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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

A nineteenth century writer made the statement that the Anabaptists of Germany in the 16th century had most of the characteristic features of Mormonism. They claimed to be inspired; they refused to acknowledge the civil government; they established a theocracy, calling Münster 'Mount Zion', they collected tithes and practiced polygamy.¹

It seems unlikely that modern descendents of either the Anabaptists or the Mormons would accept all of the above characteristics as true of their respective forefathers. Nor do most modern scholars subscribe to such ideas, particularly those who are specialists in Anabaptist or Mormon history.

The problem then, is to discover in what respects these two movements were similar, without any special reference to the characteristics attributed to them in the foregoing quotation.

In an attempt to accomplish this purpose, a particular criterion will be employed: i.e., the teachings of these two groups as to what characteristics are essential to Christ's "True Church."

¹H.S. Burrage, "The Sixteenth Century Anabaptists," American Society of Church History Papers, Series 2, III, 155, citing J.P. Thompson, "Church and State." [No page number or publication details given.]
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints claims to be the Restored Church of Jesus Christ, and it claims that this restoration took place in the year 1830.²

The idea of the restitution of the apostolic church was also the central thought in the early Anabaptist movement. Littell, in his Anabaptist View of the Church, makes repeated reference to the various Anabaptist groups as the "Church of the Restitution,"³ "the True Church,"⁴ and "the Party of the Restitution."⁵ "The goal of these Anabaptist groups . . . was not to introduce something new but to restore something old. 'Restitution' was their slogan."⁶ Bender refers to Grebel's work as "the glorious revival of the true apostolic church of Jesus Christ,"⁷ and to the Anabaptists in general as "seeking to re-create without compromise the original New Testament church."⁸ And finally,

²Joseph Smith, The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1948), 20:1. Cited hereafter as D&C.


⁴Ibid., p. xi. ⁵Ibid., p. 19. ⁶Ibid., p. 50.

⁷Harold S. Bender, Conrad Grebel, 1498-1526, the Founder of the Swiss Brethren (Goshen Indiana: The Mennonite Historical Society, 1950); p. xvi.

Robert Friedmann says of the Anabaptists that "they understood their order as a restitution of the eternal order of God's kingdom -- as far as this is possible for frail human beings."9

Since the founders of both the Anabaptist movement and of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints claim to have done essentially the same thing, it is proposed to examine the doctrines and practices which each group considered essential to effect a restoration of the "True Church." This will be done with a view to determining in what respects their claims are parallel, exclusive, or contradictory. An effort will be made to point out those areas which the average Mormon is inclined to accept as peculiar to his faith, but which were actually revived by the sorely persecuted Anabaptists three hundred years before the "Mormon Restoration."

Anabaptist Groups to be Considered

Every writer who writes on the Anabaptists is faced with the problem of defining the term "Anabaptist" since it has been used so loosely in times past. Newman has divided Anabaptism into five sections: (1) Chiliastic, (2) Soundly Biblical, (3) Mystical, (4) Pantheistic, and (5) Anti-trinitarian.10 Rolan\textsuperscript{d} Bainton has applied the term "the Left

---

Wing of the Reformation\textsuperscript{11} to these groups rather than classifying them all as Anabaptists. Franklin Littell\textsuperscript{12} and R.M. Jones have suggested that, for the sake of historical accuracy, the term "Anabaptist" should be restricted to those who (1) opposed infant baptism, (2) insisted on adult baptism as a visible sign of the covenant of man and God, (3) called themselves a true church formed exactly on the pattern of the apostolic church, (4) treated the Gospel as a new law to be literally followed, (5) maintained a rigorous church discipline, and (6) denied the authority of the magistrates to interfere in religious matters.\textsuperscript{13} According to this definition, only the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterians, the South German Brethren, and the Mennonites would be called Anabaptists.\textsuperscript{14} Robert Friedmann would add a fifth group, the Philippites of Moravia, Austria, and Southwest Germany.\textsuperscript{15}

The confusion with regard to the meaning of the term Anabaptist results from the early stages of the Reformation. The word itself is a Latin derivative meaning "one who re-baptizes" and was applied by the Lutherans and the

\textsuperscript{11}Journal of Religion, XXI (1941) part 2, 24-34.
\textsuperscript{12}The Anabaptist View, p.48.
\textsuperscript{14}Littell, p.48.
\textsuperscript{15}Robert Friedmann, "The Philippite Brethren, A Chapter in Anabaptist History, MOR, XXXII (October, 1958), 272.
Zwinglians to all those who separated themselves from the main body of the state church, with little regard for the reasons for separation. Their reasons for doing so are very transparent.

The insistent use of the term Wiedertäufer or Anabaptistici by the enemies of the movement was because the groups fell thereby subject to the death penalty under the ancient Roman law against re-baptizers (Donatists). The propaganda campaign succeeded.16

The only thing that many of those who have been termed Anabaptists had in common is the fact that they were in opposition to the state churches. They were therefore indiscriminately called Anabaptists by their enemies for purposes of persecution. Thomas Müntzer, for example, has been traditionally called an Anabaptist, and even the founder of the Anabaptist movement, and yet he never did practice believer's baptism.

There has been a considerable amount of pressure in recent years, particularly by the American Mennonite scholars of this century, to more accurately define "Anabaptist." Harold S. Bender, editor of the Mennonite Quarterly Review, and the late John Horsch of an older generation led in this movement. A whole generation of scholars have followed them. Such persons as Harold Bender, Robert Friedmann, John C. Wenger, and with some reservations Franklin Littell,

are among the strongest defenders of this position at the present time. George H. Williams, the editor of Volume XXV of The Library of Christian Classics, The Mystical and Anabaptist Writers, has recently referred to those whom the Mennonite scholars are pleased to call "Anabaptists" as "Evangelical Anabaptists," and includes "Revolutionary" and "Contemplative" groups under the Anabaptist heading also.

Although there is admittedly still opposition to them, the Mennonite scholars seem to be in a very strong position, and therefore, for purposes of convenience, this investigation will use the term "Anabaptist" in the sense that these spiritual, and in many cases also literal, descendants of the sixteenth century Anabaptists claim that it should be used to refer to the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterite Brethren, and the Mennonites. The South Germans and the Philippites will not be included because of lack of source materials. In some cases persons will be quoted who were forerunners of these specific groups, or who led groups out of which these groups grew, but in all cases only ideas which are harmonious with those of the groups herein defined as Anabaptist will be used. As much as possible, references will be taken from the sixteenth century rather than from a later period, in order to get a clear picture of the foundation principles of these branches of the Anabaptist movement.

In dealing with the Latter-day Saints a similar
policy will be followed, in that references will be taken exclusively from the writings of Joseph Smith and the history of the church during his leadership. In this way it is hoped to avoid any later accretions to Mormon thinking and practice.

**Historical Relationships of Anabaptist Groups**

The Swiss Brethren were the first of the three groups under consideration to come into existence. They were organized in the third week of January, 1525, in Zurich, Switzerland. The chief figures in the founding of this group were Conrad Grebel, Felix Manz, and George Blaurock, protégés of Zwingli who broke with him over his unwillingness to go as far as they thought that he should in revamping the church. When he fostered a program that could only result in a union of church and state, a complete rupture was inevitable. Thus on January 21, 1525, George Blaurock requested Conrad Grebel to baptize him, and Anabaptism was born. Blaurock was soon exiled from Switzerland, and ended up in the Tyrol, where he formed an Anabaptist following. He was burned as the stake in September of 1529. Manz was actually the first martyr of the new faith, having been drowned in 1527. Grebel was the first to die, but he died a natural death in 1526. Michael Sattler was the most prominent leader in Switzerland after

---

17 Bender's Conrad Grebel, 1498-1526, The Founder of the Swiss Brethren, gives a complete treatment of this.
the death of Manz, but he too was martyred just a few months after Manz.

Persecution forced others besides the three prominent leaders just mentioned to leave Switzerland, and among these was Reublin. It was he who, shortly after the movement began, at Easter, 1525, baptized Dr. Balthazar Hubmaier and his Waldshut congregation. Others were influential in spreading the doctrines to other places. The persecution remained very severe in Switzerland long after it had died down elsewhere, particularly in Holland, and the result was that the Swiss were largely deprived of their strong leadership, and came to rely on the Mennonites for overall guidance. They hence became known as Mennonites, and exist as such today.

The Hutterian Brethren were the next in line of origin. They trace their roots to the Swiss Brethren by two different routes. The first is by way of Hubmaier, who was previously mentioned as being baptized by Reublin at Waldshut in 1525. He was forced to flee to Moravia where he established an Anabaptist congregation at Nicholsburg, which he led until his death at the stake in 1528. He was opposed by Hans Hut on the question of the use of violence, and when Hut was forced to leave Moravia in 1527, Jacob Wiedemann succeeded him as leader of the non-violent group. This group was soon forced to leave Nicholsburg, and under Wiedemann's leadership they settled at Austerlitz and esta-
lished the practice of community of goods, which has charac-
terized that sect ever since.

The second route is through George Blaurock, who,
as previously mentioned, fled from Zurich to the Tyrol.
Just when he reached that area is not known, but when he
was burned at the stake in September, 1529, Jacob Hutter
succeeded him as leader of the Tyrolean Anabaptists. It
was sometime in this same year that Hutter first went to
Moravia looking for a more favorable place for his people
to settle. When he returned to the Tyrol he sent some of
his followers to Moravia, and was soon called there to try
to settle a dispute between George Zaunring, his own lieu-
tenant, and Jacob Wiedemann. Zaunring's followers left
Austerlitz and settled at Auspitz, and Hutter became bish-
op of that group in 1533. His group eventually absorbed
the others, and hence that branch of Anabaptism bears his
name. He was martyred while on a return trip to the Tyrol
in 1536. The history of this group is one of intermittent
wandering in search of religious freedom, accompanied by
an almost constant and very severe persecution.18

The third of these Anabaptist groups is the Menno-
nites. The person for whom they are named was ordained a
Catholic priest in 1524, the year before the Swiss Brethren

18 John Horsch, The Hutterian Brethren, 1528-1931,
A Story of Martyrdom and Loyalty (Goshen, Indiana: Menno-
nite Historical Society, 1931), is the most comprehensive
English language treatment of this sect.
came into existence. He soon developed doubts about the doctrine of transubstantiation, and when he heard of the Anabaptists in 1531 he was led to a thorough study of the New Testament to try to combat their doctrines. This study resulted in his rejection of the practice of infant baptism but he remained a Catholic priest for five years after this time, towards the end of which he openly preached against Catholic doctrine from his Catholic pulpit. He was very zealous in preaching against the Münster debacle during 1534-35.\(^\text{19}\) He finally left the Catholic church, spent a

\(^{19}\)About 1550 Melchior Hofmann, a Lutheran preacher, turned radical and designated himself as a second Enoch. He prophesied that he would spend six months in jail, and would then be released to establish the Kingdom of God at Strasbourg. In May, 1533, he found himself in jail, however, this was the only part of his prophecy to come true. Instead of being released, he languished in jail for several years and eventually died there. In the meantime he lost control of his following.

Jan Matthys, who had joined Hofmann in 1531, now assumed the leadership. His radicalism caused the more conservative Melchiorites to refuse to follow him. He soon announced (probably because of his favorable reception there) that it had been revealed to him that Münster, not Strasbourg, was to be the new Jerusalem, and in January of 1534, his followers took possession of the city by force. In April, 1534, Matthys was killed in defending the city, and John of Leyden became the leader. He replaced the twelve judges that had been installed to rule the "tribes" with a monarchy. He caused himself to be ceremoniously crowned, and began to live in luxury in spite of the severe conditions caused by the siege which the Bishop of Münster had laid to the city. Nor did he exercise any restraint in the use of force to gain his ends. All unbelievers were excluded by force, threats were hurled at Luther, the pope, and neighboring rulers, polygamy was introduced, civil order neglected, and the new king ruled in terror. In spite of this the inhabitants vigorously defended the city.

In June of 1535, the city fell amid indescribable scenes of brutality, and the Anabaptist rule in Münster
year in retirement, and then in 1537 accepted ordination at the hands of Obbe Philips, an Anabaptist leader.

At this point a word about Obbe Philips is in order. He had been a follower of Melchior Hofmann, the Strasbourg radical, and became the leader of the peaceful wing of Anabaptists in North Germany and the Netherlands which refused to follow the radical leadership of Jan Matthys and John of Leyden when they took over from the imprisoned Hofmann. Obbe defected from the brotherhood in 1541, disillusioned by the fact that his ordination depended on the authority of Matthys, "the false Münsterite leader." His brother Dietrich remained, however, and he and Menno Simons became the prominent leaders of the sect. Menno, the more liberal of the two, soon gave his name to the brotherhood. 20

The connection between the Swiss Brethren and the Hutterian Brethren is thus very easily traced, but there does not seem to have been any connection between these two groups and the Mennonites until a later date in history. On this point John Horsch has observed that

it is a fact deserving particular notice . . . that between the Obbenites and the Swiss Brethren there was substantial agreement in faith and practice, though there had been no contact between the two bodies. . . . Evidently neither Obbe Philips nor Menno Simons at the

was at an end.

Menno Simons preached particularly against the use of force, polygamy, an earthly king, and the "revelations" which the Münsterite leaders claimed to receive.

time of his conversion and baptism was acquainted with the few booklets published by the Swiss Brethren, nor with the writings of Balthazar Hubmaier. As late as the middle of the next century . . . the Mennonites of the Netherlands had only very meagre knowledge of the Brethren in the Southern lands. 21

Definition of "Anabaptist Restitution"

There does not appear to have been anything like complete agreement among the Anabaptist leaders as to what points were essential in a restitution of the "True Church." They were agreed that the New Testament apostolic church must be duplicated, but beyond this opinions were very diverse.

Dietrich Philips, Menno Simons' co-leader, mentioned "seven ordinances of the true church." These were (1) pure and unfalsified doctrine together with correct ministers, (2) scriptural use of baptism and the Lord's Supper, (3) foot-washing, (4) evangelical separation including the ban, (5) brotherly love, (6) keeping all of Christ's commandments, and (7) suffering and persecution. 22 Simons agreed with Philips on four of the points, but eliminated foot-washing and evangelical separation, and added "a bold confession of God and Christ" to his list of requisites of


the "True Church." However, in other of his teachings he did include the ban, describing it as a sign of the regenerate.

The Schleitheim Confession of the Swiss Brethren, written in 1527 by the leaders of the Swiss Anabaptist movement, lists seven points: (1) baptism of believers only, (2) use of the ban, (3) only those baptized by believer's baptism, and not under the ban allowed to participate in the Breaking of Bread, (4) separation from abomination [i.e. the established church services, drinking houses etc.], (5) pastors of good report, (6) non-use of the sword and inability of Christians to be magistrates, and (7) non-use of the oath.

The Hutterian leader, Peter Walpot, in writing to Simon, the Polish Apothecary in 1571, questioned him particularly about (1) believer's baptism, (2) love of neighbor, (3) the simple nature of assemblies, and (4) the proper ban or excommunication.

Conrad Grebel, in writing to Thomas Müntzer, mentioned (1) support of the ministry by voluntary offering

24 Simons, p. 94.
only, (2) use of the ban against those who do not conform to the "rule of Christ," (3) non-use of the sword, (4) faith baptism, (5) non-use of singing in worship, and (6) no formal liturgy in imitation of the mass.27

Various modern writers have compiled lists which they think are representative of the main tenets of the Anabaptist movement, and no two of these are alike. Newman lists fourteen points: (1) brotherly concern for the physical welfare of the believers, (2) only truly regenerate allowed in church, (3) opposition to infant baptism, (4) separation of church and state, and liberty of conscience, (5) inability of Christians to be magistrates, (6) non-use of oaths, (7) refusal to bear arms, (8) opposition to capital punishment, (9) claim of divine commission to set up a theocratic kingdom, (10) opposition to predestinarian teachings, (11) austere life filled with suffering, (12) admission of only the worthy to the Lord's Supper, (13) extreme separatism, and (14) connectional church government, with a superintendency, itinerant ministry, and carefully defined inter-dependency of local congregations.28

Smucker, referring particularly to the Mennonites, lists seven points: (1) believer's baptism, (2) voluntary church membership, (3) freedom of conscience, (4) separation of church and state, (5) non-resistance, (6) non-

27Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 178.
use of oaths, and (7) primacy of the New Testament. 29

And finally, Littell lists only four points as essential to the Anabaptist pattern of restitution: (1) believer's baptism, (2) spiritual government or ban, (3) community, (4) the authority of the civil government, apostolic non-resistance, and the oath. 30

From this veritable maze it is necessary to select those points on which there seems to be the most agreement as being necessary to the Anabaptist concept of the "True Church." The following points have been selected as filling this requirement: (1) believer's baptism, (2) the Lord's Supper, (3) non-resistance, (4) the Christian's responsibility to government, (5) the oath, (6) brotherly love, or community of goods, (7) church discipline, or the ban. These points will be considered as typical of Anabaptist thought.

**Definition of the Mormon Restoration**

To enumerate all of the points which Joseph Smith considered necessary in a restoration of the "True Church" would be tedious, as well as beyond the scope of this study. Three fundamental points will therefore be considered. The first one is shared with the Anabaptists by virtue of the fact that both groups claimed to be restoring something.

---

30 Littell, pp. 76 ff.
If something is to be restored it must have been previously lost, and therefore both groups believed in an apostacy of the Christian church. The other two points were apparently not considered by the Anabaptists to be very important, but they are basic, in fact the first principles of the Latter-day Saint restoration. These are (1) divine revelation, and (2) priesthood authority. This is the real distinction between Anabaptism and Mormonism. Whereas the former attempted a revival based on an appeal to the scriptures, the latter claimed a restoration which made its own scriptures.

**Methodology**

This investigation will rely most heavily upon the historical research method in that the writings of the founders of these two movements will be scrutinized in order to ascertain their opinions and teachings on the points previously alluded to. No attempt will be made to trace the development of any of these ideas, but rather to determine the ideas which guided the founders while the groups under consideration were still in their formative years.

In the last chapter it is proposed to evaluate this material with reference to the extent of similarities and striking dis-similarities which existed between these two groups. An evaluation of the significance of these parallels will also be made.
The author is cognizant of the fact that it is difficult to be thoroughly unbiased and objective in a study such as this because of his connection with one of the groups under consideration, but every effort will be made to avoid giving unequal sympathy to the views of either group.
CHAPTER II

THE ANABAPTIST RESTITUTION

Baptism

The Basis of Conflict

Believer's or faith baptism was one point insisted upon by all Anabaptists as a mark of the "True Church." However, it has been pointed out that baptism was not the real issue between the Reformers and the Anabaptists, but rather it was a battle between two opposing views of the church. The Reformers were determined to maintain the parish system, whereby all who lived within the parish (or the state) were members of the church, but the Anabaptists were out to restore an Apostolic Christianity on a voluntary basis. Since baptism was the sign of initiation into the church, it became important as the most obvious dividing line between the two systems. Schaff bears out this statement when he says that

they [the Anabaptists] thought that the Reformers stopped half-way, and did not go to the root of the evil. They broke with the historical tradition, and constructed a new church of believers on the voluntary principle. Their fundamental doctrine was that baptism is a voluntary act, and requires personal acceptance, and faith in Christ. They rejected in-

1Littell, p. 29
fant baptism as an anti-scriptural invention. They could find no trace of it in the New Testament, the only authority [which they would accept] in matters of faith.²

The Reformers obviously could not adopt a system of voluntary church membership and still maintain a state church; and on the other hand, the Anabaptists could not feel that the prevailing system was scriptural. And so we find the first Anabaptist baptism being performed in Zurich on January 21, 1525. H. S. Bender tells the story of this event as follows:

In a vividly pictured story of the baptismal scene the chronicler relates that after prayer George Blaurock entreated Conrad Grebel for God's sake to baptize him with the right Christian baptism, whereupon as he kneeled down Grebel baptized him.³

Thus the practice of believer's baptism was inaugurated in the Sixteenth Century. Now let us examine a little more closely what lay behind this doctrine.

Prerequisites of Baptism

Conrad Grebel's comments on the prerequisites of baptism were practical and to the point. He said that in order to be baptized one must give up "fornication, gambling, drinking, and usury."⁴ Menno Simons based his stand

³Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. xiv, citing Geschichtsbuch des Hutterischen Bruders, pp. 34-35.
⁴Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 146, citing Egli, Akten Sammlung, August 2, 1525, No. 792, p. 372.
on this matter on the "great commission" found in Mark 16:15-16:

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.

From this Menno concluded that

here we have the Lord's commandment concerning baptism, as to when according to the ordinance of God it shall be administered and received; namely, that the Gospel first must be preached, and then those baptized who believe it, . . . 5

When the above statements of Conrad Grebel and Menno Simons are considered together their content is about equal to a statement made by Joseph Smith on the same subject, with the exception that Smith's fourth point, which follows baptism, is not mentioned by the other two.

We believe that the first four principles and ordinances of the Gospel are: first, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, Repentance; third, Baptism by immersion . . . fourth, the Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.6

We may safely conclude that the founders of the Anabaptist movement and of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints would agree that the prerequisites of "True Church" baptism are first of all the hearing of the gospel, secondly faith, and thirdly repentance.

---

5 Simons, p. 120.

6 Joseph Smith, The Pearl of Great Price (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1949), p. 60. Cited hereafter as PGP.
Significance of Baptism

In contrast to the sacramental idea of baptism entertained by the Catholic church, and also to some extent by the Reformers, the Anabaptists looked on baptism strictly as an outward sign of an inner change, as well as a significance of a determination to live a godly life in the future. Conrad Grebel described it as

a sign of a change in the inner man, a new birth, a washing away of sin, and accordingly a pledge of obedience to Christ and of the purpose to 'walk according to Christ,'" [and] nothing else than a dying to the old man and the putting on of a new.  

As time went on Grebel also came to emphasize proper baptism as a part of the obedience required of the church. Menno Simons said essentially the same thing in slightly different words, claiming that an inward baptism must precede the outward baptism, and that outward baptism is only a useless form unless inward baptism precedes it.

For if outward baptism could save without the inward, then the whole Scriptures which speak of the new man would be spoken to no purpose.

The outward baptism is only an evidence of "obedience which is of faith." And furthermore

---

7Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 207, citing Boehmer-Kirn, Thomas Müntzer's Briefwechsel. [no page given]
8Ibid., p. 287. 9Ibid., p. 116.
10Simons, p. 124. 11Ibid.
baptism is a sign of obedience, commanded of Christ, by which we testify when we receive it that we believe the Word of the Lord, that we repent of our former life and conduct, that we desire to rise with Christ unto a new life, and that we believe in the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ. Not . . . that we believe in the remission of sins through baptism, by no means. . . . We testify thereby that we have repented and believe in forgiveness through Christ.\textsuperscript{12}

Menno Simons also emphasized that one who has come to years of understanding cannot be saved without faith and baptism.\textsuperscript{13}

It has also been said that some Anabaptists did not feel that a full believer's baptism was complete until he had suffered martyrdom, for "there are three that bear witness in the earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood."\textsuperscript{14} The tenacity with which these people clung to their beliefs in the face of death lends credence to this claim.

The Latter-day Saint position on the significance of baptism agrees quite closely with that of the Anabaptists as evidenced in the following quotation.

And again, by way of commandment to the church concerning the manner of baptism -- All those who humble themselves before God, and desire to be baptized, and come forth with broken hearts and contrite spirits, and witness before the church that they have truly repented of all their sins, and are willing to take upon them the name of Jesus Christ, having a determination to serve him to the end, and truly manifest by their works that they have received of the Spirit of Christ unto the remission of their sins, shall be received by baptism into his church.\textsuperscript{15}

A statement of Joseph Smith further clarifies this position:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 125. \textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 123. \\
\textsuperscript{14}Littell, p. 109. \textsuperscript{15}DOG, 20:37.
\end{flushright}
Baptism is a sign to God, to angels, and to heaven that we do the will of God, and there is no other way beneath the heavens whereby God hath ordained for man to come to Him to be saved, and enter into the Kingdom of God." \(^18\)

Baptism thus signifies three things to the Mormon:

1. determination to live right,  
2. forgiveness of sins,  
3. admittance into the church.

**The Mode of Baptism**

In the early days of Anabaptism there was little concern with the particular form under which baptism was administered. Sprinkling or pouring was the prevailing custom, although immersion was practised in a few isolated cases. \(^17\) The early Anabaptist writers pass up countless opportunities to discuss the mode of baptism, but this neglect is because they apparently looked upon it as an unessential part of the "True Church." Nevertheless there are many accounts of the baptisms that took place.

Hans Hut\(^18\) is described as baptizing by "dipping his hand in a water pitcher and making a cross on their foreheads."\(^19\) An account of a Flanders baptismal ceremony

---


\(^17\)C. Henry Smith, p. 20.

\(^18\)An early leader of the Moravian Anabaptists who oppose Balthasar Hubmaier, and was forced to flee from Maravia in 1527.

\(^19\)Littell, p. 106.
sends that

one takes a dish with water, in which the minister puts his hand and then drops water upon the head of the recipient in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost upon the basis of the faith that he, the recipient, has in this baptism. 20

Another writer has stated that immersion was considered equal to sprinkling in Hamburg and Holland, in spite of the fact that Menno Simons originally placed little stress on baptism. 21

In the "Protest and Defense" to the Zurich Council Conrad Grebel speaks of candidates being poured over with water [baptized] meaning that just as they were cleansed within by the coming of the Holy Spirit 22 so they also were poured over with water externally to signify for the inner cleansing and dying to sin. 23

In the light of the foregoing description of the mode of baptism used by Grebel the following statement seems rather strange:

Finally many of them demanded to be baptized, and on Palm Sunday, April 9, 1525, a great crowd streamed out of the city [St. Gall] to the banks of the River Sitter to be baptized by Grebel. 24


22 Note that here the Holy Spirit is represented as coming before baptism, whereas in the L.D.S. Faith it is a separate ordinance and follows baptism.

23 Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 287. 24 Ibid., p. 143.
Why it was necessary to journey out to the banks of a river for a ceremony which consisted only of having water poured over oneself remains unexplained.

Two Anabaptist liturgies of baptism are available to us, the first from among the Swiss Brethren:

The baptism was rather imbedded in a brief liturgy spoken alternately by Blaurock and Manz. Blaurock first asks Bruggbach whether he desires baptism (Blaurock says 'grace'). Bruggbach answers affirmatively. Then Manz quotes from the related passages in Acts (10:47): 'Can any man forbid water, that these should be baptized?' Blaurock replies, 'No one.' Now Manz siezes a metal ladle with a handle ... and pours water from it on the head of the baptismal candidate, saying 'I baptize you in the name of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.'

The second comes to us from the writings of the Rutterian leader, Peter Rideman. He first of all makes the rather obvious observation that there must be two persons present before a baptism can be performed, the candidate and the baptizer. Then,

he that baptizeth pointeth out to the man his sins, how he may come to God, and find grace in Him, and how baptism is a covenant with God. ... Thus he who is baptized must first request, ask for, and desire it. Then he who baptizeth asketh him if he believeth in God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Thus [sic] the other must confess his faith. He is further asked if he rejecteth world, sin, and devil. These he must reject. ... If he so desireth, the baptizer then telleth him to


26 A Rutterite leader of the first half of the Sixteenth Century. He was a minister for twenty-seven years, nine of which he spent in prison. He was born about 1506 in Silesia, and joined the brotherhood by 1532, and died in 1556.
humble himself with bent knees before God and His church, and he taketh pure water and poureth it upon him and saith, 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who in accordance with thy faith hath forgiven thy sins and drawn and received thee into his Kingdom. Therefore sin henceforth no more, lest a worse thing befall thee.'

Although these two accounts are very specific, it is immediately noticed that there is quite a difference between the two ceremonies, particularly in their wording. The Latter-day Saint mode of baptism is also very clearly set forth, and differs somewhat from that of the Anabaptists.

And again the Lord called others, and said unto them likewise; and he gave unto them power to baptize. And he said unto them: On this wise shall ye baptize; and there shall be no disputations among you. [italics mine]

Verily I say unto you, that whose repenteth of his sins through your words and desireth to be baptized in my name, on this wise shall ye baptize them -- Behold, ye shall go down and stand in the water, and in my name shall ye baptize them.

And now behold, these are the words which ye shall say, calling them by name, saying:

Having authority given me of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

And then shall ye immerse them in the water, and come forth again out of the water.

Three things stand out in this passage as different from the Anabaptist passages previously cited. First, the com-

---


mand that there should be no further disputes as to the mode of baptism. Second, that the person officiating is required to state his authority; and third, that immersion is the only acceptable form. In contrast to the Anabaptists the Mormons were very form conscious about "True Church" baptism. Another very significant difference is the Mormon lack of dependence on the New Testament forms.

Infant Baptism

A large portion of the Anabaptist writings on baptism are concerned with infant baptism and its correlate, believer's baptism. As previously stated, this is the particular point that made the state church system incompatible with the ideas of the Anabaptists. To their way of thinking a state church could not be a "True Church."

One major Anabaptist argument was that infant baptism "is in fact no baptism," for "young children are without understanding and unteachable; therefore baptism cannot be administered to them." Young children cannot conform to the "right and necessary" sequence of preaching, faith, rebirth, and baptism, and they therefore cannot be baptized.


30 Simons, p. 120.

Another frequently used argument was that we have not a single command in the Scriptures that infants are to be baptized, or that the apostles practiced it, therefore we confess with good sense that infant baptism is nothing but human invention and notion. . . .32

[and] in the New Testament no ceremonies for infants are enjoined, for it treats both in doctrines and sacraments with those who have ears to hear and hearts to understand.33

With this Rideman agrees, saying that nowhere in scripture is infant baptism even considered, much less commanded.34 He makes a point of the fact that there is no evidence that Jesus or his apostles ever baptized children.35 In answering Melancthon's charges, the Anabaptists confirmed the charge that they looked upon infant baptism as wrong and of no value for salvation, by virtue of the fact that Christ atoned for original sin in children.36

With all of these points Latter-day Saint doctrine is in general agreement, with the possible exception of Menno Simons' statement in relation to the lack of New Testament injunctions concerning ceremonies for children. He claimed that the scripture "Suffer the little children to

32Simons, p. 126. See also p. 129, where he gives the conditions for settling the argument by saying, "Only show us the Word of God, and the matter is settled."
33Ibid., p. 120. 34Rideman, p. 69.
35Heimann, MQR, XXVI (January, 1952), p. 44.
come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven," is clear proof that infant baptism is not necessary. However, in another place he intimates while discussing this same scripture that he is not too sure just what it does mean, but that it probably refers to some sort of a spiritual bringing.

The Latter-day Saints interpret this same scripture to mean that infants should be brought before the church and given a name and a blessing, but as with the Anabaptists no hint of infant baptism is accepted.

Conrad Grebel, in his letter to Thomas Müntzer, cites a long list of scriptures to prove that children are automatically saved,

[for] all children who have not yet come to the discernment of the knowledge of good and evil, and have not yet eaten of the true knowledge, that they are surely saved by the suffering of Christ, . . . who has restored their vitiated life, because they would have been subject to death and condemnation only if Christ had not suffered; but they're not yet grown up to the infirmity of our broken nature -- unless, indeed, it can be proved that Christ did not suffer for children.

Horsch further quotes Grebel as saying:

We believe that all children who cannot yet distinguish between good and evil are assuredly saved.

---


39 D&C, 20:70.


41 Library of Christian Classics, XXV, 285. See also Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 285
through the sufferings of Christ. . . . As concerns the argument that faith is required of all [for salvation] we hold that infants are excepted, and believe that they are saved without faith.\(^{42}\)

And Dirck Philips wrote:

The infants may not be judged and condemned for the sin of Adam. . . . but as long as they are childlike and without the knowledge of good and evil, they are pleasing and acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.\(^{43}\)

Robert Friedman shows Peter Rideman's teaching to have been that all men inherit from Adam the inclination to sin, and that original sin is the first cause of physical death for men; as well as the cause of eternal death, because it leads men to sin. However, the children shall not bear the iniquities of the fathers according to Ezekial 16:20; 33:10-19; and therefore God accepts little children without baptism.\(^{44}\)

The Book of Mormon contains an interesting parallel to these writings of Grebel and Rideman:

It is solemn mockery before God, that ye should baptize little children. . . . Teach repentance and baptism unto those who are accountable and capable of committing sin. . . . Little children need no repentance, neither baptism. Behold, baptism is unto repentance to the fulfilling the commandments unto the remission of sins. But little children are alive in Christ, even from the foundation of the world.\(^{45}\)

Latter-day Saint doctrine goes further than did Rideman by

\(^{42}\)Horsch, *Mennonites*, p. 370.  \(^{43}\)Ibid.

\(^{44}\)Robert Friedman, "Peter Riedemann on Original Sin and the Way of Redemption," *MiR*, XXVI (July, 1952), 212.  

\(^{45}\)Book of Mormon, Moroni 8:9-12.
asserting that not only will the children not bear the sins of the fathers, but that those parents who do not prepare their children for baptism by teaching them the principles of salvation, will bear the sin of their children upon their own heads. 46

Rideman's comments on two deaths, physical and eternal, are surprisingly similar to a sermon on the physical and spiritual deaths contained in the Book of Mormon, where it is pointed out that the sin of Adam brought physical death into the world; but that this was atoned for by the blood of Christ. On the other hand the individual sins of mankind subject them to a spiritual death, or eternal exclusion from the presence of God, and these can only be overcome by true repentance and baptism. 47 Only then will God have mercy on man through His Only Begotten Son, and save men from spiritual death.

It is generally assumed that rejection of infant baptism by the Anabaptists meant adoption of adult baptism, but some of the writings of Menno Simons indicate that he did not accept such a position completely. He taught that age was not the important factor, but rather faith and understanding.

The promise of Jesus Christ assures us of the salvation of our little ones if they die in infancy. But if the good Father lets them grow up and grants them His grace, then we hope to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord as much as we are able. When they

46 Dec, 68:25. 47 Book of Mormon, Alma 12:
can understand God's Word, and when they believe it, the scripture directs them to be baptized.48

Little ones must wait, according to God's Word until they can understand the holy Gospel of grace and sincerely confess it; and then, and then only is it time, no matter how young or how old, for them to receive Christian baptism. . . . If they die before coming to years of understanding and before they have faith, then they die under the promise of God.49

The Latter-day Saint position is very close to that expressed above.

No one can be received into the church of Christ unless he has arrived unto the years of accountability before God, and is capable of repentance.

The Mormons declared this age to be eight years,51 something which the Anabaptists did not do. As indicated above, the Latter-day Saints are expected to teach their children in order that they may develop faith and be ready for baptism at this age. Before they reach the age of accountability it is asserted that they cannot sin, for the power is not given unto Satan to tempt little children, until they begin to become accountable before me.52

In connection with the above quotation, the following observation from Menno Simons is interesting:

For who has read but half a word of the Lord does not know that a cross made with fingers cannot help or save a child; that the guiltless, pure, little creature, the innocent child which is cleansed by the blood of the Lord is not possessed of any devil.53

53Simons, p. 712.
In defense of the idea that infant baptism is a human invention, Rideman claims that the popes in their decrees have ordained that children who can say the Lord's Prayer and Apostle's Creed should be baptized, which they would not have needed to ordain if it had been so before.54

There can be no doubt that there is complete agreement between the founders of the Anabaptist movement and the founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints that infant baptism is an invention of man, that little children are innocent and pure before God, and that baptizing them is nothing more than solemn mockery before God. In both cases their ideas of a restoration of the "True Church" involved a return to believer's baptism.

The Lord's Supper

Non-Sacramental Character

The Anabaptists were very critical of the Catholic mass as well as of the sacramental rites of the Reformers. Menno Simons criticized the Catholics for not being exclusive enough about those admitted to communion.55 He also criticized the Catholic belief in transubstantiation, saying that the actual flesh and blood of Christ could not be in the elements, "for with that He ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of His Father, immortal and unchangeable."56

54Rideman, p. 69. 55Simons, p. 555. 56Ibid., p.143
Dear Lord, is not this wicked error and great blindness to teach and to believe that a piece of bread and a mouthful of wine is changed into the real and actual flesh and blood of the Son of God, and that therewith we may be delivered from hell, the devil, sin, and death, and be made children of grace? Oh, unheard of heresy! 57

He could hardly have been plainer in denying the sacramental character of the Lord's Supper, and in addition to this he emphasized in other of his writings that there is no remission of sins for partaking of the Lord's Supper. 58

Fritz Blanke, writing on the first Anabaptist congregation, points out that in 1525 in all Zurich churches the remonstrance and the host still stood, the minister still wore the clerical robes, and the Roman mass, with the exception of the sacrifice, was still celebrated in Latin. 59 This is why we find Conrad Grebel campaigning for the abolition of the mass even after Zwingli's reforms had taken place. And he, like Menno Simons, was teaching that it was not a sacrament, as both the Catholics and the Reformers claimed. 60

The anthropomorphic concept of God which is an earmark of the Mormon faith, makes it necessary for them to agree with the Anabaptist argument and to deny transubstantiation. The prayers used by the Latter-day Saints in observing the Lord's Supper use the terms "this bread" and "this wine," and specifically mention that the ordinance is

59Blanke, MQR, XXVII, 19. 60Bender, C. Grebel, p.177
performed "in remembrance" of the sacrifice of Christ.

Strictly speaking the Mormon position is not sacramental even though the prayer contains the promise, "ye shall have my spirit to be with you." The simple act of participation in the Lord's Supper does not imply a forgiveness of sins, for it is admitted that a person can partake unworthily, and in the *Doctrine and Covenants*, 46:4, members of the church are cautioned to make "reconciliation" before partaking. Whether this is reconciliation with God, or simply with other members of the congregation, is not explained. In another place Joseph Smith urged

the importance of doing it with acceptance before the Lord, and asked, How long do you suppose a man may partake of this ordinance unworthily, and the Lord not withdraw His Spirit from him? . . . Therefore our hearts ought to be humble, and we to repent of our sins, and put away evil among us. It would therefore seem that the promise referred to above is dependent on the worthiness of the participant, rather than the mere act of participation in the ordinance.

**Meaning of the Lord's Supper**

What then is the meaning of the Lord's Supper if it is not a sacrament? Menno Simons lists three things which he thinks that the Lord's Supper means:

We believe and confess concerning the Lord's holy Supper that it is [first] a holy sacramental sign, ins-
tituted of the Lord Himself in bread and wine, and left to His disciples in remembrance of Him. (Matt. 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; 1 Cor. 11). . . . Second, it is an emblem of Christian love, of unity, and of peace in the church of Christ . . . Third, it is a communion of the flesh and blood of Christ . . . This communion consists in the fact that Christ has accepted us in His great love, and we are become partakers of Him.63

Note that Simons says that this applies to "the church of Christ."

Conrad Grebel seems to have emphasized the fact that this ordinance was a meal of fellowship.64 Fritz Blanke, in the previously mentioned article, shows that the Brethren observed the Lord's Supper from the point of view that "they would now henceforth lead and live a Christian life," thus emphasizing the covenantal aspect which was Menno Simons' third point.65

The Mormon point of view on the meaning of the Lord's Supper is set forth in the Book of Mormon as follows:

And this shall ye do in remembrance of my body, which I have shown unto you. And it shall be a testimony unto the Father that ye do always remember me. And if ye do always remember me ye shall have my spirit to be with you. . . . and this doth witness unto the Father that ye are willing to do that which I have commanded you.66

This view is very close to Menno Simons' conception, with the emphasis on the first and third of his points, namely: the ordinance is performed in remembrance of Him, and it signifies a covenant with Him. That it is a meal signify-

63 Simons, p. 515.  64 Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 177.
65 MG, XXVII, 18.  66 3 Nephi, 18:10
ing fellowship is not specifically mentioned, although it is implied by the use of the plural forms "we," and "they" in the sacramental prayers. The officiating priest speaks on behalf of all the participants.

Mode of Administration

In his letter to Thomas Müntzer Conrad Grebel made several points concerning the mode of administration of the Lord's Supper. (1) Only the words of Jesus should be used, (2) no special bread, special cup, vestments, singing, additions, or deviations from the scriptural order should be adopted, (3) it should not be celebrated by one person alone, (4) it should not be celebrated in a church, in order to prevent false devotion.67 Blanke's study of the Zollikon congregation shows these directions being closely followed by the Brethren.68

Grebel also taught that the Lord's Supper should be observed frequently, although he did not specify the time,69 and he insisted that those who were not worthy should be excluded from participation, for condemnation would result from participating without sincere brotherly life.70

With all of this the Mennonites and Hutterites were in agreement, with the possible exception of the frequency of the celebration. We find that when the Amish group broke

67 Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 177. 68 MGR, XXVII, 19.
69 Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 207. 70 Ibid., p. 177.
away from the Mennonites about 1700, they began to observe communion "twice each year instead of once as had been the custom heretofore," indicating that by that date at least, the Mennonites did not observe the Lord's Supper "frequently." 71

The prayers to be used in the administration of the Lord's Supper are recorded in two places in Mormon Scriptures72 and both of these differ somewhat from the words of the New Testament. Both the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants accounts of these prayers purport to be revelations given to his prophets by Jesus himself. If this claim is accepted these prayers meet Grebel's requirement that the words of Jesus only should be used. With Grebel's second point concerning special additions to the ceremony, and his third point forbidding private celebration73 of the ordinance, the Mormon church is in agreement, these points being directed particularly against the Catholic practice. However, the fourth point is directly opposed by the Latter-day Saints, for they are commanded to go "to the house of prayer" to offer up their sacraments.74 They agree that the observance should take place frequently,75 and that unworthy participation leads to condemnation.76 They also

71 C. Henry Smith, p. 130.
72 Dec, 20:76-79, also Moroni, chaps. 4 & 5.
73 Observance by the officiator alone.
agree that the unworthy individual should not be allowed to participate when he is known to be unworthy.\textsuperscript{77}

One point which is stressed by the Latter-day Saints but which the Anabaptists do not appear to have given much consideration to is that of the authority which one must have in order to administer the Lord's Supper.\textsuperscript{78}

The Mormons and the Anabaptists are quite close in their agreement as to the nature and the meaning of the Lord's Supper, but they do differ somewhat in their administration of it, notably in the prayers that are used. However, both groups would agree that the traditional and the Reformed practices were not correct,\textsuperscript{79} and that a change was necessary for a Restitution or Restoration of the "True Church."

\textbf{Non-resistance}

Since wars are usually waged by governments, the principle of non-resistance is an important one in the relationship of Christians to secular government. The Anabaptists placed considerable emphasis on this principle, and it did much to make them unpopular with the governments of the day.

Peter Rideman gives the scriptural basis of the

\textsuperscript{77}\textsuperscript{77} D\&C, 46:4, 3 Nephi 18:26.

\textsuperscript{78} D\&C, 46:4, 3 Nephi 18:26.

\textsuperscript{79} D\&C, 46:4, 3 Nephi 18:5; Moroni 4:1; D\&C, 20:40, 46.

\textsuperscript{79} See particularly Wiswedel, MOR, XXIX, 212 ff., where transubstantiation and consubstantiation are denied.
Hutterite (and generally the Anabaptist) attitude to violence as follows:

Now since Christ, the Prince of Peace, hath prepared and won for himself a kingdom, that is a church, through his own blood; in this same kingdom all worldly warfare hath an end. (Luke 2:14; Ephesians 5:1, 2; Isaiah 11:6-9; Micah 4:3) . . . as Paul also exhorted us saying, 'Dear brothers, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto the wrath of God, for the Lord saith, vengeance is mine; I will repay it.' (Romans 12:19; Deuteronomy 32:35; Hebrews 12:19-21) . . . For, since we are Christ's disciples, we must show forth the nature of him who, though he could, indeed, have done so, repaid not evil with evil. (I Peter 2:21-23)

He further asserts that no Christian may take the sword or participate in war, for since vengeance is the Lord's, it should be left to Him and not exercised by his children.

Menno Simons also made a good scriptural case for non-resistance. He cited John 18:11, where Peter was commanded to put up his sword, and then from the Sermon on the Mount he pointed out that Christians are commanded to love their enemies; to do good to them that abuse them; to give the mantle when the cloak is taken; and to turn the cheek. He then asks:

How can a Christian defend scripturally, retaliation, rebellion, war, striking, slaying, torturing, stealing, robbing and plundering and burning of cities, and conquering countries?

"True Christians," he says, "are patient and show no vengeance no matter how they are mistreated." They suffer patiently and do not battle with swords or muskets.

---

80Rideman, p. 103. 81Simons, p. 555. 82Ibid., p. 347.
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.\textsuperscript{83}

This attitude is representative of all the Evangelical Anabaptists with the exception of Balthasar Hubmaier, the Münsterites, and the Batenburgers. With these exceptions the Anabaptists vigorously denounced war or "the sword" as they termed it, as "outside the perfection of Christ."\textsuperscript{84} In their way of thinking, members of the "True Church" could not use violence in any form.

Conrad Grebel, when considering the matter of self-defense, taught that it was not permissible for Christians to use force, even in this case, "for among the children of God killing is altogether done away with."\textsuperscript{85}

Michael Sattler\textsuperscript{86} was even more specific. He considered the ever-present threat of a Turkish invasion which faced Europe during his life-time. He concluded that

if the Turks should come, we ought not to resist them. For it is written (Matt. 5:21): Thou shalt not kill.

\textsuperscript{83}Simons, p. 555.


\textsuperscript{85}Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 207, citing Boehmer Kirn, Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel, p. 97. [No publication data given for the original source].

\textsuperscript{86}Michael Sattler (c1490-1527) was an important leader of Swiss and South German Anabaptism. He presided at the Schleitheim Conference that drew up the Seven Articles (Feb. 24, 1527). He was burned at the stake May 20/21, 1527.
We must not defend ourselves against the Turks and others of our persecutors.  

The Latter-day Saint position is not so extreme as that of the Anabaptists, counselling its people to renounce war and proclaim peace, and seek diligently to turn the hearts of the children to their fathers, and the hearts of the fathers to the children.  

Then, like the Anabaptists, the Latter-day Saints also get down to cases, and the story that they tell is somewhat different from that found in the Anabaptist writings.  

Now I speak unto you concerning your families -- if men will smite you, or your families, once, and ye bear it patiently and revile not against them neither seek revenge, ye shall be rewarded; But if ye bear it not patiently, it shall be accounted unto you as being meted out as a just measure unto you.  

The account goes on to promise an hundredfold reward if a second offense is patiently born, and a fourfold doubling of the reward if a third offense is patiently born. So far this coincides with Anabaptist teaching. However,  

if that enemy shall escape my vengeance, . . . ye shall see to it that ye warn him in my name, that he come no more upon you. . . . And then, if he shall come upon you . . . I have delivered thine enemy into thine hands; and then if thou wilt spare him, thou shalt be rewarded for thy righteousness; . . . nevertheless, . . . if thou rewardest him according to his works thou art justified.  

37 "The Martyrdom of Michael Sattler," Library of Christian Classics, XXV, 141. The report goes on to say that Sattler said that if was were right he would rather fight against the so-called Christians, than against the Turks, because the Turk "knows nothing of the Christian faith, and is a Turk after the flesh. But you who would [claim to] be Christians and who . . . persecute the pious witnesses of Christ are Turks after the spirit!"  

This is of course utterly incompatible with the Anabaptist idea of non-resistance.

The same principle is to be applied among nations. The victim should raise the standard of peace to the belligerent three times, and if it is still not accepted, then bring these testimonies before the Lord; then I, the Lord, [will] give unto them a commandment, and justify them in going out to battle against that nation.  

It should be noted, however, that if an enemy repents after each offense, then he must be forgiven until "seventy times seven," and his victim is not justified in taking action against him. 

This is obviously a somewhat more legalistic point of view than that of the Anabaptists, but the two amount to about the same thing in the end, namely: that he who bears his persecutions patiently, and without revenge, will ultimately receive the greatest reward. Nevertheless, the Mormon position leaves means for physical defense that the Anabaptists would have deplored. Both groups claimed their point of view to be that of the "True Church."

The Anabaptists did not expect to be completely defenseless in spite of their rejection of violence. Michael Sattler claimed that Christians should "beseech God with earnest prayer to repel and resist them [their enemies]." 

According to Menno Simons "the Word of God, which is a two-

---

90^D&C^, 98:34-35.  91^D&C^, 98:40  
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edged sword," is the only weapon with which a Christian should fight and defend himself. He used the Savior himself as justification of this position.

If Christ fights his enemies with the sword of His mouth, if He smites the earth with the rod of His mouth, and slays the wicked with the breath of His lips; and if we are to be conformed unto His image, how can we, then, oppose our enemies with any other sword?

To the "Word of God" He later added patience, hope, and silence as other weapons of the follower of Christ. At no time can a member of the "True Church" use force.

Relationship to Secular Government

The issue of the relationship of the Christian to secular government poses three questions: first, is government ordained of God?; second, must a Christian do everything that a government requires of him?; third, may a Christian take part in government?

In answer to the first question, Peter Rideman said that "governmental authority is appointed and ordained by God as a rod of His anger for the discipline and punishment of the evil and profligate nation." And Manno Simons stated that "we publicly and unequivocally confess that the office of the magistrate is of God, even as we have always confessed." The proposal of the Brethren to Zwingli that

---

93 Simons, p. 42. 94 Ibid., p. 44.
95 Ibid., p. 555. 96 Rideman, p. 102.
97 Simons, p. 549, see also p. 922.
the new free church should elect a Christian council is good evidence that that group also accepted government as instituted of God.

Agreement on the second question, as to whether a Christian must obey the government is also quite general. Menno Simons pledged obedience to the government, but with an exception.

We have obeyed them [the magistrates] when not contrary to the Word of God. [italics mine] We intend to do so all our lives. For we are not so stupid as not to know what the Lord's Word commands in this respect. Taxes and tolls we pay as Christ has taught and Himself practised. We pray for the imperial majesty, kings, lords, princes, and all in authority. We honor and obey them. (1 Timothy 2:2; Romans 13:1).

Peter Rideman expressed the same obedience with practically the same reservation:

Therefore one should be obedient and subject to rulers as ordained by God for the purpose of protection, insofar as they do not attack the conscience or command that which is against God. (Italics mine.)

Rideman looked upon taxes as ordained and commanded of God, just as did Menno Simons, and cited Romans 13:1-7, and Matthew 22:15-21 as his basis for this belief. However, he was careful to distinguish between the yearly taxes, which he considered to be divinely ordained, and the war taxes, which were inspired, according to him, by the devil. The latter tax he refused to pay.

---
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The Swiss Brethren followed approximately the same line, but like Menno, they did not distinguish between war tax and general taxes, an omission for which the Hutterites severely criticised them.\footnote{Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, XX, Part I, 255, cited by F.H. Littell, "The Anabaptist Doctrine of Restitution of the True Church," \textit{MQR}, XXIV (January, 1950), 50.}

On the question of participation in government, Menno Simons seems to have taken the most liberal view of all the "orthodox\footnote{This excludes such groups as the Münsterites.} Anabaptist leaders, even allowing his followers to become magistrates.\footnote{Robert J. Smithson, \textit{The Anabaptists, Their Contribution to Our Protestant Heritage}, (London: James Clarke and Co., Ltd., 1935), p. 125. Cited by Littell, \textit{MQR} XXIV, 50.} However, Menno cautioned those who did become magistrates to continue to follow their "Prince, Head, and Leader Christ," and not to attempt to cover their "unrighteousness, wickedness, pomp and pride, avarice, plunder, and tyranny with the name of magistrate."

For he who is a Christian must follow the Spirit, Word, and example of Christ, no matter whether he be emperor, king, or whatever he be.\footnote{Simons, p. 922.}

Felix Manz, in 1525, stated that it was his belief "that no Christian could be a magistrate, \ldots for he had no scripture for such a thing." Bender goes on to say that there is little reason to doubt that Manz's associates shared this same view.\footnote{Bender, \textit{Conrad Grebel}, p. 200.} The Hutterites, by the nature of
their withdrawal from the world, wanted nothing to do with secular government. 107 In their answer to Melancthon the Anabaptists denied the ability of Christians to function in government. 108 Point six of the Schleitheim Confession of Faith of 1527 also deals with this matter.

Can a Christian become an earthly ruler if he is elected to such an office? The answer is: Christ was to be made king, and He fled (John 6:15). We should do likewise and follow Him, . . . Christ has suffered, not reigned, leaving us an example that we should follow His steps. 109

The Latter-day Saint position on the origin of governments is clearly set forth in section 134 of the Doctrine and Covenants. It begins by stating that

We believe that governments were instituted of God for the benefit of man; and that he holds men accountable for their acts in relation to them, both in making laws and administering them, for the good and safety of society. 110

This statement goes a step further than those of the Anabaptists in that it declares men responsible to God for their actions toward governments.

On the subject of obedience to government Joseph Smith was also very plain:

We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law. 111

We believe that all men are bound to sustain and uphold the respective government in which they reside, . . . and that sedition and rebellion are unbecoming.

109Horsch, Mennonites, p. 73.
every citizen . . . and should be punished accordingly; and that all governments have a right to enact such laws as in their own judgements are best calculated to secure the public interest; at the same time however, holding sacred the freedom of conscience. (Italics mine.)

Thus Joseph Smith makes the same reservation as did Menno Simons and Peter Rideman.

In connection with participation in government, one of the most striking evidences of the Latter-day Saint position is the fact that Joseph Smith accepted a nomination to run for President of the United States in February, 1844, just four months before his death. This endorsement of participation in Government is in marked contrast to the refusal of most Anabaptist leaders to allow their followers this privilege, and even the reluctant consent of Menno Simons is quite different.

Another question which is an integral part of the relationship of the Christian to secular government, is that of religious liberty, or the right of the government to dictate the religion of its subjects. Zwingli, and the Reformers in general, attempted to simply reform the existing Catholic Church. The new church was to be a state church just as the old one had been, and no change in the membership was contemplated. The whole population of the state was to be taken over into the new church without their hav-

---
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113 Joseph Fielding Smith, Essentials in Church History (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1922) pp. 355-58.
ing any say in the matter. As has already been pointed out, such a concept was completely foreign to the ideal of a disciplined church of believers which was held by the Anabaptists. Thus we find Conrad Grebel, Felix Manz, Balthazar Hubmaier, Hans Denck, and Menno Simons, appealing for liberty of conscience.\textsuperscript{114} By this they did not mean a general toleration within the church, but rather a separation of church and state and the rejection of all persecution.\textsuperscript{115} In their opinion, a church to which all were forced to belong in spite of conscience, could not be a New Testament church.\textsuperscript{116} A man must be free to think as he felt inclined; free to associate voluntarily with the faith of his choice, and at the same time the church must be free to exercise strong internal discipline.\textsuperscript{117} These practices the Anabaptists claimed to restore.

The Mormon position in regard to this problem is stated as follows:

We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.\textsuperscript{118}

Or, more specifically on the question of the relationship of church and state and the establishment of a state church:

We do not believe it just to mingle religious influ-

\textsuperscript{115}Horsch, \textit{Mennonites}, p. 323. \textsuperscript{116}Ibid., p. 12.
\textsuperscript{117}Littell, \textit{The Anabaptist View}, p. 65. \textsuperscript{118}PGR p 30
ence with civil government, whereby one religious society is fostered and another proscribed in its spiritual privileges, and the individual rights of its members, as citizens, denied.\footnote{119}

On the subject of internal discipline, the Mormon and Anabaptist positions also appear to be in agreement.

We believe that all religious societies have a right to deal with their members for disorderly conduct, according to the rules and regulations of such societies; provided that such dealings be for fellowship and good standing; . . . They can only excommunicate them from their society, and withdraw from them their fellow-ship.\footnote{120}

The similarity of the positions assumed by both the Anabaptists and the Mormons on the subject of religious liberty and tolerance, indicates that they faced much the same problems in the way of opposition and persecution, even though they had their origins three hundred years apart. To assume any other position would not have been consistent with their claim to a re-establishment of the "True Church," composed of believers only.

**The Oath**

The use of oaths is another matter on which the Anabaptists took a very firm stand, using Matthew 5:33-35 as their justification. Menno Simons is representative of the Anabaptist position. He denied the assertion that this passage referred only to light-minded false oaths, as his opponents claimed,\footnote{121} but he would have his followers do as

\footnotesize{\begin{align*}
119 \text{D&C, 134:9.} & \quad 120 \text{D&C, 134:10.} \\
121 \text{Simons, p. 922, also Wiswedel, MQR, XXIX, 212 ff.}
\end{align*}\normalsize}
the scriptures instruct and use only "yea" and "nay." 122

Bullinger accused the Anabaptists of not having recourse to law or using law courts. 123 Their answer to Melanchthon, in which they argued that a Christian should neither sit in court as a judge nor go to court in litigation, confirms this accusation. 124 Their refusal to take oaths, although not solely responsible for their lack of recourse to law, was a factor in their non-use of the law courts. Ride-man argued that since no temporal thing can be claimed as one's own, a Christian cannot go to court to argue over what is not his anyway. 125

The Latter-day Saints, on the other hand, while agreeing that one's conversation should be confined to "yea" and "nay," have never made any issue of oaths taken in courts, nor of oaths of allegiance sworn to a government. In fact they specifically declare their belief that all men should have the right of "appeal to the civil law for redress of all wrongs and grievances." 126 They did not find it necessary to adopt such an extreme position as that held by the Anabaptists. They interpreted this script-to be practically synonymous with "Thou shalt not take the

122 Simons, p. 926.
123H. Bullinger, Der Widertöuer Ursprung, Fürgang, Secten, Wäsen (Zurich, 1561) Fol. 15, cited by Bender, MOR, XXX, 10.
124 Wiswedel, MOR, XXIX, 212ff. 125 Rideman, p. 112.
126 D&C, 134:11
the name of the Lord in vain."

Both groups would agree that in the "True Church" sober language must be the rule, and a man's word must be his bond.

Community of Goods

The Anabaptists took very seriously the injunction of the Savior that one should be his brother's keeper. The effort to carry out this instruction found expression in two significant ways: the material aspect, which will be considered in this section; and the moral and spiritual aspect which will be considered in the following section.

Menno Simons wrote that "we do not teach and practice community of goods," but because all "truly believing Christians are members of one body and are baptized by one Spirit into one body," and have one Lord and one God, "therefore it is Christian and reasonable that they piously love one another, and that the one member be solicitous for the welfare of the other."127

If we see our brethren in need or peril, driven forth for the Word of the Lord, then we should not close our doors to them, but receive them in our houses and share with them our food, aid them, and assist them in their tribulations, . . . In such a manner we should risk our lives for our brethren, even if we know beforehand that it will be at the cost of our lives.128

The foregoing is rather strong doctrine, but is designed to meet the emergencies of the times. Dietrich

Philips, one of Menno's close associates and a fellow elder in the church, gave a formula that would apply in more normal times.

Thus then, the rich, who have received many temporal possessions from the Lord, are to minister to the poor therewith (Romans 15:27; II Corinthians 8:9), and supply their lack, so that they in turn may come to their aid as they have need.129

Once again it will be noted that this was to be practised on a strictly voluntary, private basis.

It seems likely that the Swiss Brethren looked upon their responsibility for the welfare of their less-fortunate brethren in much the same way as did Menno Simons and his followers. Evidence for this assumption is found in Harold S. Bender's reference to the possibility that the example of the apostolic church at Jerusalem may have led them to project a "communism of consumption," however, "there is not the least evidence that the Brethren ever set up a practical program to carry out such a theoretical idea."130 Felix Manz, one of Grebel's close friends and collaborators, is quoted as saying that by community of goods he meant merely that a Christian should share with his neighbor when he was in need.131

On the other hand, the Hutterian Brethren in Moravia

130Bender, Conrad Grebel, pp. 254-55, n. 29.
131Elizabeth H. Bender, "Gottfried Keller's Ursula," MQR, XVI (July, 1943), 139, n. 10.
not only projected such a program, but carried it through to a practical reality. They began their practise of community of goods at Nikolsburg, about 1528, under the direction of Jacob Wedemann, before Jacob Hutter had come on the scene. According to John Horsch their efforts were successful, and promoted their spiritual as well as their physical well-being.

Of the Hutterian congregations in Moravia it can be said that they were centers of true spiritual life and activity, of genuine Christian piety and devotion. It is not probable that at any time since the apostolic period the Christian ideal of brotherly love and entire consecration to the service of God was anywhere so full realized as among the Moravian "Anabaptists." 132

Peter Rideman defined "community" as:

Naught else than that those who have fellowship have all things in common together, none having aught for himself, but each having all things with the others, even as the Father hath nothing for himself, but all that he hath he hath with the Son, and again, the Son hath nothing for himself, but all that He hath, he hath with the Father and all who have fellowship with him.

Thus all those who have fellowship with him likewise have nothing for themselves, ... Thus everything serveth to the betterment and building up of one's neighbor and to the praise and glory of God the Father. 133

Franz Heiman claims that the object of the Hutterian Brethren in setting up this system was not material well-being, but rather to "liberate the Christian life from material impediments." 134 It was permeated by the force of brotherly love and resting upon the idea of the perfect

133 Rideman, p. 43.
134 This distinguishes it from modern communism.
equality of those who are united in God."\textsuperscript{135} It can be readily imagined that a great deal of love would be necessary for such a scheme to succeed.

One Hutterite writer based his arguments for a sharing of worldly goods on two points: (1) a brotherly love which in its fullest extent makes it impossible to speak any longer of mine and thine, and (2) complete surrender [Ger. Gelassenheit] to the divine commands.\textsuperscript{136}

Another argument which was popular with the Hutterites argues that everything that God has created is common to all men, just as is the shining of the sun. Therefore "whoever appropriates them for himself and encloses them is a thief and steals what is not his. For everything has been created free in common." He then goes on to say that the world is full of such thieves, and that property laws are human rather than divine institutions." He continues by saying that "free, unhampered, patient, and full hearts in Christ" are necessary for such a system to function, and intimates that only those who practise such a system are "God's own."\textsuperscript{137} An interesting sidelight comes from Hans Leopold, who suffered martyrdom at Augsburg in 1528. He said of the Brethren that "if they know of anyone that is in need,

\textsuperscript{135}Heimann, MQR, XXVI, 32.
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whether or not he is a member of their church, they believe it their duty, out of love of God, to render him help and aid.\textsuperscript{138}

The Mormon program for temporal welfare was similar in many ways to that of the Hutterites. Rather than saying that everything was created "free in common," it was based on the principle that everything in the world is the Lord's and is therefore under the jurisdiction of the servants of the Lord, that is to say, the leaders of the church. These leaders, under the direction of God should apportion out "stewardships," equal according to need, to members of the church which they would hold as long as they were in good standing in the church.\textsuperscript{139} Each branch of the church was to operate as an independent unit\textsuperscript{140} and each person was to deliver his surplus to the bishop's storehouse in order that all might be equally provided for.\textsuperscript{141} Anyone who did not abide by the rules governing the system was to be cast out of it.\textsuperscript{142} However, because of lack of sufficient brotherly love, this system was finally placed in abeyance.\textsuperscript{143} It is interesting to note that several times during their history the Hutterites have found it necessary to take the same step

\textsuperscript{138}Horsch, Mennonites, p. 317.
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\textsuperscript{143}\textit{D&C}, 105:34. A Law of Consecration and a United Order were both instituted in the early days of the church, both were discontinued, and the latter revived in Utah.
for the same reason.\textsuperscript{144}

The Law of Tithing has replaced this system in the Latter-day Saints church, in which "one tenth of their interest annually" is required of the church membership,\textsuperscript{146} while the rich are expected to relieve the distress of the poor.\textsuperscript{146} The United Order, which was re-established in Utah on a limited basis, approximated the Hutterite system with its dormitories, communal kitchens and dining halls, and diminished family life. The Orderville experiment serves as an example.\textsuperscript{147} It was eventually abandoned for a system which more nearly resembles that of Menno Simons, in which the Mormons were required to care for their needy brethren while retaining private property.

It is thus seen that both the Anabaptists and the Mormons placed emphasis on the duty of members of the "True Church" to care for their brethren in their temporal need. In this case as in so many other cases, both groups taught that it was the responsibility of all, not just a special group in the church dedicated to such a program, to care for their brethren. This is in contrast to the earlier Catholic practice which the Reformers left largely as they found it.

\textsuperscript{144}Horsch, The Hutterian Brethren, pp. 75-76.
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The Ban

Purpose of the Ban

The second aspect of being a brother's keeper is to see that the church is properly disciplined. The first goal of this campaign is to protect members of the "True Church" from apostate doctrine and "ungodly" practices.

John and Paul teach us firmly that we are . . . to shun apostates, lest they infect us with the impure, seductive doctrine, and involve us in their ungodly, carnal lives.148

The second aim is to win back the apostate himself.

Paul teaches us that we are . . . to shun the apostate so that he may be led to reflect and to repent of his wicked life or sectarian doctrine through the shame of such shunning.149

This should be done "without foregoing public admonition which adds to the mortification and public rebuke of their sins and godless conduct, so inciting them to do penance."150

And if one is so excluded, we have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet is he called to repentance.151

When Menno Simons referred to apostates he apparently meant not only those who had joined the brotherhood and then strayed from it, but also those members of the state church who had never joined the brotherhood, or in other words, all who did not conform to his ideas of the Church

---
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of Christ.  For he instructed "all genuine children of God" who had been born again and had separated themselves from the idolatrous generation and assumed the yoke of Christ, to "avoid all who . . . are not in the pure doctrine of Christ in the Scriptural usage of his sacraments." In his way of thinking members of the "True Church" should not fellowship anyone but other members in good standing of the "True Church."

Joseph Smith agreed that the purpose of excommunication was to purge the church of those not worthy of membership. He also agreed that in the case of an open offense a public rebuke was necessary, "that he or she may be ashamed," but secret rebuke was deemed sufficient for one who offended secretly, "that the church may not speak reproachfully of him or her." Who Should be Banned?

In writing to John a Lasko, Menno Simons asked him to "cleanse" his church by excluding "according to the Word of God,"

all harlots, and fornicators, drunkards, slanderers, swearers, those who lead a shameful and disorderly life,

---

152 John Horsch in his Mennonites in Europe, p. 328, points out that shunning was advocated by the Obbenites before Menno Simons joined them, and that it was practised against "anyone who would make it his business to turn people away from sound doctrine." This included particularly the fanatical Anabaptists sects, which were a great trouble to the Evangelical Anabaptists in the Netherlands.

the proud, the avaricious, the idolators, and those who are disobedient unto God, adulterers and the like, in order that you may become the holy Christian Church. Conrad Grebel added gamblers and usurers to the list, for, he says, "Such an one should not be found among Christians."

L.D.S. scriptures also mention several sins for which the offenders should be "cast out" of the church. These are killing, stealing, lying, looking upon a woman to lust after her, and committing adultery. Adultery was particularly stressed as a cause for expulsion.

Mechanics of the Ban

The Anabaptist doctrine of the Ban was based on Matthew 18:15-17. Peter Rideman interpreted this to mean that those who transgressed should first be warned in private and if they did not repent they should then be warned before the church, and if they still did not repent they should be excluded, or banned. His description is interesting:

Therefore we watch over one another, telling each his faults, warning and rebuking with all diligence. But where one will not accept the rebuke, but disregardeth it, the matter is brought before the Church, and if he hear not the Church, then he is excluded and put out.

Article two of the Schleitheim Confession says that erring brethren should be admonished twice, and if not re-
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pentant, they should be reproved the third time before the church, and expelled. This should be taken care of before the communion service is held so that only those who are worthy might participate.\(^{160}\)

Menno Simons carried his interpretation a little farther, saying that

in an offence of brother against brother [one should] use three admonitions before excommunication, in the case of a heretic of a sectary use two, and in the case of an open offensive, sensual sinner who is already condemned by the Word of God, use none at all as has been heard. I Corinthians 5, II Corinthians 13.\(^{161}\)

In the case of a private sin two or three witnesses should be required, but an open transgression is its own witness.\(^{162}\)

In the case of sins which were also civil offenses to be dealt with by the magistrate, the offender was to be cut off without admonishment lest the church be viewed as "an ugly leaven before the whole world." This covered such crimes as murder, witchcraft, incendiary, theft, and similar criminal deeds.\(^{163}\) Or, as Peter Rideman put it:

If, however, one be discovered in the gross and deadly sins [fornication, covetousness, idolatry, railing, drunkenness, and robbery] such an one is put out and excluded or separated from the Church without admonition.\(^{164}\)

Menno Simons was careful to point out that a man is

\(^{160}\)Horsch, Mennonites, p. 72. \(^{161}\)Simons, p. 982.
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free to forgive a brother who has trespassed against him, but not those trespasses which he has committed against God. He was also definite in stating that "a public violation calls for a public rebuke." Peter Rideman agreed with this position when he emphasized that an individual may forgive a personal sin, but the full power to exclude and accept rests with the whole church.

The Mormon position on the matter of dealing with offenders is very straightforward:

Thou knowest my laws concerning these things are given in my scriptures; he that sinneth and repenteth not shall be cast out.

The scriptures referred to here are more than likely Matthew 18:15-17, which has already been cited as a favorite proof text of the Anabaptists. If this is the case, agreement between the two groups is very close.

Under the United Order this matter worked much the same as it did with the Hutterites, in contrast to the other Anabaptist groups, and to the later Mormon practice.

And it shall come to pass, that he that sinneth and repenteth not shall be cast out of the church, and shall not receive again that which he has consecrated unto the poor and the needy of my church, or in other words, unto me.

Just as with the Hutterites, a man was not allowed to withdraw that which was put into the common fund when he was expelled from the order. A man could lose materially as

---

as well as losing his fellowship.

Another point of agreement with the Anabaptist view is that those who have contravened the law of the land "shall be delivered up and dealt with according to the laws of the land." Included in this category are murderers, robbers, stealers, and liars. 169

Matthew 18 is somewhat modified by the Doctrine and Covenants which advises that the first thing to do when one is offended by another is to consult him in private, but if he does not repent, rather than taking two or three witnesses as Menno Simons advised, 170 he should be delivered "up unto the church, not to the members, but to the elders." 171 Such refinements as Menno Simon's three warnings for a brother, two for a heretic or sectary, and none for an open offensive sinner, are not found in L.D.S. doctrine. The closest thing to it deals with adultery and murder.

But he that has committed adultery and repents with all his heart, and forsaketh it, and doeth it no more, thou shalt forgive; but if he doeth it again, he shall not be forgiven, but shall be cast out. 172

Thou shalt not kill; and he that kills shall not have forgiveness in this world, nor in the world to come. 173

It appears as if one warning was deemed sufficient in any

---
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case, and if the offender did not repent he was to be cast out. However, if he did repent he was to be forgiven. If he should commit the offense again, and again repent, he must again be forgiven. However, in the case of adultery there was to be no forgiveness of a second offense, and in the case of murder there was no forgiveness at all.

In spite of differences of opinion as to how many warnings should be given before action is taken, these two groups seem to have been in agreement on the main points concerning the ban, i.e., those who offend and do not repent shall be cut off. The "True Church" cannot tolerate such persons in its membership.

In the Anabaptist way of thinking, excommunication or banning, was to be carried out by the congregation rather than by the leaders. For evidence we have the case of Michael Sattler, who, while confined to prison, wrote to a particular congregation suggesting that certain of their number be placed under the ban. He did not excommunicate them himself

not because he considers the matter trivial, but for the deeper reason that he does not consider himself authorized to act in that manner. The excommunication is to be carried out in love, for the good of both the church and those expelled, and it is to be carried out by the congregation.174

Rideman explained that Christ had committed to the church the power which he had received to remit sins. As proof

he cited the words of the Savior: "Receive ye the Holy
Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit here on earth, they are
remitted also in heaven; and whose soever sins ye retain
here on earth, they are retained in heaven." In commenting
on this statement, Rideman said further:

But that this power and key is given to the Church
and not to individual persons is shown by the words of
Christ [when he said in Matthew 18 to first consult
him privately, but to tell it to the church if he was
not reconciled]. 175

Verheyden confirms the fact that a similar belief and prac-
tice was followed among the Dutch Mennonites. 176

In the Mormon system, however, as has already been
hinted, the elders rather than the congregation were to
handle the discipline. The Bishops 177 and at a higher
level the high council 178 were to deal with these problems.
The sustaining vote of the people was necessary only after
these had made their decision, when they would be asked to
"lift up their hands against him or her." 179

Menno Simons cautioned his followers about re-
admitting those who had been banned, without "attending
closely for a time the fruits of their repentance." 180

On the same subject Peter Rideman instructed that

the repentant one is received anew by a sign, namely
the laying on of hands, as an indication that he once

175 Rideman, p. 44. 176 Verheyden, MOR, XXI, 62.
more has part, and is rooted in the grace of God. All suspicion and complaint are swept away, and he is accepted again in love.\textsuperscript{181}

Readmittance of one who had been excommunicated from the Mormon faith was also based on repentance. However, from that point on the method differs from that of the Anabaptists. Whereas Menno Simons said only that repentance must be genuine before readmission, and Peter Rideman said that laying on of hands should be used as a sign of readmission, Joseph Smith taught that one who had been excommunicated must start all over again as if he had never been a member of the church.

Respecting an apostate, or one who has been cut off from the Church, and who wishes to come in again, the law of our Church expressly says that such shall repent, and be baptized, and be admitted as at first.\textsuperscript{182}

**Extent of the Ban**

There was general agreement among the Anabaptists that the ban covered not only "spiritual communion such as the Lord's supper, and the handshake, and the kiss of peace," but also daily contacts.\textsuperscript{183} This brought up the question of family relationships when one of the members was banned. Menno Simons finally concluded, on the basis of the fact that only one ban is mentioned in the scriptures, that a husband must shun his wife and vice versa, if one of them

\textsuperscript{181}Heimann, *MQR*, XXVI, 47.
\textsuperscript{182}Joseph Smith, *History of the Church*, I, 338.
\textsuperscript{183}Simons, p. 971.
should be banned. This of course applied to all other members of the family also. A member of the "True Church" was not allowed to have business dealings with, or even receive into his house, one who was under the ban at the risk of being banned himself. Only the Swiss Brethren attempted any moderation of this policy, basing their actions on Paul's advice of winning the non-Christian spouse to Christianity. At the conference of the Swiss Brethren in Strassbourg in 1557, avoidance of the excommunicated was one of the topics discussed. Strict avoidance was never practised among this group, but the controversy which was raging in the Low Countries had caused disturbances in some of their congregations. They declared avoidance between marriage partners to be too extreme. All Anabaptists were strictly cautioned against marrying outside of their faith. Excommunication was the penalty for so doing.

---

184 Simons, p. 971. See also pp. 457-485. Note that on pp. 1050-51 Menno expresses his unwillingness to ban a married person whose conscience does not allow him or her to leave a mate who is under the ban, so long as the latter does not try to wean him or her away from the faith, and allows complete freedom to practise the faith.

185 Ibid., p. 1006.

186 Littell, MQR, XXIV, 40.

187 Horsch, Mennonites, p. 129. He goes on on p. 323 to suggest that the difference in attitudes between the Swiss and the Lowlanders was because of the trouble the latter had been caused by the radical Anabaptist sects.

188 Simons, p. 1041, citing the Wismar Articles, drawn up in 1554 by seven Dutch Mennonite elders including Menno Simons, Dirck Philips, Leonard Bouwens, and Gillis of Aachen.
The L.D.S. church professed a belief in the right of all religious societies to discipline their members "provided that such dealings be for fellowship and good standing," but there does not appear to be anything in L.D.S. doctrine that is synonymous with the Anabaptist "shunning" or "avoidance". The church was forbidden to cast anyone out of their public meetings, or any member of the church out of sacrament meetings, which indicates a somewhat more liberal attitude than that held by the early Anabaptists. However, the offender, although admitted to the meeting, was expected to voluntarily abstain from partaking of the Lord's Supper until he had repented of his sins.

The evidence at hand indicates that the discipline in the Anabaptist movement was somewhat more rigid in nature than that of the Mormon Church, with the number of admonitions varying according to the religious affiliation of the offender and the nature of his offense. Nevertheless, the object of discipline was the same in both cases: to build up a church which was as nearly as possible free from the sins of the world, and to bring those who did offend to a state of repentance. This they viewed as consonant with the practise of the primitive Christian church, and as an earmark of Christ's "True Church."

A concept which both of these movements shared, and which is in many respects related to that of church disci-

---

pline, is that of "the church withdrawn." As has already been indicated both groups believed in believer's baptism, thus making their organizations somewhat exclusive, and, in a sense, withdrawn. Not only must one be a believer, but he must conform to the resolution which baptism was thought to evidence if he was to maintain his standing in the church. The practise of "shunning" as executed by the Mennonites of Northern Europe involved a withdrawal from all "who would make it his business to turn people away from sound doctrine." 191

Perhaps the best example of withdrawal among the Anabaptists is that of the Hutterites. They established communal settlements, or Bruderhofs, which were completely self sustaining, and which had a minimum of contact with the surrounding "world."

In the case of the Mormons this withdrawal was in some respects even more striking. It led them to move progressively further westward until they were beyond the frontiers of civilization, where they could establish their "Zion," and live in isolation from the "world." But like the Anabaptists they were not ultimately successful in this endeavor. First the call of "gold!" in California in 1849 brought wagon trains streaming through their settlements; and then the coming of the trans-continental railroad in 1869 made the Great Basin easily accessible to any-

191 Above, p. 59, n. 152.
one who wished to go there. With this development their physical isolation vanished and they were compelled to resume living "in the world''.

Isolation from the world and its practises was seen by both the early Anabaptists and the Mormons as an earmark of the "True Church." The persecution heaped upon both groups undoubtedly had much to do with this attitude.
CHAPTER III

THE MORMON RESTORATION

The Great Apostacy

Before anything can be restored, or revived, it
must of necessity be lost, fall into disrepair, or become
neglected. Since both Anabaptists and Mormons claim to
have restored the "True Church," they necessarily share a
belief in a great apostasy from the true Christian faith.

In writing to Gellius Faber, Menno Simons touches on
this point in a passage which at first glance could be very
easily mistaken for part of a sermon of a Mormon missionary.

Paul testifies in plain words . . . [that] that day
shall not come, except there come a falling away first,
and that man of sin be revealed. Here Paul teaches in
plain polite words that the falling away from the faith
would come as it did.

Since Paul openly testifies by the Spirit of God
that the falling away would come before the day of the
Lord, and also shows through whom it would come, namely
the man of sin; and since it is clearly visible that
the son of perdition has placed himself . . . in the
before mentioned church, and has wholly corrupted it,
has deceitfully changed it under the name of Christ
from the doctrine and ordinance of God to his own doc-
trine and ordinances, therefore I would leave it to the
attentive reader to judge whether this church, which is
so completely occupied, overpowered, and destroyed,
can be God's temple.1

In another place Menno referred to the Christian

1Simons, pp. 756-57
church as "the adulterous bride, the erring church," and expressed his desire to return it to "her first husband," or in other words, to Christ,\(^2\) and to right the situation which had led to "anti-Christian abominations and Babylonian traffic by which the true apostolic truth, because of the long time, was wiped out and demolished."\(^3\)

Now compare the words of Joseph Smith on this same subject:

> I asked the personages who stood above me in the light, which of all the sects was right -- and which I should join. I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong, and the personage who addressed me said that all their creeds were an abomination in His sight: that those professors were all corrupt; that 'they draw near to me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; they teach for doctrines the commandments of men: having a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof.' He again forbade me to join any of them.\(^4\)

This declaration is perhaps not so pointed as that of Menno Simons in associating the existing church with anti-Christ, but nevertheless the meaning is unmistakeable. There has been a general apostacy of Christendom, and none of the existing faiths is the "True Church." In this particular belief the Anabaptists and Mormons are in complete agreement.

There is no agreement among the Anabaptists, nor among the Mormons, as to the date at which the apostacy began. Menno Simons thought that it began early, was heightenened under Constantine, and "culminated in the Edict of

\(^2\)Simons, p. 298.  \(^3\)Ibid, p. 189.

Innocent I, 407 A.D., which enforced Infant Baptism. . . .

Among the Anabaptists the special mark of the 'Fall' was the union of Church and State, and use of the civil arm in matters of faith." This was looked upon not only as the mark of the "Fall" but in a sense as its cause also.

In its prime Christianity was a lay religion; under the imperial authority there arose a swarm of professionals, who did not comprehend the democratic simplicity of Christian brethren. The rise of the hierarchy was a sign of the 'Fall.'

The Reformers claimed that the true church had remained under the papacy, even though it was badly corrupted and scarcely recognizable. This was consistent with their claims of simply being reformers of an already true church which simply needed a reformation of abuses which they were prepared to give to it.

The Anabaptists, on the other hand, claimed that there had been no gathering, or grouping together, of the "True Church" during the apostate state of Christianity. During this period the faithful were "in dispersion," and they usually identified the faithful with the heretics condemned by the Catholic church.

5Littell, The Anabaptist View, p. 63. This is confirmed by James Leo Garrett in his article on "The Nature of the Church According to the Radical Continental Reformation," MQR, XXXII (April, 1936), 112.

6Ibid., p. 67.


8Littell, The Anabaptist View, p. 72. The real
Joseph Smith does not appear to have made any statement concerning the date of the beginning of the great apostasy. His purposes were apparently adequately served by declaring that such a thing had occurred, and this being so it made very little difference when it had occurred.

As to the date of the restitution, it is interesting to note that the *Hutterite Chronicle* initially names 1517 as the year in which this important occurrence took place, by virtue of the fact that Luther's theses appeared at that time. However, later revisions date the restitution in 1524, 1525, or 1526 in Switzerland. Grebel would more than likely have agreed with this revised dating, for although he acknowledged the value of the work that the Reformers had done in uncovering the apostacy, he still maintained that up to the present they had not restored true Christianity, either as far as the organization and ordinances of the church were concerned or in regard to the behavior of the individual believer.

Menno Simons inferred that the apostacy had come to and end with the commencement of Anabaptist preaching when he said that

You will find by the grace of God that this doctrine is the pure Gospel which the Lord taught by his own mouth,

---

radicals discounted this by saying there had been no true church for fourteen hundred years. Garrett, *MQR*, XXXII, 112, shows that the Polish Anabaptists dated the "Fall" at 111 A.D., Sebastian Frank at 131 A.D., and Thomas Müntzer at the death of the apostles. No true church had existed from these respective dates in their opinions.


10Bender, *Conrad Grebel*, p. 172.
and which His holy apostles preached through the whole world, and in the power of the spirit testified to with life and death. Ours is not new doctrine, as the preachers . . . would have you believe. It is the old doctrine that was preached and practised in the church . . . the doctrine by which the church was begotten, is being begotten, and will be begotten to the end.\textsuperscript{11}

It would appear that the Swiss Brethren also agreed with this point of view by virtue of their argument at the Bern Debate of 1538 "that the True Church had ceased for a time and that they themselves had undertaken a new beginning."\textsuperscript{12}

The date of the restoration is plainly stated in Mormon claims, although it is claimed to have been a process accomplished in several different stages, rather than a single event. First came the restoration, on May 15, 1829, of the Aaronic Priesthood and the power to baptize. This is said to have been restored by a heavenly messenger who "said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament."\textsuperscript{13} Joseph Smith and his companion, Oliver Cowdery, were also baptized on this date. Then came the restoration of the apostleship, probably in the month of June, 1829.\textsuperscript{14} The actual organization of a church and the ordination of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery as the first and second elders of that church occurred on April 6, 1830.

We dismissed with the pleasing knowledge that we were

\textsuperscript{11}Simons, p. 192. \textsuperscript{12}Garrett, \textit{MQR}, XXXII, 115.
\textsuperscript{13}Joseph Smith, \textit{History of the Church}, I, 40.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., note.
now individually members of, and acknowledged of God, 'The Church of Jesus Christ,' organized in accordance with commandments and revelations given by Him to ourselves in these last days, as well as according to the order of the Church as recorded in the New Testament.15

This last-mentioned event and date are generally considered, by adherents to the Mormon faith, to mark the formal restoration of the "True Church."

It can be seen from the foregoing that the Anabaptist and Mormon claims are parallel. Both taught that the "True Church" had apostatized and that a restoration was necessary. Both groups claimed to effect such a restoration, and both claimed that its restoration was conformable to the New Testament. The biggest difference is in Joseph Smith's inclusion of "commandments and revelations given by Him to ourselves in these last days," and this aspect will be considered next.

Divine Revelation

The Anabaptists, and particularly Menno Simons, made some very pointed statements on the subject of Divine Revelation. Menno Simons' strong stand is probably the result of his numerous contacts with claims to revelation, an experience which the leaders of the other arms of Anabaptists did not have. It should be remembered that he campaigned against the revelation-claiming Münsterites for a considerable length of time before he became an Anabaptist.

15Ibid., pp. 75-79.
He seemed to abhor everything connected with them, and since revelation was one of their cardinal tenets, he wanted to have nothing to do with it.

In the course of explaining why he did not cease teaching and writing, Menno Simons very clearly proclaimed his position as far as revelation was concerned.

I speak frankly with a certain and sure conviction, not by some revelation or heavenly inspiration, but by the express, definite word of the Lord. . . . We do not declare our own invention, dreams, or visions.\(^{16}\)

Brethren, I tell you the truth and lie not. I am no Enoch [as Melchior Hofmann claimed to be], I am no Elias, I am not one who sees visions, I am no prophet who can teach and prophesy otherwise than that is written in the Word of God. . . . Once more, I have no visions nor angelic inspirations. Neither do I desire such lest I be deceived. (Italics mine.)\(^{17}\)

One could scarcely wish for a clearer statement than this.

In writing to "the corrupt sects" he further revealed his complete distrust of revelation by referring to their doctrine as "false prophets, . . . dreaming visions, and lying miracles."\(^{18}\) As far as Menno Simons was concerned, nothing good could come out of a revelation.

The attitude of Joseph Smith towards revelation was diametrically opposed to that of Menno Simons. Where the latter wanted "no visions nor angelic inspirations" lest he be deceived, Joseph Smith actively sought such communication. He states in his own history that it was a desire to gain

\(^{16}\)Simons, p. 308.  \(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 310.
\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 218.
knowledge from God that led him to go into the woods to pray previous to the experience of his first vision; a desire inspired by a verse of scripture in James 1:5, which promises an answer to those who seek.19

When a period of three years passed after this first experience without any further communication, Joseph became concerned about the situation, and he gave an account of his actions as follows:

I betook myself to prayer and supplication to Almighty God for forgiveness of all my sins and follies, and also for a manifestation to me that I might know my state and standing before Him; for I had full confidence in obtaining a divine manifestation as I had previously done. (Italics mine.)20

Further evidence that Joseph Smith sought revelation is found in the headings of several sections of the Doctrine and Covenants. These particular headings say in effect that Joseph had inquired of the Lord, and received the answer contained in the revelation following.21

Conrad Grebel based his tests of truth solely on the written word, the Scriptures. Bender says of his method:

Everything must be tested by the New Testament, and what is not found therein as the teaching of Christ and the apostles or as an apostolic practice must be abandoned.22

When placed on trial, Grebel, Manz, and Blaurock vigorously denied "the accusation that they had boasted of having re-

19Joseph Smith, History of the Church, I, 4.
20Ibid., p. 11.
21See for example, secs. 6, 7, 8, 11, 14, 18, etc.
22Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 175
ceived marvelous signs and visions."\textsuperscript{23} This puts the Swiss Brethren in the same class as Menno Simons as far as the question of revelation is concerned. The wanted no connection with it.

In his investigation of "Some Theological Emphases of the Early Swiss Anabaptists," Gordon D. Kaufman concluded that their early tracts show no tendency to apocalypticism, "nor is the note of prophecy or new revelations to be found."\textsuperscript{24} Another investigation, that of "The Inner and Outer Word," by Wilhelm Wiswedel, points out that the Evangelical Anabaptists valued Scripture much more highly than the "inner illumination" which some other groups of the radical reformation placed so much emphasis on.\textsuperscript{25}

Frank J. Wray cites Dietrich Philips as saying that the church of God would be built upon the ground of the apostles and the prophets,\textsuperscript{26} but he has nothing to say about revelation, apparently assuming that the scriptures contain all that is necessary for the rebuilding of the church. In this same article Pilgram Marpeck is quoted as saying that "the church still stands upon its original foundation and power or mission. There has been no new commission, nor will there be one."\textsuperscript{27} Thus the Anabaptists deny the need

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 158. \hspace{1em} \textsuperscript{24}\textsuperscript{MQR}, XXV (April, 1951), 79.

\textsuperscript{25}"The Inner and Outer Word: A Study in the Anabaptist Doctrine of Scripture," \textsuperscript{MQR}, XXVI (July, 1952), 171 ff.

\textsuperscript{26}\textsuperscript{MQR}, XXVIII, 189. \hspace{1em} \textsuperscript{27}Ibid., 191.
\end{flushright}
for further revelation, as well as denying ever having received any.\textsuperscript{28}

Even a casual acquaintance with Mormon history enables one to see immediately that Mormonism and Anabaptism are diametrically opposed in their views on the need for revelation. Opposing Warpeck's claim that there would be no new commission is the Mormon claim that they received such a commission.

The Book of Mormon . . . was given by inspiration . . . proving to the world . . . that God does inspire men and calls them to his holy work in this age and generation, as well as in generations of old.\textsuperscript{29}

In contrast to the Anabaptist practise of referring back to a scriptural text for each doctrine and practise, the Mormon church, as was indicated in the previous section, claimed a divine revelation preceding every step of the restoration. For example, at the very basis of the Mormon Restoration is the claim of a visitation of the Father and the Son to deliver personal instructions.\textsuperscript{30} The Book of Mormon

\textsuperscript{28}The Sixteenth Century groups which made any claim at all to divine revelation are those which present day scholarship is inclined to classify as Spiritualist rather than Anabaptist. These people looked for no new gathering of a "True Church," at least "not without special commission to a prophet from God." [Littell, "The Anabaptist View," p. 35] Among these were Franck and Schwenkfeld, who "both believed that the true church was lost unless a prophet appeared who was especially commissioned to gather in the faithful." [Ibid., p. 36] The Anabaptists abhorred such ideas.

\textsuperscript{29}D&C, 20:9-11.

\textsuperscript{30}Joseph Smith, \textit{History of the Church}, I, 5-6.
also came to light amid claims to heavenly visitation,\(^{31}\)
and as has previously been pointed out, the bestowal of the
priesthood also depends on claims of heavenly visitation.\(^{32}\)
A glance through the *Doctrine and Covenants* further confirms
the statement that the Mormons believed in a need for divine
revelation. One hundred and twenty-one of the one hundred
and thirty-six sections of that book are prefaced with the
heading "Revelation to Joseph Smith the Prophet." Two
others are attributed to heavenly messengers, and a third
is an account of a vision.

From this evidence it seems fair to assert that
divine revelation is the basis of the Mormon restoration,
and yet this did not prevent Joseph Smith from asserting
that his actions were in agreement with the New Testament,
that his church was organized "according to the order of the
Church as recorded in the New Testament,"\(^{33}\) which is exact-
ly the claim made by the Anabaptists. Both groups claimed
to bring back the New Testament "True Church."

**Priesthood Authority**

As was pointed out in the Introduction, Menno
Simons and Dietrich Philips insisted that the "correct"
character of the ministers was one of the distinguishing
marks of the "True Church." Menno said that they must lead
exemplary lives, practise only Believer's Baptism, Supper

\(^{31}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 9-18.}\) \(^{32}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 39-42.}\)
\(^{33}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 75-79.}\)
in both kinds, have a virtuous wife and obedient children, 
rule their house well, and be humble and self-supported. 34

They must:

look wholly to God for their daily needs, diligently 
supporting themselves as much as is possible . . . from 
their own or rented farm, or from working at their trade; 
lest they be found selling the free Word of God which 
was given them without price, and living on shameful 
gain, robbery, and theft. 35

In spite of his encouragement of self-support, Menno Simons 
lived largely on voluntary donations from his followers. In 
fact it was his "proud boast that he had lived for years 
from brother to brother and never gone hungry nor in want." 36
Conrad Grebel had a similar opinion, maintaining that the 
church should not levy tithes, nor should the state do so on 
behalf of the church. Rather the church should be supported 
by the voluntary contributions of the members. 37

This position is based in part on Paul's instructions 
to Timothy 38 and on the Savior's instructions to His apostles 
to freely give what they had freely received. 39 The Mormons 
apparently accepted this same position, although it was not 
spelled out in the same words. Joseph Smith stated that 
"the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only 
upon the principles of righteousness," and hence those called 
as leaders must possess qualities of persuasion, long-

---

36Littell, The Anabaptist View, p. 83.
37Bender, Conrad Grebel, p. 205.
suffering, gentleness and meekness, and unfeigned love and kindness. While the United Order was being lived the principle was accepted that:

He who is appointed to administer spiritual things, the same is worthy of his hire, even as those who are appointed to a stewardship to administer temporal things [are worthy of their hire].

However, with the abolition of the Order, self-support of the leadership became the practice, with the exception of some of those who gave full time to the work of the ministry.

On the whole the Anabaptists sought the basis of their priesthood authority in the scriptures. One instance of this is their interpretation of the Great Commission as binding on the lay members as well as on the ministers. In this respect they fostered an application of the universal priesthood of all believers. Another interpretation is given by Dietrich Philips, who claimed that

the true ministers of the divine Word are easily recognized by the saving teachings of Jesus Christ, by their godly walk, and by the fruits which they bear. . . . For whoever speaks the Lord's Word is sent of God (John 3:34), and he that doeth righteousness is born of God (I John 2:29), and he that converts men from unrighteousness to the living God remains in the counsel of God and declares to the people the Lord's word (Jer. 23:3), and he that is persecuted because he teaches and bears witness to the truth fares just as the Scripture says.

(ITALICS mine.)

In other words, he who acts like a servant of God is a ser-

---

40 _D&C_, 121:36-41. 41 _D&C_, 70:12


vant of God. He goes on to cite the calling of Aaron as an example of how men should be called to serve God, but his interpretation is highly figurative.

The Mormon Church, on the other hand, would not have agreed with this view and was inclined to give the account of the calling of Aaron a somewhat more literal interpretation. The call of God was said to be something more than a call through the scriptures, for, in the words of Joseph Smith, "We believe that a man must be called of God, by prophecy, [italics mine] and by the laying on of hands, by those who are in authority to preach the gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof." The good life, the righteousness, and the speaking of the Lord's Word which Philip points out as evidence of authority would have been accepted by the Mormons as attributes which the servants of God should have, but at the same time Joseph Smith claimed that such attributes were of little avail if the individual was not called of God as was Aaron -- by prophecy and by the laying on of hands. Nor did the Mormon church subscribe to the idea that the simple reading in the scriptures of a call given to someone else, such as the "great commission," can invest the reader with authority and constitute a "call."

Numerous sections of the Doctrine and Covenants, including sections twelve, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, and nineteen, attest to this statement in that they are specific

44 FGP, p. 60.
calls to specific individuals.

The preachers of the Reformed churches, which opposed the Anabaptists, had in many instances received their ordinations to the priesthood in the Catholic church, and this ordination was accepted in the Reformed churches on the grounds that it came from Christ, not the pope. The Anabaptists refused to recognize any such ordinations, saying that "true preachers can be sent only by a pure and holy church," and they contended that such a church was not in existence when they set up their congregations.\(^4\) Therefore no previous ordination could be accepted.

The Mormons, by virtue of a similar attitude as to the apostate condition of all the other churches when their organization came into being, shared with the Anabaptists a rejection of the ordinations and other ordinances of any church but their own. Section twenty-two of the *Doctrine and Covenants* applies this idea specifically to baptism, and by implication to other ordinances also.

This being the case, the question arises as to how ministers should be called. Menno Simons commented on this problem several times, and based his stand on scripture. He pointed out two ways in which men were called in the New Testament church:

[1] Some are called by God alone without any human agent, as was the case of the prophets and apostles.

---

\(^4\) Frank J. Wray, *MQR*, XXVIII, 187. This statement is based on the records of the Bern disputation of 1538.
How the first method could be effected without the revelation which Menno categorically denied seems problematical, but he cleared up the problem by saying that

all they who by such a power are touched in their hearts, are driven by the Holy Ghost, are constrained by love to God and their neighbor, and are called by the Lord himself, or by a church without fault. 47

They [the servants of God] did not appropriate this honor to themselves as do the preachers of this world; but like Aaron they were called of God, or by the spotless church, . . . They were driven into this office by the Spirit of God, with pious hearts. 48

In other words, in order for a man to be called he must feel a deep inward call himself, and he must be called by a pure church. Menno Simons' account of his own call is instructive in this regard, and points out how the church must go about determining who should be called.

At last, after much prayer, before the Lord and His church I gave these conditions; that we should pray earnestly to the Lord for a season. Then if it should be pleasing to His holy will that I could or should labor in His praise, He would give me such a mind and heart . . . And if not, that He might employ means so that nothing would come of it. For Christ says, If two or three shall agree on earth touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven . . .

I have been called though unworthy, to this office by the people who had subjected themselves to Christ and His Word, led a penitent life in the fear of God, served their neighbors in love, bore the cross, sought the welfare and the weal of all men, loved righteousness and truth, and abhorred wickedness and unrighteousness. 49

48Ibid. 49Ibid., p. 672.
On another occasion Menno stated that the choice must be made "with fasting and prayer, and after the example and doctrine of the apostolic church [they must be] ordained to the service of the Lord by the laying on of hands." In his reply to Gellius Faber he emphatically stated that a minister called by the magistracy could have no authority of God, nor could one called by an unworthy church have any true authority.

Joseph Smith would agree that the "inner call" which Menno Simons alluded to is a necessary part of a man's call to the service of God, but that it is in itself not sufficient in spite of Menno's indication that this is one way that the call can come. The Latter-day Saints would include both of Menno Simons' methods in one, and add to them. A man must feel the urge to serve, but at the same time those in authority must feel inspired to call him, and the congregation must have the right to either sustain or reject the proposed ordination; for, "no person is to be ordained to any office in this church, where there is a regularly organized branch of the same, without the vote of that church," for, "all things must be done in order, and by common consent in the church." This would seem to imply that the call does not come through the congregation, but through "those in authority," and the congregation simply

50Ibid., p. 667. 51Ibid., pp. 644-45.
52D&C, sec. 4. 53PGP, p. 60. 54D&C, 20:65.
has the right to say whether they will or will not accept
the candidate to preside over them.\textsuperscript{55}

The account of the call of Joseph Smith to the
priesthood provides an interesting comparison to that of
Menno Simons which has already been cited:

We on a certain day went into the woods to pray and in-
quire of the Lord respecting baptism for the remission
of sins, \ldots While we were thus employed, praying and
calling upon the Lord, a messenger from heaven descend-
ed in a cloud of light, and having laid his hands upon
us, he ordained us, saying: 'Upon you my fellow servants,
in the name of Messiah I confer the Priesthood of Aaron,
which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and
of the Gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion
for the remission of sins.'\textsuperscript{56}

This claim of ordination by a heavenly messenger was made
necessary by the Mormon claim that the authority to act in
God's name was not present in any of the churches of the
time, and to be consistent with the claim that the call must
come through one having authority, the device of a heavenly
messenger was employed.

Sometime after the ordinances referred to above
were received, we find the following in Joseph Smith's
account:

The word of the Lord came unto us \ldots commanding us
that I should ordain Oliver Cowdery to be an Elder in
the Church of Jesus Christ; and that he also should
ordain me to the same office; and then to ordain others,
as it should be made known unto us from time to time.
We were, however, commanded to defer this action until
such times as it should be practicable to have our breth-
ren, who had been and who should be baptized assembled

\textsuperscript{56}Joseph Smith, \textit{History of the Church}, I, 39.
together, when we must have their sanction to our thus proceeding to ordain each other, and have them decide by vote whether they were willing to accept us as spiritual teachers or not. (Italics mine.)\textsuperscript{57}

In accordance with the above, the following is recorded as having taken place at the organization of the Church on April 6, 1830:

We proceeded, according to previous commandment, to call on our brethren to know whether they accepted us as their teachers in the things of the Kingdom of God, and whether they were satisfied that we should proceed and be organized as a Church according to said commandment which we had received. To these several propositions they consented by a unanimous vote.\textsuperscript{58}

The priesthood succession in the Mormon church thus purports to be a "restored" apostolic succession. The reason why the Anabaptists did not adopt some sort of a plan of this type is in part explained by the following observations of Paul Peachy:

About 1540 Obbe Philips [who baptized and ordained Menno Simons] defected from the Anabaptist movement, according to his own claims, because he had received ordination from Jan Matthys who turned out to have been one of the false Münsterite leaders. It appears that Menno and his associates, since they in turn had been ordained by Obbe, were for a time deeply shaken. If Obbe had not been duly ordained (in apostolic succession) what about all those who had their office through him? . . . He [Menno] had the courage to move forward on the strength of his own inner call, without being unnerved finally by the realization that except for his Catholic ordination which he had renounced, he could lay claim to no external line of succession. [This led him to say that] the church cannot be transmitted outwardly but is ever the creation of the spirit.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., p. 61. \textsuperscript{58}Ibid., p. 77.

Peter Rideman stressed the fact that ministers must wait until "God draweth them out and chooseth them" rather than attempting to get themselves placed in office. The choosing of the person to fill the office was to be conducted in an atmosphere of sincere prayer. "Those who have been recognized through God's counsel to be suitable are presented to all," and if there are just enough to fill the vacant offices, these are the ones; however, if there are more candidates than offices, lots are cast to determine "whom the Lord showeth us." The laying on of hands then confirms the appointment to office.60

The decree of the Emden Colloquy in 1578 states that bishops and ministers are to be chosen by the congregation through the inspiration of God, which would be manifest by a majority vote, and that the entire congregation must meet for such an election.61 This same council pointed out that the desired inspiration can only be obtained by the fasting and prayer of the congregation. The congregation is thus the intermediary in calling leaders in the Anabaptist movement, whereas "those in authority" fulfill this function in the Mormon faith.

Traditional Catholic theology considered the keys of Peter to consist of the power to forgive or not forgive sins,

60 Paul B. Miller, "Worship Among the Early Anabaptists," MQR, XXX (October, 1956), 239-39, citing Rideman, pp. 80, 81.

61 Peachy, MQR, XXX, 221-22.
but the Anabaptists rejected this interpretation. Dietrich Philips claimed that:

Christ gave his congregation the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 16:19) that they might punish, exclude, and put away the wicked, and receive the penitent and believing. What the congregation binds on earth will be bound in heaven, and, on the other hand, what they loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. This must not be understood [to mean] that men have power to forgive sins or to retain them (John 20:23).  

He went on to point out that the discernment of whose sins had or had not been forgiven comes by the Holy Ghost. This amounts to a simple identification of the Keys of the Kingdom with the Anabaptist Ban. Menno Simons agreed with this interpretation and admonished his followers to be careful "with the binding of the first key in righteousness unto eternal death, or with the loosing of the second key in grace unto eternal life."  

Joseph Smith's interpretation of "keys" was somewhat different than that of the Anabaptists. To begin with he claimed that such keys rest with "the Presidency of the High Priesthood," rather than with the congregation. Nor was he willing to identify these keys with nothing more than the power to admit persons to and excommunicate them from membership in the church. Instead he identified them with the power to preside over the church, and with the performance of many ordinances besides that of baptism.

---

63 Simons, p. 993.  
64 D&C, 81:2  
65 D&C, 124:143.  
66 D&C, 124:34.
One area in which there seems to have existed a maximum of confusion in Anabaptist circles is in the matter of the titles of the officers of the church, and the duties of the same. Paul Peachy, in his study of "Anabaptism and Church Organization," has pointed out a number of these.

The Schleitheim Articles . . . speak of the Hirt, the Shepherd. The Discipline of Believers speaks of Vorssteher and preachers. . . . At Zofingern the Brethren use terms like Eltisten (elder), Vorstander (leader), Hirt (shepherd or pastor), Leerer (teacher), Diener des Worts (minister of the Word), and Pfarrer (pastor). Following various scriptures, Peter Rideman speaks of apostles, (to go through the country and establish the faith), bishops and shepherds (who have the same office, except that it is local), helpers (who help the shepherds and exhort), rulers, also called ministers of temporal need, and lastly elders (who consider the good of the church community together with the minister.)

The same multiplicity characterizes the Dutch. There on finds Bisschop, leeraer (teacher), vermaner (admonisher), diaken, diennaar (minister), oudste (elder), leeraar in denollen dienst, sorgh-dragers der gemeinte (those who care for the churches), opzeiner (overseer), etc.67

At the Emden Colloquy in 1578 Brixius Gerrit made an effort to eliminate some of this confusion when he pointed out a two fold ministry based on I Timothy 3, and Acts 6.

He claimed that the first aspect of the ministry was that of teachers and bishops, and the second that of deacons or ministers. The deacons might also carry on the work of exhortation if necessary.68 However, this simplification does not seem to have been widely accepted. Harold Bender's article on "The Office of Bishop in Anabaptist Mennonite History," shows the confusion that existed as to the meaning of the

---

67 MQR, XXX, 220. 68 Ibid., p. 223.
ecclesiastical terms bishop, elder, deacon, and minister in the various Mennonite groups. Another writer has pointed out that although the deacons were permitted to preach, the major ecclesiastical performances were reserved for the elders. The elder not only assumed leadership of the congregation but was entitled to baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, ordain other preachers, and exercise discipline. This the ordinary preacher was not entitled to do. The elders were usually selected from among the preachers, and the office was voluntary as opposed to professional.

At first glance the titles and duties of the officers of the Mormon faith appear to be perhaps even more confused than that of the Anabaptists, however, by studying sections twenty and one hundred and seven of the Doctrine and Covenants one can form quite a clear conception of the relationship of these various offices. Just as Peter Rideman pointed out that there was a two fold ministry of apostles and bishops, the Doctrine and Covenants indicates that there are two orders of priesthood, the Melchizedek and the Aaronic, and the latter is encompassed by the former. Section twenty defines the duties of the deacons, teachers, and priests of the Aaronic Priesthood, and the elders of the Melchizedek.

69Harold S. Bender, "The Office of Bishop in Anabaptist Mennonite History," MQR, XXX (April, 1956), 126-32.
70Cornelius Krahn, "The Office of Elder in Anabaptist Mennonite History," MQR, XXX (April, 1956), 122. Non-professional clergy now exists only in very conservative groups.
Section one hundred and seven discusses the Seventy, the high priests, bishops, the presiding high council, and the council of Twelve Apostles. The Mormon definition of priesthood seems to be more complex than that of the Anabaptists, and at the same time it is more thoroughly analyzed in the Mormon literature referred to than in any Anabaptist literature which is presently available.

It is thus seen that both groups considered it imperative that the "True Church" should have an upright and devoted leadership. However, they did not agree on how such a leadership was to be called, what its division of responsibility should be, or how it should obtain its authority.
CHAPTER IV

ADDITIONAL SIMILARITIES

Some of the most interesting similarities between the Anabaptists and the Mormons lie in the area of secondary parallels. Some of these are characteristics which both groups would consider as being earmarks of the "True Church" although not basic to it. Others are simply interesting outgrowths of basic characteristics of the "restored" church of Jesus Christ.

Testimony

One outgrowth of the practise of believer's baptism is a personal conviction, or testimony, of the divine mission of Jesus Christ. Along with this goes just as certain a conviction that one is on the right road, and is following a path that leads to eternal life. To put it in the words of Robert Friedmann:

Once an Anabaptist had taken the decisive step of accepting baptism upon faith, his way was clearly indicated and his testimonies show a remarkable assurance of being on the right way.¹

Hans Denck stated it this way:

Therefore salvation is not bound up with the Scriptures, however good or useful they may be for that purpose. The reason is this. It is not possible for the Scrip-
tured to make a bad heart good, though they may convey to it better information. But a good heart illumined with the light of God (a heart with a divine spark in it) is improved by everything.2

It seems to have been this "divine spark" that gave the Anabaptists the assurance which they needed to remain unflinching under overwhelming persecution, and enabled them even to preach their doctrines to the observers while standing in the flames to which they had been consigned as heretics.

A similar assurance is found in the Mormon faith, and as a result we find Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, and Martin Harris saying, "Wherefore we know of a surety that the work is true."3 This is admittedly somewhat different than dying for one's faith, but nevertheless it must have required a considerable amount of courage in view of the ridicule and persecution to which they knew such a testimony would make them liable. However, we also find Joseph Smith "seal[ing] his testimony with his blood," along with his brother Hyrum, the victims of religious persecution.4 This assurance that they had taken the right step in accepting baptism enabled the Mormons to withstand the persecution that drove them to the ends of the American frontier. In the cases of both the Anabaptists and the Mormons the persecution heaped upon them was unsuccessful in exterminating

3Book of Mormon, introduction, (n,p.)
their respective movements. It only succeeded in doing them the favor of eliminating those who were not strong in the faith. In both movements it was felt that only those who would stand by their convictions in all conditions were worthy members of the "True Church."

**Missionary System**

The "great commission" which has been referred to several times previously in this study, again enters the picture at this point. Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli taught that this passage was directed to the apostles alone, but the Anabaptists taught that it was binding upon all Christians in all ages. They thought that the command was given to the "True Church" rather than to Christ's immediate hearers. Traditional Catholic exegesis taught that the apostles had fulfilled the command, even though at various times such vocational groups as the Franciscans had attempted to increase missionary work. The Anabaptists took the responsibility for spreading the gospel out of the hands of officials and special groups, and gave it to all of Christ's followers. Robert Friedmann emphasizes the importance of missionary work among the Anabaptists by claiming that the spreading of the gospel was one of the decisive goals of Anabaptism. John Horsch agrees with this when he says that

---

7"Anabaptism and Pietism," *MQR*, XIV (April, 1940), 97.
in the beginning the Anabaptist church was pre-eminently a missionary church, which, although it had no special missionary organization, "consisted of men and women who were noted for their zeal in propagating the gospel." This is why Anabaptism spread so rapidly.

Planning of a missionary system seems to have taken place at the famous Martyr Synod of August 20, 1527, at which time the map of Europe was divided up for the purpose of missionary enterprise. Prior to this time the Anabaptist leaders simply wandered as pilgrims, preaching and converting wherever opportunity afforded, but from the time of this planning session they undertook specifically routed trips with a view to visiting a particular area.

Among the South Germans and the Swiss the missionary impulse was crippled by persecution; and among the Dutch it fell the victim of prosperity. However, among the Hutterians there was sufficient peace for a few years to set up a highly efficient and well-supported missionary system. John Horsch has stated that it may be safely said that no other Anabaptist group nor any of the Protestant state churches carried on organized mission work to the same extent as the Hutterites -- an evidence of the importance they placed on the preached Word.

Horsch, Mennonites, p. 314.

Littell, The Anabaptist View, p. 100.


The history which the Hutterite chroniclers kept records many instances of the sending out of missionaries, one of which will suffice as an example:

In the year 1620, according to the 'old and praiseworthy custom,' a number of brethren were again sent out as messengers of the gospel to various parts of Germany. 'At this,' writes the chronicler, 'many marvelled that they, as a non-resistant people, could travel so safely in great danger, when almost no one else, of high or low degree, could do so.'

The Mormon church was also a great missionary organization from its very beginning. Although it would be inclined to accept the idea that the great commission as recorded in the New Testament was given to the apostles and others who had previously been given a specific call to preach the gospel, its Doctrine and Covenants in three places reiterates this same instruction as specifically applying to those called to the missionary work of the Mormon church. In contrast to the Anabaptists, the persecution of the Mormons has never been sufficient to completely halt their missionary program for any substantial length of time, and, in contrast with the Dutch Anabaptists, the increased wealth of the church has tended to promote, rather than retard, the missionary activity of the church. Anabaptism has its great missionary names such as Georg Blaurock, "the second Paul," who was noted for his wide travels and fearlessness in preaching the gospel. Likewise Mormonism

12 Horsch, The Hutterian Brethren, p. 57, citing the Geschichtsbuch des Hutterischen Brüder, p. 574.

has such names as Wilford Woodfuff, who brought converts into the church by the hundreds, and Lorenzo Snow, who travelled the world over in the work of establishing missions. The Anabaptists and the Mormons shared the conviction that every member of the "True Church" was obligated to act as a missionary in spreading the truth.

View of Scripture

It has been pointed out that Calvinism viewed the Bible as a whole, but that Anabaptism viewed the whole Bible from the New Testament. For the Anabaptists the Old Testament was only in force as long as it did not conflict with the New Testament. They used the Old Testament freely so long as it seemed to agree with their interpretation of the New Testament, but in cases where it did not, such as the introduction of polygamy in Münster, they were strong in their denunciation of it. Horsch points out that the Hutterites looked upon the Old Testament as a preparation for the promises of the New Testament, and that they thought that certain of its points were abrogated with the Sermon on the Mount. In general the Anabaptists looked on the Old Testament as God's covenant with the Jews, and the New Testament as His covenant with the Christians.16

16Kaufman, MQR, XXV, 81.
This view is, superficially at least, very similar to that of the Latter-day Saints. They too believe that the New Testament should be used as a vantage point from which to view the Old Testament; that the Old Testament represents the covenant with the Jews, and the New Testament the covenant with the new covenant people, or Christians. However they would go a step further and say that there are other scriptures representing other covenants, i.e. the Book of Mormon, representing God's covenant with some ancient inhabitants of America;\(^{17}\) and the Doctrine and Covenants, representing His covenants with the present-day "covenant people."\(^{18}\) All these scriptures are part of the Gospel.

**Marriage**

Polygamy is the first thing that many people think of when the word "Mormon" is mentioned. Because of the Münster episode this same situation prevailed with the Anabaptists for some time also. However, the following from the writings of Menno Simons clearly indicates that polygamy was not the practice among the Evangelical Anabaptists:

> We acknowledge, teach, and assent to no other marriage than that which Christ and His apostles publicly and plainly taught in the New Testament, namely, of one man to one woman.\(^{19}\)

The Sammelband of the Swiss Brethren, written sometime in the fifteen twenties, possibly by Michael Sattler, makes the

\(^{17}\)See the fly-leaf of the Book of Mormon.

\(^{18}\)D&C, iv-v.  

\(^{19}\)Simons, p. 200.
point that God's original plan was monogamy for life.20 Menno Simons agreed with this interpretation, saying that monogamy was the plan with Adam and Eve, but that the Lord allowed polygamy under the patriarchs and then restored monogamy with Christ.21

The Mormon church does not attempt to deny that at one time it practised polygamy, nor does it teach that the patriarchs were the only ones allowed to practise it. On the contrary it defends its own use of the principle on the grounds that it is a law which is subject to change, for:

*there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none; . . . For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken unto these things.*22 (Italics mine.)

It would appear that the Mormon and Anabaptist positions are not too far apart on this principle, both teaching that polygamy has at some times been allowed by the Lord and not at others. The main difference is that the Anabaptists looked upon it as simply allowed because of the weaknesses of the people, while the Mormons looked upon it as a command given by the Lord to "raise up a righteous seed." The Mormons practised polygamy as a commandment, whereas the Anabaptists abhorred the practise and would have nothing to do with it. They would be the first ones to affirm that they had not been commanded to practise it.

---


Eschatological Outlook

Both the Anabaptists and the Mormons looked on their particular age as the last, as the immediate prelude to the reign of Christ. Littell says that the Anabaptists were in possession of a "keen sense that the end and final reckoning are close at hand."\(^\text{23}\) We find evidence for justification of such a statement in the writings of Menno Simons.

From the Scriptures we cannot conclude but that this is the last festival of the year, the proclamation of the holy Gospel, the last invitation to the marriage of the Lamb, which is to be celebrated, published, and sanctified before the great and terrible day of the Lord.

With it, it seems, the summer will pass away and the winter come forth.\(^\text{24}\)

A similar strain is found in the writings of the Hutterites:

An eschatological element permeated Hutter's religious life, heightening its intensity into an overflowing force. He lived in the consciousness that he preached the holy Word of God 'in the very last days before the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ,' and he warned the Brethren that the last and most dangerous hour had come which was prophesied by Christ and all the prophets.

The Lord, he told them, is approaching with great power; hence everyone may prepare and ready himself that they might gain 'a free and certain admittance.'\(^\text{25}\)

This expectation of the immanent return of Christ to rule over his own is a characteristic which was shared with the early Christian church.

The Mormon Doctrine and Covenants makes numerous references to the present time as "the last days," thus in-

\(^{23}\)Littell, The Anabaptist View, p. 55
\(^{24}\)Simons, p. 24.
\(^{25}\)Franz Heimann, MQR, XXVI, 29.
indicating a point of view similar to that of the Anabaptists.

And the voice of warning shall be unto all people, by the mouths of my disciples, whom I have chosen in these last days.26 (Italics mine.)

The rise of the Church of Christ in these last days, being one thousand eight hundred and thirty years since the coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ in the flesh.27 (Italics mine.)

Thou shalt preach the fulness of my gospel, which I have sent forth in these last days. (Italics mine.)28

For unto you, . . . is the power of this priesthood given, for the last days and for the last time, in the which is the dispensation of the fulness of times.29 (Italics mine.)

I am he who led the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; and my arm is stretched out in the last days, to save my people Israel.30 (Italics mine.)

It is thus clear that both groups looked upon their own age as the last, and upon themselves as "the True Church," restored to the earth to prepare the way for the return of the Lord and the ushering in of His kingdom.

Temperate Living

There is absolutely no doubt that the members of the Anabaptist groups under discussion led very temperate and commendable lives. Even their enemies did not hesitate to admit this. A book published by George Thormann in Bern in 1693 tells of members of the Anabaptist police, who were sent to persecute these people, being converted themselves. He describes the Anabaptists as even abstaining from glib

29 DeC, 112:30. 30 DeC, 136:22.
talk, talk of earthly things, being slow to anger, shunning worldly enjoyments and vain pleasures, avoiding public inns and drink houses and excess use of wine, avoiding profanity and swearing, and trying to avoid disorderly, intemperate and ungodly conduct of any kind.\footnote{31}

Heinrich Bullinger, an opponent of the Anabaptists, said that

they henceforth led their lives under a semblance of a quite spiritual conduct. They denounced covetousness, pride, profanity, the lewd conversation and immorality of the world, drinking and gluttony.\footnote{32}

Wolfgang Capito, a Strasbourg reformer, said, "I frankly confess that in most Anabaptists there is in evidence piety and consecration and indeed a zeal which is beyond suspicion of insincerity."\footnote{33}

Franz Agricola, in writing against the Anabaptists said that

among the existing heretical sects there is none which in appearance leads a more modest, better, or more pious life than the Anabaptists. As concerns their outward public life they are irreproachable. No lying, deception, swearing, strife, harsh language, no intemperate eating and drinking, no outward personal display is found or discernible among them, but humility, patience, uprightness, meekness, honesty, temperance, straightforwardness in such measure that one would suppose that they have the Holy Spirit of God.\footnote{34}


\footnote{32}Horsch, \textit{Mennonites}, p. 294.

\footnote{33}Ibid., p. 295.  \footnote{34}Ibid.
Many more examples could be cited, but these should be sufficient to prove the point. That the Anabaptists lived clean, temperate, upright lives seems to have been a matter of common knowledge.

The Mormon teachings in this area are very similar in spirit, if not completely the same in letter of the law, to those of the Anabaptists. The Doctrine and Covenants puts it this way:

Therefore, cease from all your light speeches, from all laughter, from all your lustful desires, from all your pride and light-mindedness, and from all your wicked doings. . . . cease to be covetous; learn to impart one to another as the gospel requires. Cease to be idle; cease to be unclean; cease to find fault one with another; cease to sleep longer than is needful; . . . clothe yourselves with the bond of charity, as with a mantle. 36

Inasmuch as any man drinketh wine or strong drink among you, behold it is not good. 36

It seems remarkable that both groups should include "glib talk," or "light speeches," in the list of things to be avoided. The attempt to live a temperate life brought on much persecution, as it made marked persons of those who tried to live in such a way. The Great Chronicle of the Hutterites describes the results rather humorously as follows:

If one goes about with only a staff in his hand, a sign that he wishes no one any harm, or if he prays before his meals, he is slandered as a heretic; but as soon as he recants and conducts himself as a heathen, with a sword in his belt, and a musket on his shoulder, the world immediately welcomes him back and regards him as

a good Christian. Or again if one leaves the church and returns to his evil ways, shows himself a good fellow, begins to sing filthy drinking songs in the tavern, frequents the gambling joints and dance halls, puts a big calf skin around his neck, and wears gay clothes, . . . and swears like a Frenchman, and blasphemes God, then he is welcomed back again and received by his own. You are a good fellow they will say to him, you have done well to leave these schismatics. Such an one is doubly welcomed by the World, no matter how evil his ways may be.37

The extent of the persecution is verified by the writings of Menno Simons, which are full of complaints about the suffering that one must undergo because of a sincere attempt to live a righteous life, and he spoke from personal experience.

The persecution of the Anabaptists resulted in the death of thousands of humble people, but it could not exterminate the movement. It caused the emigration of large numbers from Switzerland to more tolerant parts of Europe, and eventually to America. In Holland, after a period of very severe persecution, a state of almost complete toleration was achieved when William of Orange became the ruler of the country. This led to a state of prosperity and influence for the Mennonites and a resulting relaxation of some of their original tenets. The Hutterites in Moravia were forced to become a wandering people because of the persecution to which they were subjected. First they were forced to flee from Moravia because of the edict of Ferdinand against them; next they were forced to leave their homes in Hungary, and finally, in the nineteenth century they left Russia to

---

settle in America, where they still live, although even now they are still subject to mild persecution of a non-violent nature.

The Mormon story is very much the same, with the exception that it does not record the execution of such a large number of martyrs as does the Anabaptist history. However, many hundreds died from exposure and the rigors of fleeing from persecution in Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois, until finally, in the isolation of the inter-mountain valleys they enjoyed a period of relative peace which allowed them to prosper and grow and become strong enough to avoid persecution. The forced migration of the Mormons is not unlike that of the Hutterites, except that it transpired in a country which boasted a Constitution guaranteeing freedom of thought and freedom of religion.

Points of Interest
Several other minor similarities might be noted which seem to have sprung from the basic similarities of these two movements. Two writers have pointed out the role which education played among the Hutterites. In an age of general illiteracy among the masses, these people had their own schools. All of their children attended them and learned to read and write and to master a craft. This applied to boys and girls alike.38 These schools were of such qual-

38 It is interesting to note that all of their chil-
ity that non-Anabaptists in the area often sent their children to be trained in them. In addition to this they also promoted adult education, something else in which they were very much in advance of their time. 39

The parallel for this in the Latter-day Saint story is the School of the Prophets which Joseph Smith established in Kirtland Ohio in March, 1833, 40 for the purpose of educating the leaders of the church in all fields of knowledge. It should be remembered that in a Mormon context this term "leaders" includes nearly all of the adult male members of

dren were educated in marked contrast to the prevailing practice of educating only the privileged classes, and even then mostly boys were educated. A good reason for this is to be found in the writings of Menno Simons, although it is doubtful that the Mennonites were as successful in their schooling efforts as were the Hutterites. On pp. 951-52 of Menno Simons Complete Writings we find the following: "Beloved brethren in Christ, if you rightly know God and His Word, and believe that the end of the righteous is everlasting life, and the end of the wicked eternal death, then study to the utmost of your power, to lead your children on the way of life and to keep them from the way of death, as much as in you is. . . . Watch over their salvation as over your own souls. Teach them, and instruct them, admonish them, threaten, correct, and chastize them, as circumstances require. . . . Direct them in reading and writing. Teach them to spin and other handicrafts suitable, useful and proper. . . . If you do this, you shall live to see much honor and joy in your children. But if you do not do it, heaviness of heart shall consume you at last. . . .

Since we are the salt of the earth . . . it is our duty . . . diligently to instruct, govern, and rule our children and household . . . in conformity with the honor and virtue that is pleasing to God."


40 Joseph Smith, History of the Church, I, 334.
the church. The fields which were to be studied were comprehensive, including theology, astronomy, agriculture, geology, current events, history and geography. 41

Schools for children were also encouraged, and the first issue of the *Evening and Morning Star*, a church newspaper published at Independence Missouri commencing in June, 1832, carried the following:

Common Schools
The disciples should lose no time in preparing schools for their children, that they may be taught as is pleasing unto the Lord, and brought up in the way of holiness. Those appointed to select and prepare books for the use of schools, will attend to that subject as soon as more weighty matters are finished. But the parents and guardians in the Church of Christ need not wait — it is all-important that children to become good should be taught. 42

Education obviously played an important part in the "restored" churches of both the Anabaptists and the Mormons.

Another interesting parallel is the use of certain scriptures by both groups. It will be remembered that in his account of his first vision, Joseph Smith reported that the Lord had said to him, with respect to the other churches, "They draw near to me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; they teach for doctrines the commandments of men: having a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof." 43 Menno Simons referred to the same scripture when he said of the churches, "In vain, says Christ, do they honor

41 D&C, 88:77-79.
42 Joseph Smith, *History of the Church*, 1, 276.
43 Ibid., 6.
me, teaching commandments of men."44

One of the best known clichés among Mormons is to the effect that a man must work out his own salvation, which results from emphasis on Philippians 2:12. It is interesting to note that the Anabaptists also emphasized this same scripture.45 The Reformers seem to have neglected it because of their emphasis justification by faith and salvation by grace.

John Horsch cites another passage from early Anabaptist writings which is very similar to one found in the Book of Mormon:

Therefore the believer has daily need to pray almighty God fervently for grace to keep the law of faith and perform his God-appointed duties and obligations, and, notwithstanding all diligence, to confess before God and men: We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was out duty to do.46

The Book of Mormon prophet, King Benjamin, put it this way:

I say, if ye should serve him with all your whole souls yet ye are unprofitable servants. And behold, all that he requires of you is to keep his commandments; and he has promised you that if ye would keep his commandments ye should prosper in the land; and he never doth vary from that which he hath said.47

Both of the foregoing quotations are based on Matt. 25:30.

A parallel use of terms also occurs between these two groups. In contrast to the Catholic practise of referring only to those canonized as saints by that terminology, both of

44Simons, p. 92.
45Horsch, Hutterian Brethren, p. 126, citing Handbuchel wider den prozess der zu Wurme Rein wider die Bruder so man die Hutterischen nennt aussgangen, (1697), no page.
the groups under consideration here applied that term to all members of the "True Church."\(^\text{48}\) It is also worthy of note that both groups referred to their members as "brother" and "sister."\(^\text{49}\) Prior to the Anabaptists these terms seem to have been largely confined to the religious orders of the Catholic church.

One of the often repeated charges against the Anabaptists was that they were "heaven stormers," who sought to get into heaven on their good works. The Reform preachers repeatedly accused them of this, and opposed them by saying that faith and grace are the necessary ingredients of salvation, and that man, because of his depravity, can do nothing to save himself. The same charge was brought against the Mormons because of their emphasis on moral living. The Anabaptists answered their accusers by saying that faith alone is not enough for salvation. We must prove faith with works of love toward God and our neighbor.

\[\ldots\] Since mere faith does not suffice for salvation, good works must also be added to it. \[\ldots\] Whoso permits his faith to stand by itself and does not prove it by good works, he changes Christian liberty into liberty of the flesh.\(^\text{50}\)

Mormon doctrine is in substantial agreement with this position, pointing out that men will be judged according to their

---

\(^\text{48}\) Simons, p. 526.

\(^\text{49}\) Horsch, Mennonites, p. 296; also R. J. Smithson, pp. 115-16. Also see Delbert Gratz, "The Bernese Anabaptists in the Sixteenth Century," \(\text{MCR, XXV (July, 1951), 169.}\)

\(^\text{50}\) Kaufman, \(\text{MCR, XXV, 94, citing Vedder, Balthasar Hübmaier (New York, 1905), pp. 230-31.}\)
works, and a man's faith presumably governs his works.

Other parallels of lesser importance could be cited, such as the rejection of Augustinian pre-destination, and the emphasis on free will, but this has already been indirectly alluded to in the idea that man must work out his own salvation, something which could not be done within the framework of a rigorous determinism. And something that both the Anabaptists and the Mormons agreed to be an important part of the "True Church." Perhaps the most significant fact is that both groups claimed to be restoring the "true" belief and practise in each of the areas mentioned in this chapter, after a lapse of several centuries.

---

51 DeC, 19:3; 76:111; 112:34.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The two most significant areas of agreement in the doctrines of the Anabaptists and the Mormons are: (1) baptism only of those deemed responsible enough to realize its implications,\(^1\) and (2) the apostacy of Christendom. The first area is significant because of the numerous consequences that result from it, and the second is important because without it neither movement had any reason for existing. Both agreed that faith and repentance are necessary prerequisites of baptism, and this, to their way of thinking, excluded the practise of infant baptism.\(^2\) The mode of baptism was not a matter of concern to the Anabaptists, sprinkling or pouring being generally accepted by them. However, with the Latter-day Saints complete immersion was an important part of the restoration, being specifically prescribed by their scriptures. The Anabaptists and the Latter-day Saints both included in their idea of the resti-

\(^1\)The Anabaptists used the term "believer's baptism," but whether this could be applied to Mormon baptism on the basis of the injunction that children are to be taught and prepared for baptism by the age of eight years is debatable.

\(^2\)Luther also taught that faith was a necessary prerequisite of baptism, but he justified the use of infant baptism by claiming that children have the necessary faith, although it is dormant.
tution or restoration of the "True Church" a concept of baptism which varied from the traditional concept. This appears to be the factor which made vital, aggressive, and yet peaceful organizations of both of these movements. Their members were all fired with a conviction of the correctness of their course of action. If they did not have such a conviction, persecution from the outside soon drove them from the church. Those who survived had a strong desire to spread their beliefs by means of missionary work which was felt to be the responsibility of all "believers." The belief that only "believers" should be members of the "True Church" inspired efforts to discipline the membership of the church, and to keep it relatively "pure." Temperate living on the part of all who remained as members after application of this discipline was a natural consequence.

The most striking area of disagreement between the two groups is on the subject of divine revelation. This too has many consequences. In fact, one would not be far wrong in asserting that most of their differences can be traced to this principle. For one thing it had an effect on their attitudes concerning the need for an apostolic priesthood. Neither group was in any position to claim that they had received their authority from any contemporary source. To have done so would have been to admit that someone already had the authority which they claimed to be restoring. In this case neither the Anabaptists nor the
Mormons would have had any further excuse for existence. Because they specifically denied the validity of divine revelation in post-apostolic times, the Anabaptists found it necessary at this point to minimize the necessity for a leadership that could establish its authority by apostolic succession. Their's certainly was not able to do so. The Mormons, on the other hand, based their whole restoration on the validity of present-day divine revelation. By so doing, they were in a position to claim direct restoration of an apostolic priesthood.

Their respective attitudes towards scripture also stem directly from their attitudes towards revelation, the Mormons having three complete sets of canonical scripture, including one compiled during the period of their "Restoration" and early history. Such a thing would have been considered blasphemous by the Anabaptists who shared the orthodox belief that the canon of scripture was completed in the days of the apostles.

The L.D.S. faith appears to be somewhat more ordinance centered than does that of the Anabaptists, in that it demands that members of the "True Church" participate in a considerably larger number of ordinances than is true in the case of the Anabaptists, in order to inherit "exaltation." The Anabaptist was required to believe, repent, submit to baptism, and then to make his faith manifest by his works, and keep himself fit to participate at regu-
lar intervals in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. While all of this was also required of the Mormon, he was in addition required to be ordained to the priesthood, and to participate in the ordinances of the temple. However, whether or not every Mormon understood it, it was taught that these ordinances could not save, but only made it possible for the person participating in them to earn his own salvation by the life that he led. Both Mormons and Anabaptists rejected the idea that participation in ordinances provided automatic salvation. It seems that in each case where the Mormon faith required other ordinances in addition to those required by the Anabaptists that it was the result of their belief in present-day revelation, for the additional ordinances referred to above are not explained in the Bible.

A belief in current revelation is also responsible for the more moderate stand which the L.D.S. founders took on the relationship of members of the "True Church" to secular government. This position implies an active support of government in order to insure that it will be good government, whereas the Anabaptists, even in their most liberal moments, were only willing to tolerate government as a control on the wicked. Likewise in the matter of violence the L.D.S. position admits of situations in which a person or a nation is justified in defending itself, whereas the Anabaptists maintained an attitude of complete non-violence under
all conditions and in all situations. The Anabaptists considered non-resistance, non-participation in government, and non-swearin of oaths to be more important than did the Mormons, and hence these principles played a greater part in the Anabaptist restitution than in the Mormon restoration. In each case the Anabaptists based their position on Biblical examples, and where the Mormon position was at variance it was almost invariably because of alleged new revelation which modified or re-interpreted that given in the Bible.

Another pertinent similarity between the Anabaptists and the Mormons was the extensive persecution to which they were both subjected, and the effect of this persecution on both groups. In both cases it was severe, but rather than wiping out either group, it appears that the ultimate result was the strengthening of the church by insuring that only those which held strong convictions of the truth of their position were left in the respective movements. This is true in spite of the fact that many of the strong leaders in both movements met early and untimely deaths.

A conclusion which cannot be avoided after consideration of the material presented herein is that although both of these groups claimed to effect essentially the same thing, the methods by which they claimed to do so are entirely different. Although there are numerous parallels and similarities in the beliefs and practices of the two groups, the very basis

---

3 This is true of the groups herein defined as Anabaptist, but not true of such groups as the Münsterites.
of their claims is entirely different. The Anabaptists claimed to restore the "True Church" by going back to the New Testament and rigorously following every piece of information which they could find there regarding the church. At the same time they were very energetic in discarding every practice which could not be justified by turning to the New Testament. In this they differed from the Reformers who were inclined to retain everything not specifically forbidden by the Scriptures. The Mormon approach was entirely different because of their different attitude towards scripture. As has been pointed out, the Mormons looked on scripture as a living thing which was continually being expanded by current divine revelation, whereas for the Anabaptist the canon of scripture was full. Joseph Smith did not therefore feel himself limited by existing scripture. The fact that a practice or belief could not be justified from the scriptures did not make it wrong, so far as he was concerned, especially when he felt that the Lord had, by new revelation, commanded that it be adopted. If a belief or practice could be justified from existing scripture, so much the better, for this would serve to convince the doubters. This of course is in marked contrast to the Anabaptist belief and practice, and for this reason it seems logical to conclude that the claims of these two groups to a restoration are based on entirely different systems and modes of thought. Where areas of agreement do exist the two groups do not attach the same importance to
them. Where the Mormon would look first for divine revelation as a sign of the "True Church," the Anabaptist would look for believer's baptism with all of its connected ramifications. At the same time the Anabaptist would look on claims to revelation as a sure sign that the truth was not present, and the Mormon would look upon believer's baptism alone as insufficient proof of the presence of the "True Church." It seems therefore that agreements between the two groups are largely incidental.

The greatest similarities are in the areas of baptism, the Lord's Supper, community of goods, the great apostacy, and to a lesser extent, the relationship of the church to secular government. Beliefs concerning shunning and the oath are peculiar to the Anabaptists, and those concerning priesthood are exclusive to the Mormons. The views of the two groups on divine revelation are contradictory, and those on non-resistance contradict to a lesser extent.

In conclusion it is desired to point out that a number of things which many adherents of the Mormon faith have long assumed to be peculiar to their faith and to have more or less originated with it were actually introduced by the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century. The most obvious of these is the condemnation of infant baptism as a worthless invention of men. Another is the preaching, to a greater extent than the Reformers, of a great and total apostacy of Christendom. Among the most important is a personal testi-
mony, or conviction, of the truth and divinity of their teachings. Massive participation in missionary work, a conviction that one must work out his own salvation, the idea that the world was already in the "last days," and a great emphasis on adult as well as regular public education of children, were among the others. And finally, an acquaintance with the history of the Anabaptists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries indicates that the hardships which they Mormon pioneers were forced to endure, severe as they were, were in many respects humane when compared to Anabaptist suffering.

Because their basic claims, especially in regard to divine revelation, make these two faiths incompatible, it seems fair to conclude that "Restitution" implies an attempt to reconstruct the "True Church" by human means, whereas "Restoration" implies the presence of divine revelation. Thus the Anabaptist Restitution of the Sixteenth century, and the Mormon Restoration of the Nineteenth century, although they do have much in common, remain unique in their own rights. Because of this uniqueness it seems improbable that the Mormon restoration is in any way dependent on Anabaptists, for their similarities are the result of common sources.

4 It should be noted that Anabaptism has almost completely lost this characteristic.

5 John Horsch's two books, The Mennonites in Europe, and The Hutterian Brethren, give good insight into the persecution which these people were forced to endure.
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ABSTRACT

Purpose and Method

This study has been prompted by the apparently similar claims of the Sixteenth century Anabaptists\(^1\) and the Nineteenth century Mormons of having effected a restoration of the "True Church" after a period of complete apostacy in Christendom. It has attempted to ascertain the extent to which these claims actually are similar by comparing the teachings of the two movements regarding the characteristics of the "True Church."

Sources

Data for the study has been obtained as far as possible from the writings of the original leaders of both movements, supplemented where necessary by commentaries on and quotations from the teachings of the founding fathers by more recent writers, particularly modern Mennonite scholars. An effort has been made to confine the study to the formative years of both movements, and so in the case of the Anabaptists the data is confined to the Sixteenth century, and that of the Mormons is drawn from Joseph Smith.

\(^1\)The Anabaptist groups considered in this study are the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterites, and the Mennonites. Others which are sometimes called Anabaptist have been excluded because of lack of harmony with Anabaptist principles.
Data

The Anabaptists, with some slight variations between groups, looked upon believer's baptism, correct use of the Lord's Supper, non-resistance to violence, non-participation in, but obedience to, government, non-use of the oath, community of goods, and correct use of the ban, as the characteristics of the "True Church."

The two things on which the Mormon Restoration placed the most emphasis were present-day divine revelation, and a priesthood claiming restored apostolic succession.

Areas of agreement are to be found in the teachings of the two movements regarding the falsity of infant baptism, the non-sacramental character of the Lord's Supper, the obligation of members of the "True Church" to care for the spiritual and material welfare of their fellow believers, and the belief that secular governments are ordained of God.

Disagreements are to be found on the use of violence for defensive purposes, the purpose for which God ordained secular government, the need for divine revelation in current times, and the need for apostolic succession in priesthood.

The Anabaptist practises of not using the oath, and of "shunning" excommunicated persons receive no emphasis in Mormon teaching.

Other interesting similarities grow out of the areas of agreement already mentioned. These similarities include the strong conviction or testimony of the correctness of their
positions, which resulted from the combination of abolition of infant baptism and defection through persecution of those who were weak in the faith; missionary systems in which all were liable to serve; the view that their own respective ages were the last; temperate living; and emphasis on education in order that one might be better equipped to "work out his own salvation."

Conclusions

Consideration of this material leads to the conclusion that although both of these groups claimed to effect the same thing, they claimed to do so by two entirely different methods, the Anabaptists relying on a return to the New Testament, and the Mormons relying on new divine revelation. The similarities in their teaching and practices are therefore largely incidental, and the differences are in most cases the result of the additions or amendments that Mormon revelation has made to the older scriptures.

It is hoped that this study will be of value in helping those who are already familiar with the Mormon claim of a "restoration" to realize that others have also made this claim, and that because of the great difference in the methods which they claimed to employ, the Anabaptist Restitution and the Mormon Restoration are unique in their own rights.
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