

LUTHER AND THE ANABAPTISTS

Luther and Early Religious Radicals

Luther's Reformation activity created great religious excitement and alarm, first in his own region of Central Germany and then rapidly throughout all of Europe. From early on his exchanges with a growing body of Roman Catholic opponents took on a theological and ecclesiological cast. He had not been content to rest with a protest against only the abuses of Rome, even though that is where he began. He went beyond and differed from the shape of religious opposition to Rome that developed among Reformers in South Germanic cities and towns. His struggle with Rome was increasingly, profoundly theological.

But there developed within the new evangelical circles a series of divergences from Luther's views, divergences which expressed themselves first in radicality of religious act and thought, and finally in open challenges to Luther's own religious positions. Edwards has rightly observed that in response to these "inner" attacks Luther relied less on theology and more on claims about himself, about his primacy in the battle with Rome; and he developed an increasing abusiveness in *ad hominem* attacks on these evangelical foes, who did not reciprocate.¹ In Luther's defence one should say that it was aggravating beyond measure to endure the fury and might of Rome, and to wrestle with his own doubts about the justice of his entire religious enterprise, only to have erstwhile supporters and even friends in that struggle turn against him. The Anabaptist protest, and Luther's response to it, falls within this context.²

The earliest Evangelicals to challenge Luther were the Zwickau Prophets, Thomas Müntzer and Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, all of whom began after Worms. They made necessary Luther's premature return from his Wartburg exile without his prince's permission in March 1522.³ His responses to these three Evangelical opponents were dissimilar in degree: for example, he never found the Prophets as disturbing as Müntzer and Karlstadt. We will focus briefly then on the latter two.

Müntzer was a mystic who likened his inner suffering and struggle toward faith to the suffering of Christ. By his third and fourth years of Reformation activity he had become sceptical and then openly scornful, of Luther's "fictitious" faith,⁴ false, he thought, precisely in its emphasis on forensic justification and its consequent absence of moral living. Müntzer's God reconciled man to himself through stages of the human's mystical perception, most of them painful because the inner self had to be purged and even killed, as Christ had been purged by suffering and killed. But the process resulted in a human capable of obeying God, of living a righteous life, again like Christ. Luther's Jesus was the "sweet Christ" to whom Müntzer contrasted his own experientially "bitter Christ".⁵ When the Saxon princes rejected his evangelical message, he turned even greater attention to the development of his *Bund*, the body of committed Christians who opened themselves fully to the Word and its inner work. Müntzer's *Bund* became a clustering

of egalitarian-minded peasants and artisans bent on some indefinable sectarian goal with a communal morality; it became also a para-military organization pointed toward the redress of lower class grievances through the use of the sword. Here Müntzer's mystical thought searched for outward form or expression, unlike many of his German mystical predecessors. Goertz has welded together Müntzer's inner mysticism and outer egalitarian activities better than any other historian, most of whom have either muted the religious element (the Marxists) or have considered his revolutionary views irrational.⁶ Some have found Müntzer to be too self-contradictory to warrant any intelligible explanation.⁷

Luther became increasingly hostile to the "turbulent Spirit" whose evangelical militarism was shocking to the point of blasphemy. The deviants within the evangelical camp became in Müntzer and his followers the most dangerous of all Luther's opponents, compared to which the struggle with Rome was mere child's play. But Müntzer was eliminated as a serious ongoing block to Luther's gospel because of the debacle of Frankenhäusen followed by his own demise. Karlstadt posed a more serious, because more continuous, threat.

The points of conflict between Karlstadt and Luther were first those of alterations in the mass and second the rate of change in church practice.⁸ In Luther's view Karlstadt was hasty on both points, thereby doing damage to the gospel. Late in December 1521 while Luther was still in the Wartburg, Karlstadt initiated a new celebration of the mass in which he omitted those parts which offered body and blood as a sacrifice to God; clothed himself not in the symbolic priestly robes but in a long, grey mantle; and distributed communion in both kinds. Riots ensued; the changes were too startling, and the populace could not restrain itself. Of course the Saxon princes were deeply disturbed. Luther himself finally left his seclusion to quell those disturbances left by both Karlstadt and others (Zwilling, the Zwickau Prophets, etc.); and in an eight-day series of remarkable sermons he restored order by advocating moderation in the introduction of religious change; humans could not break religious custom so drastically without serious damage to their faith.

A discredited Karlstadt moved increasingly toward the margins of religious life and thought in Wittenberg, both town and university. By 1524 he decided to leave, partly in order to rectify a particular church abuse of which he had been the financial beneficiary. For some years his archdeaconry position at Wittenberg brought him the income from the parish at Orlamünde, a town some distance from Wittenberg. He moved there to take up the village priesthood position, and also to inaugurate those changes in church practice which he felt the new teachings demand. He practised an egalitarianism which included farming alongside his peasant parishioners. He changed the mass drastically. But above all he tried to bring into existence a community of saints, a church which was pure, or at least purer than that which, in his estimation, Luther's policies were producing.

These evangelical deviants-radicals opposed Luther's gospel at the point of the faith-ethics relation: Lutheran faith was morally unproductive and even counterproductive. They held that the moral tone of the Saxony churches had deteriorated with the advent of the Reformation. Fiery, impetuous Müntzer imposed his own ethical interpretation and perished; Karlstadt eventually fled to an only slightly more hospitable region in the South, to Reformed territory. Lesser Evangelical figures, such as Georg Witzel and Jakob Strauss, returned in disgust to the Catholic church, though not in spirit to Rome itself. They retained a spiritual limbo between Evangelicals and Catholics, and were accepted by neither.⁹

Luther opposed these religious leaders primarily because of a fundamental difference of opinion on the relation between faith and ethics. "It is a fictitious expression to speak of a 'holy man', just as it is a fictitious expression to speak of God's falling into sin; for by the nature of things, this cannot be".¹⁰ Luther gradually came to regard Müntzer and Karlstadt as heaven-stormers who denied the power, but also therefore the grace, of God in those forms which God had announced in the gospel; they substituted their own acts of religious heroism and thereby created their own means of salvation. By 1525 his mind was fixed on that interpretation.¹¹

The Anabaptists

The Anabaptists arose in several locations apparently independently to each other,¹² never therefore creating a unified movement about which the historian can give a theological description that is universally valid. But whether in Zurich, Emden-Amsterdam, Nürnberg or Saxony as presumably independent hearths, Anabaptists did distinguish themselves from their Reformation as well as Catholic opponents by emphases on discipleship, communal Christianity with its group ethics and group discernment of scriptural understanding, biblicism as against spiritualist authority, an ethic of love as expressed in non-resistance to warfare but also generous mutual aid, membership through individual persuasion and believers' baptism, and discipline via excommunication when necessary. Theirs was not a dogmatic nor even a confessional Christianity; its emphasis was far more on living in faithfulness to the example of Christ than on a doctrinal formulation of truths about God, salvation, etc. All of this has been explicated sufficiently within the past 40 years to require no further general comments here.

The Anabaptists of Central Germany, of Luther lands, ought to be the subject of our closer examination, because they are the ones to whom Luther had some minimal access and because Lutherans were the focus of both their evangelization efforts and their religious polemics.¹³ Here the movement began with the missionizing activities of one of Müntzer's disciples, the mystic Hans Hut. In a whirlwind evangelizing tour of southern Saxony and Franconia beginning in the summer of 1526, Hut moved from one clandestine assembly to another, preaching the imminent return of Christ (dated by him around Pentecost, 1528) and the urgent need for repentance and believers' baptism. He never

remained in Central Germany long enough to build congregations; that task was left to some of his disciples, but largely to Anabaptists who had drunk at different springs. Melchior Rinck was the foundational leader of Central German Anabaptists.

Rinck's reformation activities fell within the span of only a few years - from his 1523 evangelical work in Hersfeld to his late-1531 final incarceration after his arrest at Vacha in the Fulda Abbacy. Within those years he moved from Catholic to Lutheran to Müntzerian to Denckian Anabaptism, ultimately shaping a biblical-mystical position of his own that fitted, in his opinion, the requirements of an anti-Luther evangelical option. His followers and others carried on the clandestine work after his enforced withdrawal. But his theological influence remained.

Rinck's soteriological *ordo salutis* was that one ought to "better oneself, abstain from sin, wish to repent, and have faith in the forgiveness of sins".¹⁴ On the surface that explanation appears to be not only mystical but even Pelagian. But Rinck always insisted that each stage in this process toward God was itself the product of God's work and even God's initiative. When the individual had become conscious of his own sinful condition and of the forgiveness which God offered, he should symbolize that understanding with believers' baptism, which was not in itself a conferral of the grace of God. But soteriology included regeneration, again the work of God himself, by which the human was changed ontologically so that he could abstain from sin and live a moral life - not one of absolute purity but substantially so. In any event the process was not a Lutheran justification with an imputed righteousness. In Rinck's surviving works, or the testimonies of his disciples, one encounters much more emphasis on ethics than on soteriology.¹⁵

Within the first two decades after Hut began to preach the Anabaptist gospel there developed a wide range and variety of Anabaptists in Central Germany, impossible to characterize with leaders such as Rinck because most of those leaders were successful at remaining underground and almost anonymous.¹⁶ It is primarily their followers who appear in the extant court records. But there were also Melchiorite spiritualists, wild fanatics such as a miracle-working unnamed "Prophet"¹⁷ as well as sober evangelists and congregational leaders of the more Rinckian Anabaptist variety.

Using Rinck's soteriology as normative for Central German Anabaptists, one needs to turn to ethics as their central concern. Their declarations on soteriology were more negative than positive; they said more about the falseness of Lutheran faith than they did about the truth of their own formulations. And to them the falseness of that Lutheran faith was its absence of fruit. They quoted Matt.7.16: "You will know them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles?" Indeed, their emphasis on morality in the Christian life appears to have been their most effective argument in winning converts in Luther lands.¹⁸ It brought them closer to Evangelicals who returned to Catholicism - Strauss and Witzel - than to the Lutherans.

The configuration of their ethical concerns did not begin (as some Mennonite interpreters would have it, in the case of the larger Anabaptist movement) with social ethics, especially with nonresistance to war. They were more concerned with purity of personal life and then with Anabaptist communal sharing and aid. The ethical injunctions of the Hutterite Peter Riedemann, who wrote his *Account* while in loose confinement in a Central German prison, come very close to the heart of their own ethical concerns.¹⁹ Most of them rejected community of goods as too extreme, but insisted on freely sharing with brothers and sisters in need. Some, perhaps many, went to the Hutterite locations in Moravia, both for the relative safety for the exercise of their faith, but also one suspects because there was some larger similarity of ethical interest. All of this was encapsulated in their view by the concept of discipleship, whether they used the term *Nachfolge* or not - following after Jesus as model for life.

They never displayed much evidence of having read or understood Luther. One of them admitted that he had read Melancthon's *Loci communes*, and confessed that he did not think much of the work.²⁰ They evaluated Luther and Lutheranism unfairly, judging it on the basis of observations of Lutheran pastors and parishioners in those formative years of the Lutheran church when many pastors were confused by the new teachings and inadvertently turned them into a cheap and easy grace. But their ignorance of Luther and relative indifference to learning about him should not disguise the fact that their religion was vastly different from his.

Luther on the Anabaptists

With one exception Luther knew the Anabaptists only second-hand. Late in life, in 1541, he finally met an Anabaptist, Hans Sturm, and examined him theologically. Sturm turned out to be one of the more spiritualistic types, probably a follower of Hofmann.²¹ His own network of correspondents gave him some information, probably more than the extant letters indicate.²² One could speculate that he learned even more from oral sources, from persons who visited him in Wittenberg especially but also from Melancthon and Justus Menius who did know Anabaptists. But his own evaluation of his knowledge remains valid: he admitted that he did not know much about them when he wrote his tract against their views of baptism, and suggested that his tract might incite them to reply so that he could ascertain their views better.²³ His declarations on the subject of Anabaptism were frequent, but always short; they consisted primarily of miscellaneous comments on baptism, the Christian's relation to the state or how to treat those poor deluded souls. In the absence of fuller knowledge, he unselfconsciously read the Zwickau Prophets, Müntzer and Karlstadt into their views, in which opinion he was not altogether wrong.²⁴ No twentieth century historian should heavily censure Luther, a perceptive sixteenth century observer, for failing to distinguish clearly among the bewildering varieties of religious figures.

Luther's theological opposition to the Anabaptists was rooted in soteriology, and never got much beyond that. He was appalled

at their rejection of the sacraments as means of grace; to deny that was blasphemy itself - to deny the power and autonomy of God and replace it with human rationality about the way God worked, or ought to work, with humans. On the Anabaptists Luther did not discuss the issue with respect to the mass; he had treated it more thoroughly in his exchanges with the Sacramentarians. He did focus on baptism as the single most important issue to discuss when he approached the topic of the Anabaptists. Their rejection of infant baptism and practice of believers' baptism constituted a denial of the gracious power of God in a form which God had ordained and which humans could therefore only accept gratefully. The Anabaptists in his opinion substituted their own, subjective perceptions about the way God worked for the more objective way which God himself chose.

God justified the human through grace, made him righteous in the sight of God. This was an act of God in which he moved toward humans, in contrast to the view of the Anabaptists and many Roman Catholics who conceived of the salvific movement between the human and God as man-initiated: Luther's God descended to man, both because he was gracious and loving in intention and act but also because he was "wholly other" in being. To Luther unlikeness between God and man, not likeness, was the basis for fellowship between God and man. So in one sense at least man remained after justification the same as he had been before, namely, a sinner. In many ways Luther's *simul iustus et peccator* (at the same time justified and sinner) is the very centre of his theology, certainly of his anthropology. Luther saw wholeness in man, not a division between body and soul, or flesh and spirit, or inner and outer to use the mystics' (and some Anabaptists') terminology. It was because sinful man was totally unlike God that God justified man, imputed righteousness to him, in order to restore a fellowship that had been shattered by man's sin.²⁵

Or, let us look at salvation from the vantage point of the *nova creatura*, a concept used by both Luther and the Anabaptists. Luther did not exclude the concept of the new man; but that new creature was alien, a perpetual stranger both before and also after justification, to the real, the genuine human being. In any event the essential mark of the new creature was not his moral behaviour; he did not make any progress toward some greater purity of life. But he did progress toward a more thorough understanding and condemnation of himself as sinner - he progressed, so to speak, as self-conscious sinner in dire need of God's grace. He grew in penance rather than in holiness.²⁶ Even though neither the Anabaptists nor Luther discussed this theological difference between them, one can say for the Anabaptists that they never tried to measure the amount or degree of moral goodness in regenerated humans; nor did they postulate progress toward an ever greater moral goodness, toward some beatific condition of perfection in this life. But the *nova creatura* could do good, of his own will; and this good was itself pleasing to God. A few of them were synergistic; man cooperated with God in his own salvation.²⁷ That view was not only heresy but also blasphemy to Luther.

Beyond the issue of baptism within soteriology, Luther wrote little against the Anabaptists. On a few occasions he charged them with works-righteousness.²⁸ Had he known them better he surely would have expanded on that charge. He accused the Anabaptists of having no proper, divine call to the office of preaching, and reviled them for evangelizing clandestinely, for being "Sneaks and Hedge-Preachers".²⁹ He observed that they subverted society by breaking family ties in order to wander with fellow believers from one place to another.³⁰ His catalogue of Anabaptist errors was surprisingly meagre. One must reiterate that he did not try to distinguish among a wide range of Reformation radicals, and he had dealt with their errors in many tracts not necessarily directed against Anabaptists.

What should be done with the Anabaptists? Every student of the Reformation knows the harshness of Luther's attitude toward Jews, peasants, Anabaptists, and other deviants, and also his skill at vituperation. Luther was a very angry man. It should not surprise us that he counselled death for heretics, including Anabaptists. What seems surprising to this observer is his reluctance in arriving at that conclusion. He always retained a negativism about death for heretics because "... I am terrified by the example of the papists and the Jews before Christ, for when there was a statute for the killing of false prophets and heretics, in time it came about that only the most saintly and innocent were killed... I cannot admit that false teachers are to be put to death. It is enough to banish".³¹ But what if the heretic was also seditious? What if he disrupted society, even to the point of potentially inciting rebellion? Then death was a necessary sentence, not for false belief but only for sedition. As the years wore on the example of Müntzer burned in Luther's memory. False belief could indeed lead to blasphemy - by Luther's definition the public proclamation of false belief - and even to insurrection. By February 1530 therefore Luther began to declare that the death sentence for Anabaptists was necessary.³² But by 1540 he may have reverted to his earlier position of exile only for Anabaptist heretics, or so a chance comment in the *Table Talk* seems to indicate.³³ In any event he was never as callously indifferent to the suffering of humans who erred religiously as was Melancthon.³⁴ Perhaps Luther felt too close to the stake himself.

Some Concluding Comments

1. The content, spirit and tenor of the sixteenth century writings of Luther and the Anabaptists against each other indicate only disagreement. This should not blind us to the reality of some agreement, and at least some dependence of the Anabaptists upon Luther. Anabaptists were aware of Luther's leadership in the break with Rome, and their own religious predilections ought to have made them grateful. They should have been even more grateful to him for his leadership in releasing the Word, in opening up Scripture for fresh interpretations that revitalized the Christian religion. Or again, Luther emphasized with penetrating theological insight and great skill in articulation that sin was absolutely destructive of the

God-human relation. For our own times we can properly praise him for bringing a sedulousness of study to Scripture long before the advent of higher criticism. And he understood and explicated the mystery and power of evil, again long before Auschwitz and Sartre. The Anabaptists hardly seemed to notice.

2. Theological and ecclesiastical differences between Luther and the Anabaptists were only vaguely realized by both parties; they must therefore be put forward in our own times on the basis of deriving respective points of view from evidence other than their carping criticisms of each other. Each side talked past the other; they engaged in no direct *Gespräch* of the type employed in the South by the Reformed groups. Not only did they not understand each other; each side seemed not to care about trying. And so they engaged primarily in vituperation, at which Luther was of course a master. To focus on his squabbles with the Anabaptists is hardly the best way to appreciate the man in an anniversary year.

3. Neither side got around to discussing what may be the single most important difference between them for our own times: the nature of the church. In a review of John M. Todd, *Luther: A Life* (Crossroad, 1983) and Peter Manns, *Martin Luther: An Illustrated Biography*, trans. by M. Shaw (Crossroads, 1983), J. M. Cameron suggests that the "sectarianism" of the Anabaptists might well have been drawn logically from Luther's own premises: *sola fide*, *sola scriptura*, the priesthood of all believers, might logically require withdrawal of Christians from a sinful society and especially require the exclusion of the state from any authority within the group of believers.³⁵ Cameron scores both Todd and Manns for failing even to raise the possibility of dependence on this point. In our late twentieth century secularized society the *Volkskirche* claim of the church to be territorially valid and binding, seems utterly anachronistic. An Anabaptist free church ecclesiology seems much more appropriate. But perhaps even on this point the Anabaptists might have drawn their inspiration from Luther's ideas and words, if not from his acts. Again they seem not to have noticed.

NOTES

- 1 Mark U. Edwards, *Luther and the False Brethren* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1975), pp.2-3. Edwards does not include the Anabaptists in his treatment, which is surely a mistake; but most of the generalizations he makes about Luther's treatment of radical opponents and their responses would apply also to the Anabaptists.
- 2 It is difficult to cite representative works on the Anabaptists because of the large number of monographs that have appeared within the past 25 years, focusing on narrow topics. Two works which cover them theologically and socially ought to be noted here. George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962); and Claus-Peter Clasen, *Anabaptism: A Social History, 1525-1618* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1972).
- 3 John S. Oyer, *Lutheran Reformers Against Anabaptists: Luther, Melancthon*

- and *Menius and the Anabaptists of Central Germany* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1964), chap.1; Edwards, *passim*.
- 4 *Von dem getichten glawben*, printed in Günther Franz and Paul Kirn, eds., *Thomas Müntzer Schriften und Briefe: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1968), pp.217-24; translated and edited by James M. Stayer, "Thomas Müntzer's Protestation and Imaginary Faith", *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, LV (1981), 122-30 (hereafter *MQR*).
 - 5 *Hoch verursachte Schutzrede*, in Franz, 322-43; translated and edited by Hans J. Hillerbrand, "Thomas Muentzer's Last Tract Against Martin Luther", *MQR*, XXXVIII (1964), 20-36.
 - 6 Hans-Jürgen Goertz, *Innere und äussere Ordnung in der Theologie Thomas Müntzers* (Leiden: Brill, 1967). See his essay on the theme of mysticism and revolution, "The Mystic with the Hammer; Thomas Müntzer's Theological Basis for Revolution", *MQR*, L (1976), 83-113.
 - 7 In an otherwise strong, older work, Hinrichs lays too much weight on a jealousy of and rivalry to Luther at the expense of understanding Müntzer in his own right. Carl Hinrichs, *Luther und Müntzer: Ihre Auseinandersetzung über Obrigkeit und Widerstandsrecht* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1952).
 - 8 Edwards, *op.cit.*, *passim*; Oyer, *op.cit.*, 21-28.
 - 9 Georg Witzel has not attracted the scholarly attention that he deserves. See Winfried Trusen, *Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche; zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1957); his more than one hundred tracts have been handled bibliographically by Gregor Richter, *Die Schriften Georg Witzels bibliographisch bearbeitet* (Fulda, 1913; reprint Nieuwkoop: de Graaf, 1963). For Strauss see Joachim Rogge, *Der Beitrag des Predigers Jakob Strauss zur frühen Reformationsgeschichte* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957); and John S. Oyer, "The Influence of Jakob Strauss on the Anabaptists", in Marc Lienhard, ed., *The Origins and Characteristics of Anabaptism* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1977), pp.62-82. Witzel showed much interest in Anabaptists such as Rinck who protested against what they thought to be Lutheran unethical behaviour.
 - 10 Carter Lindberg, "Justice and Injustice in Luther's Judgment of 'Holiness Movements'", paper delivered at the International Consultation of Theologians "Disclosing Luther's Ecumenical Significance", Oct. 12-15, 1982, at Bildungshaus Maria Rosenberg, Waldfischbach, West Germany (to be published in 1983), p.1, n.1; "Commentary on Psalm 51 (1532)", *Luther's Works*, Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehmann, eds. (55 vols.; St Louis: Concordia, 1955 ff.) (hereafter *LW*), XII, 325.
 - 11 Luther's most important tract against the Radicals was "Against the Heavenly Prophets in the Matter of Images and Sacraments, 1525", *LW*, XL, 73-224.
 - 12 Williams, *op.cit.*, postulated three geographical origins: Zürich, Amsterdam and Nürnberg. See also James M. Stayer, Werner O. Packull, and Klaus Deppermann, "From Monogenesis to Polygenesis: The Historical Discussion of Anabaptist Origins", *MQR*, XLIX (1975), 83-121.
 - 13 Oyer, *Lutheran Reformers*, chaps. ii and iii: Paul Wappler, *Die Täuferbewegung in Thüringen von 1526-1584* (Jena: Fischer, 1913).
 - 14 "Verhör Melchior Rincks in Marburg", in Günther Franz et al, eds., *Urkundliche Quellen zur hessischen Reformationsgeschichte*, IV, *Wiedertäuferakten 1527-1626* (Marburg: Elwert, 1951), Article 4, p.8.
 - 15 John S. Oyer, "Luther and the Anabaptists on *simul iustus et peccator* and

- the New Creature", paper delivered at the International Consultation of Theologians "Disclosing Luther's Ecumenical Significance", Oct.12-15, 1982, at Bildungshaus Maria Rosenberg, Waldfischbach, West Germany (to be published in 1983), p.5.
- 16 For instance, Mathes Hasenhan, Ludwig Spon, all shadowy creatures about whom one gains only vague bits of information from the trials of some of their followers.
 - 17 As Melchiorites, the Tasch-Schnabel group in Franz, *Urkundliche Quellen, passim*; and Oyer, *Lutheran Reformers*, 72-74. For the "Prophet" see Wappler, *Thüringen*, pp.81-85.
 - 18 For instance, two converts of Rinck, Adam Angersbach and Heinz Ot, in Wappler, *Thüringen*, 328-29, 330.
 - 19 For instance, Riedemann has sections on paying taxes, making cutlery, making clothing, on standing drinks in taverns, as well as the more usual topics such as relation to governments. Peter Riedemann, *Rechenschaft unsrer Religion, Lehre und Glaubens* (Cayley, Alberta: Huterischen Brüder, 1962; but many editions, including some in English).
 - 20 Peter Lose testimony, in Franz, *Urkundliche Quellen*, p.191.
 - 21 See the account in Paul Wappler, *Inquisition und Ketzerprozesse in Zwickau zur Reformationszeit* (Leipzig: Heinsius, 1908), pp.34-49.
 - 22 *Tischreden*, in *Luthers sämmtliche Werke*, ed. by J. G. Plockmann and J. K. Irmischer (67 vols.; Erlangen: Heyder u. Zimmer, 1826 ff.), LXI, 83 (hereafter *EA*), where he had heard from the Abbot of Fulda; *ibid*, 89-90; *D. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. by K. Burdach et al., (Weimar: Böhlau, 1930 ff.) (hereafter *WB*), VIII, 111-12; for some examples. I apologize for using several different editions of Luther's works.
 - 23 Martin Luther, *Von der Widertauffe an zwen Pfarherrn, ein Brief* (Wittenberg: Wachter, 1528), p.Eiii recto. Translated as "Concerning Rebaptism", *LW*, XL, 225-262.
 - 24 Oyer, *Lutheran Reformers*, chaps. iv and viii.
 - 25 Lindberg, *op.cit*.
 - 26 *Ibid*.
 - 27 Oyer, "Luther and the Anabaptists on *simul iustus et peccator*" for comments on Hubmaier and Menno.
 - 28 "Vorrede" to Justus Menius, *Der Widdertauffer Lere vnd Gemeinnis aus heiliger Schrift widderlegt* (Wittenberg: Schirlentz, 1530), pp. Aiv recto-verso; Exegesis of Matt. 5, 6, 7, in *EA*, XLIII, 317-21.
 - 29 "Ein Brieff D. Mart. Luthers, Von den Schleichern vnd Winckel-predigern", *D. Martin Luthers Werke; Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, ed. by J. K. F. Knaake et al. (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883-1914), XXX, Part 3, 515-27.
 - 30 *Von der Widertauffe*, p. Aiv recto; Letter to J. Hess, Jan. 1528, *WB*, IV, 371-72.
 - 31 Letter to Johannes Brenz, *WB*, IV, 498-99, quoted here from Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1950), p.314.
 - 32 "Exposition of Psalm 82", *LW*, XIII, 39-72.
 - 33 *Tischreden*, *EA*, LXI, 91.

34 For instance, see Philip Melancthon, *Das weltliche Oberkeitt den Wider-taufferen mit leiblicher Straff zu weren schuldig sey* (Wittenberg: Klug, 1536).

35 J. M. Cameron, "Sleepwalker", *New York Review*, Feb. 17, 1983, pp.8-10.

JOHN S. OYER

* * * * *

Recent publications available from the Treasurer:

The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century

(Volume 1 of the new *History of the English Baptists*)

by B. R. White of Regent's Park College, Oxford

£4.95, US \$10.00.

Baptists in the Twentieth Century

edited by Keith Clements

This volume presents the papers given at the 1983 Summer School of the Society. They include material on Baptist Church life, Baptists and Politics, J. H. Shakespeare and the ecumenical movement, Baptist architects etc.

£4.95 US \$10.00.