

Evangelical Anabaptism— Historical Disproof of Quinn’s Tolerance through Uncertainty

Kirk R. MacGregor

Abstract:

Bequeathing philosophical sophistication to a position taken by many Westerners as self-evident since the Enlightenment, Philip Quinn argues that uncertainty about religious convictions is the necessary foundation for religious tolerance. While this view has received philosophical refutation from William Lane Craig and James Kraft, the myriad examples of religious violence down through history convince many that Quinn is *de facto* correct (i.e., accurately hitting upon a contingent fact of human psychology) even though *de jure* incorrect (i.e., wrongfully suggesting that uncertainty and tolerance are logically connected). This piece aims to dismantle Quinn’s *de facto* case through the dramatic counterexample of sixteenth-century evangelical Anabaptism. Unique among Reformation groups, evangelical Anabaptists showed tolerance toward Jews, Catholics, Lutherans, and the Reformed precisely on the basis of their certainty about Jesus’ teachings, saving death, resurrection, and demand for self-denying discipleship on their lives. This is true despite the fact that evangelical Anabaptists had the motive and means to exact violence upon Catholics, Lutherans, and the Reformed, all of whom massacred thousands of Anabaptists. Rather, evangelical Anabaptists, owing to their absolute belief in the Lordship of Jesus, refused to exact violence upon their religious adversaries but willingly suffered martyrdom at their hands.

The late contemporary philosopher Philip Quinn (1940-2004) has given potent expression to the often unstated assumption, permeating Western culture since the Wars of Religion and the Thirty Years’ War, that the only workable basis for religious tolerance is uncertainty regarding the truth of one’s own religious beliefs.¹ Arguably the driving force behind the Enlightenment,² this presupposition has gained wide currency since the mid-seventeenth century and is now taken for granted by most Americans, especially following the events

of September 11, 2001. Read with a hermeneutic of charity, Quinn's argument can assume two forms. First is the logical form, which maintains that the only possible moral justification for anyone to violently coerce others to subscribe to some belief is if that person were certain about its truth, and that the only possible moral justification for anyone to violently persecute others for subscribing to some belief is if that person were certain about its falsehood. Hence uncertainty regarding the truth or falsity of all religious beliefs is necessary for ensuring the objective immorality of religious intolerance.³ This logical form has been successfully refuted by William Lane Craig and James Kraft.⁴ Second, however, is the pragmatic form, according to which it is a contingent fact of human psychology that if persons are certain about their religious beliefs, then, given the means and opportunity, they will inevitably resort to violence in spreading their beliefs and eliminating dissenters.⁵ Notice that the modesty of this claim renders it impervious to philosophical refutation, for it asserts that religious certainty leads to intolerance not via logical necessity (*de jure*) but via the contingencies of human cognitive development and access to political resources (*de facto*). Rather, what is needed to disprove this claim is a clear historical counterexample of a group that held their religious beliefs with certainty and, though possessing the means and opportunity to violently coerce agreement and quash disagreement, displayed tolerance toward persons of different religious persuasions, nonbelievers, and dissenters. Presenting such a counterexample will occupy the burden of this piece.

As a historian of Christianity whose areas of expertise include Reformation studies, I submit the evangelical Anabaptists as a notable counterexample to Quinn's pragmatic argument. This immediately raises the question of definition: what identifies an individual or community as belonging to the evangelical Anabaptist movement? Reformation scholars have separated the broad phenomenon of Anabaptism, an umbrella covering any early modern individual who received and advocated believers' baptism over against infant baptism, into three distinct branches.⁶ First, revolutionary Anabaptism fused the legitimate socio-economic grievances of the late medieval central European peasantry with a millenarian reading of biblical apocalyptic to wage religiously authorized armed revolt against Catholic and

Protestant rulers alike, who in turn drowned out the movement in blood through the 1525 quelling of the Peasants' War and the 1535 dismantling of the Kingdom of Münster. While statistically comprising less than five percent of sixteenth-century Anabaptists, revolutionary Anabaptism bred terror in the hearts of the European bourgeoisie and aristocracy, who proceeded to brand all Anabaptists as dangerous fanatics who must be exterminated.⁷ Revolutionary Anabaptism is, of course, precisely the kind of movement whose actions Quinn deems representative of all persons with the same spiritual certitude and worldly might. Second, separatist Anabaptism regarded the socio-political order as the kingdom of Satan and therefore quit the world for a pacifist and apolitical existence in small, self-sufficient conventicles practicing economic communitarianism.⁸ Despite the unfettered aversion of the Amish, Hutterites, and other separatist Anabaptists toward religious violence, they would not constitute a counterexample to Quinn's thesis, because their voluntary disavowal of worldly power rendered them incapable of carrying out violent acts of religious intolerance. Third, evangelical Anabaptism attempted to implement Jesus' gospel of the Kingdom of God within European society. Lamenting how many laypeople interpreted Luther's and Zwingli's doctrine of *sola fide* as an "easy believism," evangelical Anabaptists sought a return to New Testament principles in their entirety, including the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount and church discipline administered according to Matthew 18:15-20. Though it would be inaccurate to call this movement "normative Anabaptism," evangelical Anabaptism did comprise the largest branch of the sixteenth-century Anabaptist movement and received capable leadership from Balthasar Hubmaier (1480-1528) in south Germany and Bohemia, Hans Denck (1500-1527) and Pilgram Marpeck (1495-1556) in south and central Germany, and Menno Simons (1496-1561) in the Netherlands and north Germany.⁹ This essay will demonstrate that, despite having the means and the opportunity to employ religious violence, the evangelical Anabaptists advocated religious tolerance and used their socio-political power to implement it in the regions where they labored, even in the face of intense persecution from dissenters. In the process, this piece will explain the evangelical Anabaptists' theological rationale for their nonviolent treatment of religious "others," thereby disclosing the true

basis for tolerance and proposing a different root for intolerance than that suggested by Quinn.

The Relationship of Evangelical Anabaptism to Political Authority

It is a little-appreciated fact outside specialist circles on Anabaptism that the evangelical Anabaptists believed Christians could serve in positions of political authority and would make the best leaders, since they would govern not for the sake of their own fame or fortune but for the sake of the good of their constituents. Moreover, evangelical Anabaptists fostered positive relations with their local magistrates and sought the magistrates' protection against Catholic and Protestant authorities who threatened their lives. At the same time, however, evangelical Anabaptists made a sharp distinction between church and state and insisted that magistrates could not legislate on matters of religion by, for example, demanding adherence in thought, word, or deed to a particular faith or issuing edicts that privileged one confession over another. This nuanced perspective, which affirmed the possibility of Christians serving in government but denied the possibility of a Christian government, is frequently overshadowed in church history surveys by the Separatist conflation and subsequent rejection of both possibilities, as enshrined in the 1527 Schleithem Confession.¹⁰ We shall unpack evangelical Anabaptist doctrine and praxis on civil authority by considering the contributions of its representative thinkers.

Adhering to the taxonomy introduced by Jesus, evangelical Anabaptists differentiated between the kingdom of the world (or "world" for short) and the kingdom of God, both fundamentally spiritual domains which attempt to gain control over the physical universe and the persons therein. The kingdom of the world is the realm of sin and death characterized by hatred and ruled by Satan, while the kingdom of God is the realm of righteousness and life characterized by *agapē* and ruled by God the Trinity. Thus Menno Simons stipulated: "The Scriptures teach that there are two opposing princes and two opposing

kingdoms: the one is the Prince of peace; the other the prince of strife. Each of these princes has his particular kingdom and as the prince so is his kingdom.”¹¹ Based on Romans 13:1-7, 1 Peter 2:13-17, 1 Timothy 2:1-2, and Titus 3:1, evangelical Anabaptists argued that civil government was neither part of the kingdom of the world nor part of the kingdom of God. Rather, it comprised an instrument graciously created by God to protect citizens of the godly kingdom from citizens of the worldly kingdom and citizens of the worldly kingdom from one another as well as to ensure social justice for all humanity. As Balthasar Hubmaier, the theologian *par excellence* for evangelical Anabaptism, explained: “Therefore the government is obliged to shield and to free all oppressed and subjugated people, widows, orphans, friends, and strangers without regard to persons according to the will and earnest command of God.”¹² That government is a divinely instituted *tertian quid* distinct from the worldly and godly kingdoms but safeguarding the citizens of both was underscored by Pilgram Marpeck:

God has ordained the governing power for this time and for the sake of godly men; as a protection, arbiter, and punishment. . . . and mediators between goodness and evil, between the just and the unjust, established to provide physical rest and peace and to restrain evil and protect the good. For evil and good now exist together in this physical life undifferentiated and unseparated until the day when judgment takes place and good and evil are separated. This will take place when the last person to be saved is brought in. Then all worldly authority will be dissolved.¹³

Thus civil authority will retain its divine authorization and legitimacy from now until Christ’s second coming, during which time it promotes social tranquility and serves as a deterrent to crime. With these assessments Menno, from whom the Mennonites take their name, agreed. Adding that force is necessary to carry out these tasks, Menno amiably exhorted the northern coastal rulers of Holland and Germany:

Therefore, dear sirs, take heed; this is the task to which you are called: namely, to chastise and punish, in the true fear of God with fairness and Christian discretion, manifest criminals, such as

thieves, murderers, Sodomites, adulterers, seducers, sorcerers, the violent, highwaymen, robbers, etc. Your task is to do justice between a man and his neighbor, to deliver the oppressed out of the hand of the oppressor. . . . O highly renowned, noble lords, believe Christ's Word, fear God's wrath, love righteousness, do justice to widows and orphans, judge rightly between a man and his neighbor, despise no man's littleness, hate all avarice, punish with reason, allow the Word of God to be taught freely, hinder no one from walking in the truth, bow to the scepter of him who called you to this high service. Then shall your throne stand firm forever. . . . you may enlarge, help, and protect the kingdom of God with gracious consent and permission, with wise counsel and a pious, unblamable life.¹⁴

Three features of this pastoral summons deserve emphasis as windows into evangelical Anabaptist ideology on government. First, it is clear that Menno regarded holding political office as a Christian vocation, notwithstanding the apoliticism of many Mennonite groups after Menno's time. On this score, Walter Klaassen comments that Menno "did not see himself as separated from the world of the use of political power as many of his followers have. It is this recognition . . . that rulers could be Christians . . . that enables him to appeal to the rulers as passionately as he does and at such length."¹⁵ A distinguishing mark of evangelical Anabaptism as opposed to their separatist brethren, this is a point on which the movement's leaders concurred. Thus Hans Denck, styled by Martin Bucer as "the pope of the Anabaptists," reasoned by analogy: "A master of the house should treat his wife and child, menservants and maidservants as he desires that God treat him; that is not incompatible with love. And insofar as it is possible for a government to act in this way, a Christian could well serve in its office."¹⁶ Marpeck, who was employed by the city of Augsburg as an engineer for the last eleven years of his life, averred that both Christians and non-Christians may serve in civil government: "[T]he worldly power . . . to whom everyone should be subject according to Paul's teaching in Romans 13 . . . had been and still is everywhere in the world whether they [*i.e.* its leaders] are believing or unbelieving."¹⁷ To drive the point home, Hubmaier used Paul's identification of political

leaders as “God’s servants” (Rom. 13:6) to construct the following *reductio ad absurdum*: “For if a Christian could not be a servant of God, could not fulfill the mandate of God without sinning, then God would not be good. He would have made an order which a Christian could not fulfill without sin. This is a blasphemy.”¹⁸

Second, despite his general aversion to violence, Menno insisted that the government enforce civil law by punishing criminals, though not with unrestrained vengeance but with fairness, Christian discretion, and reason. As Helmut Isaak points out, for Menno legal correction could range all the way up to capital punishment.¹⁹ Positing the necessity of penalties for the maintenance of law and order, Hubmaier expressed the same sentiment in his exegesis of Romans 13:3: “Consequently, a Christian may also, according to God’s order, carry the sword in God’s place over the evildoer and punish him. Because of the evil ones it is ordered in this way by God for protection and shielding of the godly.”²⁰ Here “the sword” refers broadly to the ability of those in power to inflict punishment on those who defy the law, which may or may not involve a literal sword. But like God, who takes no pleasure in chastising the wicked (Ezekiel 18:30-32), a Christian magistrate, remarked Hubmaier, “does not hate those he punishes. He is sorry from his heart at the offences of such evil folk. Whatever he does is by the order and solemn command of God. . . . His sword is nothing else than the beneficent rod and scourge of God, with which he is commanded to chastise the evil.”²¹

Third, the government, while separate from God’s kingdom, assists in its expansion by protecting its members from the evils instigated by the world. In this way, the civil authority provides the church with the security necessary to complete the task of world evangelization. To summarize this protective role, elsewhere Menno drew an analogy between King Cyrus’ insurance of Jewish life, limb, and freedom of movement as the children of Israel made their way to the physical Promised Land and the magistrates’ insurance of Christian life, limb, and freedom of movement as the children of God make their way to the spiritual Promised Land. Just as Cyrus allowed the Jews to gather up all who would identify with the people of God for the journey to Jerusalem (Ezra 1:3), so the magistrates must not hinder the spread of the gospel but allow Christians to gather up all who believe it for

the journey to the new Jerusalem. Consequently Menno charged: “[W]ith king Cyrus. . . . it becomes you, O you highly renowned lords and princes . . . that you no longer obstruct by your mandates and powers, the journeying of the people of God to the eternal promised land; but you should . . . prosper their journey by your gracious permission.”²²

Accordingly, evangelical Anabaptists cultivated friendships with the government officials in their regions. Hubmaier dedicated twelve of his twenty-six treatises to nobles, some of whom even enter as characters into his dialogues.²³ A representative example is his foreword to the 1527 treatise *Grund und Ursache* (The Ground and Reason): “To the wellborn and Christian Lord H. Jan von Bernstain of Helffenstain, highest governor of the Margraviate of Moravia, my gracious Lord. Grace and salvation in God.”²⁴ From January 1523 to December 1525 Hubmaier served as advisor to the Waldshut City Council, all of whose members he had by April 1523 converted to evangelical Anabaptism,²⁵ and attended all their weekly meetings. After converting Nikolsburg’s Lords von Lichtenstein to Anabaptism in June 1526, from then until January 1528 Hubmaier occupied the same counseling role to the Lichtenstein brothers as Luther famously held with Frederick the Wise.²⁶ In 1527 Denck participated in the so-called Augsburg “Martyrs’ Synod,” where he sided with the City Council on the legitimacy of civil government against revolutionary Anabaptist Hans Hut, despite his knowledge that this would inevitably lead to the execution of Hut and his followers for treason.²⁷ Marpeck, as we have seen, worked as an Augsburg government employee from 1545 to 1556 and was highly favored by the City Council, who paid him the relatively high annual salary of 150 florins and refused to give him anything more than verbal reprimands (which they knew would be ignored) when the Holy Roman Empire periodically protested his Anabaptism.²⁸ Menno, mirroring Hubmaier, dedicated two sections of his *magnum opum*, the 1540 *Das Fundament des Christelycken leers* (Foundation of Christian Doctrine) or *Fundamentboek* for short, to “you great ones of the earth, whom we, through the mercy of God, acknowledge in all temporal things before our gracious Lord,” and proceeded to give them “a Christian and affectionate exhortation.”²⁹ In 1543 Menno endeared himself and his followers to the East Frisian Countess Anna of Oldenburg, who in 1545 distinguished them as “the

peaceful party among the Anabaptists” in contradistinction to the Münster radicals and so gave them legal toleration as a separate church apart from the established Reformed church.³⁰

Although the evangelical Anabaptists themselves refused to fight, the aforementioned leaders were prepared to take up arms in defense of their evangelical subjects, sometimes at the behest of those subjects. When the Habsburg imperial authorities demanded the extradition of Hubmaier’s followers from Schaffhausen, a city just northeast of Waldshut, in 1524, Hubmaier and the Waldshut City Council implored the neighboring City Council to forcibly protect the brethren. When Habsburg officials entered the city on Pentecost Day 1524, an armed militia assembled by Mayor Gutjahr marched on the town square to block the delegation and demand that the Anabaptist congregation remain in the city, a revolt which proved successful.³¹ Similarly, in spite of Holy Roman Emperor Charles V’s bounty of 500 gold guilders on Menno’s head and demand that his followers be executed, Countess Anna of Oldenburg founded East Frisia’s police force largely to slay those who would endanger the Anabaptists.³² This move was subsequently praised by Menno, who urged the police to “execute judgment and justice, assist against the violent.”³³ Seven years after his death, moreover, Menno’s congregation (the *Doopsgezinden* or “Waterlanders”) sent the Prince of Orange a considerable sum to help in the war against the Spanish, who were trying to capture the Netherlands for Roman Catholicism, as the congregation rightfully feared the wrath of the Spanish Inquisition which would inevitably befall them were Spain successful.³⁴ Not surprisingly, Hubmaier insisted that the best rulers were Christian, for only they could responsibly take up the sword without rancor toward the wicked or self-serving motives:

You must, must, must all confess that a Christian in government can perform and do so much better than a non-Christian. . . . it is evident that the more pious they are, the better and more orderly they will bear the sword according to the will of God for the protection of the innocent and for a terror to evildoers . . . having a special sympathy for all those who have transgressed, wholeheartedly wishing that it had not happened. . . . But a non-Christian takes to heart neither Christ nor God

nor blessedness, only thinking and plotting to remain in power, pomp, and circumstance.³⁵

Menno concurred with this verdict, which prompted his attempt to convert non-Christian rulers to the faith: “O you high-renowned noble lords and princes. . . . Obey, believe, fear, love, serve and follow your Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, for he it is before whom every knee shall bow. . . . Seek his honor and praise in all your thoughts, words, and actions, and you shall reign in eternity.”³⁶

From the foregoing evidence, it follows that the evangelical Anabaptists had more than sufficient political engagement and patronage to propagate their convictions through force. Moreover, the abundance of non-Anabaptists, including Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, in their midst furnished ample opportunity for religious coercion. But did the evangelical Anabaptists, as Quinn’s pragmatic argument demands, resort to such violence?

The Evangelical Anabaptist Case for and Practice of Religious Tolerance

While often touted by secularists as the product of the Enlightenment,³⁷ it was in fact evangelical Anabaptism which over a century earlier laid the foundation of and established the safeguards for the principle of religious liberty. The first early modern treatise defending freedom of thought³⁸ came from the pen of Hubmaier in 1524, entitled *Von Ketzer und ihren Verbrennern* (On Heretics and Those Who Burn Them). Appealing to the Sermon on the Mount and the Johannine discourses, Hubmaier insisted that Jesus himself taught religious tolerance, which directly contradicts the notion of a state religion: “For Christ did not come to murder, execute, or burn, but for those who live to live even more abundantly. . . . Thus while burning heretics appears to be following Christ, it is rather to deny him indeed and be more abominable than Jehoiakim, the king of Judah.”³⁹ Here Hubmaier suggested a theological basis for tolerance more profound than is generally recognized: to persecute a person for heresy amounts

to an implicit denial of the incarnation, since the God revealed in Christ is the God of the invitation, not of coercion.⁴⁰ This concept is expanded elsewhere in Hubmaier's analysis of the relationship between the character of God and human freedom:

[T]he heavenly Father, who now looks at humanity anew by the merit of Jesus Christ our Lord, blesses and draws him with his life-giving Word which he speaks into the heart of a person. This drawing and call is like an invitation to a marriage or to an evening meal. Through it God gives power and authority to all people insofar as they themselves want to come; the free choice is left to them. . . . But whoever does not want to come, like Jerusalem and those who have bought oxen and houses and have taken wives—these he leaves out as unworthy. . . . He wants to have uncoerced, willing, and joyous guests. . . . For God does not force anyone. . . . In the same way Lot was not compelled by the two angels in Sodom.⁴¹

Thus if not even God compels people into his kingdom but offers them an invitation which they can freely accept or deny, it follows that humans have no right to compel people into the godly kingdom either.

Consequently, God has not placed in human hands—neither those of lay Christians nor clergy nor government officials—the right to persecute heretics, whether they truly be heretics or not. Contra the widespread medieval and early modern notion, stemming back to Aquinas,⁴² that heretics amounted to spiritual murderers who must (even more than physical murderers) be slain for the common good, Hubmaier convicted of spiritual murder precisely those who demand the execution of heretics. This is because the latter condemn potential heretics to perdition before the end of their natural lifetimes, which God had mercifully granted to furnish them further opportunities to repent and be saved (Romans 2:4). As Jesus explained in the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matthew 13:36-43), believers and nonbelievers must live together peacefully in society until the day of the Lord's judgment. Only God, and not any human, has the authority to uproot the tares and consign them to punishment.⁴³ From this it follows,

declared Hubmaier, that the inquisitors are themselves “the greatest heretics of all” in burning alleged heretics “contrary to the teaching and example of Christ,” thereby “uprooting the wheat with the tares before the appointed time.”⁴⁴ Hence, while “it is proper for secular authorities to execute the wicked (Rom. 13:4) who cause bodily harm to the defenseless. . . they must not judge the godless.”⁴⁵ Denck summed up the evangelical Anabaptist conviction with this statement: “No Christian who wishes to boast in his Lord may use power to coerce. . . . For the realm of our King consists alone in the teaching and power of the Spirit.”⁴⁶

Due to their insistence on freedom of conscience, Hubmaier and his evangelical Anabaptist coreligionists promoted the use of apologetics in winning unbelievers to the gospel. As one of the preeminent apologists of his day,⁴⁷ Hubmaier explained that those who disagree with sound doctrine “should be overcome with holy dialogue, not quarrelsomely but gently” with “statements of authority and gospel evidences. . . having debated the truth with them”; should they refuse to listen, we “with patience and supplication. . . should pray and hope for their repentance.”⁴⁸ Echoing this sentiment was Denck, who pointed to Jesus’ use of careful exegesis of and logical argument from Scripture vis-à-vis the Jewish religious authorities as a model for Christians to follow: “Whoever truly acknowledges Christ as Lord ought to do nothing but what he commands him. Now he commands all his disciples to teach transgressors. . . [in] his scripture . . . which, in all references, must be held up in perspective, compared and integrated, if we are to find a basis for truth.”⁴⁹ Menno styled this apologetic use of Scripture as “wielding the sword of the Spirit.”⁵⁰ Unfortunately, as the evangelical Anabaptists lamented, such did not constitute standard procedure for most sixteenth-century Protestants and Catholics. Instead, they fell into the same trap as the first-century Jewish religious leaders; just as the Jewish leaders sought a religio-political messiah who would violently throw off the yoke of Rome and make Judaism the dominant faith in the Ancient Near East, so Protestants and Catholics clung to the church-state Christendom amalgam and its “holy violence” for ensuring their expansion and survival. As Marpeck remarked, this pseudo-Christian move could only be made at the expense of denying the true redemption offered by Jesus:

Far be it from us that we should seek to be redeemed like the Jews and these present alleged Christians who comfort themselves and hope to be redeemed by human power and the arm of man. The Jews, contrary to Christ and His own, claim to expect a Messiah or Christ who will redeem them from all power of the Gentiles by means of the arm of man and carnal weapons. . . . Thus also the alleged Christians are now blinded by this Jewish error (contrary to the bright light and Word which they claim to have and of which they boast), and assume that with the carnal sword and the arm of man Christ will release and redeem them from those who . . . frighten them. . . . The old Latin Roman Church, which is ruled by imperial power, also hopes that the emperor will achieve the victory in the semblance and name of Christ against all those who resist her. . . . It will happen in order that all those will be punished who, in the semblance of Christ, suppose that they will decide with the carnal sword.⁵¹

This quotation reveals a common understanding among the evangelical Anabaptists: the messiahship of Jesus, who refused to usurp the duly constituted political roles of king (John 6:15) and judge (Luke 12:13-14) but insisted that his kingdom, namely the Kingdom of God, was not of this world (John 18:36), demanded the separation of church and government. To see why, we note that, for evangelical Anabaptists, the church and God's Kingdom were one and the same, an identification which followed inescapably from their definition of the church as the invisible body comprising God and the company of all his redeemed rather than any visible institution. As Menno affirmed, "The Prince of peace is Christ Jesus; his kingdom is the kingdom of peace, which is his church."⁵² Thus if Jesus explicitly separated the Kingdom of God from the state, and the Kingdom of God is the church, then the separation of church and state is mandatory. On such grounds it follows that, for evangelical Anabaptism, the most devastating tragedy in all of church history proved to be the recognition of Christianity as first favored and then official religion of the Roman Empire respectively under Constantine (313) and Theodosius I (381).⁵³ This is because, in attempting to fuse church,

which is invisible, with the visible government, the church loses its essential spiritual character and ceases to be the church over which Christ rules. But if, as evangelical Anabaptists maintained, church and state must remain separate but Christians should take part in politics, then how could they do so without unwittingly melding the two? Their answer came from the Apostle Paul (Acts 16:17-39; 21:37-39; 22:25-29; 23:17-35; 24:10-22; 25:10-12; 28:16, 30-31) and the ante-Nicene apologists,⁵⁴ who, on the one hand, used their status as Roman citizens to seek such basic human liberties as protection and religious freedom for themselves and their communities but, on the other hand, never aimed to make the empire Christian or encourage the empire to pass laws favoring Christians over others.

In this way, evangelical Anabaptists employed their political influence to foster religious tolerance and proscribe laws concerning religion in the places they labored. For instance, as advisor to the Waldshut City Council, Hubmaier exhorted its members, who had previously maltreated Jews and persons deemed to be witches, to cease persecution of religious dissenters; the Council consented to Hubmaier's request.⁵⁵ In an age of such virulent anti-Semitism (and having formerly been, as a Catholic priest, a persecutor of Jews himself), Hubmaier's championing of philo-Semitism as the only Christian stance is quite remarkable: "Yes, in fact I should show friendship toward Jews and heathen. . . . [doing] works of necessity . . . such as the need to give food, to give drink, to give shelter. . . . so that they might be drawn by a Christian example to Christian faith (which issues in such friendly works, Gal. 5:23)."⁵⁶ If they do not respond to such kindness, we must patiently continue to show it, coupled with the careful use of Scripture and prayer, throughout their lives, regardless of whether or not they ever convert.⁵⁷ Hubmaier was able to implement this same policy of toleration in Nikolsburg as advisor to the Lords von Lichtenstein.⁵⁸ Denck also successfully worked for this policy in the cities of Augsburg and Basel, preventing the establishment of a state church in both cities from 1525 to his death in 1527, despite the respective attempts of Luther and Zwingli to institute such.⁵⁹ Based on Micah 4:5, which avers that in the last days "all the nations may walk in the name of their gods; we will walk in the name of Yahweh our God forever and ever," Denck declared that the gospel demands a

truly religiously plural society where not only varieties of Christians but also Muslims, nonreligious people, and Jews would live together unmolested. With words that seem far ahead of their time, Denck asserted:

Such a security will exist also in outward things, with practice of the true gospel that each will let the other move and dwell in peace—be he Turk or heathen, believing what he will—through and in his land, not submitting to a magistrate in matters of faith. Is there anything more to be desired? I stand fast on what the prophet says here. Everyone among all peoples may move around in the name of his God. That is to say, no one shall deprive another—whether heathen or Jew or Christian—but rather allow everyone to move in all territories in the name of his God. So may we benefit in the peace which God gives.⁶⁰

Marpeck labored to engender such security in Augsburg, exploiting his close relationship with its Council as the city engineer to make the city a religiously tolerant city for all between 1545 and 1556, to the dismay of first Luther and then Melanchthon.⁶¹ As previously indicated, Menno's irenic relations with Countess Anna of Oldenburg sparked a governmental policy of religious tolerance in East Frisia from 1545 to 1554; even greater was the result in Fresenburg, where his friendship with Baron Bartholomew von Ahlefeldt yielded the banishment of all religious laws from 1555 until the 1618 start of the Thirty Years' War, making it a safe haven for Jews and other persecuted minorities for over half a century.⁶²

Even though evangelical Anabaptists sought the protection of secular government and occasionally requested military action to be taken against their hunters, when arrested by duly sanctioned authorities they refused to take up arms in self-defense and would not call upon either their free coreligionists or sympathetic governments to make war against those authorities. This behavior was predicated on their respect for the state as instituted by God regardless of whether composed of just or unjust rulers (Romans 13:1-7) and the "good confession" (1 Timothy 6:13) of Jesus, who told Pilate that his disciples would not fight to prevent his crucifixion (John 18:36). Looking to the apostles

and the ante-Nicene martyrs for inspiration, evangelical Anabaptists, after having exhausted every biblically sanctioned channel to preserve their lives, embraced martyrdom as a privilege of God's counting them worthy to share in the sufferings of Christ (Acts 5:41). As Menno insisted, authentic disciples literally and voluntarily take up their crosses and follow Jesus when called upon to do so, going like their Lord like peaceful lambs to the slaughter and displaying *agapē* toward their slaughterers.

True Christians do not know vengeance, no matter how they are mistreated. In patience they possess their souls. . . . And they do not break their peace, even if they should be tempted by bondage, torture, poverty, and besides, by the sword and fire. They do not cry, Vengeance, vengeance, as does the world; but with Christ they supplicate and pray: Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.⁶³

Such a model was followed by Hubmaier, who suffered prison and torture at the hands of Zwingli from December 1525 to April 1526 in Zurich after defeating the latter in a public debate over believers' baptism. After his release and flight to Nikolsburg, Hubmaier sent an entreaty to Zwingli marked by genuine concern and compassion for his tormentor's soul. Despite pleading for the lives of his fellow evangelical Anabaptists, some of whom Zwingli had drowned in the Limmat River, conspicuous by its absence is the slightest tinge of rancor or retribution toward Zwingli:

Stop also the miserable imprisoning . . . of pious brothers, the exiling out of the territory, imprisoning, throwing into the dungeons, putting in stocks and blocks, drowning, and the like. . . . Aye, my dear Zwingle, do so for the sake of God and the truth, then the cause will soon come right everywhere. May God give you his grace and help you so that you again grasp his bright, clear, limpid Word as before and walk according to the same. May the dear merciful God the Father in heaven through Jesus Christ his most dear Son, our only Savior, grant

that to you and to us all. . . . Recognize yourself and live well in Christ.⁶⁴

Likewise, when Hubmaier and wife Elizabeth were captured by the forces of Habsburg monarch Ferdinand I at Vienna in 1528 and thereafter sentenced to death, Hubmaier displayed tremendous love toward his murderers. Just before the stake on which he would be burnt was lit, Hubmaier cried, "I forgive all those that have done me harm. . . . O Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit."⁶⁵

Although Denck, Marpeck, and Menno died natural deaths, many of their parishioners did not, especially during the years before they obtained tolerance from their respective city governments and in the surrounding regions which were not subject to those governments' jurisdiction. Over 10,000 evangelical Anabaptists were martyred by Catholic and Protestant authorities alike in the sixteenth century, as both Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (Second Diet of Speiers, 1529) and the Austrian Habsburg King Ferdinand I (Diet of Worms, 1527) placed Anabaptists under the sentence of death, free to be harassed and killed by anyone without penalty.⁶⁶ Even a casual reading of the accounts of their deaths in the *Martyrs' Mirror* reveals the magnitude of persecution they faced, matched only by their boldness, courage, and fortitude. A representative example saw between ten and seventeen evangelical Anabaptists slain by the Dominicans at the Dutch city of Vucht in 1538, seven years before Menno could procure their liberty in that region.

In this year 1538, in the month of August, ten, or seventeen persons, male and female, were apprehended in the town, who were accused of rebaptism. These were principally of the poorer class, except one, a goldsmith, called Paul von Drusnen, of whom it is reported that he was their teacher. Paul, and three others, were put to death at Vucht, in the theatre, then afterwards burnt on the 9th of September.

Paul's wife said: O Lord! Enlighten those who inflict such sufferings upon us, that they may see what they are doing. I thank thee, O God! That thou didst think me worthy to suffer for thy name's sake.

The Dominican said to another woman: Will you not stay with the holy church? She replied: I will remain with God; is this not a sufficient holy church?

Then spoke the Dominican to a man, John van Capelle: Pray that he may forgive you, because you have set us a bad example. He replied: I did not err, but I have engaged in the word of God and I am sorry that I remained so long in darkness. I entreat you, brothers, read the gospel, and live according to its precepts, and leave off your debauchery, roguery, and cursing.

...

The third woman said, O, Almighty God! Lay no greater burden on me than I can bear. Thus they died cheerfully.⁶⁷

This record bears eloquent testimony to the evangelical Anabaptist understanding of the church as the invisible Kingdom of God and their desire for the salvation of their executioners. Other accounts like this one often give the time and place of execution but rarely a complete list of the names, such as these members of Denck's flock slain two years after their shepherd's death: "Wolfgang Brand-Huber, Hans Niedermaier, and about seventy others, A.D. 1529."⁶⁸ George Huntston Williams summarizes their theology of martyrdom well: "The Christian should pray for this particular cross and be glad when it comes, for amidst tribulation comes . . . the oil of the Holy Spirit, the healing grace that makes even judicial torture and martyrdom an occasion for joy and divine benediction."⁶⁹

Concluding Reflections

With the evangelical Anabaptists we encounter a direct and massive contradiction to Quinn's pragmatic argument of tolerance through uncertainty. For here we have a group who believed with absolute certainty in their religious convictions (as certified by their willingness to die for these convictions), who participated in civil government, who possessed the political leverage to exhibit intolerance toward those in their regions who did not share their religious convictions, and who acted in precisely the opposite fashion.

They successfully (albeit temporarily) carried out the experiment of genuinely religiously tolerant and pluralistic societies in their cities and regions, where they lived together with Jews, Catholics, Lutherans, Reformed, and the occasional Muslim in peace and with the free exchange of ideas. An evangelical Anabaptist innovation, William R. Estep perceives that their “view of the state was to prove their most far-reaching contribution to the modern world.”⁷⁰ Further foreshadowing the modern age, the evangelical Anabaptists viewed apologetics among the essential ingredients of evangelism, mixed with prayer, compassion, and holy living. In sum, the evangelical Anabaptists’ basis for religious tolerance was not uncertainty, but certainty in Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God, a kingdom which demanded unconditional love and non-coercion toward those who had not yet entered it. Hence, contra Quinn, the true basis for religious tolerance is certainty in the reality of the *agapē*-centered Kingdom of God.

Moreover, the intolerance and barbaric violence all too typically displayed against the evangelical Anabaptists suggests the real root of religious intolerance: the unholy alliance of religion and government. Thus certainty concerning one’s religious convictions simply has nothing to do with intolerance. Logically extrapolating upon the evangelical Anabaptists’ convictions, it is easy to see why, for the Christian tradition, the combination of church and state has tragically spawned religious violence. When the church identifies itself with the state, the church ceases to be the Kingdom of God and so cuts itself off from God’s supernatural power, which alone can internally transform people’s lives. Bereft of this divine power, the now pseudo-church has nothing to draw upon in its attempt to grow and preserve its societal influence except the human coercive power of the state to compel, at least externally, the beliefs and behavior of persons under the state’s governance. Having abandoned the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23), the pseudo-church possesses no means for regulating faith and morals but coercion under pain of law, such that its charges at best evince merely a cultural acceptance of various Christian doctrines (*assensus*) without a personal commitment to Jesus (*fiducia*) and involuntarily perform actions which Scripture teaches true believers will voluntarily undertake. Against such a pseudo-church, Jesus’ words to its first-century counterpart stand in condemnation:

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for you cleanse the outside of the cup and dish, but inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence. Blind Pharisee, first cleanse the inside of the cup, in order that its outside may also be clean. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for you are like graves having been whitewashed, which on the outside indeed appear beautiful, but on the inside are full of the bones of dead persons and every kind of impurity. Thus also you yourselves on the outside appear righteous to human beings, but on the inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness (Matthew 23:25-28).

If this analysis is correct for the Christian faith, the truth which God has once for all entrusted to the saints (Jude 3), then how much more accurate it is for other world religions which lack such a divine starting point!

All in all, the case of evangelical Anabaptism not only demolishes Quinn's pragmatic argument but also throws valuable light on the true source of intolerance, which knowledge proves increasingly necessary in understanding and effectively responding to religious factionalism in the contemporary world.

Notes

1. As defended in Philip L. Quinn, "Toward Thinner Theologies: Hick and Alston on Religious Diversity," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 38 (1995): 145-64; "Religious Diversity and Religious Toleration," *International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion* 50 (2001): 57-80; "Epistemology in Philosophy of Religion," in *The Oxford Handbook of Epistemology*, ed. Paul Moser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 513-38; "On Religious Diversity and Tolerance," *Daedalus* (Winter 2005): 136-39.
2. M. Byrne, *Religion and the Enlightenment* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 28.
3. Quinn, "Religious Diversity and Religious Toleration," 68-73.
4. William Lane Craig, "Is Uncertainty a Sound Foundation for Religious Tolerance?" in *Religious Tolerance through Humility*, eds. James Kraft and David Basinger (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2008), 13-27; James Kraft, "Philip Quinn's Contribution to the Epistemic Challenge of Religious Diversity," *Religious Studies* 42.4 (2006): 453-65.

5. Quinn, "Religious Diversity and Religious Toleration," 57; "Epistemology in Philosophy of Religion," 513.
6. Sigrun Haude, "Anabaptism," in *The Reformation World*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (New York: Routledge, 2000), 252.
7. George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000), 161-74, 556-82.
8. C. Arnold Snyder, *Anabaptist History and Theology*, 2nd ed. (Kitchener, Ontario: Pandora Press, 1997), 193-95.
9. Thomas G. Sanders, *Protestant Concepts of Church and State*, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1985), 84.
10. "[O]ne can see in the following points that it does not befit a Christian to be a magistrate: the rule of government is according to the flesh, that of the Christians according to the Spirit. Their houses and dwelling remain in this world, that of the Christians is in heaven. Their citizenship is in this world, that of the Christians is in heaven. The weapons of the Christians are spiritual, against the fortification of the devil. The worldly are armed with steel and iron, but Christians are armed with the armor of God, with truth, righteousness, peace, faith, salvation, and with the Word of God....For any kingdom which is divided within itself will be destroyed" (*The Legacy of Michael Sattler*, trans. and ed. John H. Yoder [Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1973], 41).
11. *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, trans. and ed. J. C. Wenger (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1956), 554.
12. *Balthasar Hubmaier: Theologian of Anabaptism*, trans. and ed. H. Wayne Pipkin and John H. Yoder (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989), 499.
13. *The Writings of Pilgram Marpeck*, trans. and ed. William Klassen and Walter Klaassen (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1978), 537-38.
14. *Simons*, 193-95.
15. Walter Klaassen, "The Relevance of Menno Simons; Past and Present," in *Menno Simons: A Reappraisal*, ed. Gerald R. Brunk (Harrisonburg, VA: Eastern Mennonite College and Seminary, 1992), 28; for the authoritative demonstration of this fact see Helmut Isaak, "The Heavenly Jerusalem has Descended upon this Earth: Spiritual, Apocalyptic or Eschatological Anticipation of the Kingdom of God" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam, 1989).
16. "Wer aber eyn haußvatter ist, der handle mit weib und kind, knecht und mägd, wie er wolt, das Gott mit im handlet, das weret im die liebe nit. Und so ferr es müglich were, eyner oberkeyt auch also zu handlen, so möcht sie auch wol christlich in irem stand sein" (*Hans Denck Schriften*, 3 vols., ed. Georg Baring and Walter Fellmann [Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1955-60], 2:85).
17. *Marpeck*, 557.
18. *Hubmaier*, 521.
19. Helmut Isaak, "Menno's Vision of the Anticipation of the Kingdom of God," in *Menno Simons: A Reappraisal*, 70.
20. *Hubmaier*, 503.

21. Balthasar Hubmaier, "Concerning the Sword," in *Anabaptism in Outline: Selected Primary Sources*, ed. Walter Klaassen (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1981), 249. Here Klaassen's translation is a more faithful rendering of the German than that of Pipkin and Yoder (*cf. Hubmaier*, 511).
22. Menno Simon, *A Foundation and Plain Instruction of the Saving Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ*, trans. I. Daniel Ruff (Lancaster, PA: John Herr, 1835), 128.
23. Kirk R. MacGregor, *A Central European Synthesis of Radical and Magisterial Reform: The Sacramental Theology of Balthasar Hubmaier* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), 11.
24. *Hubmaier*, 367.
25. While the "birthday" of Anabaptism is often fixed at 21 January 1525 when Conrad Grebel baptized George Blaurock at the home of Felix Manz in Zurich, this date holds only for separatist Anabaptism, which started with these Swiss Brethren. For it has been demonstrated that Hubmaier, though not himself rebaptized until Easter Saturday 1525, began the practice of baptizing believers no later than January 1523. For the details behind this situation see MacGregor, *Central European Synthesis*, 104-24.
26. MacGregor, *Central European Synthesis*, 243-47.
27. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 282-86.
28. *Ibid.*, 1213; William R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story: An Introduction to Sixteenth-Century Anabaptism*, 3rd rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 124-25.
29. Simon, *Foundation*, 27, 126; also see *x*, where Menno includes the nobles in his dedication of the entire work.
30. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 734.
31. Johann Loserth, *D. Balthasar Hubmaier und die Anfänge der Wiedertaufe in Mähren* (Brünn: Verlag der histor.-statist., 1893), 95-99.
32. Johann Peter Müller, *Die Mennoniten in Ostfriesland vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert: aktemässige kulturgeschichtliche Darstellung* (Emden: W. Haynel, 1887), 72.
33. *Simons*, 526.
34. Estep, *Anabaptist Story*, 176.
35. "Jr müest, müest, müest ye bekhennen, das ein Christenliche Oberkhait solhs vil baß vnd ernstlicher verbringen müg vnd thon werde, denn ein vnchristenliche.... ist wissentlich, das ye frommer sy seind, ye baß vnnnd ordenlicher sy das schwert nach dem willen Gotes zû beschützung der vnschuldigen vnd zû einer forcht.... aber tregt ein sonder mitleiden mit allen denen, die sich vbersehen haben. Sy wolte von hertzen, das es nit beschehen were....ein vnchristenliche, dero weder Christus, Got, noch Gotseligkhait zû hertzen geet, sonder allain gedenckt vnd synnet, darmit sy in irem gwalt, pomp vnnnd bracht pleybe" (*Balthasar Hubmaier Schriften*, ed. Gunnar Westin and Torsten Bergsten [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1962], 437, 439, 447).
36. Simon, *Foundation*, 148-49.

37. Representative of this sentiment is the assertion of atheist New Testament scholar Gerd Lüdemann: “The origin of the idea of tolerance...is not rooted in the Bible. The idea of tolerance has a very different root. It is a non-Christian root; it’s rooted in the Enlightenment....We have to realize that for eighteen hundred years, no Christian had the idea of being tolerant to others” (*Did Jesus Rise from the Dead? Boston College Debate on 9/18/97 between William Lane Craig and Gerd Lüdemann* [Orlando: Integrated Resources, 1997], VHS recording). However, as this article proves, every part of Lüdemann’s assertion is historically inaccurate.
38. This designation is often incorrectly given to Sebastian Castellio’s 1554 *De haereticis, an sint persequendi* (Concerning Heretics and Whether They Should Be Persecuted), written on the heels of the Servetus debacle in Geneva. In point of fact, *De haereticis* did not go nearly as far as *Von Ketzer*. While Castellio argued that someone could be executed for heresy only if that person undermined (or threatened to undermine) the commonweal, Hubmaier claimed that secular authority cannot execute or even punish someone for heresy under any circumstances.
39. “Dann Christus ist nit kommen, das er metzge, vmbringe, brenne, sonder das die, so da lebend, noch reychlicher lebind....Darumb ketzer verbrennen ist Christum im schein bekennen, aber in der that verlöügnen vnd greülicher sin dann Joachim, der könig Juda” (*Hubmaier Schriften*, 98, 100).
40. MacGregor, *Central European Synthesis*, 145.
41. *Hubmaier*, 444.
42. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1981), 2.2.3.
43. Amplifying the argument, Menno highlighted that Paul and John implicitly taught the same ethic as Jesus: “Say, my dear people, where do the holy Scriptures teach that in Christ’s kingdom and church we shall rule the consciences and faith of others by force of the sword, violence, and tyranny of the magistracy—something which is left entirely to the judgment of God? Where have Christ and the apostles acted thus, advised thus, commanded thus? Ah, Christ says merely, Beware of false prophets; and Paul ordains that we shall avoid a heretical person after he has been admonished once or twice. John teaches that we shall not greet or receive the transgressor into our houses, who does not bring the doctrine of Christ, Matt. 7:15; Tit. 3:10; 2 John 1:9; they say not: Down with the heretics, accuse them before the magistrates, imprison, exile and cast them into the fire or water, as the Romans have done for many years, and as many of you would do, you who pretend to preach the word of God” (*Simons*, 537).
44. “So volgt nun das die ketzermayster die allergrösten ketzer sind, in dem das sy wider Christus leer vnd exempel die ketzer in das feür verurtailen vnd vor der zeyt der zeyt der ärnd außrauffend den waitzen zû samt dem vnkraut” (*Hubmaier Schriften*, 98). Menno stated precisely the same thing: “Reader, understand it rightly. Christ, the Son of man, sows his seed (God’s word), through his Spirit, in the world; all who hear, believe and obey it, are called the children of the

- kingdom. In the same manner the opponent sows his tares (false doctrine), in the world, and all that hear and follow him are called the children of evil. Now, both wheat and tares grow together in the same field, namely, in the world. The husbandman does not want the tares to be plucked out before their time, that is, he will not have them destroyed by rooting them up, but wants them left until the harvest, lest the wheat be destroyed with the tares, Matt. 13:29, 30" (*The Complete Works of Menno Simon*, trans. I. Daniel Ruff [Elkhart, IN: J. F. Funk, 1871], 88).
45. Darumb so tödt der weltlich gwalt die bößhafften billich vnd wol, Romm. 13 [V. 4], welche die werlosen am leib letzend....Der gwalt richtett...nit die gotloßen" (*Hubmaier Schriften*, 99).
 46. Hans Denck, "Concerning True Love," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 270.
 47. Surveying the reformer's stellar debating record against the likes of John Eck (his erstwhile *doctor vater*), Huldrych Zwingli, and John Oecolampadius, Anabaptist specialist Eddie Mabry dubs Hubmaier "a kind of apologist *par excellence*" (*Balthasar Hubmaier's Understanding of Faith* [Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988], vii).
 48. "Welche söllich sind, sol man mit hailigen kuntschafften, nit zänckisch sonder senfftlich überwinden....mit gwaltsprüchen oder Euangelischen vrsachen.... mit geduldt vnd schreyen....sol ouch bitten vnnd hoffen vmb büßwirckung" (*Hubmaier Schriften*, 97-98).
 49. *The Spiritual Legacy of Hans Denck*, trans. and ed. Clarence Bauman (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 198, 165.
 50. *Simons*, 94-95, 200.
 51. *Marpeck*, 539.
 52. *Simons*, 554.
 53. MacGregor, *Central European Synthesis*, 11.
 54. Earle E. Cairns, *Christianity through the Centuries*, 3rd rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 103-07.
 55. Carl Sachsse, *D. Balthasar Hubmaier als Theologe* (Berlin: Trowitsch und Sohn, 1914), 132.
 56. *Hubmaier*, 419.
 57. Thus Hubmaier wrote, "Allow them to continue ranting and raging (Titus 3:10) so that those who are filthy may become more filthy still (Rev. 22:11)" ("so gang iren müssig vnd laß sy die weil toben vnnd wütten, Tit. 3 [V. 10], damit die so ietz psudlet sind, noch baß psudlet werdind. Apoc. vlt. [V. 11]"; *Hubmaier Schriften*, 97).
 58. MacGregor, *Central European Synthesis*, 263. Although the Lichtensteins' 1527 arrest of revolutionary Anabaptist Hans Hut is sometimes cited as a counterexample, Hut was arrested not for his religious beliefs but for exhorting the Nikolsburg populace to take up arms and overthrow their lords, a fact repeatedly emphasized by Hubmaier in the wake of this incident.
 59. Ludwig Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer: Hans Denck* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1882), 138.

-
60. Hans Denck, "Commentary on Micah," in *Anabaptism in Outline*, 292.
 61. Jan J. Kiwiet, *Pilgram Marbeck* (Kassel: J. G. Oncken Verlag, 1957), 125-27.
 62. John Horsch, *Mennonites in Europe*, 2nd ed. (Goshen, IN: Mennonite Historical Society, 1942), 204.
 63. *Simons*, 555.
 64. *Hubmaier*, 232-33.
 65. Henry C. Vedder, *Balthasar Hübmaier: The Leader of the Anabaptists* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905), 243.
 66. Estep, *Anabaptist Story*, 74, 101.
 67. Thieleman J. Van Braght, *The Bloody Theatre or Martyrs' Mirror of the Defenseless Christians*, trans. I. Daniel Rupp (Lancaster, PA: David Miller, 1837), 374.
 68. *Ibid.*, 360.
 69. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 276.
 70. Estep, *Anabaptist Story*, 257.