "'What Will Become of Our Young People?' Goals for Indian Children in Moravian Missions," *History of Education Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (1998): 268-86; Cornelia Klink, "Mehrsprachigkeit im Unterricht der Herrnhuter Schulen in den Missionsgebieten," *Unitas Fratrum*, no. 57/58 (2006): 57-80.

18 [August Gottlieb Spangenberg], *Instructions for Missionaries of the Church of the Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren*, trans. from the German, 2nd. ed. (London: Brethren's Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel among the Heathen, 1840), 47.

19 *Ibid.*, 47.

20 *Ibid.*, 48.

21 Haller, *Early Moravian Education in Pennsylvania*, 213.

care bestowed upon the children” by the missionaries.<sup>22</sup> Missionaries were not the only people to use children to reach parents, rather, as the historian Donald Wilson has argued, this was a common assimilative device used by the nation-state of Canada throughout the nineteenth century.<sup>23</sup>

One of the major aims of Moravian schooling was to teach pupils how to read in order that they themselves would have access to the Bible, following the Pietist tradition of personal and individual devotion. In contrast to other missionary groups such as the Catholics or the Scottish Free Church, the Moravians did not provide their pupils on mission stations with a classical education, and therefore subjects such as Hebrew and Latin had no place in the Moravian mission curriculum.<sup>24</sup> However, Latin was taught at some European Moravian boarding schools. For example, for a base fee of thirty guineas per annum, female students at the “Moravian School for Young Ladies” at Ayr in Scotland received board and tuition in “reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, history, geography, the use of the globes, plain and fancy work.” For a further guinea per quarter one could be instructed in music and drawing, and, for an additional guinea each per quarter, young ladies could be instructed in Latin, French, or German.<sup>25</sup> Although not all European Moravian boarding schools taught Latin, the fact that it was offered suggests that Moravian teaching in the nineteenth century attuned itself to the needs and wants of the local communities with the resources available to it. It could be argued that Latin was not offered in mission schools because it was not deemed to be a subject that was needed by the local communities. A commonality of all Moravian schools around the globe, however, was the focus on “Christian education,” (that being moral and religious training).<sup>26</sup> With the transposition of Moravian educational philosophies onto the mission field, the focus upon moral and religious training was upheld. Moravian missionaries were given practical advice on how best to teach non-European children divine truths, including the use of such methods as rote learning and learning through singing religious tunes and verses.<sup>27</sup> Despite the global reach of the Moravian mission, there were no worldwide, prescribed educational texts that all Moravian missionaries or teachers were obliged to use. As the Moravians worked amongst many different cultures and utilized many different languages—including indigenous languages

22 [Spangenberg], *Instructions*, 47.

23 J. Donald Wilson, “‘No Blanket to Be Worn in School’: The Education of Indians in Nineteenth-Century Ontario,” in *Indian Education in Canada*, ed. Jean Barman, Yvonne Hébert, and Don McCaskill (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986), 68.

24 For reference to Catholic and Free Church of Scotland curricula see: *Evangelisches Missionsmagazin* 1 (1875): 94; *Evangelisches Missionsmagazin* 1 (1874): 94.

25 *Caledonian Mercury* (Edinburgh, Scotland), Monday, March 11, 1822; Issue 15683, 1.

26 See for example: *The Derby Mercury* (Derby, England), Wednesday, March 13, 1844, 3.

27 [Spangenberg], *Instructions*, 47.

codified by Moravian missionaries and their helpers in the fields—the lack of a universal textbook comes as no surprise. Instead of a universal textbook, the Moravians utilized many new and varied methods of teaching which were dependent upon the situation. This is evident in the numerous teaching and training techniques that were employed in different schools around the world. For example, in Greenland there were no textbooks and the missionaries had to devise their own lessons and to translate them into the Inuit language,<sup>28</sup> with the same situation apparent on the Miskito coast.<sup>29</sup> When the language of instruction was English, as was the case in Australia, textbooks such as B. F. Foster's *Elementary Copy Book* were used.<sup>30</sup>

We can gain an understanding of who was taught what within Moravian mission schools in various places through examining printed missionary reports, mission diaries, and the missionaries' own handwritten documents. Many of the mission schools offered the same elementary subjects as the Moravian boarding schools, including reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, history, geography, the use of globes, and, for girls, needlework. For example, pupils at the mission schools in Northern India were taught reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, and geography, as well as Tibetan and Urdu.<sup>31</sup> In the mission schools in Australia, similar secular subjects were taught with English being the language of instruction, and the only language taught. At the mission schools in Jamaica, the common subjects of religious instruction, reading, writing, and ciphering were taught, with some schools also providing geography, rudimentary grammar, singing and, for girls, sewing.<sup>32</sup>

Moreover, Moravian mission stations provided more than one form of schooling to the mission residents. Education and schooling was provided to infants, girls and boys, as well as adults. On Barbados, for example, the Moravians provided a day school, a Sunday school, and adult instruction. In reporting upon the various knowledge imparted in these schools the Moravian missionary John Ellis noted in 1836 that:

We teach in our day-school reading, writing, a little arithmetic, and the girls white-seam and sampler. We also give our scholars a good deal of miscellaneous instruction, upon the infant-school system; but, above all, we endeavour to impart to them *Bible knowledge*. . . . On average 110 attend daily

28 *Periodical Accounts* 14 (1836): 22.

29 *Die Heiden-Mission: Das gemeinsame Werk der Brüder-Unität*, (Löbau: E. Bastanier & Dunsky, 1867), p. 27, R.15.A.6.9.a, Unitätsarchiv Herrnhut (hereafter cited as UA).

30 Adolf Hartmann's letter book, 1864, PP HJAH 2, p. 27, MAB.

31 *Periodical Accounts* 27 (1868), 342.

32 London Association in Aid of the Moravian Missions, *Occasional Negro School Paper*, no. 7, November 1855, R.15.A.4.a.5.g.10, UA.

... To our Sunday-school, which is kept from 10 to 12 in the morning, we also give a portion of our time: on an average 220 attend. We have sometimes as many as 250. In this school they are taught reading, committing Scripture and hymns to memory, and the numbers, Roman and Arabic, that they may know how to find the chapters and verses in the Bible. ... Our adult-school we keep for the men on Monday, and the women on Tuesday evenings; on an average 25 of each sex attend, and are instructed in reading, spelling, and numbers. They also receive general information likely to be useful to them. We intend soon to teach some of them writing and cyphering.<sup>33</sup>

Although knowledge of the Bible was imparted in the schools held throughout the week, it was the Sunday schools which provided more focused Christian instruction in addition to the secular skills that would facilitate this learning. At the half-yearly examinations of the pupils at the mission schools at Genadendal in South Africa, over two hundred children were examined in subjects such as reading, religion, writing, arithmetic, geography, English, and singing. The presiding missionary was pleased with the results, with ninety-two of ninety-seven girls being able “to read, as well as children of their age in European schools.”<sup>34</sup> Such comparison to European children was a means of demonstrating to the readers of Moravian publications, such as the British *Periodical Accounts* from which this report was taken, that the effort and expense of educating non-European children was indeed worthwhile.

Although European and non-European children were on occasion juxtaposed in texts pertaining to schooling outcomes, in reality these two groups were largely kept separate. The eighteenth-century missionary David Zeisberger (1721-1808) exemplified the ideal Moravian responses to the education of European children on mission stations in one of his diary entries for the Fairfield mission station in Upper Canada. In this entry Zeisberger recounted his statement to a doctor of European heritage, who wished to build a school and send his children to the Moravian Fairfield mission station: “We cut short his hopes. We told him that we do not teach whites nor were we here for their benefit. It was our mission policy not to accept white people.”<sup>35</sup> Despite Zeisberger’s strong theoretical stance against mixed schooling, in practice white children, including the children of missionaries and German migrants, were occasionally taught at Moravian mission stations. Such was the case in the early years of the nineteenth century at the mission school at the second

33 *Periodical Accounts* 14 (1836): 196-7.

34 *Extract of a Letter from Dr. H. P. Hallbeck, Gnadendal, September 27th, 1838*, in *Periodical Accounts* 15 (1839): 486.

35 David Zeisberger, *Fairfield Mission Diary*, March 2, 1794, in Linda Sabathy-Judd, *Moravians in Upper Canada: The Diary of the Indian Mission of Fairfield on the Thames 1792-1813*, trans. and ed. Linda Sabathy-Judd (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1999), 50.



Gnadenhütten settlement in Carbon County, Pennsylvania.<sup>36</sup> Sometimes mixed classes were a consequence of governmental policy. For example, the southern Australian mission school at Ramahyuck was a governmental school from 1869 with white children learning alongside Aboriginal children. However, as soon as an alternative government school was opened to white children in a nearby settlement they enrolled in it and left the school on the mission station.<sup>37</sup> The segregation of European and indigenous or non-European children reflected broader Moravian trends in creating isolated mission stations away from the influence and effects of colonial and post-colonial society. Moravian missionaries expended much effort in keeping undesirable people of European heritage off mission stations because missionaries saw such people as corrupting indigenous peoples through the proliferation of bad vices, or through the encouragement to engage in immoral behavior, such as fornication.<sup>38</sup> Although white children would not necessarily have been responsible for bringing such vices to mission stations, the exclusion of white children from most mission schools ensured that missionaries maintained their position as the primary, if not only, mediators of European ideals and knowledge to indigenous and non-European peoples.

Moravian missionaries thus saw formal schooling as an important means to impart religious training in order to facilitate the construction of morally upstanding members of the broader Christian community, who would be versed in the elementary skills necessary for assimilation into broader colonial societies. Generally speaking, colonial and post-colonial governments in the nineteenth century also deemed schooling to be an important avenue for the moral and social advancements of all children regardless of race. Schooling was not only a form of “civilizing” indigenous peoples, it was also seen as a sign of a civilized people. In the majority of the British Empire, race and class were intertwined concepts, with the urban poor of London being used as the training grounds for outgoing missionaries of the London Missionary Society.<sup>39</sup>

36 Haller, *Early Moravian Education in Pennsylvania*, 131.

37 Leslie James Blake, ed., *Vision and Realisation: A Centenary History of State Education in Victoria*, (Melbourne: Education Department of Victoria, 1973), 3:1073.

38 See for example: Fairfield Mission Diary, October 13, 1805, in Sabathy-Judd, *Moravians in Upper Canada*, 345.

39 See for example: Thomas O. Beidelman, “Contradictions between the Sacred and the Secular Life: The Church Missionary Society in Ukaguru, Tanzania, East Africa, 1876-1914,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23, no. 1 (1981): 73-95, here 79; Larry Prochner, Helen May, and Baljit Kaur, “‘The Blessings of Civilisation’: Nineteenth-Century Missionary Infant Schools for Young Native Children in Three Colonial Settings: India, Canada and New Zealand 1820s-1840s,” *Paedagogica Historica* 45, no. 1/2 (2009): 83-102, here 85; Patricia T. Rooke, “Missionaries as Pedagogues: A Reconsideration of the Significance of Education for Slaves and Apprentices in the British West Indies, 1800-1838,” *History of Education* 9, no. 1 (1980): 65-79, here 69.

Moreover, in British-ruled lands, schooling was seen to be of special importance for working-class children for whom common schools were established from the 1840s.<sup>40</sup> Schooling aimed to discipline the young and enhance their later social, moral, and financial status. Through compulsory schooling children would learn how to read and, as reflected in the nineteenth-century Canadian Dominion reports that explicitly drew parallels between illiteracy and crime, schooling was implicitly seen as a method of reducing numbers of prison and reform house inmates.<sup>41</sup> The education of First Nations peoples in Canada was seen by governments to be important in “raising” these people to perceived European standards and in providing indigenous peoples with the skills to be assimilated into the broader settler society. The governmental goal of assimilation was one held not just by the government of the Dominion of Canada, but also by the federal government of the United States of America<sup>42</sup> as well as the colonial, and later federal, government of Australia.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, it was also a policy with which Moravian missionaries in various locations also aligned themselves.<sup>44</sup> As a missionary at New Fairfield, Hartmann agreed with the proposed assimilationist ideals of the Canadian government, and stated “this is noting we desire more in a temporal point of view than to see them take the position of the white man.”<sup>45</sup> His comments were directed towards the introduction of the Indian Act of Canada which was introduced in 1876,<sup>46</sup> and also aimed to assimilate First Nations people into the broader Euro-Canadian society and placed all aspects of Indian affairs in federal, rather than provincial, hands.<sup>47</sup> According to the legal historian Richard Bartlett, within Canada there was a desire to “civilize” First Nations peoples through processes of enfranchisement and assimilation.<sup>48</sup> Such desires were encoded in laws with acts such as the 1857 “Act to encourage the gradual Civilization of the Indian Tribes in this Province, and to amend the Laws

40 Haley P. Bamman, “Patterns of School Attendance in Toronto, 1844-1878: Some Spatial Considerations,” *History of Education Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (1972): 385.

41 George W. Ross, *Report on Compulsory Education in Canada, Great Britain, Germany and the United States. Printed by Order of the Legislative Assembly* (Toronto: Warwick & Sons, 1891), 92.

42 Jacqueline Fear-Segal, “Nineteenth-Century Indian Education: Universalism Versus Evolutionism,” *Journal of American Studies* 33, no. 2 (1999): 323-41, here 323.

43 Julie Evans et al., eds., *Equal Subjects, Unequal Rights: Indigenous Peoples in British Settler Colonies, 1830-1910* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), esp. chapter 3.

44 For the example of Australia see: Felicity Jensz, “Three Peculiarities of the Southern Australian Moravian Mission Field,” *Journal of Moravian History*, no. 7, (2009): 7-30.

45 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the One Hundredth and One General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1877), Appendix B, 14.

46 39.Vic. c. 18 (Prov. Can).

47 Richard H. Bartlett, “The Indian Act of Canada,” *Buffalo Law Review* 582, no. 27 (1977-78): 581-615, here 590.

48 *Ibid.*, 582, 590.

respecting Indians,” allowing for the enfranchisement of an “Indian”, when he “is able to speak, read and write either the english or the french language readily and well, and is sufficiently advanced in the elementary branches of education and is of good moral character and free from debt.”<sup>49</sup> This section of the act demonstrates the pivotal role that education played in the Canadian government’s hopes for the assimilation of First Nations peoples into the broader society. The subsequent Indian Act of 1876 also had ramifications for the schooling of First Nations peoples, because education was a provincial affair, while Indian affairs was a federal matter. Thus, the educational system for First Nations peoples was parallel and separate to that of non-indigenous Canadians. Although the Canadian government ideologically supported the education of First Nations peoples, until the late nineteenth century it often left the actual work of education to religious bodies such as the Moravians. Ensuing Canadian governmental policy continued to work closely with religious bodies to provide education to indigenous peoples, with the establishment of residential schools by various denominations such as the Catholics and Anglicans providing prominent examples.<sup>50</sup>

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, governmental agencies in the British Empire and in the United States not only placed increasing emphasis upon vocational training for indigenous children, they also took a more active and financial interest in such schools. This caused tensions for many missionary societies as governmental influence was not always desired. As Norman Etherington has noted in the context of the Natal in South Africa, missionaries of all denominations initially gladly accepted funding from the government for their missionary schools. However, this proved to be a “poisoned chalice” as the government tried to move the curriculum towards industrial schools, and thus to influence what the missionaries taught in their schools.<sup>51</sup> As there were numerous Moravian missions under various colonial administrations, there were of course differences in the amounts of funding governments provided to, as well as amounts of control that governments extended over, mission schools in various places. As not all Moravian schools were funded by governments there was a difference in Moravian terminology between those “Stations-Schulen” (station schools) which were “reine Missionsarbeit” (pure mission work) and those that—due to the influence of government legislations, government officers, and governmental input—were not. As Moravian mission schools

49 20.Vic.c.26, (Prov. Can), 1857, Section. 3.

50 James R. Miller, *Shingwauk’s Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

51 Norman Etherington, “Missionaries, Africans and the State in the Development of Education in Colonial Natal, 1836–1910,” in *Missionaries, Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Exchange*, eds. Patricia Grimshaw and Andrew May, (East Sussex: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 133.

were expected to be self-sustaining there was no fundamental opposition to government funding of mission schools.<sup>52</sup> Thus, Moravian missionaries who maintained mission schools strove to provide their pupils with educational outcomes that would in the first instance facilitate the development of good Christians, and secondly, facilitate the development of good subjects under various governmental structures around the world. Just how this was undertaken in Canada is the subject of the following section.

## New Fairfield in Canada

Given the history of Moravian involvement in education for non-Europeans, it is somewhat surprising that there was no Moravian-run school on the New Fairfield mission site when Adolf Hartmann and his wife were called there in 1873. The New Fairfield mission had over its 130-year history provided schooling to the Lenape, however, in the mid-nineteenth century the mission school was disbanded to the vexation of Jesse Vogler, the missionary in charge. The reason for this disbandment will be explained after a brief history of the Moravian mission amongst the Lenape has been provided.

For legal reasons, this figure is not available in open access

Fig. 2. Moravian mission house in New Fairfield (Moraviantown), Ontario, 1895 (Moravian Archives, Bethlehem)

52 *Die Heiden-Mission. Das gemeinsame Werk der Brüder-Unität: Leitfaden des Missions-Departements für die Berathung von Cap. 12 des Synodal-Verlasses von 1857, und für Neubearbeitung desselben*, (Löbau: E. Bastanier & Dunskey, 1867), p. 17, R.15.A.6.9.a, UA.

The Moravians had worked amongst the Lenape—whose traditional lands were located in southeastern Pennsylvania, southeastern New York State, Delaware and New Jersey—since the 1740s. White incursion into Lenape land had forced these people west. In the decades that followed the Lenape were displaced and removed from many locations, due to the land being ceded to white settlers, or in other cases, due to the dangers of war. After the massacre of over ninety Lenape at the hands of American troops at Gnadenhütten, Ohio, in 1782, approximately 150 Lenape sought safety from the wars under the guidance of the aforementioned Zeisberger. After years of wandering, they found shelter in the British-controlled territory of Upper Canada. In 1792, they were finally presented a piece of land by the British government upon which they established the Fairfield mission station. It was located on the Thames River near present-day Bothwell, an area that was removed from European settlements at that time. However, war still followed the group and on October 5, 1813, the Battle of the Thames took place three kilometers west of the original Fairfield. After the British were defeated, the U.S. forces ransacked and destroyed the mission station. A new mission station, New Fairfield, was rebuilt on the other side of the river.<sup>53</sup>

Schooling was, as with all Moravian missions, a central aspect of the Fairfield mission. At the original site, a school was in the process of being built by the end of 1792, which was the year in which the township site had been founded.<sup>54</sup> School was operated both at this mission site and at the new site when the mission was relocated to the other side of the Thames River in 1813. Yet, despite the long history of Moravian work amongst the Lenape, many of them were dismissively reported by Adolf Hartmann in 1874 to be “uneducated, unconverted and reserved.”<sup>55</sup> Within this trilogy of qualities lacking in the Lenape, education had first place. There was no indication that positioning of the list related to a ranking of qualities, yet of the traits that the Moravians could bring to the Indians—education, Christianity, and evangelical fervor—education was the one which transcended spiritual spheres and had the ability to affect a Lenape’s place

53 For more on the eighteenth-century history of the Moravian mission to the Lenape see: Hermann Wellenreuther and Carola Wessel, eds., *The Moravian Mission Diaries of David Zeisberger, 1772-1781* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005); Sabathy-Judd, *Moravians in Upper Canada*; Amy C. Schutt, *Peoples of the River Valleys: The Odyssey of the Delaware Indians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Leslie R. Gray, “The Moravian Missionaries, Their Indians, and the Canadian Government,” *Report of the Annual Meeting/Rapports annuels de la Société historique du Canada* 34, no. 1 (1955): 96–104; J. Taylor Hamilton, *History of the Moravian Missions* (Bethlehem: Moravian Church, 1901). Memoir of Adolf Hartmann, PP HJAH 16, MAB.

54 Fairfield Dairy, December 28, 1792, in Sabathy-Judd, *Moravians in Upper Canada*, 23.

55 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Eighth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1874), Appendix A, 9.

in broader commercial and political environments away from the mission station. Mid-nineteenth-century Moravian attitudes towards the Lenape connected the Lenape's perceived idleness with an ambivalent attitude towards Western education. A successor of Vogler and predecessor of Hartmann at New Fairfield, Edwin Reinke, deemed the Delaware to be:

naturally perverse, and (perhaps through the inherited habits of centuries bygone) averse to continuous labor; and, with the exception of certain points of etiquette, he allows his children too, from very early years, to do as they like, and they do not often like to attend school regularly, but prefer to loiter in the woods, or visit neighboring villages of white people.<sup>56</sup>

Moravians, like many other nineteenth-century missionaries, saw idleness to be a vice, and one that should be overcome by Christian diligence. Diligence was seen more broadly as a virtue that would lead to the prospect of advancement and ultimately bring success and respectability.<sup>57</sup> One way that missionaries believed that Lenape children would learn diligence, as well as be provided with structure to their days, was through schooling. However, one must not forget that the Lenape, as with all non-European peoples that the Moravians worked amongst, had their own forms of educating their young.<sup>58</sup> Despite the fact that both informal and formal forms of education were cultivated by aboriginal peoples, these forms often were not seen to be comparable to European formalized, classroom-based teaching and, thus, were deemed either not compatible or inferior to Western-style education. That said, some non-European forms of teaching and learning were acknowledged by missionaries. For example, at the Fairfield mission, the boys' play with bows and arrows was seen as a necessary practice to hone further hunting skills.<sup>59</sup> These methods were, however, never a substitute for formalized classroom-based teaching, with the establishment of a school being a priority for Moravian missionaries.<sup>60</sup>

Despite the Moravian desire to educate the Lenape children, by the 1850s, the only school on the Moravian reserve was a school run by the Lenape themselves.

56 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Sixth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1872), Appendix B, 12.

57 Trygve R. Tholfsen, "Moral Education in the Victorian Sunday School," *History of Education Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1980): 92-93.

58 For forms of North American education see: Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision*, especially chap. 1.

59 Sebastian Oppelt, *Fairfield Mission Diary*, June 1, 1800, in Sabathy-Judd, *Moravians in Upper Canada*, 204.

60 For example, on the Moravian mission station Ebenezer in the Colony of Victoria, Australia, a school for indigenous children was established before a religious service was held. See Felicity Jensz, *German Moravian Missionaries in the British Colony of Victoria, Australia, 1848-1908: Influential Strangers*, *Studies in Christian Missions*, 38 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 121.

The Moravian school had ceased to exist, and no Moravians were teaching on the mission station. Moreover, Moravian missionaries at New Fairfield had no say as to who should be appointed a teacher at the school on the reserve, or how the school might be run.<sup>61</sup> This was a highly unusual situation. In other geopolitical spaces, such as in Kansas in the United States, the Moravians were obliged by the government to maintain a school, but they were allowed to maintain their own personnel.<sup>62</sup> In nineteenth-century British Raj-controlled Tibet, a school was established “at the instance [*sic*] of the Government” in which, under the Moravians’ superintendence a Hindu teacher was appointed. The government provided the Moravians with an annual grant for the school’s upkeep.<sup>63</sup> During the same period, the Moravians established two schools for Aboriginal children in the Colony of Victoria in Australia, paying for the initial upkeep themselves until these became government schools in the 1860s and 1890s. In the West Indies, the Moravians, along with many other religious groups, were given financial support by the British government to supply freed slaves with education.<sup>64</sup> Thus, Moravian missionaries worked closely with governments throughout the British colonial world to provide education to indigenous peoples.

Why then was the situation different in Canada in the second half of the nineteenth century? And what could be the reason for the resistance of the Lenape to the offer of free Moravian schooling for their children? The Moravians had regularly been conducting a mission school until the 1850s, when the Lenape established their own school after they had had a falling out with the missionary Vogler, who was accused of profiting unfairly from a commercial transaction in relation to the sale of timber on the reserve.<sup>65</sup> In an effort to distance themselves from Vogler, the Lenape established their own school with Indian Office funds and also petitioned the Provincial Elders’ Conference (PEC) of the North-American Moravian Church in Bethlehem to replace Vogler, and his family, with a more suitable missionary.<sup>66</sup> Such an action indicates that, at least initially,

61 For appointments to the New Fairfield school see: *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Second General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1868), 5.

62 For more on the Kansas school see: *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Eighty-Seventh General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1864), 11.

63 *Periodical Accounts*, 27 (1868): 342.

64 Patricia T. Rooke, “A Scramble for Souls: The Impact of the Negro Education Grant on Evangelical Missionaries in the British West Indies,” *History of Education Quarterly* 21, no. 4 (1981): 429–47.

65 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Sixth General Meeting*, 11.

66 Vogler (New Fairfield) to Siedler (Bethlehem), February 17, 1854, Records relating to the Indian Missions of the Moravian Church (hereafter cited as MissInd), 167.10.7, MAB.

the Lenape were not against Moravian missionaries *per se*, rather they were disappointed in Vogler's conduct and attempted to rectify the situation, with the help of the PEC, in a way that would ensure that educational opportunities and spiritual guidance for their children were continued. Vogler had worked amongst the Lenape for almost twenty years at the time of the dispute and had demonstrated his commitment to the Lenape when he accompanied a group of 230 Lenape to Missouri in 1837, where he worked for a while before returning to Fairfield in 1843.<sup>67</sup> Despite this, he lost the trust of the roughly one hundred Lenape on the reserve over the timber issue and never regained it. Trust was an important factor in the relationships between missionaries and their protégés and necessary for the cohesive function of a mission station. Moreover, as mission schools were seen as "nurseries of the Church," a whole generation of children was thought to be at risk of being lost to the church if the Moravian mission school was not reopened.

After arriving on the station, Hartmann noted that it would be best to start with a small, private school, and after having gained the confidence of the Lenape, he hoped to take over all schooling on the reserve.<sup>68</sup> Yet, after the break in trust between Vogler and the Lenape, it was not an easy process for Hartmann to regain the confidence of the group. Besides the future benefits of Moravian schooling to the church, Hartmann believed that the schooling that the children received at the secular Lenape school was not of the quality that a mission school could provide. He chose to place the culpability of substandard teaching not with the schoolmaster, but rather with the Lenape parents for not compelling their children to be sent to school.<sup>69</sup>

The problem of getting children to attend a mission school was a common one experienced by missionaries from all denominations. For example, at the Basel mission station of Akropong in Ghana, the missionaries complained that, "the children do not want to come to school."<sup>70</sup> Similar sentiments were expressed by missionaries throughout the world, especially in relation to low school attendance levels. Missionaries knew that they needed to obtain parental support for the education of children on the mission stations. However, this support was often fickle and frequently relied upon material encouragement. In Zambia, for example, French Catholic White Fathers paid parents money

67 Gray, "The Moravian Missionaries, Their Indians, and the Canadian Government," 102.

68 Hartmann (Moraviantown) to de Schweinitz (Bethlehem), August 26, 1873, MissInd 167.20.2, MAB.

69 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Sixth General Meeting*, 8.

70 "die Kinder [wollen] nicht in die Schule kommen." *Evangelisches Missions Magazin*, 3 (1854): 73.



to send their children to the mission school,<sup>71</sup> and in Eastern Nigeria, Scottish Protestant missionaries rewarded their students with clothing and gifts.<sup>72</sup> In Moravian mission schools, children were not paid to attend class; it was more common for children to attend for free, with funds being supplied by European or North American supporters.<sup>73</sup> At the New Fairfield school the pupils did not have to pay tuition as the teacher's salary was covered by payments from the Lenape annuities. However, when the Lenape stopped sending their children to the mission school and established their own, the funds for the teaching staff were directed towards the teacher of the Lenape school, leaving the Moravian school with no guaranteed governmental funding for a teacher.

By establishing their own school, the Lenape demonstrated that they, as with all people amongst whom the Moravians worked, were not passive recipients of Moravian schooling. The Lenape's engagement in the schooling of their children had long been evident prior to the altercation with Vogler. In 1801, for example, they had forced the issue of having English as the language used to teach in the schools, stating that "it was not proper that the Indian children should receive instructions from the Missionaries in the Indian language, which they ... themselves spoke but imperfectly, but they might learn it best from their parents."<sup>74</sup> This disagreement was resolved through the missionaries consenting to use English in the school and the Delaware language for the hymns that the children were to sing. Besides the language of instruction, Lenape adults had also expressed their displeasure in the disciplinary conduct of the schoolteachers, which resulted in some adult members of the congregation being excluded from Holy Communion in August 1811 as they "had spoken out rudely against their teachers for reprimanding their troublesome children too strongly."<sup>75</sup> In other contexts, such as in the Australian mission field, the Moravians' reprimand became physical, which led to the mission residents writing a letter of complaint to the colonial government's Board for the Protection of the Aborigines requesting another teacher, preferably one that was not German as "it[']s no use of having two German[s] in this station for the[y] agree to[o] well together."<sup>76</sup>

71 Brendan Carmody, "Catholic Schools in Zambia: 1891-1924," *History of Education* 28, no. 1 (1999): 73-86, here 83.

72 W. H. Taylor, "Missionary Education in Africa Reconsidered: The Presbyterian Educational Impact in Eastern Nigeria 1846-1974," *African Affairs* 83, no. 331 (1984): 189-205, here 194.

73 For example, the Moravian schools in the West Indies were supported during the nineteenth century by the London Association in Aid of the Moravian Missions, which printed annual reports and canvassed members for funding. For examples of the report see: R.15.A.4.a.5.g.10-14, UA.

74 *Periodical Accounts*, 4, (1806-1808): 491-2.

75 John Schnall, Fairfield Mission Diary, May 19, 1811, in Sabathy-Judd, *Moravians in Upper Canada*, 463.

76 R. Stewart, A. Combs and P. Cameron to Board for the Protection of the Aborigines,

Besides appealing to Moravian and governmental bodies, another means that parents used to express their disgruntlement with schooling was to keep their children away. J. M. Miller has termed this a passive form of resistance.<sup>77</sup> The Lenape engaged in this tactic, as did a well-known Chippewa Chief, who, due to his disgruntlement with Moravian missionaries, kept his own and most of the other Chippewa children away from the Kansas mission school in 1866.<sup>78</sup> As these examples demonstrate, indigenous people were willing recipients of education who sought to be active partners in schooling and, on occasion, engaged in both passive and active forms of resistance to missionary education. In the case of the Lenape, their desire to actively control the schooling of their children was noted by Hartmann soon after he arrived in 1873, when he reported the following comment from a Lenape man: “If we get a Moravian teacher, we shall never get rid of them again.” Hartmann asserted that this comment “speaks highly in the favor of Moravian teachers”<sup>79</sup> reading the comment as a glowing support for the missionary school. However, this comment could also be read as a desire on the behalf of the Lenape to control their own school and the education of their children. Such examples demonstrate the long-standing willingness and capacity of Lenape parents to manipulate the broader pedagogical environment of missionary schooling in the interests of their children.

In the mid-1850s, the Lenape school was established on the reserve with funding from the Indian Office. At this school, reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, singing, composition, and drawing were taught.<sup>80</sup> Not surprisingly, exactly how this school was established was not communicated in the annual reports that Hartman submitted to the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen the Moravian mission society in Bethlehem, which supported and administrated missions under the jurisdiction of the North American Moravian Church. Rather, when Hartmann gave the historical background about the school, he was circumspect as to its origins, preferring instead to be dismissive towards it as he deemed it not to have been “conducted in a satisfactory manner,”<sup>81</sup> with children allegedly not having received much advantage from attending.<sup>82</sup> Not only had Hartmann lost access

---

September 22, 1879, B313/95/30, National Archives Australia [NAA], Victorian Branch.

77 Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision*, 355.

78 *Periodical Accounts*, 25, 270, (March 1866): 573.

79 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Ninth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1875), 8.

80 “Return F: Statement of the condition of the various Indian Schools in the Dominion, for the Year ended 30th June, 1878,” *Report for the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs* (Ottawa, 1878), 218.

81 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Eighty-Ninth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1865), 12.

82 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninetieth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel*

to children by having no missionary school on the reserve, but his flock was being threatened by the encroaching advances of the Methodists. Originally all Lenape on the reserve had belonged to the Moravian Church and this historical fact was reflected in the official Indian Department name given to the entire reserve of “Moravian Reserve” and to the people as “Moravians of the Thames.” However, by 1865, some eight years before the Hartmanns began their work, only half of the Lenape belonged to the Moravian Church because many Lenape had left to join the Methodist Church.<sup>83</sup> The Lenape chief, Phillip Jacobs, had invited the Methodists to preach in a church he built for them upon the reserve after Jacobs had had a clash with the Moravians, who he wished to “drive ... away.”<sup>84</sup> Jacobs’s allegiance, however, to the (British) Methodists was short-lived and volatile, demonstrated when he barred their access to the church he had built for them and instead adhered himself to the Episcopal (Methodist) Church.<sup>85</sup> The Methodists threatened the Moravians on both congregational and schooling fronts because they had, from the mid-1860s, offered free education to Indian children whose families were connected to that church.<sup>86</sup> As Michael Coleman has noted in his analysis of Protestant mission schools for Indians in the United States during the last half of the nineteenth century, denominational rivalry was rife and many denominations bribed children to attend particular schools through offering gifts, or through persistent urging.<sup>87</sup> On the Moravian reserve in Canada, denominational schooling was itself offered as a bribe to encourage children, and through them their parents, to attach themselves to the different denominations. The Methodists were the most active in their desire to “sheep steal” from the Moravians and, as they had schools amongst ten other Canadian Indian “bands,” the threat that they potentially posed to Moravian schooling was great.<sup>88</sup>

Hartmann continued to entertain the idea of providing a religious school for the Lenape despite the many obstacles in his way, some of which came from the Moravian authorities in Bethlehem. In 1874, the teaching position was available in the Lenape school and Hartmann applied to the Provincial Elders’ Conference in Bethlehem to send a teacher, yet they rejected the proposal on

---

*among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1866), 5.

83 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Eighty-Ninth General Meeting*, 7.

84 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the One Hundred and Second Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1878), 7.

85 *Ibid.*

86 *Ibid.*

87 Michael C. Coleman, “Motivations of Indian Children at Missionary and U.S. Government Schools,” *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 40, no. 1 (1990): 39.

88 *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended 30th June, 1875* (Ottawa: Maclean Roger & Co., 1876), 167.

the grounds that they needed to have control over both the school and the teacher. The Lenape put up similar obstacles in this instance wishing not for a Moravian, but rather for “an Indian for schoolmaster” with two men, Albert Tobias and Francis Wampum, vying for the job.<sup>89</sup> The Canadian government, through the Indian Office, had the final say over the appointment, with neither Tobias or Wampum, nor a Moravian, appointed in this case.<sup>90</sup>

Despite the challenges that Hartmann encountered from all sides, he was not deterred and continued to explore avenues for the re-establishment of a Moravian school, believing in the superiority of a Moravian religious education. The situation found its resolution in the offer by Dora Miller, a retired British Moravian schoolteacher, to establish a private school on the reserve. Thus, in 1875, after a lengthy period without a Moravian school, a private fee-free school with fifteen students was re-established upon the New Fairfield mission.<sup>91</sup> Within three years, the enrolment had doubled to include about a third of all baptized children on the reserve.<sup>92</sup> Hartmann saw the re-established Moravian day school on the reserve as being in competition, or opposition, to the Indian school, and hoped that the competition would “[stir] up the opposes [*sic*], to push on, vigorously, the education of the Indian children on the Reserve” with the “great objective” of “the bringing of the children to Jesus”.<sup>93</sup>

The Moravians were keen to maintain influence over the children through schooling so that these children would grow up within the church and stay true to it. This struggle surrounding access to the minds and hearts of Lenape children, however, was not limited to the competition between the Moravian and the Lenape school, but was also carried out on denominational lines between the Moravians and the Methodists. By 1902, the Moravians had passed their work amongst the Lenape to the Canadian Methodist Episcopal Church, due to, according to the Moravian historian J. E. Hutton, “sectarian controversy.”<sup>94</sup> The point here is not how this transformation took place, but rather that during the period that the Moravians spent amongst the Lenape,

89 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Eighth General Meeting*, 13.

90 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the One Hundred and One General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1877), Appendix B, 11.

91 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Ninth General Meeting*, Appendix A, 6; *Abstract of the Proceedings of the One Hundredth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1876), Appendix B, 11.

92 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the One Hundred and Fifth General Meeting of the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen...*, (Bethlehem, Pa.: Moravian Publication Office, 1881), Appendix A, 14.

93 *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Ninety-Ninth General Meeting*, Appendix A, 6.

94 J. E. Hutton, *A History of Moravian Missions* (London: Moravian Publications Office, 1922), 248.

For legal reasons, this figure is  
not available in open access

Fig. 3. Mission school house in New Fairfield (Moraviantown), Ontario, 1895 (Moravian Archives, Bethlehem)

much effort was spent in providing education that fulfilled the expectations that Moravians had for the maintenance of a morally upstanding Christian community. Instead of concentrating on a Sunday school or another form of Christian education outside of the school room that could complement the secular education that children received in the Lenape controlled classroom, Hartmann strove to gain control of the day school as this was the site where he believed he could have the most influence on the next generation of Christian Lenape. Education through day schools was a universally important aspect of the Moravian Church, however, as the case study of New Fairfield demonstrates, the provision of education was not a simple process, rather it was contingent upon numerous factors that missionaries in the field were not always able to control.

## Conclusion

Globally, missionary schooling had the ability to influence not only the education and formation of children but also political and religious allegiances, and thus, schooling was a contested resource over which many different people wished to maintain or obtain control. Missionary bodies were often the first and only groups to offer education to indigenous peoples at the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, by the end of the century many governments around the globe wished to exert more influence over the schooling of their

citizens and subjects. Indigenous peoples also articulating their needs and wants in terms of educational outcomes. The mission at New Fairfield was similar to many other Moravian missions around the globe, being the first group to offer Western education to the Lenape, and maintaining the school as an important means of encouraging the spiritual, mental and physical development of their pupils. By the end of the century, however, the missionaries at New Fairfield were not the only suppliers of education, with a secular school funded through the Indian Office also offering schooling for the Lenape. This school took children away from the influence of the Moravians, who fought hard to maintain their footing on the reserve where they had invested over one hundred years of effort, money and personnel.. The Methodists tried to gain a stronger hold over the Lenape by offering free schooling to children of parents who were willing to change denominational allegiances, With the Lenape themselves expressing a wish for self-empowerment in their desire to have one of their own running any prospective school. Within these competing expectations regarding the education of mission inhabitants in the mid- to late nineteenth century, those held by the Moravians did not match what the Lenape themselves wished for, and constant and willful Lenape disengagement with missionary schooling undermined the aims and aspirations of the mission.

In a broader context, this article demonstrates that the emphasis Moravians placed on educating their own people in the eighteenth century was also spread to the mission fields and continued into the nineteenth century. An important aspect of the Moravian and larger Pietist tradition was the emphasis upon reading in order that individuals, regardless of race, would have access to the Bible allowing for personal and individual devotion. Furthermore, schools were seen to be the nurseries of the church from which new generations of members would be raised both in European and Euro-American contexts, as well as in the mission field. In these fields, the Christian education provided by the Moravians, with its focus upon moral, religious and practical teachings, also complemented the expectations that colonial governments had for their indigenous subjects. This complementary stance allowed for some symbiotic relationships between the Moravians and colonial governments in various locations. However, the various peoples under Moravian care in different locations had diverse needs and desires that were often actively expressed and negotiated. Many indigenous people willingly attended missionary schools, but they were not passive recipients and missionaries found it necessary to cooperate with potential pupils and their parents. Thus, although schooling was a universal aspect of mission work, it was also a source of tension, negotiation, acceptance, and resistance on the part of multiple actors. This paper serves as a call for more research to be undertaken into nineteenth-century Moravian educational history to uncover the complexity of collaborations, constraints, and expectations within mission schools, and how those involved responded.