

ANABAPTISTS, BAPTISTS, AND THEIR STEPCHILDREN



by

Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. Francis Nigel Lee

(formerly Chairman of the Departments of Church History and Systematic Theology,
Queensland Presbyterian Theological College, Brisbane, Australia)

2006 improved edition

OTHER WORKS ON ANABAPTISM AND BAPTISM BY DR. FRANCIS NIGEL LEE

1970

Recommended Baptismal Procedure in a Reformed Church. 1970. 5 pp.

1971

The Salvation of Early-Dying Infants (in Afrikaans). South Africa, *N.G.T.T.*, 1971. 15 pp.

You Are Baptizing Incorrectly! (in Afrikaans). South Africa, NGK Publishers, 1971. 15 pp.

1976

What About Baptism? Scotland, Scottish Reformed Fellowship, 1976. 17 pp.

1980

Neglecting Baby? (in Korean). *Korean Journal of Reformed Theology*, 1980. 12 pp.

1981

Baptismal Regeneration False! 1981. 10 pp.

Have You Neglected Your Baby? Australia, Jesus Lives. 1981. 13 pp.

Calvin on Grace Before Baptism. 1981. 14 pp.

1986

Calvin versus Catabaptism. 1986. 7 pp.

Revealed to Babies! Dallas U.S.A., Commonwealth Publishers. 1986. 20 pp.

Pentecostalism: New Outpouring or Old Heresy? Tex., Commonwealth Pubs. 1986. 79 pp.

Water-and-Spirit Baptism at First Corinthians 12:13. 1986

What Is the Baptism of the Spirit? 1986. 5 pp.

1990

Baptism Does Not Cleanse! Calvin vs. christening & Baptismal Regeneration 1990. 152 pp.

Calvinism versus Catabaptism. Apr. 1990. 8 pp.

Calvin on the Unrepeatability of Triune Baptism. Apr. 1990. 6 pp.

Rebaptism Impossible: Baptism Biblically Unrepeatable! 1990. 540 pp.

Sprinkling Is Scriptural! England, *The Presbyterian*, 1990. 44 pp.

The Church Universal Always Disapproved of Rebaptisms. 1990.

1991

Baby Belief Before Baptism. I-II. 1991. 665 pp.

The Roots and the Rise of Anabaptist Heretics. Australia, *FACS*, 1991. 8 pp.

Have You Been Neglecting Your Baby? England, *The Presbyterian*, 1991 rep. 16 pp.

1992

Thornwell on the Validity of Romish Baptism. England, *The Presbyterian*. 1992.

1995

The Anabaptists and Their Stepchildren. 1995 ed. 62 pp.

Infant Salvation: Are Any Dying in Infancy Lost? 1995 ed. 224 pp.

1998

Modern Baptists as the Very Stepchildren of the Anabaptists. Dec. 1998. 3 pp.

Rebaptism is Sin. Dec. 1998. 135 pp.

The Absurd Sin of Rebaptism. Nov. 1998. 19 pp.

The Westminster Confession versus Rebaptism. Dec. 1998. 2 pp.

1999

How to Keep on Improving Your Baptism. Jan. 1999. 2 pp.

2000

The Repudiation of Anabaptism by the Ex-Anabaptist Leader Obbe Philips. 2000. 5pp.

The Sins of Adult Rebaptism and Leaving One's Babies Unbaptized. 2000. 115 pp.

2001

Augustine on So-Called "Baptismal Regeneration." July 2001. 15 pp.

Baptismal and Mariological Protestant-Romanist Dialogues. June 2001. 12 pp.

Calvin on the Validity of 'Romish' Baptism. Mar. 2001. 50 pp.

Catabaptism in the Presbyterian Church in America. Mar. 2001. 59 pp.

Modern Eastern-Orthodox Tendency to (Re-)Baptize Even Converts from Romanism.

Pentecost Sunday: God's Spirit Poured Out. Nov. 2001. 7 pp.

Protestantized Romanists not to be Rebaptized. Feb. 2001. 3 pp.

The Sin of Rebaptism. June 2001. 9 pp.

2002

All Triune Baptisms Are Unrepeatable. July 2002. 2 pp.

Baptismal Practices of Huss and the 'Bohemian Brethren.' June 2002. 5 pp.

Baptismal Practices of Waldo and his Waldensians. June 2002. 4 pp.

Baptismal Practices of Wycliffe and his Lollards. June 2002. 2 pp.

Calvin's Last Word on the Antichrist and Papal Baptism. June 2002. 2 pp.

Improve Your Baptism! July 2002. 2 pp.

Knox vs. Thornwell on the Validity of Baptisms in the Romish Church. June 2002. 2 pp.

Lee vs. Mary Collins: Converts from Rome are Not to be Rebaptized. June 2002. 3 pp.

Luther on Baptism. June 2002. 6 pp.

Mormon Deology and Baptismology. Apr. 2002. 4 pp.

What Is Biblical Baptism? June 2002. 2 pp.

2003

Calvinists Should Not Have Babies Baptized in the Romish Church. Mar. 2003. 4 pp.

2004

Does Acts 18:25 to 19:5 Imply Johannine Baptism was Inadequate? Jan. 2004. 14 pp.

2005

What Is Spirit Baptism? Jan. 2005. 5 pp.

2006

From Circumcision to Baptism. Sept. 2006. 50 pp.

PREFACE: THE SINS OF REBAPTISM AND OF LEAVING BABIES UNBAPTIZED

According to both the Holy Bible and the *Westminster Standards*, being unbaptized or being rebaptized are sins. Too, omitting to have one's baby baptized, is to break God's Law.

Scripture teaches such three sins are transgressions of the Second Commandment of the Law of God. For the Decalogue commands that God be worshipped only in the authorized way -- and not through any 'graven images' or unauthorized practices (such as re- or non-baptism) contrary to His revealed will.

In Old Testament times, bodily circumcision was unrepeatable -- and recircumcision was and is impossible. Deuteronomy 10:16 & 30:6 and Jeremiah 4:4 & 9:25-26. Because circumcision has now been replaced by baptism, the latter too is unrepeatable -- and rebaptism impossible. Romans 4:11-25 & 6:1-5; Galatians 3:6-29; Colossians 2:11-13.

Only unitarians and apostates or heretics practised 'rebaptism' in the apostolic age. Mark 7:3-8; Acts 19:1-3; First Corinthians 11:18f & 15:29. To the Visible Church Universal of the Triune God, there was only one baptism -- trinitarian, life-long, and unrepeatable. Matthew 28:19f; Mark 16:15f; Romans 6:3-23; Ephesians 4:4-6; Colossians 2:6-16.

Hebrews 6:1-6 implies that those who get themselves re-baptized, 're-crucify' Christ. For it commands: "Do not again lay down...the doctrine of baptisms!... They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh!" See Francis Nigel Lee's *Rebaptism Impossible*.

The *Westminster Confession of Faith* 28:7 declares that "the sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person. Titus 3:5."

The *Westminster Larger Catechism* 108 & 112 rightly insists that the Second Commandment requires the proper "receiving of the sacraments. Matthew 28:19." Indeed, also the Third Commandment requires that the "sacraments...be holily and reverently used...by a holy profession. First Peter 3:15[-21]"

Consequently, the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 177 also requires "that baptism is to be administered but once with water -- to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ. Matthew 3:11 & Galatians 3:27."

God solemnly warns us not to neglect getting the sacrament of initiation administered to our own babies. See Francis Nigel Lee's *Have You Been Neglecting Your Baby? On the Serious Consequences of Withholding Baptism from the Infants of Christians*.

In Genesis 17:10-14, God demands all covenant babies "must needs" receive the sign of the covenant -- or be "cut off" from God's people for a "breach" of the covenant! Comments Calvin: "As God adopts the infant son in the person of his father, so when the father repudiates such a benefit -- the infant is said to cut himself off from the Church.... God indeed will not acknowledge those as among His people, who will not bear the mark and token of adoption!"

In Exodus 4:24-26, God sought to kill Moses -- for neglecting to give the sign of the covenant to his infant child. Comments Calvin: "Let us then learn from hence to use reverently the sacraments, which are the seals of God's grace -- lest He should severely avenge our despoliation of them!"

In Exodus 12:24-48, God debarb from the second sacrament ((Passover *cf.* the Supper) all adults whose infants still lack the first sacrament (circumcision *cf.* baptism). Comments Calvin: "They should also teach their children.... For doctrine may justly be called the life of sacraments.... The paschal lamb corresponds to the holy supper.... None but the initiated were admitted.... From the analogy between the holy supper and the passover, this Law remains in force now!"

In Ezekiel 44:7 -- a foreshadowing of the New Testament Church -- God rebukes those who have received the sacrament of initiation -- for bringing those who have not, to worship in His presence. Declares God: "You have brought into My sanctuary strangers, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in My sanctuary to pollute it.... They have broken My covenant!" What application does this have to baptized Baptists -- who regard their own babies as strangers to God but yet bring them to worship Him, with them, in His House?

In Luke 7:30, God declares that "the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized." Comments Calvin: "It was already an evidence of their piety, that they [the godly] presented themselves to be baptized.... The scribes, in despising the baptism of John -- shut against themselves, through their pride, the gate of faith.... Let us first guard against despising the very least of God's invitations, and be prepared in humility to commence with small and elementary instructions!"

In Acts 2:38f, God commands the penitent: "Be baptized every one of you..., for the promise is unto you and your children!" Comments Calvin: "This passage therefore sufficiently refutes the Anabaptists, who deny baptism to the children of the faithful while they are still infants, as though they were not members of the Church.... This gross presumption is of no profit to them!" And on Acts 11:16f: "Those who are opposing infant baptism, are waging war against God!"

According to the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 124-130, the Fifth Commandment requires fathers and mothers not to commit "sins" by "the neglect of the duties required of them" -- such as that of bringing their children to be baptized. "Second Kings 5:13; Ephesians 4:4-6 & 6:4; Deuteronomy 6:6f; Ezekiel 34:2-4." Indeed, the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 166 requires that "infants descending from parents either both or but one of them professing faith in Christ...are...to be baptized. Genesis 17:7f; Galatians 3:9f; Colossians 2:11f; Acts 2:38f; Romans 4:11f; First Corinthians 7:14; Matthew 28:19; Luke 18:15f; Romans 11:16."

Rightly does the *Westminster Confession* 28:4f therefore conclude that "also the infants of one or both believing parents, are to be baptized.... It be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance! Luke 7:30 & Exodus 4:24-26."

-- Rev. Professor Dr. Francis Nigel Lee

FOREWORD

It has been my good pleasure to know Doctor Francis Nigel Lee for many years.... His previous two works from us, are *Revealed to Babies* and *Pentecostalism* [subtitled *New Outpouring or Ancient Heresy?*]. Both works are presently sold out in the United States.

Doctor Lee is author of over three hundred books and pamphlets. His subject matter has covered such topics as the covenantal Sabbath, Christianity and Communism, a Christian View of the History of Philosophy, Church Architecture, the Importance of Family Devotions, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, *etc.*

This present work on Anabaptists and their history is another fine, well-documented book that is much in need by the Reformed community. Dr. Lee explains both the history and the strange beliefs of the groups that were on the radical fringes of Christendom during and shortly after the Middle Ages.

This work breaks some interesting ground in the ongoing controversy between modern-day Baptists and the rest of Christianity over the subject of paedobaptism.... Dr. Lee demonstrates conclusively that the mainstream of the Church has always baptized covenant infants....[and] that when a body or Church departs from the precious doctrine of paedobaptism, it usually departs in other fundamental teachings of Scripture as well.

The reader may be surprised to discover that the early Anabaptists did not submerge candidates for baptism, but either sprinkled or poured. What is even more surprising, is to learn that the Mediaeval Roman Church did submerge, and that the Romanist Council of Nemens allowed the Scripture mode of sprinkling only in the case of "emergencies."

Modern Baptists are fond of claiming that the Reformers simply adopted their doctrines concerning the Sacraments (especially Baptism) from the mediaeval Roman Church. Anyone who has studied the history of the Reformation knows better. Dr. Lee has brought together a multitude of documents written by the Reformers themselves. In these various documents, the Reformers from Wycliffe to the Westminster Assembly consistently argue against the false doctrine of anti-paedobaptism from Scripture -- as well as the whole history of the Church.

The Reverend Professor Doctor Francis Nigel Lee was Professor of Systematic Theology at Queensland Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Australia [until his retirement in 2000]. His doctoral degrees include those in philosophy, jurisprudence, education, and theology. Dr. Lee's career has included callings as Official Translator for the South African Congress; Barrister of the Supreme Court of South Africa; Minister of the Word and Sacraments in both the United States and the Republic of South Africa; Professor of Philosophy; Scholar-in-Residence at a Christian "Think-Tank"; and Academic Dean at an American College.... His major publications include: *About Sunday*; *Calvin on Creation*; *Calvin on the Sciences*; *A Christian Introduction to the History of Philosophy*; *Communism Versus Creation*; *Communist Eschatology*; *Effective Evangelism*; *Origin and Destiny of Man*; *The Central Significance of Culture*; and *The Covenantal Sabbath*.

-- Rev. Dr. Richard Bacon, Commonwealth Pubs, First Presbyterian Manse, Rowlett, Texas.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, Paternoster Press published a book with a very surprising title: *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*. The author was Leonard Verduin, Pastor of the Campus Chapel at the University of Michigan from 1941 till 1962. He also translated *The Complete Works of Menno Simons* (the leading Dutch Anabaptist). We shall therefore call Verduin a "Pro-Mennonite" -- for that is clearly what he was, and is, at heart.

In his book *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*, Verduin's aim was to try to present the Anabaptists as more authentically-Christian than the Protestant Reformers themselves. This present work of mine is a reply to that of Verduin. Hence its title: *Anabaptists, Baptists, and Their Stepchildren*.

On the one hand, I seek to show that the Anabaptists were not at all Protestants -- but essentially a medley of heretical wildcat sects. On the other hand, I seek to demonstrate that they were the post-mediaeval descendants of both ancient sects and mediaeval Romanism, and also the ancestors not only of Socialism and Communism but even of many modern cults -- and that they influenced especially the sacramentology also of Baptist Christians.

To a lesser extent, I also seek to show that not Anti-Reformed Romanism but paedobaptistic Reformation Protestantism alone is the true daughter of both the Hebrew Older Testament and the Apostles' Newer Testament as well as the patristic Church Universal. In particular, I would demonstrate that especially Calvinism is the true granddaughter of Biblical Christianity -- of which contemporary churches need to be, and future churches yet shall become, the true great-granddaughters.

"Original sin," one reads in King Edward the Sixth's 1553 *Forty-two Articles* of the Reformed Church of England, consists of the enduring taint of man's fallen condition -- and not just "in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, which also the Anabaptists do now-a-days renew.... All men are bound to keep the Moral Commandments of the Law.... The custom of the Church to baptize young children is to be commended, and in any wise to be retained in the Church.... The riches and goods of Christians are not commune [or to be owned in common] -- as touching the right title and possession of the same (as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast)....

"We judge that the Christian religion doth not prohibit but that a man may swear, when the Magistrate requireth.... They which say that the souls of such as depart hence to sleep, being without all sense...until the day of judgment; or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall be raised up with the same -- do utterly dissent from right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture....

"They that go about to renew the fable of heretics called [*Pre*]Millennari, be repugnant to Holy Scripture.... They also are worthy of condemnation who endeavour at this time to restore the dangerous opinion that all men, be they never so ungodly, shall at length be saved when they have suffered pains for their sins a certain time appointed by God's justice."

I am grateful to my very dear friend Rev. Dr. Richard Bacon, President of Commonwealth Publications in Dallas, and Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Rowlett, for writing the *Foreword* for this work of mine. Since the production of the first draft in 1994, however, this work was expanded to twice its original length. It was expanded later yet further (with the addition of some new Calvin material in 1996); again in 1997; and finally with more Luther material now in 2006.

Yet in our title, precisely the very words "Anabaptist" and Baptist" -- are misnomers. Even the phrase "John the baptizer" (*Iooannes ho baptistees*) -- who was never himself baptized! -- has long been mistranslated as 'John the Baptist' (Matthew 3:1 & 14:2 and Mark 8:28 and Luke 7:20 & 7:33 & 9:9 *etc.*). Indeed, also those he baptized were not "Baptists" -- but rather baptizees (*baptistheis*). Matthew 14:16 and Mark 16:16 and Luke 7:29 *etc.*

The words "Anabaptist" -- from the Greek *anabaptizein*, meaning "dip or pour repeated(ly)" -- is found not even once in Holy Writ. True, such adultly-affused "Anabaptists" and also such adultly-submersed "Baptists" as had previously been baptized when infants, did not claim that their adult affusions or submersions were re-baptisms -- because they denied that their prior infant sprinklings were baptisms. Indeed, such adultly-affused Anabaptists and such adultly-submersed Baptists as were never previously baptized while infants -- were, when deemed to be mature enough, simply baptized once and for all, and **not** then re-baptized.

But especially in such cases, the so-called Anabaptists were not really "Ana-baptists" -- but rather "Baptists." Indeed, very strictly speaking, they were not really even Baptists -- but only baptizees. For neither Anabaptists nor Baptists held or hold that all such should themselves baptize (as did John the baptizer).

This work now goes forth with the very earnest prayer that it may open the eyes of many sincere (yet hitherto rather misguided) Baptists and Neo-Anabaptists. May they, as did the previously-anabaptistic Mrs. John Calvin of old, repudiate their religious deviations -- and then join the historic Christian Church of the Protestant Reformation, and thus come into true apostolic succession with unadulterated Christianity!

-- Rev. Professor-Emeritus Dr. Francis Nigel Lee,
Former Chairman of the Departments of Church History and Systematic Theology,
Queensland Presbyterian Theological College, Brisbane, Australia.

CONTENTS OF ANABAPTISTS, BAPTISTS, AND THEIR STEPCCHILDREN

Other works on Anabaptism and Baptism by Dr. Francis Nigel Lee

Preface: The Sins of Rebaptism and of Leaving Babies Unbaptized (by Dr. Lee)

Foreword (by Reverend Dr. Richard Bacon)

Introduction (by Rev. Professor Dr. F.N. Lee)

Table of Contents

1. Who were the Anabaptists and who are their stepchildren?
2. Anabaptists on baptism and other matters are contrary to Holy Scripture
3. Anabaptist views also on baptism are contrary to those of the Early Church
4. Submersion and other post-apostolic baptismal heresies arisen since 250 A.D.
5. The non-baptizing Paulicians and the infant-damning Petrobrusians
6. The Waldensians maintained the infant baptism of tiny Christians
7. The impact on baptism of Thomistic Roman Catholicism
8. Pre-Reformers Wycliffe and Huss and their followers anent infant baptism
9. The influence of Wycliffe through Huss upon Martin Luther
10. The rebaptismal error of the Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren'
11. The United Bohemian Brethren recanted their error of rebaptism
12. The *Bohemian Confession(s)* on rebaptism from 1504 onward
13. God maintained His baptism despite the Church's mediaeval meanderings
14. Germany's Luther on covenantal infants' faith before their infant baptism
15. Luther on the trust in Christ of believers' infants before and at their baptism
16. The deep roots and the sudden rise of the Anabaptist heretics
17. The attack by German Anabaptists against the Protestant Reformation
18. Anabaptism's Thomas Münzer or Müntzer, the monster of Mühlhausen
19. The Anabaptist Balthasar Hübmaier and the road to revolution
20. The turbulent Anabaptists and the 1525 Peasant War in Germany
21. Dr. Martin Luther on the antinomian and antipaedobaptistic Münzerites
22. Luther on the Anabaptists as a perverse eschatological phenomenon
23. Luther and Lutheranism's anti-rebaptistic Anti-Anabaptism
24. Luther on the Anabaptists' anarchy and their eschatological annihilationism
25. Ulrich Zwingli's Switzerland disturbed by the Anabaptist heresies
26. Zwingli's first condemnation of the Anabaptists' views on baptism
27. The formal birth and constitution of Switzerland's Anabaptists
28. The Anabaptists, rebaptizing defiantly, expelled from Switzerland for uproar
29. Zwingli's various writings against the errors of the Anabaptists
30. Zwingli's antirebaptismal *Questions Concerning Rebaptism*
31. Zwingli's antirebaptismal *Declaration of Christian Faith*
32. Early Anabaptists outside of Switzerland and Germany
33. *Pseudo-Clement, Pseudo-Isidore*, and Anabaptist Communism
34. The roots of Anabaptist polygamy and community of wives
35. The Dutch Anabaptist Leaders Obbe and Dirck Philips
36. The awful actions of Anabaptists in their 'millennium' at Münster
37. Polygamy since Münster: the awful aftermath of Anabaptism

38. Obbe Philips recants in his *Recollections of the Years 1533-1536*
39. Obbe Philips on the Hofmannite Anabaptist Jan Matthys
40. Obbe on the interaction between Dutch and Münster Anabaptists
41. The not-so-peaceful unorthodox-trinitarian Anabaptist Menno Simons
42. The Antitrinitarian Anabaptist Michael Servetus (or Miguel Serveto)
43. The influence of Servetus among Anabaptists internationally
44. Candid assessment of the Anabaptists' faith and practice
45. Fundamental nature of the views on baptism of the Anabaptists
46. Butzer, Oecolampadius and the *First Basle Confession* on baptism
47. Bullinger's *Unashamed Wickedness* and *2nd Basle* or *1st Helvetic Confession*
48. The development of the paedobaptistic Calvin's Anti-Anabaptist views
49. Calvin upheld covenantal infants' presumed faith before baptism
50. The Unitarian Anabaptist Servetus *versus* the Trinitarian Reformer Calvin
51. Calvin's wife and babies and his many contacts with Anabaptists
52. Calvin's opposition to the Anabaptists' soul-sleep theory
53. Anabaptists' soul-sleep refuted in Calvin's *Psychopannychia*
54. Calvin's anti-revolutionary 1544 *Treatise Against Anabaptists*
55. The Anabaptist doctrine of Christ's "heavenly flesh" refuted by Calvin
56. Calvin refutes the Anabaptist denial of postmortal consciousness
57. Pseudo-glossolaly of the Anabaptists refuted by Calvin
58. Calvin refutes the anabaptistic denial of the soul's immortality
59. Anabaptism's sexual immorality refuted by Calvin
60. Calvin refutes Anabaptism's community of goods
61. Anabaptism's superspiritualistic ecstasy refuted by Calvin
62. Baptist misallegations that Calvin favoured submersionism
63. Calvin refutes the Anabaptists from Matthew 19:14
64. Great Commission implies faith within covenantal infants ere their baptisms
65. John Calvin's 1542 *Form[ula] for Administering Baptism*
66. "Be baptized [Acts 2:38f]..., for the promise is...to you and to your children!"
67. Rev. Professor Dr. John Calvin's baptismal comments on Acts 2:38f
68. Were also infants of Samaritan believers baptized, in light of the Ethiopian?
69. Cornelius and his family trusted God long before their baptism
70. Paul's actions at Antioch and Philippi and Corinth condemn Anabaptism
71. Calvin insists that Acts 19:1-6 does not teach rebaptism
72. Calvin refutes the Anabaptist views against paedobaptism
73. Calvin on why the babies of believers should be baptized
74. Calvin said Anabaptists and Romanists not too dissimilar on baptism
75. John Calvin's strongly Anti-Anabaptist Paedobaptism
76. Calvin refutes the Gnesio-Lutheranistic slander that he was an "Anabaptist"
77. John Calvin's final words of opposition to the Anabaptists
78. The Early British Anabaptists from 1534 onward
79. The Anti-Anabaptist *Edwardine Articles* of 1553
80. The Anti-Anabaptist *Thirty-nine Articles* of 1563f
81. Continuation of the Anti-Anabaptist *Thirty-nine Articles*
82. John Knox's writings against the Anabaptists
83. The English Anabaptists called the 'Family of Love'
84. The *Belgic Confession* condemns the various views of the Anabaptists

85. Guido De Brés's 1570 book against the Anabaptists
86. Bullinger's Anti-Anabaptist *Second Swiss Confession*
87. Monolithic opposition of all the Protestant Reformers to Anabaptism
88. Mutual influence of Continental and British Anti-Anabaptists
89. The Anti-Anabaptist and Anti-Romish 1615 *Irish Articles*
90. The Anti-Anabaptist 'T-U-L-I-P' Decrees of the Synod of Dordt
91. The influence of the 1618f Synod of Dordt upon Britain
92. The Anti-Anabaptist background of Britain's Westminster Assembly
93. Baptist Professors on the origin and development of the (Ana)Baptists
94. Many modern Baptists say their pioneers derive from Anabaptists
95. The arrival and expansion of (Ana)Baptists in North America
96. British (Ana)Baptist Confessions of the seventeenth century
97. The reply to the (Ana)Baptists of the Calvinistic Westminster Assembly
98. How to "crucify the Son of God afresh" by the sin of rebaptism
99. The great sin of leaving one's own babies unbaptized
100. Godly methods for overcoming Anabaptist influences
101. Inevitable conversion of (Ana)Baptists and their (step)children to Calvinism
102. (Ana)Baptists of all countries -- repent!

INDEX (Persons; Subjects; Scriptures; Bibliography)

Biographical profile (about the author)

ANABAPTISTS, BAPTISTS, AND THEIR STEPCHILDREN

1. Who were the Anabaptists and who are their stepchildren?

The Anabaptists were various sixteenth-century sects. They all repudiated infant baptism. Nearly all of them baptized -- and often rebaptized -- adults alone.

Such Anabaptists as were trinitarian, generally baptized by pouring -- whether once or thrice. However, such other Anabaptists as were unitarian, purported to baptize by way of a single submersion.

The latter was not the apostolic practice. Indeed, it was and is also at variance with the sprinkling previously practised in the baptisms of the Early Church till around A.D. 250ff.

Too, many Anabaptists denied the incarnation of Christ. They also condemned the solemn swearing of oaths, even before law-courts. Many promoted also soul-sleep; or annihilationism; or false-prophecies; or polygamy; or communism; or revolution; *etc.*

In the Middle Ages, the ritualistic Romanists had usually baptized by total submersion. The Protestant Reformers alone re-asserted Biblical baptism. Such is baptism only of those who profess saving faith in Christ, together with their babies and their other children. It is also baptism precisely by way of Scriptural sprinkling.

Baptists, because they oppose the other views of the Anabaptists, are not the children but rather the (equally-antipaedobaptistic) stepchildren of the Anabaptists. Baptists, however, have baptized by single submersion -- at least ever since about 1638. In this, they have followed Mediaeval Romanism and such of the Anabaptists as were unitarian. Here Baptists have repudiated the baptismal practices of Holy Scripture as well as those of both the Protestant Reformation and also such Anabaptists who were trinitarian.

In modern times, the "Pro-Mennonite" Leonard Verduin has written a book on the Anabaptists with the very misleading title *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*.¹ He would represent the latter as being but the disowned children of Luther and Calvin -- and, more remotely, of Waldo and Wycliffe.

However, the truth is -- the Anabaptists disclaimed dependence upon the Reformers! For the Anabaptists actually represent re-emergent variants of neo-paganized sub-christian early-mediaeval and mid-mediaeval heresies.

Anabaptism is syncretistic. Partly, it descends from the communal concepts of Romish monasticism. Yet its ancestors include also the Semi-Manichaeic Paulicians and the Neo-Marcionitic and antipaedobaptistic Petrobrusians (who denied even the possibility of infant salvation).

At first the Anabaptists were clustered chiefly in Central Europe, from Germany to Italy. Yet they later had influence also in Western Europe from Frisia to Flanders, and in Eastern Europe from Lithuania to Hungary. Groups subsequently functioned from Russia to Spain -- and even in France, in England, and in the Americas.

Professor Dr. G.H. Williams, the foremost sympathetic authority on Anabaptism, has called it 'The Radical Reformation.'² That is a real misnomer.

'Radical' -- yes! 'Reformation'-- no! For, as Williams himself rightly points out -- Anabaptism "broke on principle with the Catholic-Protestant *corpus christianum* and...induced currents in history and the interpretation thereof which pulsate today..., through democratic progressivism to Marxism."³ Thus, even today, Neo-Anabaptism rides again!

Harvard's Dr. Williams has not hesitated to describe himself⁴ as "a professor who, and in a university which, has spiritual connections with Calvin's principal foe, Michael Servetus" the Iberian Anabaptist. Extolling the 'Neo-Anabaptist' Karl Barth as "the greatest modern Theologian," Williams has saluted the Anabaptists as architects of the modern Post-Christian pluriform society. He has expressly "salute[d] them from afar -- as the honored citizens of that larger community which is the commonwealth of all mankind."⁵ Heinous humanism!

The Anabaptists, then, were sixteenth-century antipaedobaptists. As to their doctrine of God -- they were variously Unitarian, Binitarian, Tritheistic, Quasi-Trinitarian (or, occasionally, even Trinitarian). As to creation and providence, many were either anarchistic or Neo-Manichaeic. They were also antinomian or lawless. Indeed, some were very lascivious -- and either adulterers or polygamists.

Nearly all maintained a heretical Neo-Gnostic christology. Several claimed to be prophetic visionaries and/or glossolalists, and more than a few were thoroughly communistic. Most were millenarian, fanatically and falsely predicting the 'imminent' return of Christ. Nearly all of them taught both soul-sleep and the final annihilation of the wicked (thus denying everlasting punishment). Absolutely all of them were either antinomian or legalistic. What was good in them, was not original. What was original in them, was not good.

They all agreed with one another in hating the Biblical and patristic practice of infant baptism. Most of them simply rehashed heresies already decisively rejected many centuries earlier after thorough evaluation by the Early Church Universal.

Their modern stepchildren comprehend also contemporary ecclesiastical revolutionaries. Such include Christadelphians, Mormons, Seventh-day Adventists, Jehovah witnesses, Pentecostals, and left-wing liberationists.

2. Anabaptists on baptism and other matters are contrary to Holy Scripture

There were indeed different varieties of Anabaptists. Yet all agreed in rejecting infant baptism⁶ and also the historical continuity and the social stability which it promotes -- from the beginning of humanity till the present day. "What says the Scripture?" Romans 4:3-11.

The very first verses of the Holy Bible teach that **God's Triune's Holy Spirit** has always pre-existed all the primaeval waters. Those verses say He hovered not under but over the waters. Indeed, over their **face** (namely 'al p'neey hamaqiyim'). Genesis 1:1-2 & 1:26. All of which has implications for family baptisms. So Tertullian, Jerome, and Cullmann.⁷

After that creation, the Triune God made mankind as His Own image. Genesis 1:26-28. Indeed, Genesis 2:7 clarifies it was not the entire Adam who was plunged into and under the Spirit of God. No, the Spirit came into the nostrils of Adam's **face** -- and from above.

Now baptism is the sacrament of initiation, which at Calvary replaced circumcision (Colossians 2:11-13). Although God before the fall erected His first Covenant with Adam as well as with all his descendants (Genesis 1:26f & 2:15 cf. Hosea 6:7f), there were then no sacraments as such -- till after humanity's lapse into sin.

Thereafter, God gave clothes to Adam and his descendants. That is why babies are to be clothed with or to "put on" Christ -- even in their infancy (Galatians 3:27 cf. Genesis 3:21).

But fallen man constantly sins, even from his very birth onward. So God renewed His transgressed Covenant -- with Noah and his family (Genesis 6:18 cf. Hosea 6:7f).

Then, Noah and all his covenanted household were baptized by rainwater from above. However, the wicked outside the ark were non-baptismally drowned to death by total submersion from beneath. Genesis 6:18 & 7:1-23 cf. First Peter 3:20f.

Too, the Bible insists that adult believers like Abraham, after they had professed faith in Jehovah -- were to be circumcised, covenantally, together with their (male) infants. Then, drops of blood were shed -- but there were no submersions!

Thereafter, at Calvary -- where also females of whatever age were elevated and given the sacrament (Acts 8:12 cf. Genesis 3:15f & 4:7) -- covenantal circumcision was replaced by baptism (and hence infant circumcision by infant baptism). Genesis 17:7-14; Acts 2:38f; Romans 4:11f; Colossians 2:11-13.

Now Moses the mediator of the Old Testament, and all his people, with their infants -- as the Israelitic ancestors of New Testament Christians -- were all baptized from a watery cloud **above** them. They were baptized not into the sea, but unto Moses and with the **cloud**; just as Christians are, unto Christ and with water. Yet the ungodly adult Egyptians who pursued them, were all non-baptismally drowned to death under the sea in total submersion. Exodus 14:13-29 & 15:4-10 and Psalms 77:16-20 & 78:12-14 cf. First Corinthians 10:1-2.

For an exhaustive demonstration of this, see Francis Nigel Lee's doctoral dissertation titled *Baby Belief Before Baptism*. Yet, notwithstanding the clear teachings of the Bible -- both Anabaptists and Baptists deny that the babies of believers should be baptized!

Still, trinitarian Anabaptists -- though rejecting paedobaptism -- nevertheless baptize by pouring. But Baptists (like the baptismal regenerationists in the Middle Ages, and unitarian Anabaptists) -- insist baptism should be administered only by way of submersion.

That latter method, however, is totally foreign to the Word of God -- which knows only of sprinkling and pouring. Genesis 1:2 & 2:7 & 7:4f (cf. First Peter 3: 20f); Isaiah 32:15 & 44:1-5 & 52:15f; Ezekiel 36:25-27; Daniel 4:22-23 & 5:21;⁸ Joel 2:16,23,28f; Acts 1:5f & 2:1-4a,16f,33,38f; and Hebrews 9:10-21. For abundant proof of this, see Francis Nigel Lee's monograph *Sprinkling is Scriptural!*⁸

It should also be noted that in all the circumcisions performed during the times of the Older Testament from Genesis to Malachi -- there is no question of submersion in either blood or water. To the contrary, while being circumcised, adult covenanters and their infant children thereby had their blood shed -- or **sprinklingly** poured forth.

Every ritualistic cleansing in those times (B.C. 4000 to B.C. 400) -- took place by way of pouring or sprinkling. Such never occurred by way of submersion. See Hebrews 9:10-22 and 10:22. That was the case even in patriarchal times. Genesis 7:4f & 28:18 & 35:14.

Such was the situation also under the Mosaic Law. Exodus 4:9 & 9:8-13 & 12:7 & 12:22 & 24:6-8 & 29:7-21 & 30:9f; and Leviticus 1:5-11 & 2:1-6 & 3:2-13 & 4:3-34 & 5:9 & 6:27 & 7:2-14 & 8:11-24 & 9:9-18 & 14:7-51 & 16:14-19 & 17:6-13 & 21:10 and Numbers 8:7 & 18:17 & 19:4-21 and Deuteronomy 12:16-27 & 15:23 *etc.*

Also in the Prophets, the various non-submersionistic sprinkling passages are all rich in such symbolism. Thus: Joshua 3:8-17 and First Kings 18:5-45 and Second Kings 5:1-14 and Psalms 51:2-7 & 77:16-17 & 78:12-13 and Proverbs 1:23 and Song 1:3 and Isaiah 21:4 & 32:15 & 44:1-4 & 45:8 & 52:15 & 53:12 & 63:3 and Ezekiel 11:5 & 36:18-25f & 39:29 and Daniel 4:15-33 & 5:21 & 7:14-22 & 9:24-27 and Hosea 6:1-3 and Joel 2:16-28 and Zechariah 12:10 & 13:1 and Malachi 3:1-10 & 4:5f.

For these Prophets point not only back, to the Law. They also point forward, to the Saviour! Thus, they actually predict even Christian baptism. That sign and seal, instituted after Christ's incarnation, engrafts His elect into His Church -- and symbolically refreshes them.

It should be noted in Joshua 3:8-17 that the B.C. 270 Israelitic Greek eptuagint translation has *ebapheesan* (from the verb *baptein*) as its rendition of the Hebrew *nith'loo*. Literally, this says that the priests 'bapt-ed' in the Jordan -- when they and all the Israelites (including their babies) crossed it on dry land. They all 'bapt-ed' -- but were not submersed.

Elijah, in turn, gave a preview of the work of his later successor John the baptizer (sometimes miscalled 'John the Baptist' but perhaps better callable 'John the Presbyterian'). Elijah did this, when he thrice poured water on his sacrifice on behalf of all twelve of the tribes (including their babies) -- just before it rained. First Kings 17:1 & 18:5-45 (cf. John 1:25-33 and James 5:17-18). Thus Origen, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Augustine's mentor Ambrose.⁹

Indeed, Elijah's student Elisha told Naaman the leper to be baptized. That was when he commanded him to receive that symbolic cleansing, apparently by being sprinkled in the Jordan. Second Kings 5:1-3-14, where the Septuagint has *ebaptisato*.

For already back at Leviticus 14:2-7, it was stated a priest should take the blood of a slain bird and "sprinkle it...upon him who was to be cleansed from leprosy." Accordingly, the leper Naaman was not even once submersed -- **but** cleansed specifically by...sprinkling. Thus: Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyril, and Ambrose.¹⁰

Isaiah predicted the suffering Christ would pour out His soul and sprinkle blood on His garments. As a result, in terms of the Great Commission, He would sprinkle many **nations**. Isaiah 52:15 & 53:12 & 63:3 *cf.* Matthew 28:19 and Revelation 14:1-9 & 15:2-4 & 19:15f.

To expedite this, He would **baptize** His Church with His Spirit. So Isaiah further predicted also the baptismal outpouring of the Holy Ghost. "The Spirit," he explained, shall "be **poured upon us** from on high." Isaiah 32:15.

For God declared: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty.... I will pour My Spirit upon your seed, and My blessing upon your offspring.... Drip down, you Heavens, from above; and let the skies pour down righteousness!" Isaiah 44:1f & 45:8.

Ezekiel (9:4-8) was commanded by God to "set a mark upon the **foreheads** of the men" who repudiated the abominations of the ungodly. He also predicted (36:18-25f) that God would sprinkle clean water on His people -- at the time He would give them a new heart.

That was to occur when He would pour out His Spirit. Namely with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on believers and their children at the birth of the New Testament Church on Pentecost Sunday. Ezekiel 39:29 *cf.* Acts 2:1-4 & 2:16-18 & 2:38-39. Indeed, this refers also to **baptism** (so Jerome).¹¹

Joel foresaw that God would send His rain -- even upon **sucklings**! That was to take place especially when He would pour out His Spirit -- at the **baptism** of the Holy Ghost. Joel 2:16f & 2:23f (*cf.* Acts 1:4 & 2:1f & 2:16f & 2:33 & 2:38f).

Daniel explained that Nebuchadnezzar would be baptized by the **dew**. For the Septuagint states at Daniel 5:21 that the penitent Nebuchadnezzar was symbolically cleansed -- by being moistened with the drops of dew from above.

There too, it is the Greek *ebaphee* which translates the Aramaic *yitstabba'*. Indeed, also Daniel 9:24-27 predicted that -- centuries later -- the Messiah Himself would be anointed at His 'Christ-ic' **baptism**.

Zechariah predicted this outpouring would occur when a **Fountain** opens. This would happen when Messiah got pierced. For on Pentecost Sunday, "latter rain...", the Lord shall make bright clouds and give...showers of rain." Zechariah 10:1 & 12:10 & 13:1.

Finally, the *circa* B.C. 420 Malachi indicated the Messiah would **purify** His people -- and pour out His blessings. He also indicated this would occur after Jehovah's messenger (John the baptizer) had come as a second Elijah -- preaching the baptism of repentance. See: Malachi 3:1-10 & 4:5f (*cf.* Luke 1:15-17 & 3:3-22 and Matthew 17:9-13).

So much, then, for sprinkling and the use of the word *baptein* during the times of the Older Testament. Clearly, there, both antipaedobaptism and submersionism are excluded.

We now come to **intertestamentary proselyte baptism**. From B.C. 400 to A.D. 30 and beyond, the Israelites seem to have incorporated proselytes from Paganism into the people of Abraham by way of both baptism and circumcision.

The Hebrew word *ʿbiylah*, from the verb *taabal* (as at Joshua 3:17 *etc.*) -- Greek translation, *baptisma* -- was used to describe part of the rite whereby Gentiles could convert to Judaism. Thereby, catechised Gentiles and their entire families were incorporated into the Commonwealth of Ancient Israel. Thus the Apocrypha, the Talmud, Lightfoot, Schürer. Edersheim, Schaff-Herzog, Hastings, and also the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.¹²

By and large, what has just been seen above about the intertestamentary baptism of proselytes to Judaism, holds true also of baptismal statements in **the Newer Testament itself**. Here, briefly, we deal with baptisms administered by John the baptizer -- before treating of those administered by Christ's Apostles at the direction of the Lord Jesus.

Regarding **Johannine baptism**, John went out ahead of Jesus in the spirit and power of Elijah. Why? To turn many of the children of Israel back to their God; and to turn the hearts of the fathers back to the children. Malachi 3:1 & 4:4-6 *cf.* Luke 1:13-17.

As 'the second Elijah' -- John was happy to do all of this, at great personal sacrifice, in order to "increase" the influence of Jesus among His people. First Kings 18:31-45 *cf.* John 1:25-36 & 3:23-31.

However, this 'John the baptizer' preached conversion -- before administering baptisms not only to penitent fathers but also to their children. For "all the land of Judea" -- and those of Jerusalem and "all the region round about Jordan" -- were "all baptized" by John. Matthew 3:5*f* and Mark 1:4*f*.

Indeed, John preached "the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel" (including pregnant women and their unborn infants, as well as to mothers carrying their babies in their arms). For John, the baptizer of households, preached not just to the adults of Israel -- but to whole families. Acts 13:24 *cf.* Malachi 3:2*f* & 4:4-6 and Luke 3:3-8*f* and Acts 1:5 & 2:14-39.

Furthermore, John baptized not by submersion -- but by rainlike **sprinkling**. Malachi 3:10 & 4:5*f* and First Kings 18:30-33-45 and John 1:19-33 and 3:22-25 and Acts 1:5-8 & 2:1-33 & James 5:17*f*. John knew that he himself, as Jehovah's messenger, would **pour out** a blessing.

He knew this was to occur -- soon before the advent of Christ, the Mediator of the Covenant. Malachi 1:1 & 3:1*f* & 3:10 & 4:5*f* (*cf.* Numbers 8:7 & 19:9-21 and Ezekiel 36:25 and Zechariah 12:10 & 13:1) with Matthew 3:1*f* and Luke 1:13*f*, & 1:76*f* & 3:2*f* and John 1:31*f*.

The baptizer John himself therefore declared to his converts: "I indeed baptize you with water" -- **not under** it! Matthew 3:11a and Mark 1:8a and John 1:26a & 1:31b & 1:33a.

Throughout, the Greek has *en*, meaning "with" -- and not *hupo(katoo)*, meaning "under(neath)."

Here John was absolutely categorical. He insisted that God Himself had sent him "to baptize with water." It was not under but at the Jordan that John so baptized. Matthew 3:6 and Mark 1:5. He did so, with fresh running water -- as the sprinkling symbol of purification. John 3:25-26.

Significantly, he did not baptize where the water was deep. Instead, he baptized where the water was fresh and running -- at *Aenon* alias 'Fountains.' John 3:22a.

Aenon is the plural form of the Hebrew '*ayin*, meaning a fountain. Many such fountains adorned Judaea. Ezekiel 47:10. *Aenon* was a place where there were "many" sprinkling springs for purification -- many waters (*polla hudata*). There, John had baptized with that running water. The infallible Jesus Himself so indicates. Acts 1:5a *cf.* 11:16a.

Usually, an Old Testament priest or a prophet or a king -- all being types of Christ the 'Anointed One' -- were themselves anointed. This was done precisely by their being sprinkled on their heads. Exodus 29:7 & 30:30 and Leviticus 8:12 and Numbers 4:2*f* and First Samuel 10:1 & 16:13 and Psalm 23:1-5 and First Kings 19:16*f* and Second Kings 2:9 & 3:11 & 9:1*f*.

So too -- at His baptismal anointing -- was their Antitype, Jesus Christ Himself! When John got ready to baptize Jesus as our great Prophet and Priest and King -- he would do so not by submersing but precisely by sprinkling Him. Thus, also Hippolytus and Lactantius.¹³

Elijah, before John, poured water upon the sacrifice atop the altar-stones -- representing all the tribes of Israel (together with their children). So now, apparently, John the baptizer too -- as the 'second Elijah' -- similarly poured out water, over a later generation of converted Israelites (together with their children). First Kings 18:31-35 *cf.* John 1:25-32.

Yet John did not immediately baptize these fathers and their children. First, he powerfully preached to them all. Only then, after assessing their favourable re-action, did he presuppose their at least incipient faith in the coming Christ -- as a result of his preaching the Gospel to them -- prior to baptizing them. Malachi 4:6 *cf.* Matthew 3:2*f* & Luke 3:7-14. Thus Ambrose, Lightfoot, Wall, and Cullmann.¹⁴

So, then -- both the Anabaptists and the Baptists are wrong in their claim that covenantal infants would have been refused baptism by John the baptizer. Wrong too is the claim that baptism was soon thereafter refused to infants by Christ's Own Ministers.

We come now to the **baptisms administered by the Ministers of Christ**. Many of His **Apostles** earlier seem to have been baptizees of John the baptizer. Here, we first note **how** they themselves baptized; and next we note **who** then and there got baptized at their hands.

First, then, as regards the **how** of those apostolic baptisms. As far as the **naked** cleansing of the 'defiled' **body-parts** of both circumcised Israelites and the later intertestamentary Jews are concerned -- *cf.* Edersheim's previously-mentioned "undressed

completely"¹² of Gentiles then being proselytized to Judaism! This was done not at all by naked total submersion of the whole body, but by sprinkling on the naked face *etc.*

Truly, the non-naked practice of modern Baptists who totally submerge the entirety of clothed persons -- instead of sprinklingly baptizing only the face as the naked body-part concerned -- is against all Biblical and Talmudic precedent, and is indefensible. Indeed, this is clear even from Matthew 15:1-9 and Mark 7:1-4¹⁵ (and John 1:19-33 and 13:5-10).

John the baptizer had not predicted that Jesus would submerge people under the Holy Spirit. To the contrary, John had declared that Christ would "baptize...with the Holy Ghost." Matthew 3:11b and Mark 1:8b and Luke 3:16b and John 1:33b. The Greek has *en*, meaning "with"; and not *hupo*, meaning "under" (the water).

Also Jesus had promised that He Himself would baptize -- by sending His Spirit "upon" His Apostles. Luke 24:33 & 24:49a (which has *eph'* for "upon"). They would be "en-dued" or "clothed with" power from on high. In Luke 24:48b, "en-dued" translates *en-duseesthe* (which means to "clothe with"). To His Apostles, the Lord Jesus Christ declared: "You shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" -- namely, upon their heads. Thus Acts 1:5b, where "with" translates *en*; and Acts 2:2, where "from" translates *ek* alias "out of" (Heaven).

Frankly, precisely sprinkling -- and indeed of the head -- is the New Testament mode for the baptism of all Christians -- *viz.* all Christ-professing adults, together with all of their babies and other minor children. Acts 2:17*f* *cf.* 2:38*f* & 10:48 and First Corinthians 1:13-16 & 3:6-8 & 10:1-2 and Hebrews 6:1*f* & 9:10-21 & 10:22 & 11:7 & 11:28*f* & 12:22-25 and First Peter 1:2 & 3:20*f*; and Revelation 7:2-9; 14:1*f* & 19:16 (*cf.* Isaiah 63:3) & 22:2-4. But enough -- sprinkling is Scriptural!!

As regards who received Christian baptism at the time of the Newer Testament, infants and children were baptized together with their Christ-professing parents. See: John 1:25-33 *cf.* First Kings 18:31:45 and Mark 10:13-14's *mee kooluete* alias "do not forbid them [tiny covenantal children]" *cf.* Acts 10:47's (& 11:17's) *kolusai* alias "[do not] forbid (water)!" Thus Lightfoot and Cullmann.¹⁶

This is reflected even in the many cases of (inter)national household baptisms mentioned within the Newer Testament. Such is evidenced by Matthew 28:19 and Acts 2:38*f* & 16:15 & 16:31-33 & 18:8 and First Corinthians 1:14-16 & 16:15-19 and First Peter 3:20*f*.

Indeed, also the Apostle John seems to presuppose the baptisms of households -- and even specifically by sprinkling them on their foreheads. For he reminds also the "little children" that they too have received a sealing "unction" or an "anointing."

Thus John 21:15's "lambs" or *arnia*. Also germane is the cognate First John 2:12-18's *teknia* and *paidia* alias "little offspring" and "tiny children" -- and 2:20-27 (where "unction" and "anointing" each translate *chrisma*). Too, John's Revelation 7:2-9 & 14:1 & 15:4 & 21:24*f* & 22:3-4 & 22:16-18*f* (which collectively teach sealing the foreheads of entire nations with the Name of the Triune God).

As J.V. Bartlet rightly points out in his *Hastings's Encyclopaedia* article on baptism in the New Testament:¹⁷ "The idea that a parent should enter a religious or covenant[al] relation[ship] with God as an individual merely -- *i.e.*, by himself as distinct from his immediate family -- would never occur to the ancients, least of all to a Jew.... All were seen as members of larger units, of which the family was the chief....

"Those who were to be reared 'in the Lord's training and admonition' and to 'obey their parents...in the Lord' [as distinct from antipaedobaptistically only later being brought into or to the Lord]..., Ephesians 6:1-4, must have been viewed as already Christians in status or objectively -- ranking according to their stage of development with 'those of the household of faith' and not with 'those without.' This went back to infancy [*cf.* Second Timothy 1:3-6 & 3:14-17].

"For Paul regards the child of faith, even on one side only, as thereby 'holy' -- *i.e.*, objectively in covenant with God (First Corinthians 7:14)... For 'a newly-made proselyte is like a newborn child' (Babylonian *Yebamoth* 48b). So it was with children -- both of proselytes [to Judaism], and of Christians." Indeed, the denial of this obvious truth has dire social consequences -- as we shall soon see.

Sadly, the Anti-Oldtestamentical and Anti-Intertestamentical and Anti-Newtestamentical baptismal stance of the Post-Reformational Anabaptists as to the "who" of baptism still persists. Furthermore, much of this strongly characterizes even their Baptist stepchildren today -- who have in addition embraced also the Non-Biblical submersionistic views of mediaeval Romanism.

Moreover, the Anabaptists and their modern stepchildren err not only in their baptismal views -- but also in their non-baptismal aberrations. Even the latter views of the communizing Anabaptists are encountered also among many contemporary cults and sects.

Those stepchildren include sacramentalistic 'Church of Christ' Campbellites; unitarian Christadelphians; 'charismatic' Pentecostals; premillennial Dispensationalists; polygamous Proto-Mormons; state-hating "Jehovah's witnesses"; soul-sleeping Seventh-day Adventists; and various assorted deniers of everlasting punishment. All such are indeed neither Catholic, Orthodox, nor Protestant!

What were the various heresies of Anabaptists who spawned this seed? There was the anti-trinitarianism of Denck, Joris, Campanus, and Servetus (against Genesis 1:1-3 & 1:26 and Matthew 28:19 and Revelation 4:5-8f). There was the denial of Christ's incarnation by Hofmann and Simons (against Luke 1:31f and Romans 1:3f and Hebrews 2:9-17 & 5:1-8).

There was the repeated adultery of Hätzer -- and the polygamy of the demagogue Beukels and of the murderer Matthys (against Malachi 2:14-16 and Matthew 19:4-9 and First Thessalonians 4:3-8). There was also the revolutionism of Münzer, Knipperdolling and even Joris (against Romans 13:1-7 and First Peter 2:13-17 and Titus 3:1f).

Their communism (alias community of goods and community of wives) was condemned by Exodus 20:15-17 and Acts 5:4 and Ephesians 4:24-28. The pseudo-pentecostal babblings

of Münzer, and the false-prophecies of Simons, were against Matthew 6:7 and First Corinthians 14:7-21 and First John 4:1-6. Their anarchistic opposition to oathing was against Deuteronomy 10:20 and Jeremiah 4:2 and Second Corinthians 1:23. Their doctrine of soul-sleep was against Luke 23:43 and Second Corinthians 5:1-9 and Philippians 1:21-23. In many cases, they denied even everlasting punishment -- against Isaiah 34:8-10 and Mark 9:42-48 and Revelation 14:11 & 20:10.

3. Anabaptist views also on baptism are contrary to those of the Early Church

Not just secular scholars but also Church History clearly substantiates the above claims. For the Early Church Fathers all opposed the communism,¹⁸ revolutionism,¹⁹ soul-sleep,²⁰ and pseudo-pentecostalistic babblings²¹ of the various ancient heresies.

The unitarian Anabaptist Servetus, in his confrontations against the Biblical arguments of trinitarian Paedobaptists like Calvin (in his *Institutes* IV:16:31), appealed for support -- from the adult ablutions of 'magical' Ancient **Paganism**. For he called in the assistance of Egypt's Pre-Christian god Thoth (alias Hermes Trismegistus) -- and also invoked the adult submersions even of the Post-Christian syncretistic Sybils!

Yet right now, we focus specifically on the antipaedobaptism of ancient **Heretics**. In that regard, there are indeed only few pre-incarnational and post-biblical extant records about baptism -- until Cyprian in 250 A.D. Yet also many Pre-Cyprianic works do yield at least fragmentary traces of either sprinkling, or infant baptism, or both -- in the Church Universal.

Such Pre-Cyprianic works include not only pre-incarnational traditions such as those of the *Apocrypha*, and the *Talmud* -- as already discussed.¹² They include also post-incarnational writings like those of Philo, Josephus, Clement of Rome, the *Didachee*, (Pseudo-)Barnabas, Ignatius, Pliny, Aristides, Diognetus, Papias, Hermas, the post-incarnational apocryphal writings, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, Athenagoras, Theodotus, Irenaeus, Polycrates, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, the *Old Egyptian Ordinance*, Hippolytus, and Origen.²²

Thus the A.D. 42 hellenized Judaist Philo comments²³ on Numbers 19:2-19 as to how "persons are sprinkled with pure water." There, he explains, Moses commanded "to pour water upon" ashes. Then -- "moistening some branches of hyssop with the mixture of ashes and water" -- he [Moses] further commanded "to sprinkle it over those who were to be purified" (cf. Hebrews 9:13). Philo also declares²⁴ that "**reason** is baptized with the things that come upon it." Then again further, regarding the brazen laver of the (42 A.D.) Jewish Temple, he warns:²⁵ "Let him who is about to be sprinkled with the water of purification from this laver, remember!"

Similarly, around A.D. 93 -- after the **Romans** destroyed the temple in Jerusalem during A.D. 70 -- the famous Judaistic Historian Josephus (in his *Antiquities of the Jews*) commented²⁶ on Exodus 29:10-18. Said he: "Within these gates [to the tabernacle], was the vessel for sprinkling.... Therefrom, the priests washed their hands and poured water.... Moses took some from the blood of the sacrifices, and **sprinkled** the robes of Aaron himself and his sons; and sanctified them with **sprink water**."

Josephus also declared²⁷ that in Numbers 19:4-20 the red "heifer was slain by the high priest, and her blood sprinkled with his finger.... When therefore any persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring water." Then, "baptizing (*baptizantes*) part of these ashes in it, they sprinkled (*errhainon*) them with it." Cf. too Hebrews 9:13.

Shortly after the completion of the Newer Testament probably just before A.D. 70 -- one encounters perhaps the earliest extant Christian writing since the Holy Bible. There, the Apostle Paul's co-worker the Roman Clement (Philippians 4:3), makes important remarks.

Apparently referring to the account of God's baptisms of Noah's family in First Peter 3:20f, Clement declares:²⁸ "**He did not deluge Noah!**" And later:²⁹ "You, therefore, O overseers, will anoint the **head** of the baptized....as a type of...**baptism**."

The Lord's Teaching through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations, commonly called the *Didache* alias *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, may well have been written as early as 80 A.D. (or barely a decade after the Roman destruction of the temple of the Jews and the likeliest date for the completion of infallible Scripture). It declares:³⁰

"You shall not remove your hand from your son or from your daughter! But from their youth [alias from their youngness onward, Genesis 8:21], you shall teach them the fear of God [Ephesians 4:4-6 & 6:1-4]!...

"**Concerning baptism**, this is how you must baptize. Having first said all these things [cf. Matthew 28:18], baptize unto (*eis*) the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, with living water [*en hudati zoonti* alias with running water]! But if you have not [running water]..., baptize unto other water (*eis allo hudoor*)." With and unto -- but not 'down under' or beneath other water! "But if you have neither [running nor other water], **pour out water** thrice upon the **head** unto (*eis*) the Name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit!.... Do not give that which is holy, to the dogs [Matthew 7:6]!" In other words, restrict also holy baptism to sheep and their lambs -- but do not administer it to pigs and their piglets!

Then there is also perhaps the earliest patristic treatise dealing with the sprinkling ceremony of the Older Testament's red heifer. We refer to the *Epistle of Barnabas*, probably written before 100 A.D., where the Older Testament's ceremony is compared with the similar sprinkling of New Testament baptism.

The Epistle addresses Christians awaiting baptism. Speaking to them about the red heifer, it says:³¹ "What do you think this type was?... The 'young men' [or Old Testament priests] would sprinkle the people one by one....

"The 'young men' [or New Testament administrators] who sprinkle, are those who preach to us the 'Good Tidings'.... We go down toward [but not under] the water, full of sins and uncleanness -- and come away, bearing fruit in the heart!" Isaiah 52:15f & Acts 8:35-39.

Around A.D. 150, the Christian Justin Martyr wrote to Trypho the Judaist:³² "Wash and be clean!... Wash this washing, and...circumcise the **true** circumcision!... You [Jews], indeed, who have been circumcised as to the flesh -- need our [**baptism**, as our Christian]

circumcision; but we, having this [baptism], have not need of that [*viz.* your circumcision].... What need, then, have I of circumcision?...

"What need is there of that 'baptism' [*viz.* of your circumcision] -- for me who have been **baptized**, by the Holy Spirit?!" Indeed, seemingly commenting on Hebrews 9:9f, Justin Martyr also stated:³³ "The Law released from blame...by certain **sprinklings**...and diverse kinds of **baptisms**."

Also the A.D. 195 Clement of Alexandria, who advocated Christian baptism by Scriptural sprinkling, attempts to show³⁴ how God had 'pre-evangelistically' not left Himself without witness even among the ancient heathen by giving them the blessings of "rain from Heaven" (Acts 14:11-17). Floods and submersions, however, were God's curses!

He writes too of being "**baptized** by tears." Says he:³⁵ "If you truly desire to see God -- take to yourself means of purification..., wreathing your brows with righteousness...like Elijah's rain of salvation [First Kings 17:1 & 18:33-45 *cf.* John 1:15-33]!... So receive the water of the Word! Wash, you polluted ones! Purify yourselves..., by sprinkling yourselves with the true drops!"

The same Clement states also in his famous *Paedagogue*:³⁶ "Faith, with baptism, is trained by the Holy Spirit.... 'For as many as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ' [Galatians 3:26-29 *cf.* Romans 4:11f].... Jesus therefore...said: 'I thank You, O Father, God of Heaven and Earth, that You have hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and have revealed them to babes' [Luke 10:21 *cf.* Matthew 11:25].... Let our seals be either a dove [descending from above] or a fish [catchable through baptismal water]!... If there be one fishing, he will remember the Apostle -- and **the small children** [*paidioon*] drawn out of the water."

It is true the sectarianly proto-pentecostalized Semi-Montanist Tertullian around A.D. 200 opposed, but did not seek to invalidate, infant baptism. Yet even then, he did not oppose baptism by sprinkling.³⁷ Nevertheless, his by-then-sectarian opposition to paedobaptism -- only proves that the Church Universal had long been practising it!

The great Origen championed both infant baptism and sprinkling. It should be recalled that he himself was an Alexandrian hellenist,³⁸ with a huge knowledge also of the Greek Septuagint's Older Testament. Here are five sample citations from Origen, who also calls the baptism of rebirth "the second circumcision."³⁹

(1) "Infants also are by the usage of the Church baptized."⁴⁰ (2) "According to the saying of our Lord on infants, 'and you were an infant when you were baptized.'⁴¹ (3) "The coming Elijah [John the baptizer] would baptize"; for Elijah commanded "four pots of water be poured upon (*epicheete*) the sacrifice, and that it be done thrice."⁴² (4) "Infants are baptized."⁴³ And also (5): "The Church had from the Apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants."⁴⁴

Explains the A.D. 250 Cyprian:⁴⁵ "As to the case of infants..., they must...be baptized.... In respect of the observance of the eighth day in the Jewish circumcision of the flesh, a

sacrament was given beforehand.... When Christ came, it was fulfilled [*cf.* Genesis 17:1-14 with Colossians 2:11-13].... Nobody is to be hindered...from baptism and from grace. How much rather ought we to shrink from hindering an infant!... By us no one ought to be hindered from baptism.... [It] is to be even more observed in respect of infants and newly-born persons!"

Regarding sprinkling, Cyprian declares:⁴⁶ "The sick are seen to be sprinkled or to be poured upon.... The Holy Scripture says, Ezekiel 36:25-26, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you'.... The sprinkling of water possesses equal value with the saving washing.... They who are baptized in sickness, receive no less measure of the Holy Spirit."

Cyprian's commitment to infant and household baptism and to the validity of the mode of sprinkling, can be seen also in his statement⁴⁷ that "the Jews under the Apostles...had already gained the most ancient baptism of the Law and Moses." Numbers 8:5-7 & 19:8-13 *cf.* Hebrews 9:10-21.

Cyprian also wrote to Demetrianus⁴⁸ about Ezekiel 9:4-6 that the executioners of God's wrath were commanded to "slay all -- old and young, maids and little children -- that had not the mark upon their foreheads." Cyprian then applied this to Christians, saying it signifies that none can now escape but those only who are "regenerated -- and signed with Christ's mark." See too Matthew 28:19 *cf.* Revelation 7:2-4 & 9:4 & 14:1 & 22:2-4.

Even the Baptist A.W. Argyle -- Regent's Park College Tutor at Oxford -- has made some important concessions. He admits⁴⁹ that there indeed "appears to be [at least] one cryptic reference to infant baptism in an allegorical passage of the *Paedagogus*" written by the 195f A.D. Clement of Alexandria.

Moreover, Argyle further concedes that also the 230 A.D. Origen describes "the practice of infant baptism not only as a custom of the church, but as an apostolic custom." Nay more! Argyle further admits the indisputable fact that (the 250f A.D.) "Cyprian Bishop of Carthage...directs that infants should be baptized."

Before Cyprian, only heretics had rejected infant baptism and had begun to insist on a magical and neo-paganistic submersionism. Until and far beyond Cyprian -- ever since the Apostles, baptisms of believers and their children had been administered in the Church Universal by way of sprinkling.

We would here refer to three of our own dissertations. See: *Baptism Does Not Cleanse; and Rebaptism Impossible; and Baby Belief Before Baptism*.⁵⁰

Yet sadly, Cyprian himself was also the first Catabaptist in Church History. By this is meant he insisted that all baptized even triunely outside the Church Universal, should be rebaptized in the Church Universal.

Mercifully, this Cyprianic error was even then repudiated by practically the whole of the rest of the Church Universal. Regrettably, Cyprian introduced not only rebaptism but also the swiftly-spreading and paganistic pollution now called 'baptismal regenerationism.'

Thus Presbyterian Professor Dr. Samuel Angus wrote:⁵¹ "It was inevitable that [heathen] Hellenic religion should leave a deep impression upon...later Christianity..., mainly because Hellenic converts became the pillars of the Church.... In considering the history of Christian sacramentarianism..., the organization of the [later] Catholic Church was largely the creation of the genius of Cyprian -- who was a firm believer in magic."

Unintended corroboration of the above, comes also from another camp. Thus Romanist Professor Dr. B.V. Miller insists:⁵³ "All competent scholars are agreed that from the end of the third century, the Catholic Theology...was fixed.... The principal author of the innovation and of the change in the current of theological tradition, is said to be St. Cyprian."

4. Submersion and other post-apostolic baptismal heresies arisen since 250 A.D.

So from the A.D. 250 time of Cyprian onward, the Church degenerated -- by syncretizing with Paganism. More and more water now got used at baptisms.

The false new theory was that the greater the quantity of water at baptisms (and the more naked the candidate), the greater quantity and quality of sins were washed away. Enter sacramentalistic baptismal regenerationism!

Too, from A.D. 350 onward, infant baptism was often deferred till just before infant or adult death. Supposedly, this was intended to wash away nearly all of one's sins committed till as late in life as possible.

Yet this was no attack against **infant baptism!** For even the then largely-romanizing Church Universal rightly regarded babies too as sinners -- all stained with Adam's original sin. Thus, paedobaptism was clearly enunciated by Lactantius, Asterius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianze, Gregory of Nyssa, Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine.

Thus, Gregory Nazianzen states:⁵³ "Do you have an infant?... Let him be sanctified from his infancy!... What do you say to those who are as yet infants?... Shall we baptize them too? Yes, by all means!...

"The evidence of this is circumcision -- which is a typical seal [Genesis 17:1-14 cf. Romans 4:11f & 6:3-5 and Colossians 2:11-13 and Hebrews 9:10-14f & 10:22 & 11:28].... And in like manner, the smearing [or 'striking' or sprinkling] of the doorposts protects the firstborn [Exodus 12:7-22]."

Gregory also insists:⁵⁴ "The grace of baptism is one of the helps given.... The children of the Hebrews escaped death by the christic blood which purified the doorposts when the firstborn of the Egyptians perished [Exodus 11:4-7 & 12:12].... So also to me is this baptism [or seal] of God...a seal indeed to infants (*neepiachois*)."
Cf. Romans 4:11f & 6:3-5.

Chrysostom too writes:⁵⁵ "Our circumcision..., the grace of baptism..., fills us with the grace of the Spirit.... One who is in the very beginning of his age...may receive this

circumcision made without hands [Colossians 2:11-13]." And again:⁵⁶ "It is necessary to say something as to what the baptism is.... It is called...circumcision [Colossians 2:11-13].... Those about to be baptized -- [include] children."

There is also the great Ambrose, the teacher of Augustine. On First Kings 18:34, Ambrose observes:⁵⁷ "John baptized unto repentance, and all Judea gathered together.... Elijah showed...a type of baptism.... That returning of the river-waters backward...was caused by Elijah [cf. First Kings 17:1 & 18:31-45 and Second Kings 2:7-9 with Luke 1:15-17 and John 1:25-33].... It signified the sacrament of the laver also to the children of Israel."

Augustine, in his work *On Free Will*, says of antipaedobaptistic sects:⁵⁸ They are wont to ask also this question, 'What good to infants does the sacrament of Christ's baptism do?'.... The faith of those by whom the child is offered to be consecrated, profits the child!"

Also in his work *On the Rewards of Sins*, he adds:⁵⁹ "The regenerating Spirit is...in those that bring the child, and in the child that is brought.... The water affords outwardly the sacrament..., and the Spirit operates inwardly."

Indeed, Augustine even wrote to Dardanus:⁶⁰ "Infants sanctified by the sacrament of Christ, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, belong in His temple.... The Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants."

Now even after the start of the increasing declension of the Post-Cyprianic Church into submersionistic baptismal regenerationism, the Biblical baptismal mode of **sprinkling** was still practised by Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius, Lactantius, Athanasius, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Basil, Gregory of Nazianze, Gregory of Nyssa, the *Second Council of Constantinople*, Ambrose, Didymus of Alexandria, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret.⁶¹ The last two lived just before the Church Universal's submersion into the Dark Ages of the Papacy.

Thus Basil the Great states on First Kings 18:33f:⁶² "Elijah has shown the power of baptism...by means of water.... The water is mystically poured thrice."

Also Gregory of Nyssa compares Elijah's "pouring" of the water -- to the trinitarian baptism of his own day. Gregory says:⁶³ "Thus did Elijah, through that wondrous sacrifice of his, evidently proclaim to us beforehand -- the mysterious consecration which was afterwards to be accomplished by baptism. For the fire was kindled by the water which had been poured over thrice -- so as to show that where the mystic water is, there also is the...fiery Spirit Who burns up the ungodly and enlightens the faithful."

Even Jerome of Bethlehem, the author of the Latin *Vulgate* translation of the Bible, remarks that when "the Spirit of God moved above...[and] over the face of the water and produced from them the **infant** world, [it was] a type of the Christian **child** that is drawn from the laver of **baptism**."⁶⁴ He also refers⁶⁵ to "Ezekiel 36:16 *et seq.*" -- where the Lord God predicted, 'I will pour out or sprinkle clean water upon you.' That, he says, means: " I will pour out the clean water of saving baptism...so that a new heart...may be given by the pouring out and sprinkling of water."

Also Augustine's great mentor Ambrose insists⁶⁶ on First Kings 18:34: "In the Books of the Kings...Elijah put wood upon the altar and said they should throw water over it.... The water flowed.... John baptized unto repentance.... Elijah showed...a type of baptism."

Indeed, even Cyril of Alexandria wrote⁶⁷ around A.D. 400: "We have been baptized not with naked water nor with the [sprinkled] ashes of the heifer, but with the Holy Spirit.... Be glad, O Earth, because of those who are about to be sprinkled!... Do not regard this washing as by simple water!.... The Spirit seals the soul!....

"The laver within the tabernacle, was the symbol of baptism.... The Holy Spirit descended, so that He might endue with power.... For the Lord says 'You shall be baptized by the Holy Spirit!'... The water is poured around externally, while the Spirit completely baptizes the soul internally."

It should also be noted that the Patristic Church Universal reprehended re-baptisms -- whether by the Church Universal herself, or by any of the sects. Some of the apostate Gnostics, and the Montanist heretics, 'rebaptized' -- as too did the sabellianizing Callistus.

But early-orthodox Christians never did. For triune baptism severed Christians from both unitarian Judaists and polytheistic Pagans (thus Justin Martyr). There is no way in which gnostic washings could ever be regarded as Christian Baptisms (thus Irenaeus).

Especially to Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Hippolytus -- triune baptisms were quite unrepeatable. The Alexandrine Clement rejected both Montanist rebaptisms and also submersionism in general.

Only from around A.D. 220 onward did the first rebaptisms begin to plague the Church Universal herself. In the Sabellian controversy, Hippolytus condemned Callistus for maintaining that "second baptism was permitted" -- and condemned also the heretic Marcus for promising another baptism subsequent to the first.

It is true that Cyprian and Firmilian overreacted by themselves rebaptizing penitent sectarian Hyper-Montanists and Novatianists who themselves rebaptized. But the famous Church Father Stephen rightly refuted all of their rebaptistic views.

Cyril of Jerusalem championed the antirebaptistic baptism also of infants -- and indeed by sprinkling. Indeed, Hilary of Poitiers taught that trinitarian baptism lasts for a lifetime, and that all rebaptisms should be unthinkable.

Jerome of Bethlehem was strongly antirebaptistic, especially in his campaign against the persecutory and papocaesaristic Luciferians. Against rebaptism, Jerome here appealed to the verdict of Church History -- but also to many portions of Holy Scripture too.

Ambrose of Milan stressed sprinkling. He rebuffed rebaptism especially from Hebrews chapter six, maintaining:⁶⁸ "The Apostle...could not be silent as to those who thought that baptism was to be repeated..., lest a false belief in a reiterated baptism should lead astray....

"Baptism is not to be repeated.... He teaches one baptism. In him who is [re-]baptized, the Son of God is [re-]crucified.... But Christ was crucified once.... So there is but one, not several, baptisms [*cf.* too Ephesians 4:4-6].... The reiteration by anyone of the sacrament of baptism, is not permitted."

Chrysostom here adds:⁶⁹ "It is not possible that Christ should be crucified a second time.... He then that baptizes a second time, crucifies Him again.... He that does this, having forgotten the former grace and ordering his own life carelessly -- acts in all respects as if there were another Baptism... The thing is impossible.... The one who has betrayed all that was granted to him, is not worthy to be renewed again.... There is no second Baptism!" See especially Hebrews 6:1-6.

In his major work *On Baptism Against the Donatists*, Augustine condemns their rebaptisms and himself refuses to re-baptize such of them as repented and then joined the Church Universal. For copious discussion of this, see Francis Nigel Lee's Doctor in Sacred Theology dissertation *Triune Baptisms Repeatable?* (subtitled *The Biblical Unrepeatability of Baptism in the Name of the Triune God in Church History*).⁷⁰

Indeed, also the greatest of Eastern-Orthodox Theologians, John of Damascus, declares:⁷¹ "Those then who get rebaptized -- after being baptized into Father and Son and Holy Spirit, and after having been taught that there is one divine nature in three subsistences -- these, as the divine Apostle says, 'crucify the Christ afresh.' He says 'it is impossible for those who were once enlightened &c -- to renew them again unto repentance. Seeing they crucify to themselves the Christ afresh, and put Him to an open shame.'" Hebrews 6:1-6.

Furthermore, sprinkling was the sole essential baptismal practice constantly upheld in the ancient Armenian Liturgical Codex.⁷² This is very significant, inasmuch as Armenia is often claimed by many to be the first land-as-such to embrace Christianity as its national religion (around 300 A.D.).

Yet, during the Late-Patristic period, in the deteriorating Church Universal -- Biblical sprinkling decreased, and magical submersion increased. In fact, still further deformations at the time of baptism itself included: consecration of the water; baptismal regenerationism; transferring a 'kiss of peace'; immediate post-baptismal communion (including even paedocommunion); and, finally, transubstantiationism.

Why? Even the Romish Theologian Bernard Schmid in his *Manual of Patrology* has stated the reason -- and accurately! While writing⁷³ about the "Decline of Patristic Literature from 461 till about 700," that patrologist notes:

"The universal decline of patristic literature during the period we have now to consider, was due to a twofold cause. First, the untoward political events of the time; and second, the internal troubles that afflicted the Church....

"We may recall in the West the constant incursions of barbarian hordes; and in the East the rise and growth of Islamism.... The interior troubles of the Church arose from the unbridled fanaticism of the various sects."

Such "various sects" include seventh-century Neo-Marcionite and Neo-Manichaeic 'Adoptionists' in Armenia, who rejected original sin and infant baptism. They include also the later Paulicians or *Cathari*, who substituted their own new rite (the *consolamentum*) in the place of baptism – and also the twelfth-century Petrobrusians, who held infants to be unsaveable and accordingly unbaptizable.⁷⁴

Of all the errors in the Post-Cyprianic Church Universal mentioned earlier above, the paganistic and neo-paganizing heresy of baptismal regenerationism was probably the most dangerous.⁷⁵ Especially this insidious evil, particularly from the middle of the fifth century onward, promoted the rapid advance of the further error of total submersionism.

Only at the advent of the later Protestant Reformation was this paganizing perversion fully reversed. For it was then that Biblical baptism for entire covenantal households -- together with its meaningful mode of Scriptural sprinkling -- was restored correctively.⁷⁶

5. The non-baptizing Paulicians and the infant-damning Petrobrusians

In the Middle Ages, the neo-paganistic doctrines of the inherent goodness of babies and the denial of their original sin (in certain circles) -- sometimes expressed itself in a rejection of infant baptism. This was found in various heretical sects outside the Church Universal.

Thus wildcat 'Adoptionists' now arose in Armenia at the end of the seventh century. Too -- drawing from Marcionism and Manichaeism -- also most of the Paulicians rejected the Christian sacraments altogether.⁷⁷

As Professor Dr. Edwin Yamauchi has pointed out⁷⁸ in his important article *Manichaeans*: "The Paulician movement, which spread in Armenia from the seventh to the twelfth century -- though it repudiated Manichaeism -- resembled it in its dualistic views. The Paulicians came to Bulgaria in the tenth century and helped to develop the Bogomils, who flourished in the Balkans in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The latter in turn stimulated the important Manichaeic-like heresy of the Cathars or Albigensians in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries."

In 1012 A.D., Neo-Manichaeans appeared even in Germany. A group in Treves rejected infant baptism. These were the so-called *Cathari* -- called 'Bogomils' in the East, and 'Albigensians' in the West. Instead of Biblical baptism, they substituted their own rite (called the *consolamentum*) -- which also women were allowed to administer. Thereby, they laid on hands -- and imposed John's Gospel onto the candidate's breast.⁷⁹

As Professor Dr. Paul Steeves indicates⁸⁰ in his article *The Paulicians and the Bogomils*, "the Paulicians...held that only the Gospel and letters of Paul were divinely inspired. An evil deity...had inspired the rest of the New Testament, and the Old Testament.

"The Paulicians claimed that this evil deity was the creator and god of this world. The true God of Heaven, they said, was opposed to all material things.... Physical and material...sacraments...must have come from the same evil spirit....

"Some of the Bulgars adopted Paulician ideas into a new religious system that acquired the name 'Bogomilism'.... Around the middle of the tenth century, Bogomils began to teach that the first-born son of God was Satanael....

"This deity was expelled from Heaven. He made a new Heaven and Earth, in which he placed Adam and Eve. Satanael and Eve became the parents of Cain.... Moses and John the Baptist, according to Bogomil teaching, were both servants of Satanael.... The Bogomils...despised marriage.... They rejected baptism and communion, as Satanic rites."

In Western Europe and especially in France, a group of Neo-Marcionistic Antipaedobaptists arose at the beginning of the twelfth century. Around 1105, Peter de Bruys and his 'Petrobrusians' and Henry of Lausanne and his 'Henricians' practised rebaptism. That is, they rejected infant baptism, and themselves purported to baptize as adults such whom the Church had baptized previously during infancy.

Unlike nearly all modern Baptists, however, these Petrobrusians held that infants are incapable of being saved. They also revived the Donatistic view that piety in the administrator of baptism is essential for the valid administration of a sacrament. Indeed -- even according to the modern Baptist Erroll Hulse -- just like the later Anabaptists, "Peter de Bruys...rejected large parts of Scripture and embraced the false doctrine of 'soul-sleep.'"⁸¹

According to the great British Scholar Rev. Dr. William Wall,⁸² "the Petrobrusians -- otherwise called the 'Henricians' -- did own water-baptism, and yet denied infant-baptism.... **Peter Bruis and Henry [of Lausanne were] the two first antipaedobaptist preachers in the World.**" Yet they rejected most of the Bible, and promoted the heresy of 'soul-sleep.'

However, sociologically speaking, in denying infant baptism -- they had no long-term historical stability. Consequently, concludes Wall,⁸³ they "quickly dwindled away -- or came over to those that owned it." Indeed, with the exception of these non-ecclesiastical and disorganized infant-damning twelfth-century Petrobrusians, "there is no certain evidence of any church or society of men that opposed infant baptism" -- till the antireformational German and Swiss Anabaptists from about 1522 onward.

6. The Waldensians maintained the infant baptism of tiny Christians

Ritualistic Rome, with her rigid heresy of baptismal regenerationism, increasingly practised baptism specifically by submersion. Yet from about 1180 onward, we also encounter the protests of the Proto-Protestant Waldensians.

While rejecting Romanism's various ritualistic additions to baptism, these disciples of Peter Waldo did not repudiate the validity of any trinitarian baptisms as such. Not even when performed in the Church of Rome.

Whenever the Waldensians were unable to avail themselves of the rather scarce services of their own (mostly-itinerant) pastors, some of them very questionably arranged for their own children -- rather than to remain unbaptized -- to be baptized even by Romish priests. Still

others, with reluctance, even delayed for a few years those baptisms (because not necessary for salvation) -- until their own Waldensian pastors were later available, and able to officiate.

"The Waldensians," Martin Luther rightly wrote,⁸⁴ "baptize little ones.... They proceed, then, to baptize little children."

As Dr. Wall explains,⁸⁵ apart from the infant-damning Petrobrusians, "there is no certain evidence of any church or society of men that opposed infant baptism -- till...[the German Anabaptists in] 1522. For the main body of the Waldenses, there is no probability at all."

So too even the Baptist A.H. Newman, in his *History of Antipedobaptism*. There, he admits:⁸⁶ "The early Waldensian pastors...had scarcely anything in common with Baptists."

For "the Waldenses," as Rev. Professor Dr. Samuel Miller rightly points out in his work *Infant Baptism*,⁸⁷ "in their Confessions of Faith and other writings drawn up between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries...for several hundred years before the Reformation..., have indeed written on the subject." However, the evidence leads to only one conclusion -- "The great body of the Waldenses were Paedobaptists."

Miller then cites from Waldensian Historians themselves: "'Baptism,' say they, 'is administered in a full congregation of the faithful, to the end that he who is received into the church may be reputed and held by all as a Christian brother.... We present our children in baptism.... The things which are not necessary in baptism, are -- the exorcisms; the breathings; the sign of the cross upon the head or forehead of the infant" and/or the adult.

Later, under the influence of Calvinism, the Waldensians linked up with the Reformed Faith. The Waldensians' own historic adherence to infant baptism is clearly seen in their 1655 *Waldensian Confession*.

For there, they state⁸⁸ "that we do agree in sound doctrine with all the Reformed Churches of France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland...and others as it is set forth by them in their Confessions -- as also in the *Confession of Augsburg*." Very clear!

Indeed, that Protestant *Augsburg Confession* -- endorsed also by Calvin and the Calvinists -- states⁸⁹ "that children are to be baptized." It then goes on to "condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the baptism of children."

7. The impact on baptism of Thomistic Roman Catholicism

However, it was not the Biblical but rather the magical view of baptism which predominated in the Late Middle Ages. For around 1250, Thomas of Aquino propagated 'baptismal regeneration' as the only view which would soon be standardized officially -- in the Roman Catholic Church.⁹⁰

Sometimes, Thomas Aquinas upheld the right view -- for the wrong reason. Thus:⁹¹ "A sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing -- inasmuch as it sanctifies a man."

Yet by the latter clause, he meant -- quite wrongly -- that baptism itself regenerates. Again wrongly, he also held that originally it was administered by submersion.⁹² Centuries of baptismal regenerationism had by this time made submersionism very popular. Yet Thomas had to concede that "pouring and sprinkling are also allowable."⁹³

However, and sadly, he also opined that baptism is itself an "instrumental cause" initiating saving grace and bringing it to man.⁹⁴ "Baptism is given this ability, so that anybody is regenerated through it itself"⁹⁵ -- *ex opere operato*, alias sacramentalistically.

Baptism, believed Thomas Aquinas, is therefore the door to the Kingdom of Heaven.⁹⁶ It is essential to salvation -- except for those desiring to be baptized yet who die before this can be accomplished. Baptism, he insisted, is regeneration.⁹⁷ Lay-baptism was and still is permitted -- chiefly because all unbaptized children were and are regarded as being excluded from Heaven.⁹⁸

Under practically-omnipresent baptismal regenerationism in the Church Universal -- submersion (whether triple or single) was now thought to be a "safer" mode of baptism than sprinkling. This can yet be seen throughout ritualistic Eastern-Orthodoxy as well as in the Eastern Rite of Roman Catholicism.

However, the water still needed to be applied to the head -- as the most important part of the human body!⁹⁹ The 1284 Council of Nemours limited head-sprinkling to cases of necessity.¹⁰⁰ But the Pre-Reformation, and especially the Protestant Reformation, would ere long restore the Biblical mode (of sprinkling the head) to its rightful place. Acts 2:1-4, 16a, 33 and Revelation 7:2f & 14:1 & 22:4.

Meanwhile, the Deformed Church Universal had long abandoned the fourth century's tendency unnecessarily to delay baptism. It had instead, now for many centuries, administered it all too hastily. Yet it now did this chiefly because superstitiously it was terrified that all unbaptized persons, including babies, could not go to Heaven. Hence also babies were baptized, and usually by submersion. The more water used and the more of the body thereby washed -- the more sins were deemed to be washed away!

8. Pre-Reformers Wycliffe and Huss and their followers anent infant baptism

Fortunately, however, the Christian Gospel was still preserved -- especially in Northern Europe. In 1377, the English 'Pre-Reformer' John Wycliffe (1324-84) assailed the Romish mass.¹⁰¹ In 1402, the Wycliffite Jan Huss did the same in Bohemia.¹⁰²

Neither of them ever questioned infant baptism. To the contrary, Wycliffe declared: "On account of the words in the last chapter of Matthew [28:19], our church introduces believers who answer for the infant...."

"The child of a believer is carried into the church to be baptized, according to the rule of Christ." Yet "it seems hard...to assert" like the Romanists, "that this infant will be lost" if dying unbaptized! Nevertheless, "without a doubt, infants are duly baptized with water."¹⁰³

Wycliffe, and his English followers the Lollards, rejected baptismal regenerationism. As the great baptismal scholar Rev. Dr. Wall has pointed out,¹⁰⁴ "one of the articles usually enjoined [by their enemies], for the Lollards...to recant, was (as the martyrologist John Foxe¹⁰⁵ recites it), this: 'that an infant, though he die unbaptized, shall be saved.'"

Indeed, the Norfolk and Suffolk followers of the 1424 Wycliffite William White were constantly "speaking against [Romish] women baptizing new-born infants in private houses." For they stoutly opposed "the opinion of such as think children damned who depart before they come to their baptism.

"Wycliffe had said that the water itself, without...the Spirit, is of little efficacy.... He and his followers had said that if the parents be good Christians and pray for their child, there is hope that it may be saved -- though it do by some sudden chance die before it can be baptized." Thus William White.

So England's great 'Pre-Reformer' John Wycliffe was not only a convinced paedobaptist. But apparently, he was aware of Romish baptismal regenerationism as well as sectarian rebaptism. And he rejected both of those views.

Even England's King Richard's Queen Anne was herself a Wycliffite. She was the sister of King Wenceslas IV of Bohemia (in the modern Czech Republic). It was probably chiefly through her agency that Wycliffe's views were taken over almost without amendment by the Bohemian 'Pre-Reformer' Jan Huss -- and also by his friend Jerome of Prague, who had become a Wycliffite while at Oxford University before returning to his native Bohemia.¹⁰⁶

The followers of Huss were called the Hussites. "The Hussites of Bohemia," according to the Dr. Wall,¹⁰⁷ were of the "opinion...that infants dying unbaptized, may be saved by the mercy of God.... Indeed, they were disciples of our Wycliffe."

9. The influence of Wycliffe through Huss upon Martin Luther

The Wycliffite Huss would influence Martin Luther himself -- and thus launch the Protestant Reformation! Rome's 'Holy Council' itself pronounced "John Huss to have been and to be...the disciple...of John Wycliffe." So too, Luther later exclaimed that the Romish controversialist Eck "vilifies me as a 'heretic' and a 'Bohemian'" -- even "publicly accusing me of the heresy of and support for the Bohemian 'heretics.'" For Eck was indeed accusing Luther: "Many of the things which you adduce, are heresies of...Wycliffe and Huss!"

Luther himself, however, insisted that "John Huss and Jerome of Prague were good Christians." Luther also insisted that "Paul and Augustine are in reality Hussites." And again: "All this is not Luther's work. The credit belongs to John Huss."

Thus, added Luther, "it is high time that we seriously and honestly consider the case of the Bohemians, and come into union with them.... I have no desire to pass judgment...upon John Huss's articles.... I have not yet found any errors in his writings."

Luther even went back behind the Wycliffite Huss -- to the Englishman Wycliffe himself. Declared Luther: "As far as the [papal] 'decretals' are concerned..., they are...things it is not necessary to believe -- as John Wycliffe said." Indeed, after becoming a Protestant, in 1520 Luther boldly admitted: "I shall be called a Wycliffite!"

So, according to both Luther himself and his Romish opponent Dr. Eck, Luther was both a Wycliffite and a Hussite. For proof of all the aforesaid claims, see the documentation given in Francis Nigel Lee's 1989 monograph *Luther and Calvinism on Antichrist in the Bible*.¹⁰⁸

10. The rebaptism error of the Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren'

After some Romanists murdered Huss, his numerous followers unfortunately soon split up three different ways. Thus arose the only-partially-reformed Calixtines, the militant Proto-Protestant Taborites, and the separatistic 'Bohemian Brethren' (or later 'Moravians').

The Bohemians, the Church Historian Dr. Philip Schaff explains,¹⁰⁹ rightly "denounced the Pope of Rome as Antichrist." Yet they also wisely recognized that something of the historic Christian Church (though grossly deformed) was still to be found even within Romanism, despite its numerous papal perversions.

"At first, they received the sacraments from Calixtine and Romish priests who joined them." Indeed, "in 1467 they effected an independent organization...under the lead of Michael, formerly a Catholic priest." This was the 'Minor United Brethren' -- a minority party within the Bohemian Brethren (which as a whole remained anti-rebaptist).

Yet that minority party then soon over-reacted. Misinterpreting Joshua 5:2f and Acts 19:3f, it forgot that in Biblical times Josiah and Paul had not recircumcisingly discarded or rebaptizingly jettisoned but had rather retrieved and reformed -- the deformed Church of God.

Too, in Ezekiel 34:11-15, God does not say He would send new shepherds to build new sheepfolds for new sheep. He says He Himself would re-gather His scattered sheep; bring them back into their old sheepfolds; and punish not them but rather the false-shepherds who had scattered them.

In Bohemia, however, the ex-priest Michael and his 'Minor United Brethren' did something rather different. They forgot that baptism had replaced circumcision; and that re-baptism is therefore just as impossible as is re-circumcision. Jeremiah 9:25f and Romans 6:1-5f cf. Colossians 2:11-13.

So they revolutionarily went and elected by lot three priests from their number, and then laid their own Ex-Romish hands on them. Then they themselves were all solemnly 'rebaptized' by those three priests.

This latter act was a Neo-Donatist and a catabaptistic error itself certainly not devoid of sacramentalism. Never, however, did these Bohemian Brethren either abandon infant baptism as such -- nor rebaptize as adults those they deemed to have been baptized in infancy. Thus,

these Bohemians -- though indeed confused Catabaptists -- were not antipaedobaptistic Anabaptists. Still less were they adult-submersing Baptists.

As even the Pro-Mennonite Verduin has admitted:¹¹⁰ "The Brethren did practice infant baptism...of children born to 'believing parents'.... The point was not anti-pedobaptism, but anti-Constantinianism" -- or rather an exaggerated Anti-Romanism and a rebaptistic form of Neo-Donatism quite contrary to Holy Scripture (*cf.* Exodus 4:24-26 with Colossians 2:11-13).

11. The United Bohemian Brethren recanted the error of rebaptism

Fortunately, some of the later and better Theologians of this 'minority party' within the Bohemian Brethren -- soon resiled from their catabaptistic position. They then abandoned that 'rebaptismal' radicalism -- perhaps still during the fifteenth century.

Already by the time of their 1504 *Bohemian Confession* (later published in 1535) -- they had abandoned also a 'purely symbolical' sacramentology similar to that of the later Baptists. In its place, they would soon substitute that of the mainstream Protestant Reformation.

Perhaps under Luther's influence from 1520 onward, they opted for consubstantiation. Later yet, they also gradually abandoned even that -- for the purer truth of Calvinism. On this, one should see their letter sent to Beza in December 1575 -- and, further, their *Bohemian Confession* of that same year.

Now it seems this 1467*f* Bohemian Brethren 'minority party' had already abandoned its catabaptistic doctrines -- by 1504. No doubt its leaders informed the antirebaptismal Luther about this, before he supported them in 1520. At any rate, in their 1504 *Bohemian Confession* -- as well as in its 1535 *Prologue* -- they courageously distanced themselves from the previous rebaptistic lapse of some (and only some) of their own ancestors.

Thus, in the 1535 *Prologue*, the Ministers of the Church of the Bohemian Brethren assured their King Ferdinand the First of Bohemia and Hungary that they were certainly not Anabaptists. This disclaimer was necessary. For their Romish opponents were then quite falsely alleging that very thing about them (and later also about Calvinian Calvinists).

Explained these 'Bohemian Brethren':¹¹¹ "It is not unknown to anybody that we do not belong to the party of the Anabaptists. For we take our origin from the Church of the Bohemians.... We had already existed many years before them [the Anabaptists], and we do not defend their error-filled teachings.

"We have nothing in common with the Anabaptists...and have taken over nothing from them.... Our association has been in existence for much longer -- from before anyone ever first heard anything about the Anabaptists....

"Now [some of] our ancestors were wont to rebaptize those who had been baptized by Romish priests in former years , Yet they [such of our ancestors] still had an altogether different viewpoint and another purpose and an entirely other reason than the Anabaptists.

"Now, however, even this rebaptism has been abolished completely among us.... A short account will be given in this writing -- by the most excellent men of our Church....

"Further. Whenever we are because of this 'rebaptism' regarded as Anabaptists -- by the very 'sophisticated' [Romish] priests of Bohemia -- even this weapon is necessarily turned against them. For their ancestors too 're-re-baptized' those who had been baptized by papal priests, but who had thereafter been dedicated in [re]baptism" by the Bohemian Brethren.

For the Romish priests then, "by way of reprisal, once again repeated the baptism [already given] by the Bohemian Brethren -- to those [re-]renewed as papists." The Romish priests in Bohemia thus "[re-]rebaptized those [re-]baptized by both us and by our ancestors -- and they forced people even with violence to receive their baptism....

"Yet the [Bohemian Romish] priests maintain they had not faltered nor erred when they rebaptized or [re-]rebaptized those baptized [or rebaptized] by us. For they regarded us as heretics, sectarians and ecclesiastical excommunicatees. Thus, it also seemed very right to them -- that our baptism was of no significance, effect and power. This is why they [the Romanists in Bohemia] rebaptized....

"We too have been brought to answer them that we like many others -- just as they -- give nothing to [administering] baptism and other things [among ourselves].... We too used to regard [but no longer so regard] the baptism administered by them, as invalid and void....

"It is therefore clear that they have just as much guilt toward us, as we have toward them -- in rebaptizing the baptized." For both practices were, and are, clearly unbiblical.

12. The Bohemian Confession(s) on rebaptism from 1504 onward

Thus the 1535 *Prologue*. However, even earlier -- also before Luther's conversion to Protestantism, alias his advance toward Biblical Christianity -- one already encounters a 1504 *Bohemian Confession* to King Vladislav (which was updated constantly thereafter). We now cite from the 1535 version.

Article 12 declares "that children are baptized...and dedicated to Christ...according to His words: 'Permit the children to come to Me, and do not hinder them; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven' [Matthew 19:14]!' Therefore, we baptize ours."

For we all "rest upon the words of the Lord for children, in the Name of the Holy Trinity. Indeed, this statement [Matthew 28:19] is general: 'Teach all nations, inasmuch as you baptize them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' We do not baptize them again thereafter; and we no longer rebaptize [our converts from Romanism]....

"They [a former generation of the 'minority party' within the Bohemian Brethren] previously rebaptized those who wished to be taken up into our churches from others.... When the Romanists violently fought against the 'Bohemians' in matters of faith and religion, the leaders of both Churches clashed with Scripture....

"In several localities the one repeated the baptism of the other, for as long as they persevered in the greatest hatred. For the ancestors of our faith, who then completely separated themselves from them [from both Romanists and indeed from all others], had their own particular association, and administered the sacraments -- and rebaptized all who wished to join their churches....

"This kind of rebaptism existed in our churches -- until we acquired a better insight about this. However, in the course of time...through the goodness of God the light of truth illuminated our men more brightly....

"After they had investigated the Scriptures more carefully, and after they had at the same time been supported by the help of several learned men -- they realized that rebaptism is not necessary for the Church. And they then immediately discontinued and abolished it, with the approval of all.

"Hence, with the general agreement of our men, every repetition of baptism was abolished.... Nowhere is baptism any longer repeated among us.

"Yet some priests of the so-called Bohemian-Romish party, just as in former times, even now still rebaptize our people! Although for the most part against their wishes, and in opposition to the parents."¹¹²

13. God maintained His baptism despite the Church's mediaeval meanderings

To a much lesser extent than in Britain under the Wycliffites and in Bohemia under the Hussites, Christianity had continued even in darkest Southern Europe. It had continued not only in the stagnant southeast, but also in the papal southwest -- in spite of the tyranny there.

In 1520, Luther called this *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*. In his famous tract by that name, he boldly declared ¹¹³ that "the papacy is the kingdom of Babylon." Yet even there, he insisted, one still finds "the sacrament of baptism....

"Blessed be God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ Who according to the riches of His mercy hath preserved in His Church -- His sacrament!.... He desired that by it, little children...might be...sanctified in the simple faith of His Word.... Satan...could not quench the power of baptism in little children.... Baptism is the beginning and foundation....

"We ought to receive baptism at the hands of a man, just as if Christ Himself...were baptizing us with His Own hands. For it is not man's baptism, but Christ's...which we receive -- by the hand of a man....

"There is much of comfort, and a mighty aid to faith, in the knowledge that one has been baptized not by man but by the Trine God Himself through a man acting among us in His Name.... The sacrament of baptism, even in respect to its sign, is not the matter of a moment - - but continues for all time....

"This glorious liberty of ours, and this understanding of baptism, have been carried captive in our day! And whom have we to thank for this, but the Roman pontiff with his despotism?...

"Neither pope...nor any other man has the right to impose a single syllable of [his] law...upon a Christian man...and deal with us far worse than the [Islamic] Turk.... Few know this glory of baptism and the blessedness of Christian liberty..., because of the tyranny of the pope....

"The papacy is of a truth the kingdom of Babylon -- yea, of very Antichrist." Yet notwithstanding this, triune baptism -- even in the papacy -- has remained indestructible and unrepeatable, because still valid!

Also the Frenchman Calvin describes the woes of the Western Church with great precision. Yet he still condemns the catabaptistic insistence of Anabaptists and others, in rejecting the once-and-for-all validity of triune baptisms previously [and also subsequently] administered even in the Romish Church. Thus the great genius of Geneva explains:¹¹⁴

"In ancient times there remained among the Jews certain special privileges of a Church. So, in the present day, we deny not to the Papists those vestiges of a Church which the Lord had allowed to remain among them."

Too, "when the Lord had once made His covenant with the Jews, it was preserved.... Nor could circumcision be so profaned by their impure hands, as not still to be a true sign and sacrament of His Covenant." That is, prior to Christ's incarnation.

So, also with the Post-Patristic Church -- God "deposited His covenant in Gaul, Italy, Germany, Spain, and England. When these countries were oppressed by the tyranny of [the Papal] Antichrist -- He, in order that His covenant might remain inviolable, first preserved baptism there as an evidence of the covenant. Baptism which, consecrated by His lips, retains its power in spite of human depravity.....

"A sacrament is not to be estimated by the hand of him by whom it is administered, but is to be received as from the hand of God Himself.... This confutes the error of the Donatists, who measured the efficacy and worth of the sacrament by the dignity of the minister. Such in the present day are our Catabaptists, who deny that we are duly baptized -- because we were baptized in the Papacy by wicked men and idolaters. Hence, they furiously insist on Anabaptism.

"Against these absurdities we shall be fortified sufficiently, if we reflect that by baptism we were initiated not into the name of any man but into the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.... Therefore that baptism is not of man but of God -- by whomsoever it may have been administered. Be it that those who baptized us were most ignorant of God and all piety -- or were despisers -- still, they did not baptize us into a fellowship with their ignorance or sacrilege but into the Faith of Jesus Christ -- because the Name which they invoked was not their own but God's. Nor did they baptize into any other Name....

"It did not harm the Jews, that they were circumcised by impure and apostate priests. It did not nullify the symbol, so as to make it necessary to repeat it.... The objection that baptism ought to be celebrated in the assembly of the godly, does not prove that it loses its whole efficacy because it is partly defective....

"We do not abolish [baptism as] the institution of God, though idolaters may corrupt it. Circumcision was anciently vitiated [or defaced] by many superstitions, and yet ceased not to be regarded as a symbol of grace.

"Nor did Josiah and Hezekiah, when they assembled out of all Israel those who had revolted from God -- call them to be circumcised anew! [Indeed, how could they be? Jeremiah 9:25f]....

"We do not believe that the promise itself has vanished. We rather reflect thus: God in baptism promises the remission of sins, and will undoubtedly perform what He has promised to all believers....

"When the Lord invites the Jewish people to repentance -- He gives no injunction concerning another circumcision, though...they were circumcised by a wicked and sacrilegious hand.... Howsoever much the covenant might have been violated by them, the symbol of the covenant always remained according to the appointment of the Lord -- firm and inviolable.

"Solely therefore on the condition of repentance, they were restored to the covenant which God had once made with them in circumcision. Though this which they had received at the hand of a covenant-breaking priest -- they themselves had as polluted, as much as lay in them....

"In regard to us, it [baptism] was indeed long buried on account of unbelief. Now, therefore -- let us with faith receive" its thus-offered benefits!

14. Germany's Luther on covenantal infants' faith before their infant baptism

According to Scripture, it is the Spirit-empowered Word which regenerates. James 1:18. According to the Anabaptists, the Spirit alone regenerates -- unmonitorable by the Word. Rome, however, says that regeneration is effected by or through baptism -- and that baptism then and thus produces faith.

Rome thus held that infants could not believe savingly, until after and because they had been baptized. The Anabaptists held that infants cannot believe (and still less profess belief), so that infants should not be baptized -- but that adults could receive baptism (yet only after professing their faith). The Protestant Reformation objected first to Rome and then to the Anabaptists. Instead, it pointed both of them -- back to the Bible!

Probably even before his formal break with Rome, Luther had realized -- through studying Holy Scripture -- that baptism presupposes prior faith within the baptizee himself. From the Bible alone, Luther was led to deny the Romish error (and the later Anabaptist

heresy) that unbaptized infants cannot believe. He demonstrated the contrary. On this, see Francis Nigel Lee's book *Revealed to Babies*.

To Luther, Genesis 17:7 teaches that the Triune God is the Lord not only of adult believers but also of their seed. Himself the seed of believing parents, John the baptizer believed -- while yet in his mother's womb. Luke 1:41.

Luther also saw that Matthew 18:6f refers to little ones who believe in Jesus. Indeed, in Matthew 19:14 -- Jesus even declares that only those adults are fit for the Kingdom of Heaven, who believe like such infants.¹¹⁵

Thus Luther rightly realized that John the baptizer -- when yet a baby born to believing parents -- was himself already a believer in Christ, even before John's own birth. Luke 1:36-44. That was obviously before his later infant circumcision, and also before any possible baptism which John may or may not have received either in infancy or thereafter.

Referring to the Lord Jesus Christ's blessing of the children in Mark 10:14f -- Luther emphasizes¹¹⁶ that infant faith is present "before, or certainly in, the baptism.... If any baptism is certain of success, the baptism of children is most certain... In adults there may be deception, because of their mature reason. But in children there can be no deception, because of their slumbering reason."

Now if such infants indeed have a "slumbering reason" -- then why not also a slumbering faith? For, as Luther insists -- ever since man's fall into total depravity, "reason is a whore." But faith alone saves -- whether it commences before or during or after baptism!

What is this "slumbering" reason? Luther explains: "Tell me, is the Christian deprived of his reason when he is asleep? Certainly -- then -- his faith and God's grace do not leave him! If faith remains with the sleeping Christian [even] while his reason is not conscious of the faith -- why should there not be faith [with]in children, before reason is aware of it?

"A similar situation obtains, when a Christian is engaged in strenuous labour and is not [then] conscious of his faith and reason. Will you say that, on account of this, his faith has come to an end?" Of course not!

Luther later told the Anabaptists that Mark 16:16 does not say 'he who confesses he has faith and is baptized, shall be saved.' Instead -- the inspired Mark actually says that 'he who believes and is baptized, shall be saved.'

Explains Luther:¹¹⁷ "It is true that a [hu]man should believe, for baptism.... But his faith, **you** do not know!... Because all men are liars, and only God knows the heart....

"I do not get baptized because I am sure of faith, but because God has commanded it... Who then can exclude the little children?...

"We have a command to offer every one the universal gospel and the universal baptism. The children must also be included. We plant and water; and leave **God** to give the increase!"

15. Luther on the trust in Christ of believers' infants before and at their baptism

Well-known is Luther's (Quasi-Calvinian) emphasis on 'infant faith' at and even before infant baptism. For, he insists, "children must themselves believe -- lest the majesty of the Word and Sacrament be obscured."¹¹⁸ So "we are of the opinion and the expectation, that the child should believe; and we pray that God give it faith. Yet we do not baptize it for that reason, but because God has so commanded."¹¹⁹

Already in 1521 Luther clearly stated¹²⁰ that "without faith, no Sacrament is of any use.... The Sacrament of baptism is a divine sign or seal given by virtue of the promise and Word of Christ in the last chapter of Mark [16:16]. 'He that believes and is baptized, shall be saved.'"

Again, Luther also insisted¹²¹ that the Church prays for God to pour out His blessing upon the one to be baptized -- "so that he may become worthy to come to grace at his baptism.... The children themselves believe...and have their own faith which God works within them -- through the faithful intercession of their parents who faithfully bring them to the Christian Church.... Through their [parental] intercession and assistances, the children receive their own faith from God."

Luther appealed to infant circumcision (Genesis 17:10f), and asserted against the Anabaptists that children actually believe. Matthew 18:6 & 19:14.

Also, against the Romanists, he insisted: "Baptism helps no one. It is also to be given to no one -- except he believes for himself. Without personal faith, no one is to be baptized."

Ancient Anabaptists and baptistic Baptists and latter-day 'Lutherans' and even perversely-unpresuming paedobaptistic Presbyterians -- listen! Oh, all of you watered-down modern Sub-Reformed Quasi-Protestants! Carefully listen to Luther!

16. The deep roots and the sudden rise of the Anabaptist heretics

Only around 1522 did the Anabaptists emerge. They were subdivided into many different varieties, with considerable differences among all of those sects.

The great German Church Historian Rev. Professor Dr. Albrecht Ritschl, in his famous three-volume *History of Pietism*, attributed the origin of the Anabaptists to the mediaeval 'spiritual Franciscans.' Indeed, also the noted Dutch Doctrine Historian Drs. G. Kramer considered¹²² the Anabaptists to have agreed with Romanism in many weighty matters of faith.

Yet some of the Anabaptists' views seem to derive -- also *via* Francke and Paracelsus -- even from the Neo-Paganistic Pre-Renaissance. This is unquestionably so in the cases of Campanus, Denck, Münzer and Servetus. See in Francis Nigel Lee's book *A Christian Introduction to the History of Philosophy*, Craig Press, Nutley N.J., 1969, pp. 142f.

Also modern Baptist(ic) Church Historians have agreed with many of these assessments. Thus, in his book *The Anabaptist Story*, Professor Dr. W.R. Estep rightly insists¹²³ that "not one of the Swiss Anabaptist leaders came from a Waldensian background.... All of the early Anabaptist leaders came originally from the Roman Church..., or directly out of Catholicism into Anabaptist life."

Even more interesting is the admission of History Professor Dr. K.R. Davis in his book *Anabaptism and Asceticism*, published by the modern Mennonite Anabaptists themselves. "The Marburg Anabaptists," explains Davis,¹²⁴ "question[ed] prospective members and those requesting the sign of baptism thus:

"If need should require it, are you prepared to devote all your possessions to the service of the brotherhood?" Behold the dechristianizing advocacy of communism -- even at anabaptized baptisms!

Indeed, based on his Hutterite studies, the authority R. Friedmann has observed "that Anabaptist baptism might perhaps be compared to a monastic vow.... Novak advocates the same idea...that, in general, 'Anabaptism represents a laicization of the Catholic monastic spirituality.'"

Now most Anabaptists departed much further from Scripture than Romanism had -- and upheld even a Neo-Paganistic denial of the incarnation. Williams admits:¹²⁵ "The ancient heretical christology (originally developed by Valentinus and assimilated by Apollinarius)...was variously communicated to the sixteenth-century Radicals.... In part, indirectly by the perpetration of the 'celestial flesh heresy' in Bogomile and Cathar circles."

True, some of the simpler Anabaptists -- such as the widow Idelette Stordeur, even before she presbyterianized and married the Protestant Reformer John Calvin -- were indeed sincere Christians. Yet as to their distinctives, even when at their very best, the Anabaptist leaders can most appropriately be described as Sub-Christian.

For what was good in them, did not originate with them. Indeed, what did originate with them -- was not good.

The Anabaptists were divided into many varieties. Yet they were nevertheless all apparently influenced by the dualistic, Neo-Manichaeic, Anti-Old-Testamentistic and antipaedobaptistic¹²⁶ oriental sect of the ninth-century Paulicians.

Indeed, most of the Anabaptists were also tinged by the French Petrobrusian Neo-Marcionistic antipaedobaptist soul-sleepers of the twelfth century. Thus the modern Baptist Church Historians Rev. Professor Drs. H.C. Vedder and W.M.S. West.¹²⁷

Rev. Dr. West divides those "Anabaptists" *inter alia* into 'Spiritualists' and 'Anti-Trinitarians.' He holds that the 'Spiritualists' include "Thomas M nzer..., and...eventually Andreas Carlstadt.... The most famous names among the 'Anti-Trinitarians' are Miguel Servetus...and Faustus Socinus."

Some Anabaptists believed babies were 'safe.' Others believed they were lost -- because deemed to be incapable of certainly professing, or even of credibly possessing, any faith in Christ at all.

Again, some Anabaptists believed baptism was merely a sign of faith. Others believed it made prior faith secure. Yet others believed faith was vain without baptism. But all Anabaptists believed it was wrong, if not even sinful, to baptize babies.

17. The attack by German Anabaptists against the Protestant Reformation

The Protestant Reformation was the great "time of renewal" of Christ's Church, after the gloom of the Dark Ages. It is comparable to the earlier advent of Christ and His Spirit, after the gloomy times following Malachi at the end of the Older Testament. Cf. Hebrews 9:10-14.

The 'Newer Reformation' commenced when the paedobaptist Martin Luther of Wittenberg issued his *Ninety-Five Theses* against the prior Romish deformation of Christ's Church. The *Theses* were promulgated on Reformation Day, 31st October, 1517.

However, by 1522, not just reactionary Romish priests (from the ultra-right wing) were fanatically and viciously attacking the great Reformer. Even more so, so too were revolutionary Anabaptist weavers, and later also peasants -- from the lunatic left.

As early as 1519, Andreas Carlstadt began to attack the Church's doctrine of worship. But he then rapidly became increasingly fanatical, libertarian, populist, and revolutionary. By 1521, he had become quite closely associated with the left-wing lunatic Thomas Münzer (for whom see our next section below). This resulted in the rise of the so-called 'Zwickau Prophets' alias the first of the anabaptistic *Schwärmer* or swarms (of heretics).

As the famous Lutheran scholar Steimle has explained:¹²⁸ "In December [1521] the 'Zwickau Prophets' Niclas Storch, Thomas Drechsel...and Marcus Stübner...appeared in Wittenberg -- claiming direct divine inspiration" [cf. Pentecostalism!]. They then went on, "and preached the overturn of present conditions...."

"The City Council, in the endeavor to restore order, on January 24th 1522...adopted a *Worthy Ordinance for the Princely City of Wittenberg* in which...a date was fixed on which the images should be removed from the parish church.... But the excited populace did not await the day. Taking the matter into its own hands it invaded the church, tore images and pictures from the walls, and burned them up" -- thus sinfully and anti-decalogically destroying the private property of others.

As a result, Luther denounced Zwickau as "Babylon" (cf. Isaiah 48:20). He elaborated: "I see that the people are delivered up to Satan [cf. First Corinthians 5:5].... Anabaptists teach that if you wish to know Christ, you must...become a Nicolaitan [cf. the Antinomians in Revelation 2:14-15]. This is manifestly diabolical advice, which is in conflict with the First and Second Tables [of the Decalogue]."

Professor Dr. Robert D. Linder sums up the situation admirably. He points out¹²⁹ that the weavers "Nicholas Storch, Thomas Drechsel and Marcus Stübner...preached a radical biblicism." That "included rejection of infant baptism; [and] denial of the need for a professional ministry and organized religion (because all 'godly' men were 'under the direct influence of the Spirit')." They also advocated: "'special revelation' through 'visions and dreams'; the imminent return of Christ; and perhaps psychopannych[ian]ism" alias an assumed post-mortal and unconscious 'sleep' of the soul until the very end of World History.

"Driven from the Saxon town of Zwickau where they originated, and where they had influenced Thomas Münzer, they visited Wittenberg in December 1521 during Luther's absence.... Their millennial 'enthusiasm' and outspoken criticism of the Wittenberger's liturgy, led to their expulsion in 1522."

Significantly, also the modern British Baptist Historian Erroll Hulse rightly calls¹³⁰ these first German Anabaptists "radical prophets." Explains Hulse: "The leaders of this group were Storch, Stübner and Münzer -- the latter of ill-fame, because of his...claim of prophecy: the ability of 'inspired speech' similar to the claims of Neo-Pentecostals today.... Carlstadt, a well-known personality in town, was much influenced by the visitors. Eventually, he came to the position where he refused to administer infant baptism."

The Historian Professor Dr. Robert G. Clouse describes¹³¹ how "Carlstadt" radicalized, and then "believed infant baptism was unnecessary.... When Luther returned to Wittenberg, Carlstadt left for Orlamünde...and renounced his academic degrees. He took an anticlerical attitude, began dressing as a peasant, wearing no shoes.... These actions were based upon his conviction that inner religious experience demanded social equality [*cf.* Communism].

"Luther visited Orlamünde.... In a debate with him, Carlstadt claimed he [himself] spoke by direct revelation of the Holy Spirit -- rather than with the 'papistical' talk of Luther" from the Holy Scriptures!

18. Anabaptism's Thomas Münzer or Müntzer, the monster of Mühlhausen

In his own very important article on Thomas Mün(t)zer, Dr. Clouse rightly indicates¹³² that "he preached in a violent way.... He also organized his followers into bands, ready to take up arms....

"Some of these disciples destroyed a shrine.... This action...caused Duke John and Duke Frederick of Saxony to order Münzer to preach before them. In his sermon...he demanded that the rulers use force to establish the true Gospel....

"After some months in South Germany, he appeared at Mühlhausen, where he preached to the townsmen and helped to involve them in the Peasant Revolt.... His teaching against infant baptism and his emphasis on the [alleged new] inspiration of the Holy Spirit, influenced other Anabaptists.... Marxist Historians emphasize Münzer, because he anticipated later social revolutionaries." Thus Dr. R.G. Clouse.

Also Harvard's Professor Dr. G.H. Williams -- himself sympathetic to Anabaptism -- has admitted¹³³ "that Thomas Münzer was a fierce fanatic, possessed of a demoniac spirit." When previously a Romanist, "he became father-confessor in a Bernadine convent" -- yet, even then, he was plagued with "radical doubt as to the existence of God."

However, after "he entered the circle of the three so-called 'Zwickau Prophets'" -- Münzer went around "preaching a radical Biblicism characterized by direct revelation in visions and dreams..., the abandonment of infant baptism, [and] belief in the millennium [right then to be set up here on Earth] to be preceded by the ascendancy of the [Islamic] Turk as Antichrist.... He appears to have encouraged the postponement of baptism until children should be of sufficient age to understand the action."

In his communistic 1524 *Sermon Before the Princes*, Münzer alluded apparently to Luther as "Brother Fattened Swine" and "Brother Soft Life" and even "Mr. Liar." Also the Lutheran Theologians, he alleged, were "vicious reprobates."¹³⁴ Preaching revolution, Münzer called upon the common people to crush the 'godless'¹³⁵ -- *i.e.* the Lutherans (and the Romanists?).

Williams explains:¹³⁶ "Münzer reinterpreted the politically conservative text of Romans chapter thirteen -- into a revolutionary passage...making the Ernestine princes by hortatory anticipation the executors of God's wrath against the godless and the protectors of the revolutionary saints.... Münzer warned that if the princes should fail to identify themselves with the 'covenantal people' -- the sword would pass from them to the people..."

"Sovereignty resided in the godly people" -- meaning Münzer's kind of people! "He took the outpouring of the Spirit in himself and others, as confirmation of the prophecy of Joel (chapters 2:27-32 & 3:1-4)."

This, Thomas Münzer combined "with the equalization of the saints -- in the common possession both of the gifts of the Spirit and the goods of life." Marxism and Mobocracy -- here we come!

Even today -- the message of Münzer is alive and well on Hal Lindsay's great planet Earth. Compare George Orwell's *Animal Farm* and his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* -- and even the Neo-Anabaptist Ron Sider's 1984 *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*.

19. The Anabaptist Balthasar Hübmaier and the road to revolution

Münzer was apparently much encouraged by his fellow South German -- Balthasar Hübmaier of Wausthut (or Waldshut). He too had been a Roman Catholic priest -- and had studied under Luther's implacable opponent, Dr. Johann Eck. Hübmaier himself had persecuted Jews -- and helped promote the burning down of their synagogue in Regensberg.¹³⁷

According to the Baptists Vedder and Estep,¹³⁸ "foot washing was practised by Hübmaier even before believer's baptism [*sic!*] was introduced." Yet by Easter 1525, after not baptizing but merely 'dedicating' most infants (yet still baptizing them when parents demanded it),

Hübmaier introduced rebaptism in Waldshut. He himself rebaptized some three hundred Christians. This he did by sprinkling or pouring, but not by submersion.¹³⁹

Those who now practise infant baptism, averred Hübmaier, "rob us of the true baptism.... One must not baptize infants.... If so, I may baptize my dog or my donkey; or I may circumcise girls." Or "I may make idols out of St. Paul and St. Peter -- [or] I may bring infants to the Lord's Supper."¹⁴⁰ Paedocommunionists -- note well!

To Hübmaier,¹⁴¹ "infant baptism is a deception invented...by men.... The sprinkling of infants...is no baptism, nor is it worthy of such a name."

1527 saw the publication of his work *The Reason and Cause Why Every Man Who Was Christened in Infancy Is Under Obligation to be Baptized According to the Ordinances of Christ Even Though He Be One Hundred Years Old*.¹⁴² And in his last polemic writing (*On Infant Baptism*),¹⁴³ Hübmaier not only condemned that ordinance but even declared that it actually does the infant harm.

Moreover, Hübmaier was also an anti-pacifistic and anarchistic Anabaptist. See his work *On the Sword* (translated by the Baptist Vedder). In that regard, Hübmaier made common cause even with the revolutionistic Anabaptist Thomas Münzer.

Bullinger charged Hübmaier with a restless spirit of innovation. Hübmaier certainly was extremely brazen. Boldly, he had claimed even Luther supported his views!

So Luther retorted that "Balthasar Hübör [Hübmaier] quotes me, among others, by name -- in his blasphemous book on rebaptism -- as if I were of his foolish mind. But I take comfort in the fact that neither friend nor foe will believe such a lie -- since I have sufficiently in my sermons shown my faith in infant baptism."

In addition, Luther classified the Anabaptists as being of the same ilk as the Judaistic fanatics at the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. He also compared them to the Donatistic Circumcellions who ravaged the African Church as from 340 A.D.¹⁴⁴

That comparison is truly remarkable -- both sacramentologically, and also as regards revolutionism! For the Donatists had rejected the validity of baptisms performed by the Church Universal in North Africa. Indeed, after repudiating the Church Universal's baptisms, the Donatistic Circumcellions went around destroying both churches and real estate -- just like the Anabaptists later did in Germany.

After some of the North African clergy had betrayed or compromised Christianity in order to save their own skins during the last Pagan-Roman persecution of Christians, Donatus and his followers separated from the Church Universal in A.D. 313. Then they went off and formed their own separatist sect.

The Donatists were indeed Paedobaptists, However, they unbiblically demanded worthiness in baptizers and baptizees as an alleged precondition for valid baptism. They therefore catabaptistically rebaptized all converts they gained from the Church Universal.

Some two decades later, a lunatic fringe emerged from Donatism -- the **Circumcellions**. These were mendicant monks who wandered about the countryside among the peasants -- plundering, burning and murdering in a revolutionary frenzy.

In his standard work *The Donatist Church*, an expansion of his Ph.D. dissertation, Dr. W.H.C. Frend explains¹⁴⁵ that "the extreme section of the Donatist Church did not merely support revolt, but they fomented it themselves...[through their] close link between...bands of fanatics known as Circumcellions.... In the year 340, one first hears of the strange revolutionary fringe of Donatism, the Circumcellion movement. There is little doubt that today one would regard these Circumcellions as 'terrorists'....

"When there was some tough work to be done, like sacking a Catholic church or a Roman villa, or bringing troublesome dissenters to heel, the [rebaptistic] Circumcellions would be called in.... They were peasants from Upper Numidia and Mauretania, and they were Donatists....

"The Circumcellions exerted due pressure.... Slaves and masters found their positions reversed.... The Circumcellions...were...religious fanatics. They derived their name from the fact that they lived 'around the shrines' (*circum cellas*) whence they got their food."

From about 355 onward, aggressive Donatism carried all before it -- throughout most parts of Northern Africa. Explains Dr. Frend: "Donatism swept through Numidia and Mauretania like a forest fire." Overseers of the Visible Church Universal "were rudely deposed.... The altars at which the Early Catholics had worshipped only a short time before, were broken up and burnt. The communion wine was thrown to the dogs -- or heated into a powerful stimulant and drunk intoxicatingly. The Catholic liturgical vessels were thrown out of windows, to be smashed."

Revolution reigned -- both in state and in church. Frend summarizes the situation profoundly, in just one line: "**Rebaptism** once more became the **rule!**"

The Donatist leader Optatus -- *cf.* the later Anabaptists Münzer and Hübmaier! -- continues Frend, "represented from the first the arrogant fanaticism of Numidian Donatism, and was himself bent on accomplishing social as well as religious revolution by violent means. His views were thus akin to those of the Bogomil and Albigensian leaders who in the Middle Ages combined religious dissent with social reform....

"Optatus was capable of harnessing and directing the latent religious enthusiasm of the Numidian country-dwellers.... Under his inspiration, the Circumcellions became something of a military force. Their clubs and staves were supplemented by swords, spears, and other weapons.... Their depredations became endemic. Optatus seems to have intended to create a new social order, with Circumcellion aid.

"In Augustine's bare words (*Contra Litteras Petiliani* I:24-26), he [Optatus] redistributed lands...and punished oppressive landowners by forcing them to abandon their estates.... The violences of the Circumcellions grew every year. The activities of 'terrorist bands' covered 'nearly all Africa' -- according to Posidius (*Vita* 10)....

"The Circumcellions made the whole diocese of Hippo unsafe. Villas were besieged and destroyed.... In these years, we read more of the fanatical outrages of the Circumcellions - - burning, pillaging, and rebaptizing. Forty-eight...were rebaptized in one village on a single day. Augustine [of Hippo] himself felt uncertain of his hold over some of his congregation (*Epistle* 124:2).... The vehemence with which Augustine [in his *Contra Gaudentium* I:11:25] describes the outrages of the Circumcellions and the Donatist *sanctimoniales* who accompanied them, suggests comparative helplessness."

The resemblance between the earlier rebaptistic Circumcellions and the later rebaptistic Anabaptists, is striking indeed. So too is their undeniable resemblance to the modern wayward World[ly] Council of Churches' Liberation Theologians' pernicious motto: "Resurrection means Insurrection!" Indeed, all such resemblances are hardly coincidental.

20. The turbulent Anabaptists and the 1525 Peasant War in Germany

Matters exploded early in 1525, upon the publication of the *Twelve Articles of all the Peasants*. Allegedly, and indeed apparently, this had been authored by Hübmaier.

As the Lutheran Theologian Charles M. Jacobs has pointed out:¹⁴⁶ "The social ferment out of which the Peasants' War arose, had its beginning far back of the Reformation. It had been in progress for a full century before the Reformation began....

"Heretical ideas of many kinds had combined.... The hope of the coming millennium glowed most brightly in the hearts of those who had the least to hope for, this side of it....

"This view of it was zealously spread by radical...preachers of religious revolution. The best known of these men, were Thomas Münzer and Balthasar Hübmaier....

"[Now] Münzer, Hübmaier and others were preaching religious revolution.... The[ir] *Twelve Articles of All the Peasants*...were adopted originally by the peasants...from January or February 1525....

"On the basis of extensive research, Wilhelm Stolze in his 1926 work *Peasant War and Reformation* has suggested that they were written by Hübmaier.... A valuable edition of the most important sources, is that of Böhmer's *Documents for the History of the Peasant War and the Anabaptists* (Bonn, 1910)....

"In April [1525], the peasants of Swabia attacked their landlords and rulers -- [and] plundered and destroyed castles, monasteries, and churches.... Before May 1st [the ancestor of the modern 'May Day' of later Communists and Socialists!], most of Franconia was at the mercy of the peasant bands....

"Similar outbreaks followed in many localities -- especially in Thüringen, where Mühlhausen, the home of Thomas Münzer, was the storm center. Their early successes led the peasants to...the most revolting atrocities."

Also the Dutch *Christian Encyclopaedia* has linked Hübmaier to the Peasant War.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, the Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*¹⁴⁸ even mentions his acquaintance with the monster Münzer.

Now -- of the 1525 *Twelve Articles of all the Peasants*, the Fourth condemns the "custom hitherto that no poor man has had the power to be allowed to catch game, wild fowls, or fish in running water.... This seems to us altogether improper" -- also on private land!

Further, the Tenth Article communistically demands what it called "the common fields" -- which, it alleged, "once belonged to a community. We would take these back again into the hands of our communities"¹⁴⁹ -- such as that of Adam and Eve before the fall.

Yet this conveniently forgets that Eve alone, and no other women, was still only Adam's flesh and bone, both before and after the fall. Too -- even then, and also if the fall had never occurred -- man would still have left his father and his mother and cleaved to his wife. Cleaved to his own wife -- and not to his wives (plural), and stil less to the wives of others!

Article Ten also ignores the fact that, right after the fall, Adam and Eve each possessed his or her own God-given sexuality and male or female clothes -- and that not Adam but only Eve would be able to get pregnant. Indeed, Cain soon brought his own offering of his vegetables, and Abel of his own flocks -- to God. Thus, not communal but private property!

Indeed, God accepted Abel's gift to Him -- but **not** Cain's. Genesis 2:23-24 & 3:15-21 & 4:3-5. And hereby -- farewell indeed, and good riddance, to the apparently Aquinian and certainly Neo-Münsterian Marxist myth of any kind of "Primordial Communism" (*sic*)!

Revolutionary insurrection now spread rapidly across the whole of Southwestern and Central Germany. Soon, all was in uproar. Palaces, castles, convents and libraries were all put to the torch by Münzer's Anabaptists. Ten years later, they even ruled -- from the City of Münster -- as proletarian princes!

Karl Marx's colleague, the famous Communist Friedrich Engels, remarked:¹⁵⁰ "The peasants and plebeians...united in a revolutionary party whose demands and doctrines were most clearly expressed by Münzer.... The millennium and the day of judgment over the degenerated Church and corrupted World proposed and described by the mystic, seemed to Münzer imminently close....

"Under the cloak of Christian forms, he preached a kind of pantheism...and at times even approached atheism.... There is no Heaven in the beyond.... There is no devil but man's evil lusts.... His political program approached Communism.... Even on the eve of the [1848] February Revolution, there was more than one modern communist sect that had not such a well-stocked theoretical arsenal as was Münzer's in the sixteenth century....

"By 'the Kingdom of God' Münzer understood a society in which there would be no class differences or private property and...authority independent of or foreign to the members of the society.... A union[!] was established to implement all this.

"Münzer set to work at once to organize the union. His sermons became still more militant and revolutionary.... He depicted the previous oppression in fiery colours, and countered it with his dream vision of the millennium of social[istic] republican equality. He published one revolutionary pamphlet after another, and sent emissaries in all directions.

"'All the World must suffer a big jolt!' [proclaimed Münzer]. There will be such a game, that the ungodly will be thrown off their seats -- and the downtrodden will rise!"

Thus the Classic Communist, Friedrich Engels. Indeed, as the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels itself would later urge: "Working men of all countries -- unite!"

Friedrich Engels was by no means the only leading Communist to praise these Anabaptists (in his 1850 book *The Peasant War in Germany*). Marx's other associate, Karl Kautsky, did the same.

He did so, in his 1894 book *Communism in the Middle Ages and in the Time of the Reformation* -- and also in his 1897 other book *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*. Ever since, radically communist text-books world-wide have been doing exactly the same.

Proclaimed Münzer:¹⁵¹ "All things shall be common, and occasionally they shall be distributed according to each one's necessity.... Whatever prince, count or lord will not submit to this -- and, being forewarned -- his head shall be stricken off, or he shall be hanged!"

Münzer then collected together eight thousand peasants, and ransacked the cloisters and the houses of the rich throughout Thuringia. However, he was solidly defeated at the Battle of Frankhausen in 1525, and beheaded shortly thereafter.

Yet the death of Münzer was by no means the end of the bloodshed. From Thuringia, the Peasant Revolt now spread to Swabia. There, the preaching of Melchior Hofmann -- later the leading Anabaptist -- inspired the peasants to make their demands, as laid down in the *Twelve Articles*.

Without waiting for the nobility to reply, the peasants revolted. In eight days, one hundred and seventy-nine castles and twenty-eight cloisters were burnt down.

Many of the nobility were butchered. But the princes finally arose against the fanatics, and the revolt ended in the bloody death of nearly one hundred thousand peasants.

Luther early in 1525 immediately made two responses to the demands of the anabaptistic peasants. The first, was his dispassionate *Admonition to Peace*. It was subtitled *A Reply to the Twelve Articles of the Peasants in Swabia*.

Unfortunately, the peasants ignored his *Admonition* -- and promptly started murdering and burning and robbing. This quickly led Luther to write also a second tract -- his *Against the Robbing and Murdering Hordes of Peasants*. There, he very strongly rebuked their attempted anarchy.

