

# The Challenge of Anabaptist Baptism and the Lutheran Confession

*Arnold J. Koelpin*

[Historical background to Formula of Concord XII, 6-8]

Caught in the crossfire between Latin canonists and reform-minded fanatics, the 16th century Lutherans were driven to take their stand on a double front. The old school churchmen tried to hang the label of "innovators" on all Luther's adherents in an effort to discredit them theologically as well as politically. At the Augsburg Diet in 1530, Papal defender, Dr. John Eck, blatantly lumped Luther together with Zwingli, Carlstadt, Hubmaier, and Denk, as an "iconoclast, Sacramentarian, Anabaptist, and New Epicurean."<sup>1</sup>

Because of the unfair tactic of such criticism the evangelical theologians at Augsburg enlarged their original apology to include the Articles of Faith and Doctrine (AC 1-21) that form the base of the Augsburg Confession. In them the defendants unmistakably countered the charge of innovation. They condemned the error of the sectarians, while at the same time maintaining their testimony against Rome. From the other corner, the fanatics tried their best to capture the reform movement by accusing the Lutheran confessors of not making a clean break from Roman heresies.

Among the opposing parties the understanding of baptism ranks high on the list of controversies. Scores of tracts on this subject have come down to us from this era.<sup>2</sup> Yet in reading the Lutheran position in the Book of Concord we are struck by a lack of detail on this matter. The debate over the meaning of baptism appears as a minor issue both in the Augsburg Confession (1530) and in the Formula of Concord (1580) when compared with the great sacramentarian struggle over the Lord's Supper.

There are obvious historical reasons for this lack. By 1530 the original leaders of the Anabaptist opposition had died or been killed, most of them as victims of the Imperial law against causing insurrection. Politically speaking, at least, the movement seemed discredited. Later, when the Formula was accepted to effect an intra-churchly concord, the Lutherans were no longer specifically troubled by the baptism question as a doctrinal issue.

Nonetheless, second generation Lutherans did not neglect the challenge of Anabaptist baptism. "As far as our ministry is concerned," the writers of the Formula of Concord agreed, "we do not propose to look on idly or stand by silently while something contrary to the Augsburg Confession is imported into our churches and schools." They then appended Article XII to the Formula of Concord as a catch-all against sectarian errors, pointing the finger specifically at those factions and sects which never accepted the Augsburg Confession, such as the Anabaptists. "We have no part or share in their errors, be they few or many," the confession stated, "and...we reject and condemn all these errors as wrong, heretical, and contrary to our Christian and biblically-based Augsburg Confession."<sup>3</sup>

Included in the errors cited in Article XII of the Formula of Concord are three which deal directly with baptism. They focus on the problem of child baptism, and in a series of negative theses they reject the teachings:

1. That unbaptized children are not sinners before God but righteous and innocent, and hence in their innocence they will be saved without Baptism, which they do not need. Thus they [the factions and sects] deny and reject the entire teaching of original sin and all that pertains thereto.
2. That children should not be baptized until they have achieved the use of reason and are able to make their own confession of faith.
3. That the children of Christians, because they are born of Christian and believing parents, are holy and children of God even without and prior to baptism. Therefore they do not esteem infant Baptism very highly and do not advocate it, contrary to the express words of the promise which extends only to those who keep the covenant and do not despise it (Gen. 17:4-8, 19-21).<sup>4</sup>

Even though this presentation merely touches certain basics, the confessional stance was clear, at least as far as it concerned church-political legitimacy. But the controversy over baptism was not to disappear in the face of Lutheran, and Roman, opposition.

On the contrary, because of historical developments the baptism debate has assumed proportions in our day beyond the expectations of our forefathers. Today scores of Protestant denominations either deny infant baptism or cast doubt on its credibility. Pentecostal fervor has only added to the dissention by separating water baptism from Spirit baptism, and in some cases, both of them from the ultimate baptism of blood in martyrdom.

The list of witnesses who recently have questioned the traditional practice of infant baptism includes the Reformed theologian, Karl Barth. In a 1951 opinion to the University of Tuebingen faculty, Barth wrote: "From the standpoint of the doctrine of baptism, infant baptism can hardly be preserved without exegetical and practical artifices and sophisms -- the proof to the contrary has yet to be supplied! One wants to preserve it only if one is resolved to do so on grounds which lie outside the Biblical passages on baptism and outside of the thing itself."<sup>5</sup>

T.E. Watson's 1976 (revised) paperback collection *Should Infants Be Baptized?* marshals an array of paedo-baptist writings questioning indiscriminate baptism. Joachim Jeremias' scholarly search into the baptism practice of the early church, *Hat die Urkirche die Kindertaufe geübt?*, caused a running verbal feud with Kurt Aland, who denied the practice.

G.R. Beasley-Murray's extensive treatment of the subject, *Baptism in the New Testament*, summarizes the present state of affairs without evasion:

The most distressing difficulty of the present discussion concerns the validity of infant baptism. How can any who maintain the standpoint from which this book is written accord to infant baptism the significance of Apostolic baptism? And in such case, how should a convert not be urged to receive Apostolic baptism, even though in infancy he had received the very defective rite of infant baptism? In these circumstances scandal cannot be avoided. The Baptist considers the Paedo-baptist unbaptized; the Paedo-baptist theologian regards a submission to believers' baptism after the receiving of infant baptism to be an affront to the Word of God and nigh to blasphemy. Conscience thus strikes conscience: the Paedo-baptist bristles with indignation and the Baptist feels compelled staunchly to maintain his here-I-stand-I-cannot-do-no-other attitude. The breaking of the deadlock is conceivable only if either group, or both, move from positions traditionally held. And that cannot happen without hurt, for every surrender of cherished positions brings pain and any attempt to compromise creates opposition. Yet the issue is of crucial importance; if we try to dodge it, it will continue to haunt us and be an open sore throughout the years.<sup>6</sup>

All this attention to the sacrament of baptism may strike us the more strange when we realize that there was no extensive defense of infant baptism until the 16th century. Why not? The reason lies on the surface. Infant baptism was so generally accepted prior to the coming of Anabaptism that few, if any, took pains to justify the practice. Irenaus (c. 200 A.D.) maintained that Jesus sanctified all ages of life. Origin (c. 250 A.D.) affirmed the apostolic foundation of infant baptism. Even Augustine's (c. 400 A.D.) testimony against Pelagius seemed to concentrate not on defending the baptism of little children, but in proving by the practice that children were born with original sin. In the *Summae* Aquinas (c. 1250 A.D.) only briefly touches the subject. He is content to follow the faith of the church. Not until the debates between the reformers and the radicals do the individual arguments in support of infant baptism heap up.

There is always something refreshing in returning to the origins of any question. At no other place does the full import of the old proverb *principiis obsta* (resist at the beginnings) strike us. The Anabaptist challenge to the traditional understanding and practice of baptism arose within the Reformation itself out of a concern for reform. The radical position in turn definitively stamped the classical Lutheran expression regarding the sacrament of baptism. Lutheranism's characteristic emphasis on the Word and sacraments as the means of grace in its catechism and sermons is the result. We enter the debate, therefore, at its inception and because of limitations confine ourselves to the initial years, 1521-25.

## 1. The Zwickau "Prophets" challenge Luther's position on baptism

The arrival of the Zwickau "Prophets" -- Nicholas Storch, Marcus Thomae (called Stuebner), and Thomas Drechsel in Wittenberg, late in December 1521, occasioned a new phase in the discussion of baptism for Luther and his followers.<sup>7</sup> Previous to this time the Wittenberg Reformers had contested the Roman understanding of baptism as set forth in the composite scholastic heritage.<sup>8</sup> In *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, written the year before, Luther had expressed thanks that God "preserved in his church this sacrament at least, untouched and untainted by the ordinances of men, and has made it free to all nations and classes of mankind."<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, he criticized the fact that churchly practice caused adults to forget their baptism in daily life and to replace its ongoing use with the sacrament of penance.

But with the appearance of the trio from Zwickau the Wittenbergers had to meet a more radical call for reformation than they themselves had advanced. Significantly, the major issue was baptism. Luther admitted he had always expected Satan to attack this touchy area and registered his concern that the whole question would create a schism among his followers -- as in fact it did. "I have always expected. Satan to touch this sore," he confided in Melanchthon, "but he did not want to do it through the papists. It is among us and among our followers that he is stirring up this grievous schism, but Christ will quickly trample him under our feet."<sup>10</sup> Among those influenced by the Zwickauers' views were Thomas Muentzer, Andrew Bodenstein von Carlstadt, Martin Cellarius (Borrhaus), who later established contact with the Anabaptists in Switzerland and Strassburg, and Dr. jur. Gerhard Westerburg, Carlstadt's brother-in-law, who was to become active as an Anabaptist in Cologne.

To reconstruct the "Prophets'" arguments regarding baptism we must rely primarily on correspondence and reports from the Evangelical circles.<sup>11</sup> The Zwickauers themselves left no written account of their beliefs. Stuebner, the only one of the three whom Melanchthon identifies as being literate, responded to the question whether he had written any books by saying, "Nayn, unser herrgott hats ym verpotten" -- "No, our Lord God forbade him to do so."<sup>12</sup>

Much of the correspondence from Wittenberg involved Luther as leader of the evangelical cause. He first learned of the problem during his stay at the Wartburg through reports from Melanchthon and Amsdorf. After the disturbances in Wittenberg moved him to return home in March, 1522, Luther had occasion to discuss the issue with all three "Prophets" individually during the course of the next year.<sup>13</sup> Direct contact seems to have ended at that point. The church visitations in Zwickau in January, 1529, however, revealed that the movement had continued in seclusion. As late as 1597, a third-hand account of Storch's theology, was published by Marcus Wagner. Article VI of the Wagner report deals specifically with baptism.<sup>14</sup>

Piecing together the scattered reports into a composite picture, we find the Zwickauers criticized traditional baptism especially on two counts. Melanchthon identifies them as infant baptism (*baptismus parvulorum*) and the use of sponsors (*fides aliena*).<sup>15</sup> The radicals rejected infant baptism for the simple reason that children in infancy did not have faith. This assertion was based on the natural observation that the little ones neither reasoned nor spoke; and hence they neither understood what was happening at their baptism nor could they give evidence of their faith. Lacking these essentials of faith, infants must be denied baptism, it was argued, since the Scriptures join faith and baptism: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mk. 16:16).

The second question regarding the use of sponsors for the child followed naturally. For if a child did not possess its own faith, there was no reason to believe that parents or sponsors could assist by speaking on the child's behalf. The radicals rejected this practice as equally unacceptable because, in their eyes, the faith of another person has no value for the child.<sup>16</sup> One of the reports flatly states: "It has come to our attention that some doubt whether the faith of sponsors helps the child at baptism."<sup>17</sup> Faith apparently was so individual a matter that involvement of others was out of the question.

The "Prophets'" concern for the personalness and individuality of faith came from their vision of God's Spirit directly active in the soul.<sup>18</sup> Little wonder, therefore, that Storch, whom Luther identifies as head of the sect, made infant baptism the chief topic of disagreement. Storch saw little significance in the baptismal act as such. To him the water of baptism was plain, ordinary water. Luther notes how Storch laughed at the thought

that "a handful of water is able to save men."<sup>19</sup> According to the Wagner report Storch taught: "We should not pour water on any child nor bring it to church for baptism, because the water is the same water as evaporates into moisture and which we see daily. And if one were to douse a dog with it or dunk him in it, he would be bathed as nicely as when we sprinkle a child with it."<sup>20</sup>

On this point there was disagreement in the ranks of the "Prophets." Stuebner sought to argue the case more Biblically. Although he also claimed a direct perception of God's will through visions and conversations, yet Stuebner kept pressing the unscripturalness of infant baptism. Evidently his training at the University of Wittenberg, where he reportedly had become "very well-versed in Sacred Scripture," had left its impressions.<sup>21</sup>

But for Storch baptism remained purely an external rite. Its significance, if it were practiced at all, lay in its use as a mere outward sign of the inward happening of faith. What really counted, in his estimation, was the baptism by fire and the Spirit.<sup>22</sup> The manner in which Storch dismissed baptism, "Ey, was liegt dan an diesem artikel!"—"Oh, what's the value of this teaching anyway!"<sup>23</sup>—underscored his real concern for a type of personal faith arising from the voice of God in the inner soul rather than by external means.

Does the extreme subjective character of this position suggest that this protest movement arose on its own, independent of previous contexts? To our surprise the Zwickauers cited Luther as their authority.<sup>24</sup> The connection between the radicals and the Reformer evidently did not come from Luther's criticism of Roman baptism. Luther nowhere even hinted at rejecting infant baptism. What the radicals learned from Luther seems to have been an appreciation for faith itself in the life of a Christian, a thought Luther himself found prominent in his reading of the mystics. Already the year before the Zwickauers' arrival in Wittenberg, Luther had disseminated his *Sermon on the New Testament, that is, on the Holy Mass*, in which he stressed the importance of faith when one partakes of the sacrament. But that message must have come through as onesidedly to the men from Zwickau as it did to Balthasar Hubmaier, a later leader in Anabaptism, who claimed this tract influenced his thinking on the baptism question;<sup>25</sup> for Luther did not use these insights to undo, but to renew the teaching concerning the sacrament.

Contrary to Luther's intention, the Zwickau "Prophets" isolated the mystical understanding of faith. In their way of thinking, faith became identified with the inner perception of God; consequently the water of baptism was used merely as an external ritual done at Christ's behest. As a result baptism had to be withdrawn from children because they lacked the inner perception of faith. That this sequence approximates the radical view is supported by an observation of Nicolaus Hausmann, the Evangelical pastor in the hometown of Zwickau. He identifies the Storchite articles of faith as *pickardish*, a label often used to identify Bohemian sectarianism. As a degenerate form of the medieval "Beghard," *pickard* referred to that part of the Hussite party which emerged at Tabor in 1420 to develop their own sacramental views. They held that converts were to be rebaptized and that infants were baptized only in view of a future faith.

Whether the Zwickau "Prophets" also followed the Bohemian practice cannot be positively established. Reports on the Zwickau movement some fifty years later generally connected the Storchite group with the practice of rebaptism. In his *De Vita Phillipi Melancthonis Narratio* Camerarius claims, "Claus Storch was the first author of Anabaptism."<sup>26</sup> The 1597 Wagner report relates that Storch's baptism was a type of initiation rite into the prophetic community of his followers and that the Anabaptist movement found its roots here.<sup>27</sup> Even if all signs pointed in that direction, however, it is strange that the Lutherans who were directly involved in the debate with the trio from Zwickau make no mention of rebaptism.

Whatever the case might be, the initial impressions remained with Luther and the Wittenberg theologians throughout their lives. If today we remember Storch for no other reason, we will recall his influence on Luther's statement in the Small Catechism: "Baptism is not simple water only . . .," as Storch had made it out to be. In a wider setting, the arrival of the threesome in Wittenberg marks the beginning of the 16th century controversy over infant baptism for Luther and his followers. Through the Zwickau movement late medieval mysticism cropped out in Saxon lands and caused the Lutherans to center their attention on the significance and necessity of baptism.

## 2. The challenge of Thomas Muentzer

Out of the Zwickau circle emerged another critic of the traditional doctrine of baptism in the person of Thomas Muentzer. The man was a fiercely independent and creative Bible student who had formed an early attachment to Storch.

Unfortunately, Muentzer's teachings lie for us today under the shroud of the debate concerning the man himself. In the ideological struggle between East and West, Communists and spiritualists alike claim him as their own. In recent assessments he appears as an historical enigma whose Janus-head looks backward to the religious mysticism of the Middle Ages and forward to the social revolt against privilege. Accordingly, his utterances are either strongly programmatic or they are intensely personal, deriving their meaning from his own spiritual development. One historian concludes that Muentzer's theology fuses his perception of a mystical relationship with God with his understanding of life's realities in such a way that the mystical becomes a model for reality.<sup>28</sup>

How strongly the inwardness of mystical theology had worked itself into the religious attitudes of Muentzer is demonstrated by his call for reforming the teaching and practice of baptism. He infolds his thoughts in the tract *Protestation...* (1524).<sup>29</sup> In it he traces the process of decay in the church back to the time when the church turned from understanding the inner essence of baptism to idolizing the outward signs. "In the early church," Muentzer explains, "they received adults only after a long period of instruction in church schools and called them 'Catechumens' because of their indoctrination. This [practice] was not the kind of [later] idolatry which relies more on the holy signs than on the inner essence."<sup>30</sup> Muentzer then traces this shift in emphasis historically to the introduction of infant baptism.

What had happened? When the church began to baptize infants, Muentzer clarifies, baptism became a ceremony in which the difference between the elect and the unregenerate disappeared. It had only been possible to make and maintain such a distinction by baptizing adults after a long period of instruction. Since instruction provided the key to the practice of baptism, the early church had done well, according to Muentzer, to establish the catechumenate and thus keep a proper understanding of baptism's inner essence. But when the church began to baptize infants, they made a break with the past. The church began to rely on the holy signs and as a consequence introduced the hypocritical practice of using sponsors. The institution of the catechuminate disappeared. Genuine baptism was lost. The decay set in.<sup>31</sup>

By perverting the proper understanding of baptism, Muentzer continues, the church also resorted to a perverted use of the Scriptures to defend the innovations. Instead of interpreting the Bible by comparing each passage to the whole of Scripture, the advocates of infant baptism fractured Biblical truth by isolating passages from their context. A prime example was the use of John 3:5, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God," to support the necessity of water baptism for salvation. In context, Muentzer asserted, the term "water" should not be interpreted literally, but according to its inner meaning.

But what Muentzer found to be most exasperating was the attempt to buttress inflated views of baptism's importance by what was not found in the Scriptures. The holy Bible, he stated, did not give one syllable of evidence for baptizing children. Both the command for infant baptism and examples of the same are lacking; nor for that matter do we find that the water of baptism was applied to Mary or to the disciples. For this reason the true understanding of baptism must lie elsewhere than in the act of pouring water over a person.

Muentzer then summoned the church to return to a genuine baptism according to the Scriptures. Here the example of the early Christian catechuminate pointed the way. Although he did not ask for a revival of the ancient institution as such, Muentzer did look for a renewal of the inner essence of baptism which the old institution fostered. What this meant he makes clear in a commentary on the first seven chapters of St. John's Gospel. Using his interpretive principles, he represents the water of baptism as the Biblical way of expressing the "movement of our spirit in God's Spirit."<sup>32</sup>

The use of water imagery to describe the Spirit's activity in a believer's life occurs frequently in Muentzer's writings. Already in the *Prague Manifesto* of 1521, he described how the Spirit came on the elect "who are deluged and drowned by such a flood which the world is unable to endure."<sup>33</sup> Two years later he carried this thought into the revised liturgy for his parish at Allstedt. Both readings chosen for baptism, Psalm

69 and Matthew 3:13-17, refer to water in the life of a Christian. In his exposition of these texts, Muentzer relates the process of rebirth to a Christian's inner experience of being overpowered by waves of water, and he contrasts this reality to the fantasy of merely pouring water on a child at baptism.<sup>34</sup> This preoccupation with water imagery caught the attention of the Humanist Egranus in Zwickau. Mockingly Egranus taunted him, "Perhaps you have learned that from the spirit of which you boast and which, it is rumored, you have dipped out of the water."<sup>35</sup>

But the matter was no jest to Muentzer. As he explained in a letter to Luther, he saw the whole life of Christian cross-bearing mirrored in the experience of water in flux. "No mortal knows whether Christ or his doctrine be true or false," he wrote, "unless his own will be conformed to the cross, unless he first suffer the storms and surges of his own inner churning (literally, "of his own waters"), which oppress the spirit of the elect."<sup>36</sup> No less than five times in his *Protestation* he emphatically underscores the importance of such "movements" as expressing the Spirit's action in the individual in the anguishing experience of coming to faith.

Thus in its true interpretation the water of baptism was nothing but an expression of the Spirit-activated life of suffering under the cross. Muentzer's theology of cross-bearing coincided with his understanding of baptism. He could find no better way of expressing the essence of baptism than by relating its holy sign of water to the movements which take place within believers activated by the Spirit of God. In this way he spiritualized baptism, and the act of baptizing receded into the background. Through this reorientation the way lay open to reform.

Did Muentzer follow through in his call for reform? The church records at Allstedt reveal that the practice of infant baptism with sponsors was still being used in 1524. But in a letter to the congregation Muentzer did recommend postponement of baptism until children could recall the event without the use of sponsors.<sup>37</sup> His growing interest in establishing a new order of baptism was cut short by the events of the Peasants' War and his own death in it. How Thomas Muentzer might have carried his baptism theology into practice must remain a matter of speculation.

### 3. The challenge of Carlstadt

If the arguments of the Zwickau "Prophets" concerning baptism made any impression on Andrew Bodenstein von Carlstadt, Luther's senior colleague on the Wittenberg theological faculty during the 1521 disturbances, he gave no immediate indication. For their part, however, both the Zwickauers and Thomas Muentzer sought closer contact with him—to Carlstadt's dismay!<sup>38</sup>

Early in 1522 Carlstadt and Luther were both asked to express their judgments on the radicals' views of baptism. We are not certain what direction Carlstadt's thoughts took at that time. But in the spring of the next year he gave the first indications of a change in attitude. He had taken his stand previously in *151 Theses* (1517), where with Luther he held to the Augustinian position in emphasizing the importance of God's Word and promise. But in 1523 a basic pattern of his "new" theology began to take shape.

We find traces of his modified position in the March 1523 tract *On the Diversity of God's Simple, Unified Will*.<sup>39</sup> Former assertions of sacramental objectivity are missing. In the new understanding Carlstadt subordinates the act of baptism to the occurrence of rebirth. "Our spiritual birth," he notes, "occurs in the radical dying away of our own will. That is what baptism means. The Apostles sprinkled and we immerse [to show] that ardor, appetites, and lusts should be quenched, just as one extinguishes fire with water. This is burial in and with Christ. As Christ rises in the renewed life and mortal life is changed into immortality, so the Old Adam in us should be drowned and laid to rest with all its desire and self-will and disobedience, and ours be a new life in obedience and according to God's will."<sup>40</sup>

Carlstadt's interest in the inner significance of baptism comes more sharply into focus when he sets the meaning of baptism in contrast to the outward sign. He views baptism as a ceremonial, drawing a parallel between the Old Testament sign of circumcision and the water of baptism. Arguing that both signs did not come from God's eternal but from His temporal will, he concludes that they remain only outward signs because of their temporal character. In themselves they, are ineffective in bringing about a true and lasting Christian unity

with God. Yet the signs are not superfluous. They perform a service for faith. For the believer, and for him alone, they are a sign of his inner condition and of his confession of faith in the righteous, true, and living triune God. Where Spirit-born faith is lacking, however, the outward sign of baptism is valueless.

On this background Carlstadt explains at length how God's work and our spiritual condition must remain free from all externals. "A believer is not bound to external things," he observes, "nor is it necessary to promote inner unity with external signs, as if the Spirit could not work life without material means. In fact He simply does this without reliance and trust in externals."<sup>41</sup> In effect, the traditional meaning and use of the sacrament as an instrument of God's Spirit was set aside. What remained was only the significance of baptism as a ceremonial.

With the writing of the tract on God's will, the die was cast. During a nine month period of silence, in which he intentionally refrained from writing, Carlstadt moved even further from Luther's view on baptism.<sup>42</sup> When he took up his pen again, the rupture with Luther was complete. By July, 1524, Luther indicated he knew the extreme direction in which Carlstadt was headed. In a letter to John Brismann he complained that his former Wittenberg colleague appeared to be so interested in the immediate perception of God that he was ready to do away with all sacraments.<sup>43</sup> Reports began to circulate that Carlstadt belittled the sacrament of baptism in his sermons and that he refused to baptize children. The news spread as far as Zurich, where in September a group of radical Zwinglians, led by Conrad Grebel, sought contact with Carlstadt and Muentzer, urging them to set down their beliefs more explicitly.<sup>44</sup>

The formal split between Carlstadt and Luther occurred in a dramatic scene at Jena, August 22, 1524. In the parlor of Black Bear Inn Luther challenged Carlstadt to write against him and tossed him a golden guilder as the gauntlet of their public feud. Carlstadt's resolve to counter his former colleague was reinforced by his banishment from the Saxon lands. In documenting the reasons for his exile, Carlstadt identified three particular matters on which he and his Wittenberg opponent disagreed: 1. on the Sacrament of the Altar, 2. on baptism, 3. on the living voice of God.<sup>45</sup>

The exiled theologian treated all three areas of disagreement in a series of eight tracts. He went to Basle to have them printed and ready for distribution, especially in the South German and Swiss reformation centers.<sup>46</sup> The single treatise on baptism was never printed, however, since the Basle printer, Hans Welch, found the writing too polemical against Luther and too radical with regard to infant baptism!<sup>47</sup>

Later, Dr. Gerhard Westerburg, Carlstadt's brother-in-law, put forth special efforts to have the tract on baptism printed. He was assisted by Felix Manz, a leader of the Swiss radicals in Zurich. The Zurich connection proved to be important, for the tract seems to have served a double purpose. Primarily it was Carlstadt's response to Luther's dare. But more important for the development of the Anabaptist movement, the baptism tract served as a reply to the Zurich radicals' request for a more explicit statement on the subject. Even though the tract was never printed, it was circulated in manuscript form among the group surrounding Manz and Grebel, who initiated the practice of rebaptism the following spring.<sup>48</sup> The Reformation historian, Hans Hillerbrand, suggests that we might find the content of the unprinted baptismal tract reflected in Manz's only extensive writing, a statement on baptism to the Zurich Council a few weeks after his futile attempt to have Carlstadt's tract printed.<sup>49</sup>

We will take a different tack in seeking to retrieve the document. While the full content of the treatise will necessarily remain unknown, Carlstadt did indicate the probable structure of his arguments in the other seven tracts. Our search for the lost tract has uncovered a possible title for the work -- *Against the Abuse of Baptism (Wider den miszbrauch der Tauff)*. In his apology for the 1524 series of tracts Carlstadt refers to "my writing/against sacramental grace/ against the abuse of baptism/ against idols and, the mass..."<sup>50</sup>

From the outset it is clear that Carlstadt repudiated infant baptism. He underscored his conviction by refusing to allow his young wife to have their son, born early in 1525, baptized. Luther protested. Yet, consistent with his earlier thinking, Carlstadt found that Luther, by supporting infant baptism, failed to recognize the role baptism has in the process of repentance.

To Carlstadt repentance and faith are primary considerations in treating the subject of baptism. True repentance occurs in the name of Jesus and in the Spirit of God, he wrote. It consists in the Spirit-wrought

recognition of sin and in the avoidance of evil. As soon as one repents, he receives the forgiveness of sins; baptism does the same. To be baptized in Jesus' name consists in crucifying one's flesh by recognizing Christ as the crucified and by living according to God's will each day. All this is brought about by a faith which recognizes Christ for what He is. Failure to make repentance, a part of baptism has resulted in the frivolous practice of baptizing infants. Carlstadt sees no reason to include infants in the ceremonial, since the basics of knowledge and faith necessary for repentance are lacking in them. Children are incapable of faith, he argues, because they "do not understand their evil desires, to say nothing of crucifying them through Christ."<sup>51</sup>

From this vantage point Carlstadt proceeds to advocate the baptism of believers only. Since *sola fide* had been a great question in Luther's reform, Carlstadt, as a theologian, felt obliged to speak on the problem of faith and the sacramental elements. But in his self-designated role as the "new layman" for whom simplicity and spirituality alone counted, he rejected the use of material "things" in matters of faith. A person must not seek forgiveness of sins in the sacrament itself, he felt. By doing this he would be basing faith on things rather than on God.

Such phony faith in the sacrament or in the sacramental Word does not bring comfort. Only by means of true faith in Christ and the living Word of God does the sacrament have any worth.<sup>52</sup> So baptism is dependent on a person's faith. For this reason one must postpone baptism until the right time. It should be denied to those who do not have faith and given to true believers only. In practice this meant that baptism must be deferred until a person has been instructed in faith and is able to profess the same.<sup>53</sup>

Of what use then is baptism? Here Carlstadt sees a distinct parallel between the Lord's Supper and baptism. Although the elements differ and baptism is in the initial position, both serve to maintain true fellowship with Christ. The elements remind us of Christ's death for our sakes and keep us from the fellowship with Satan. In this respect they are like any external thing -- manna, for example -- which expresses fellowship with God.<sup>54</sup> It would be an abuse of both sacraments, however, to make the elements anything more than the earthly material they really are. By claiming bread to be more than mere bread or baptism more than a washing with water, we would be guilty of going beyond God's institution. The water of baptism is simple water and baptism itself is an outward thing.<sup>55</sup>

In itself, therefore, according to Carlstadt, baptism with water does not unite us with Christ, as little as do eating the bread and drinking the wine. Otherwise Scripture would have made clear reference to the physical presence of Christ in baptism. Since it must be denied for lack of Scripture that Christ is bodily present in baptism, the same must be denied for the Lord's Supper. To speak of a physical fellowship instead of a spiritual one is contrary to the true fellowship with Christ. To speak of a participation sacramentally (*sacramentaliter*) is an abuse of the sacrament. Rather we participate spiritually (*spiritualiter*).<sup>56</sup> We have true fellowship with Christ spiritually by faith and knowledge. Carlstadt finds any suggestion of dragging Christ down to earth to be present in earthly elements, as in the water of baptism, repulsive. "I want a Christ who dwells in my heart by faith and is rooted thereby love," he appeals with reference to the Lord's Supper. "Christ does as much for me physically in heaven as down here in my mouth, yes, more!"<sup>57</sup>

Does this spiritualized understanding of the sacrament in effect make the Sacramental elements superfluous? Not really! Carlstadt gives two reasons for maintaining baptism. First of all, it is God's ordinance and everything commanded by God must be followed as He ordained it. Additionally, the sacrament serves as a sign of faith, as he had earlier stated.<sup>58</sup>

In a summary statement, Carlstadt returns to the basic premise that baptism reflects repentance. "If someone wishes to be baptized rightly in the name of Christ, he must repent, leave the old life, and start a new life. It is impossible to have the fellowship of baptism and be in league with the Devil at the same time, even though the washing with water is an external thing with nothing more than mere water."<sup>59</sup> These words place into our hands the key to this theologian's teaching on the sacrament: baptism is subordinate to repentance and faith. In this order of things the Spirit works prior and apart from the use of the sacrament. In reality sacramental action was little more than a ceremonial or rite, as Carlstadt had once claimed it to be.

In his journey to South Germany and Switzerland in autumn 1524, Carlstadt's attack on the traditional views of baptism raised a great stir—as did his teaching on the Lord's Supper. The Zurich radicals read his



works with interest. Under pressure, the Zurich reformer, Ulrich Zwingli, took a stand against his former followers. Encouraged by the Strassburg preachers to declare the Scriptural foundations for infant baptism, he gave to them a lengthy reply in a December letter. After the appearance of Carlstadt in Strassburg, the city preacher, Martin Bucer, also felt called upon to write a defense of infant baptism. It was the beginning of a long debate for him.

#### 4. Luther's response and confession

In the fundamental revision of the Roman sacramental system spelled out in the *Pagan Servitude of the Church* (1520), Luther had retained baptism as a God-ordained sacrament. But even the renewed understanding of the sacrament, deriving from the mystery which is Christ Himself (I Tim: 3:16), did not satisfy the radical reformers.<sup>60</sup> They considered the retention of sacramental baptism to be a vestige of papist teaching. The special emphasis of Luther's defense in the years 1522-1525, therefore, fell of necessity on the subject of infant baptism. On that question the divergence in the teaching and practice of baptism came out most clearly.<sup>61</sup>

Luther's first judgments concerning the radical arguments came from the seclusion of the Wartburg. His answer reveals a firm and unwavering conviction that infant baptism was Scriptural. At Melanchthon's request he responded to the interlocking issues of infant faith and the use of sponsors.<sup>62</sup>

Against the Zwickauers' contention that children cannot believe because they cannot express their faith, Luther assumes the defensive. He protests making the ability to display faith the proof of faith itself. If faith is known only by demonstration, he argues, then what happens when adult Christians are inactive, as during their sleeping hours? "Can't God in the same way keep faith in small children during the whole time of their infancy, as if it were a continuous sleep?"<sup>63</sup> By this line of argument Luther intends to highlight God's work in creating faith (*fides infusa*).

But the more critical question still remains: if God creates and sustains faith in infants as well as in adults, how does God bring infants to faith, who can neither reason nor speak? To this Luther simply replies that God uses other believers to sponsor the child (*fides aliena*). The entire argument on infant baptism, in his estimation, hinges on this firm assertion. "If we cannot uphold this," he writes to Melanchthon, "then there is nothing else to be debated, and baptism of small children has to be rejected."<sup>64</sup>

This insight was by no means freshly designed by Luther to meet the challenge of the Zwickau "Prophets." He had taken the same position two years before as part of his review of Rome's seven sacraments. There he not only wholeheartedly supported infant baptism, but explained how the newborn are brought to faith through baptism. He wrote:

In contradiction to what has been said, some might cite the **baptism of infants** who do not comprehend the promise of God and cannot have the faith of baptism; so that therefore either faith is not necessary or else infant baptism is without effect. Here I say what all say: Infants are aided by faith of others, namely, those who bring them for baptism. For the Word of God is powerful enough, when uttered, to change even a godless heart, which is no less unresponsive and helpless than any infant. So through the prayer of the believing church which presents it, a prayer to which all things are possible [Mark 9:23], the infant is changed, cleansed, and renewed by in-poured faith. Nor should I doubt that even a godless adult could be changed, in any of the sacraments, if the same church prayed for and presented him, as we read of the paralytic in the Gospel, who was healed through the faith of others [Mark 2:3-12].<sup>65</sup>

To maintain that infant's faith comes through the faith of sponsors, however, is not to claim that one person can believe for another. Such a claim, Luther felt, would short-circuit the action of God for which the sponsor intercedes. The faith of the sponsor who prays on the infant's behalf is not to be confused with the child's own personal faith (*fides propria*). Luther clarifies: "This fact cannot be shaken: it is impossible that that for which one prays will not happen. Otherwise the whole doctrine of faith would waver, and personal faith, which is based on Christ's promise, would be of no value. Indeed the faith in which my neighbor intercedes on my behalf belongs to me personally but is really also someone else's faith, so far as my neighbor is concerned."<sup>66</sup> In this way God blesses what one person does for another in faith. Christ Himself never turned

away anyone who was brought to Him by the faith of another. Scripture gives many examples of persons brought to faith by another acting in faith—a thought which Luther later carried out in his sermons.

Thus to affirm infants' faith and the use of sponsors at baptism preserves three divine truths: 1. God alone creates and preserves faith (*fides infusa*), 2. faith is a personal matter, i.e. one person cannot believe for another (*fides propria*), 3. Christ wills that one person bring another to Him in faith (*fides aliena*). "To present a child for baptism," Luther says in résumé, "is nothing else but to offer it to Christ, who is present on earth and opens his hands of grace toward the child."<sup>67</sup>

But the question of infant's faith, in Luther's estimation, must also be addressed to the Christian church, as the sponsoring body. Historically, the church had not only followed the practice of infant baptism, but by its testimony had demonstrated that it believed this article. Despite the absence of explicit Scripture passages, the church by a special miracle of God had continued to make this confession: by baptism "children also participate in the benefits and promises of Christ."<sup>68</sup> The confession of this article was the mark of the true church.

Shifting his ground, Luther assumes the offensive. The burden of proof, he claims, lies with the Zwickau radicals. They need to bring examples or testimony to support their case against infant baptism, since they have erred twice in their arguments. First of all, they have presupposed that infants cannot believe contrary to Scripture and the testimony of the church. Secondly, they have followed a false principle of interpretation. Scripture does not spell everything out explicitly. It is enough that it does not say anything against infant baptism, for "what is not against Scripture is for Scripture, and Scripture is for it."<sup>69</sup>

Take the example of circumcision. Following the Zwickauers' sophistry, Luther points out, one could have done away with circumcision by arguing: since children did not have Abraham's faith, they ought not have received the sign of his faith. But circumcision possessed the power of God's Word and promise, even as Baptism now does. They differ indeed with respect to their ordinances. Circumcision was bound to time and place; baptism is free for people of all ages. But they remain alike in power. By inference, therefore, the example of infant circumcision speaks for infant baptism.<sup>70</sup>

After this initial encounter with the Zwickau "Prophets," Luther became increasingly aware of the influence and issues of the radical position. Muentzer's attack on the traditional and evangelical practice of baptism did not appear to have made much impact on Luther. At least, he made no special effort to answer that opponent. Whether Carlstadt's unpublished tract on baptism reached him in some form is also doubtful. Even in the lengthy treatise, *Against the Heavenly Prophets*, in which he refuted his former colleague, Luther rarely refers to baptism.

But the burden of the radicals' teaching on baptism did not escape Luther's attention. In the aforementioned treatise, he viewed his controversy over the Lord's Supper on the same plane as the baptism debate. The issues involved in the sacramentarian struggle were all the same. The spiritualists were offended that God comes to us outwardly through an external element rather than merely inwardly by the Spirit. Indicating that such reasoning is really an attack on Christ and His Word, Luther begs us to follow his presentation. "If God wills I will help you too discern the devil in these prophets so that you can yourself deal with him," he writes. And then in a striking passage he explains how God deals with us:

Now when God sends forth his holy gospel he deals with us in a twofold manner, first outwardly, then inwardly. Outwardly he deals with us through the oral word of the gospel and through material signs, that is, baptism and the sacrament of the altar. Inwardly he deals with us through the Holy Spirit, faith, and other gifts. But whatever their measure or order the outward factors should and must precede. The inward experience follows and is effected by the outward. God has determined to give the inward to no one except through the outward. For he wants to give no one the Spirit or faith outside of the outward Word and sign instituted by him, as he says in Luke 16 [:29], "Let them hear Moses and the prophets." Accordingly Paul can call baptism a "washing of regeneration" wherein God "richly pours out the Holy Spirit" [Titus 3:5]. And the oral gospel "is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith (Rom. 1[:16]).

Observe carefully, my brother, this order, for everything depends on it. However, cleverly this factious spirit makes believe that he regards highly the Word and Spirit of God and declaims passionately about

love and zeal for the truth and righteousness of God, he nevertheless has as his purpose to reverse this order. His insolence leads him to set up a contrary order and as we have said, seeks to subordinate God's outward order to an inner spiritual one. Casting this order to the wind with ridicule and scorn, he wants to get the Spirit first. Will a handful of water, he says, make me clean from sin? The Spirit, the Spirit, the Spirit, must do this inwardly. Can bread and wine profit me? Will breathing over the bread bring Christ in the sacrament? No, no, one must eat the flesh of Christ spiritually. The Wittenbergers are ignorant of this. They make faith depend on the letter. Who ever does not know the devil might be misled by these many splendid words to think that five holy spirits were in the possession of Karlstadt and his followers.<sup>71</sup>

Thus Luther measured Karlstadt's sacramental theology against the Scripture Word and found it wanting. To maintain baptism as a mere outward sign of an inward happening misses the point. Baptism, like the Lord's Supper, is not subordinate to the process of rebirth and renewal, as the sectarian spirit had piously declared. The reverse order is God's method. The Word precedes; faith follows. The Spirit works inward faith through the outward Word of God, through the oral word and the material signs. On this issue, the spirits divide.

Over the years from 1522 to 1525, Luther repeatedly extended his defense of infant baptism. In sermons and letters he discussed the relationship of baptism and faith and in clarification distinguished three positions apart from his own.<sup>72</sup>

1. The Roman teaching: In the scholastic tradition the question of how infants come to faith is explained with reference to the church. Infants are baptized on the basis of the church's faith and laid into its bosom. In this action the faith of the sponsor plays an introductory role and the sacrament works forgiveness as an *opus operatum* **without** the child's personal faith. Later the child's own faith is graciously infused. Luther criticizes such a construction for trying to solve the mystery of how God works faith through the sacrament. The scholastic solution empties the sacrament of its power by substituting our work for its own, and thereby attributes a wrong power to the sponsor's faith (*fides aliena*). The fathers did better by leaving the "how" of infant faith unresolved.<sup>73</sup>

2. The Waldensian (Bohemian) teaching: The Waldensian solution to the problem of infant baptism is adduced with reference to the child. In contradistinction to the Roman doctrine, the Waldensians emphasized the necessity of personal faith in receiving baptism. Since they held that infants had no such faith, they baptized the little ones **in view of** a future faith which would come when the use of reason began. Until that time children had at least been received into Christendom and brought to the Gospel. Only later, when faith came, did a third aspect of baptism take effect, namely, the reception of the forgiveness of sins.

Such sophistry, Luther contends, does not do justice to the child as a living member of Christ's kingdom. And it creates two kinds of baptism, one for the young and another for the adult, contrary to Paul's testimony that there is only one baptism, as there is only one Lord and one faith (Eph. 4:5).<sup>74</sup>

3. The "new" teaching of the radicals: The new does not differ from the old in the matter of infants' faith. Both agree that infants have no personal faith. The difference comes in the application of baptism. The radicals reject the infused faith (*fides infusa*) and the use of sponsors (*fides aliena*) and for this reason ask that one wait until children are grown.<sup>75</sup>

What then is the solution to the whole perplexing problem of infant baptism and infant faith? For Luther the answer lies in the Word. "I ought not only lay [the child] in the bosom of the church, but in the Word of God," he remarked.<sup>76</sup> By clinging to the Word, Luther sought to avoid the sophistry that the fathers also dodged. For, he stressed, there is no logical connection between the *fides aliena* and the *fides propria*, between the sponsor's faith and the child's own faith. The secret of the baptism procedure lies in the Word.<sup>77</sup> It is important to know that in the sacrament Christ is at work, not we. Sponsors and priests are only instruments.<sup>78</sup> We bring the child, He commands (Mt. 19:14); we do our duty, He performs.<sup>79</sup>

In baptism as in the Lord's Supper, therefore, Christ is truly present and active. "Now in baptism," Luther declares "He is as present as he was at that time [on earth]."<sup>80</sup> The real presence of Christ makes out of the simple water something more: the water of baptism is God's water. The internal Word and the external element are not divisible. "Water, wine, and bread are all externals," he states, "but God is within them with his words which he speaks."<sup>81</sup> Through water and the Word Christ bestows faith as a gift of the Spirit of God.

Baptism is nothing else than a means of bringing the Gospel. Nothing special is offered in baptism that is not already in the Gospel. "For what is baptism other than the Gospel?" Luther asks with affirmation.<sup>82</sup>

To set any other conditions for faith and baptism, in Luther's estimation, attempts to go beyond the Gospel into the hidden things of God. The radicals make this mistake. They make baptismal faith dependent on the use of reason. But God's Word and faith are not aided by the use of reason. For reason is dead where God is at work and it deceives man's perception of things. If the opponents of infant baptism desire certainty, it does not come from hearing the confession of faith from those who are able to use their reason. The practice of believers' baptism wrongly bases baptism on such outward proof rather than on the sure Word of Christ. One cannot see into the heart of another to judge the state of faith. Those who baptize are excused from such judgments. Our certainty lies in the command of Christ and not in deciphering His hidden will.<sup>83</sup>

What then should a person think about the differences between young and old with respect to their use of reason? In spiritual hearing, that is, in the hearing of faith, Luther confesses, infants are examples for adults. For "adults often grasp [the Word] with their ears and reason without faith. But infants hear it with their ears without their reason but with faith."<sup>84</sup>

We can attribute certainty, therefore, sooner to infant baptism than to adult baptism. For it rests on Christ's command to bring little children to Him, while adults come by themselves. The embryonic reason in infants does not deceive like the mature reason of adults. Both of them possess faith by the same spiritual hearing. Any view of baptism which overlooks "that faith in God's Word is a much different and deeper thing than that which reason does with God's Word" is, in Luther's words, "pure sophistry." For faith, he asserts, "is God's work alone beyond all reason. It is as near to the child as to the adult, yes, much nearer; and it is as far away from the adult as from the child, yes, much farther."<sup>85</sup>

From this perspective Luther briefly explains three Biblical parallels to baptism: circumcision, the baptism by fire and the Spirit, and the baptism of John. Against the radicals' claim to exclude children from baptism because they did not have faith, Luther repeats the example of circumcision. To the Israelite, he says, circumcision was the sign of faith in the coming Christ. Should the opponents still remain unconvinced, they must listen to Christ's command and promise. He asks that infants be brought to Him, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. This word of Christ assures us that infants have faith, because the kingdom of heaven is given only to believers.

In reply to the attempt to minimize baptism with water in favor of baptism with fire and the Spirit, Luther contends that Spirit baptism was nothing special. It was nothing more than the Spirit given to every believer for the forgiveness of sins. Nor was John's baptism special. In fact, it fell short of Christ's baptism. For John gave only the sign with his baptism, signifying the teaching of the Law. But Christ's baptism brought both the sign and what it signified, namely, the grace of the Spirit of God given us in the Gospel. This truth, and nothing else, summed up the baptismal theology of the Reformer from Wittenberg.

By 1525, the initial phase of the controversy over baptism was drawing to a close. In that same year the first rebaptism took place in Switzerland, where the Zurich radicals sought to correct their "meaningless" baptism as infants. After this time the Wittenbergers more or less lost direct contact with the leaders of Anabaptism. But the basic arguments were in. And later writings served to augment and strengthen the Lutheran confession against the ongoing challenge of the Baptist theology.

<sup>1</sup> John Eck, *Sub Domini Jhesu et Mariae Patrocinio. Articulos 404 partim . . .* (Ingolstadt, 1530).

<sup>2</sup> For a listing see: Hans J. Hillerbrand, *Bibliography of Anabaptism, 1520-1630* (Elkhart, Indiana: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 1962), and its supplement by the same editor, *A Bibliography of Anabaptism 1520-1630, a Sequel* (St. Louis: Center for Reformation Research, 1975).

<sup>3</sup> The "Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration," found in *The Book of Concord*, Tappert edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p.633.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 634.

<sup>5</sup> Karl Barth, "Gutachten der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Tübingen über Fragen der Taufordnung" in *Für Arbeit und Besinnung*, 5. Jahrgang, Nr. 21, 1951, p. 419.

- <sup>6</sup> G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 387.
- <sup>7</sup> Paul Wappler, *Thomas Muentzer in Zwickau und die "Zwickauer Propheten"*, reprinted in "Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte," Nr. 182 (Gütersloh, 1966), esp. pp. 58-81.
- <sup>8</sup> See Werner Jetter, *Die Taufe beim jungen Luther* (Tübingen, 1954).
- <sup>9</sup> LW 36, p. 57.
- <sup>10</sup> WA Br 2, p. 427:117ff; LW 48, p. 371f.
- <sup>11</sup> Nicolaus Müller, *Die Wittenberger Bewegung 1521 and 1522* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 129-166.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 129 § 160.
- <sup>13</sup> WA Tr 2, Nr. 2060; 3, Nr. 2837; 5, Nr. 5568.
- <sup>14</sup> Wappler, pp. 81-86.
- <sup>15</sup> Müller, p. 139.
- <sup>16</sup> WA Br 2, p. 425:42ff.
- <sup>17</sup> Theodor Kolde, *Altteste Bericht über die Zwickauer Propheten, found in "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,"* Vol. V (Gotha, 1882), p. 323.
- <sup>18</sup> Müller, p. 129. Also WA Br 2, p. 424f.
- <sup>19</sup> WA Tr 2, Nr. 2060, p. 307:11f.
- <sup>20</sup> Wappler, p. 84.
- <sup>21</sup> Müller, pp. 135, 139, 144.
- <sup>22</sup> WA Br 2, 546, 19ff.
- <sup>23</sup> Müller, p. 144.
- <sup>24</sup> Müller, p. 104 & 160.
- <sup>25</sup> Gunnar Westin/Torsten Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier Schriften*, found in "Quellen and Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte", 29 (Gütersloh, 1962), p. 223.
- <sup>26</sup> Joachim Camerarius, *De Vita Phillipi Melancthonis Narratio* (Halle, 1577), p.45.
- <sup>27</sup> Wappler, p. 57, footnote 243.
- <sup>28</sup> H-J. Goertz, *Innere und Aeußere Ordnung in der Theologie Thomas Muntzers* (Leiden, 1967), p. 148f.
- <sup>29</sup> Thomas Muentzer, *Schriften and Briefe*, edited by Guenther Franz, found in "Quellen and Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 30" (Gütersloh, 1966).
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30 and 32f.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30f.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>34</sup> E. Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1902), Vol. 1.1., 507.
- <sup>35</sup> Muentzer, p. 367.
- <sup>36</sup> WA Br 3, p. 105:30ff.
- <sup>37</sup> Muentzer, p. 522.
- <sup>38</sup> See H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt* (Leipzig, 1905), Vol. I, p. 400ff; and II, p. 14ff; 114ff.
- <sup>39</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, *Von Manigfaeltigkeit des einfaeltigen einigen Willens Gottes... 1523*.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. Cij b.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. Gij f.
- <sup>42</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, "Ursachen das And. Carolstat ein zeyt still geschwigen," found in E. Hertzsch, *Karlstads Schriften aus den Jahren 1523-25* (Halle/Saale, 1956), Vol. I, pp. 1-19.
- <sup>43</sup> WA Br 3, p. 315:15ff.
- <sup>44</sup> "Brief von Konrad Grebel und seinen Brüdern an Thomas Muntzer, Zurich, 5. September 1524," found in H. Fast, *Der linke Flügel der Reformation* (Bremen, 1962), p. 22f.
- <sup>45</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, *Ursachen der halben Andres Carolstatt ausz den landen zu Sachsen vertryben, 6. November 1524*, found in Hertzsch, II, p. 57:26ff.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>47</sup> *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Basler Reformation*, edited by E. Dürr, (Basle, 1921), Vol. I, p. 174ff.
- <sup>48</sup> Conrad Grebel reports his acquaintance with the eight works of Carlstadt. See E. Arbenz (ed.), *Die Vadianische Briefsammlung* (St. Gallen, 1897), Vol. III, p. 88f.
- <sup>49</sup> See H. Hillerbrand, *The Origins of Sixteenth-century Anabaptism: Another Look*, found in "Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte," Vol. 53 (1962), p. 163.
- <sup>50</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, "Anzeyg etlicher Hauptartikeln Christlicher leere (1525)," found in Hertzsch, Vol. II, p. 73:25ff.
- <sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 91:3-6.
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70:4ff. Also A.B. Karlstadt, "Von dem widerchristlichen Misbrauch des Herrn Brod und Klech, 1524," found in Walch I, *Luthers Werke*, Vol. XX, pp. 138-141.
- <sup>53</sup> Karlstadt, "Anzeyg," p. 70:14-17; also Zwingli VIII, p. 300.

- <sup>54</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, "Erklärung des X Capitels Corinth 1, 1525," found in C. F. Jaeger, *Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt* (Stuttgart, 1856), p. 463f. See also A. B. Karlstadt, "Auslegung dieser Wort Christi: das is mein Leib. . . 1524," found in Jaeger, p. 451ff.
- <sup>55</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, "Wie sich der Gelaub und Unglaub gegen dem Liecht und Finsternis. . . halten. 1524." found in Jaeger, p. 514.
- <sup>56</sup> A. B. Karlstadt, "Dialogus oder ein gesprechbüchlin von dem gewlichen und abgottisch miszbrauch/des hochwirdigsten sacraments. 1524," found in Hertzsch, II, p. 25:1-16.
- <sup>57</sup> Karlstadt, "Erklärung," p. 463.
- <sup>58</sup> Karlstadt, "Auslegung," p. 451f.
- <sup>59</sup> Karlstadt, "Erklärung," p. 464.
- <sup>60</sup> WA 6, p. 551:11f; LW 36, p.93f.
- <sup>61</sup> Mention should be made of the thorough study of Karl Brinkel, *Die Lehre Luthers von der fides infantium bei der Kindertaufe* (Berlin, 1958).
- <sup>62</sup> WA Br 2, Nr. 449 & 450; LW 48, pp. 364-372.
- <sup>63</sup> WA Br 2, p. 425:47ff; LW 48, p. 367f.
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>65</sup> WA 6, p. 538:4ff, in "De Captivitate Babylonica ecclesiae praeludium"; LW 36, p. 73.
- <sup>66</sup> WA Br 2, p. 425:54 - 426:70; LW 48, p. 368f. See also WA 17, II, p. 72ff.
- <sup>67</sup> WA Br 2, p. 426:98f; LW 48, p. 371.
- <sup>68</sup> WA Br 2, p. 426:98f; p. 426:70-97; LW 48, p. 370.
- <sup>69</sup> WA Br 2, p. 427:101ff; LW 48, p. 371.
- <sup>70</sup> WA Br 2, p. 427:108-116; LW 48, p. 371.
- <sup>71</sup> WA 19, p. 136:9 - 137:4; LW 40, p. 146f.
- <sup>72</sup> Brinkel, pp. 20-23, gives a chronological listing of Luther's expressions on infant baptism. See especially WA 17, II, p. 72ff, "Sermon -- 3rd Sunday after Epiphany, 1523," Also WA 15, p. 696ff, "Sermon -- 19th Sunday after Trinity, 1524."
- <sup>73</sup> WA 17, II, p. 79:23 - 81:7; WA 15, p. 709:33ff.
- <sup>74</sup> WA 17, II, p. 81:7 - 82:21; WA 15, p. 710:39ff.
- <sup>75</sup> WA 15, p. 709:35ff.
- <sup>76</sup> WA 15, p. 710:32f.
- <sup>77</sup> WA 15, p. 710:36ff.
- <sup>78</sup> WA 17, II, p. 84:7-13.
- <sup>79</sup> WA 15, p. 710:34ff.
- <sup>80</sup> WA 17, II, p. 84:1; see also WA Br 2, p. 546:34f.
- <sup>81</sup> WA 15, p. 669:9f and 17ff.
- <sup>82</sup> WA 17, II, p. 87:31f.
- <sup>83</sup> WA 17, II, p. 84:26 - 86:14.
- <sup>84</sup> WA 17, II, p. 87:5ff.
- <sup>85</sup> WA 17, II, p. 87:13ff.