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Abstract

This is an historical/theological study of the life and thought of Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich (1803-1857). Fröhlich was a 19th century Swiss pastor who left the Reformed (Calvinist) Church and became an Anabaptist. This act was more than simply a change in church membership. Fröhlich renounced Reformed, Protestantism for the "radical" theology of the Anabaptists.

Fröhlich's activities led to the formation of a new late-Anabaptist denomination. This project will examine Fröhlich's personal and theological development as he made this transition and will demonstrate how this transition shaped the character of this new denomination. A primary focus will be the notion of non-resistance and pacifism in the denomination.

This research does not focus upon one particular question. Part One of this work will consist of a survey of the historical context of Fröhlich and his movement. Part Two will be an analysis of Fröhlich's writing. The method utilized to analyze Fröhlich's writing will be to classify or locate his thought within traditional, systematic, theological categories, by comparing his work to representative Anabaptist, Roman Catholic, and Protestant theology.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis, should be considered only as a starting point, for understanding the teaching and legacy of Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich. This research does not centre about a particular question but will explore and analyse the biographical, theological and doctrinal aspects of Fröhlich writing. Even though some Anabaptists consider Fröhlich to be an Anabaptist,¹ he was never explicit as to which individuals or religious traditions substantially informed or influenced his theology. This work will attempt to uncover Fröhlich's Anabaptist roots in order to determine whether Fröhlich's theology was in fact Anabaptist and how this may have influenced or shaped the denomination he founded.

According to Dr. Peter Brock, a historian at the University of Toronto, the history of the tradition founded by Fröhlich "...constitutes one of the least known chapters in the history of the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement".² In a review of a book on Fröhlich, Delbert Gratz a professor at Bluffton College, noted that the author of the book, provided very little insight on the "...source or sources of influence on the various aspects of Fröhlich's thinking".³ Gratz suggested that it is time that more work was done in this area.
There has been little research into the relationship between Calvinism, the Reformed Church and the Anabaptists in the 19th. and 20th. centuries. Most research is centred about Calvin (16th. century) and his relationship with the Anabaptists. What makes this research interesting is that Fröhlich was a 19th. century, Reformed Church pastor who subsequently left the Reform Church and allied himself with the Anabaptists, a religious tradition that had historically been denigrated and persecuted by the Calvinists.

The sources utilized for this work, will be Fröhlich's extant writings, which consist largely of sermons, letters, biographical pieces, commentaries on Biblical books and passages, and also essays and booklets on various points of doctrine and belief. Except for one small booklet, these works have all been translated into English. At one point Fröhlich was preaching as many as 450 sermons per year and a large number of the outlines of these sermons have been preserved. Fröhlich wrote quite extensively and was said to have written 200 to 300 letters in duplicate annually. The English speaking branch of the denomination (The Apostolic Christian Church) has managed to preserve, translate and publish the works of Fröhlich.

Other than Fröhlich's work, the publications of the Apostolic Christian Church consist of either devotional or apologetic works. A few "histories" have been published by
members of the denomination over the years. However, to date the denomination has not published any "critical" or "analytical" works that have engaged Fröhlich's doctrines or theology.

Part One of this work will examine the history of Samuel Fröhlich and the period during which he lived. This will be effected by first surveying the political and religious influences of France, the French Revolution and Napoleon on Switzerland, the homeland of Fröhlich. This survey of the French influence will be followed by an examination of the evolution of religious tolerance in Switzerland and how this affected the life, work, and legacy of Fröhlich.

Part Two of this work will examine Fröhlich's thought and theology by situating them within the traditional systematic theological categories. This work is an initial attempt to locate Fröhlich's thought within these categories. These categories will include: anthropology, theology, christology, and soteriology. This analysis will attempt to identify areas in Fröhlich's writing that demonstrate how various theological concepts and issues were perceived by Fröhlich and other Anabaptists. These concepts and issues will then be compared to Lutheran, Roman Catholic and Reform theologies.
Historical Background of Samuel Fröhlich

Fröhlich became an adherent of Anabaptist teaching and theology after becoming disillusioned with his studies in theology at the University of Basle and the doctrines of the Reformed Church of Switzerland. Fröhlich's preaching as a young Reformed pastor was regarded as being contrary to the teachings of the State Church on a variety of issues. Consequently, Fröhlich was dismissed from the Reformed Church ministry.

Upon leaving the Reformed Church, Fröhlich found himself "persecuted". He was no longer permitted to preach in the Reformed Church or at all, for that matter. His subsequent marriage was not legally recognized since it had not been performed in the state Church. He was often forced to move from various towns by the civil authorities, since the authorities saw Fröhlich as a subversive influence.5

For a time Fröhlich wandered as an itinerant preacher. As he spoke to various Mennonite congregations, it became apparent that his evolving theology and beliefs were clearly influenced by Anabaptist teaching. Fröhlich was also invited to preach at some of the churches he had served as a Reformed pastor. The result of Fröhlich's evangelizing work was the establishment of a new Anabaptist denomination. This group became known as the "Evangelical Baptists" in Switzerland and
Germany, and were known as the "Nazarenes" in Hungary, Romania and the former Yugoslavia.

As members of the denomination emigrated to North America, (starting in the 1840's) the American branch of the denomination was eventually named (1920's) the "Apostolic Christian Church of America". A schism within the denomination in the early years of this century resulted in the formation of another group that became known as the "Apostolic Christian Church (Nazarean)". In terms of theology the Evangelical Baptists, Nazarenes, and Apostolic Christians are generally Anabaptist.

The following is an overview of this work:

Chapter I - Historical Background of Fröhlich and his Era

The first chapter of Part One will introduce Samuel Fröhlich and the origins of the denomination that eventually evolved from his efforts. The chapter will begin with a brief summary of the radical Reformation in Switzerland. This will be followed by a sketch of the French Revolution and the resulting Helvetic Republic. The establishment of the Helvetic Republic marked the beginning of a degree of toleration for the Anabaptists.

Chapter one continues with an outline of Fröhlich's formative years and education. Fröhlich's "conversion" story will be presented, largely using his own words. This will illustrate the reasons that motivated Fröhlich to leave
the "state church" and initiate his contacts with the Anabaptists. An outline of how Fröhlich's influence spread throughout Switzerland will follow.

**Chapter II - The Nazarenes of Eastern Europe**

This chapter will relate the story of the "Nazarenes" of Hungary and Yugoslavia, focusing particularly on their nonresistance and pacifism. The chapter will then examine the "Apostolic Christians" of North America. Their story has become a significant and influential part of the legacy of Samuel Fröhlich.

**Chapter III - Anabaptist Theology and the Traditional Systematic Theological Categories**

This chapter, the beginning of the Part Two of this work, will open with an introduction to the historical, Anabaptist perspective of theology in general, and will then examine the Anabaptist approach to the traditional systematic theological categories.

The focus of this chapter will be an analysis of Fröhlich's anthropology (theory of human nature). Included in this analysis will be Fröhlich's understanding of the human condition in terms of "sin" and his understanding of the "fall". Also included in this section will be Fröhlich's perspective on the relationship and distinctions between the "soul" and "spirit".
Chapter IV - Soteriology

This chapter will examine Fröhlich's soteriology, (theory of salvation). The discussion of "soteriology" will revolve around the topic of infant baptism, an issue that was central to Fröhlich's disillusionment with Reform theology, and his eventual adoption of Anabaptist/Mennonite theology. Fröhlich also adopted the controversial position that baptism by immersion was necessary even though he himself was baptized only by "sprinkling". Controversies over this issue led to divisions among some Mennonite congregations where Fröhlich preached. Those that left these Mennonite congregations and followed Fröhlich were, some of the earliest converts to the "new tradition" and were called - Neutaufer.

Chapter V - Fröhlich's Doctrine of God

This chapter will focus on Fröhlich's "theology" (theory of God), the Trinity, the role of the Holy Spirit and his Christology. These topics will be investigated by comparing Fröhlich's Anabaptist/Mennonite convictions with those of Reform, Lutheran and Catholic theologies.

Conclusion - Fröhlich's Legacy

The concluding chapter will provide a short overview of how the teachings and legacy of Samuel Fröhlich have fared, by comparing aspects of the contemporary denomination to that of the denomination's early years, when it was an actively
evangelistic, Anabaptist movement. This chapter will also explore the intriguing possibility of the preservation of the articles and focus of the Schleitheim Confession (1527) in the denominations baptismal catechism.
PART ONE - CHAPTER I

Historical Background of Samuel Fröhlich and his Era

The Swiss Reformation

The Reformation in Switzerland began in 1519 with a series of lectures on the New Testament by Ulrich Zwingli. Zwingli followed these lectures with assaults on the notions of purgatory, the invocation of saints, and monasticism.¹ Zwingli had begun criticizing the traditional teachings of Roman Catholicism about the same time as Martin Luther, but he claims he was not greatly influenced by Luther. Zwingli was led to these "new" conclusions by his own studies.²

Zwingli, was a popular preacher in the Catholic Church in Zurich, who had begun to demand radical reform of the Church. Eventually he resigned as a priest (1522) but was immediately reinstated to his old position by the civil government of Zurich, but he was also now under their authority. This action by the civil government marked what we might call the "formal" beginning of the Swiss Reformation.³

By Easter of 1525 Zwingli's Reformed state church had come into existence and Roman Catholicism was abolished in Zurich. Bern remained officially Catholic until February of 1528 when it also embraced the Zwinglian Reformed state church.⁴
Switzerland and the Anabaptists

Swiss Anabaptism originated during the time of Ulrich Zwingli in Zurich, and from there its proponents travelled to Bern and then on to other parts of Switzerland. Until they separated from him over points of doctrine, Conrad Grebel, the leader of the Zurich group of Anabaptists, Felix Manz and others, co-operated with Zwingi during the early stages of the Reformation. Initially the issues of contention were tithing and the levying of interest. The issue that finally severed the relationship was the question of adult baptism.5

By 1524, there was so much dissention over the issue of "infant baptism" that the city council felt that agitation around the question of infant baptism would lead to social difficulties. It ruled that children must be baptized and that any parents who refused or insisted on adult baptism would be given one week to comply or they were to be expelled from Zurich.

A group of dissidents gathered for a meeting and baptized those who attended. This act marked the creation of a new religious group that was distinct from both the Roman Catholic Church and emerging Protestantism.6 The members of this group were soon called the Anabaptists or "re-baptizers" even though they preferred to be called simply "brethren".7

This group of Brethren and their subsequent followers soon felt a need to draw boundaries and formulate guiding
principles. In response to these needs, a group of Anabaptist leaders met in the Swiss village of Schleitheim in February of 1527 and one result of this meeting was the writing of what is known as the Schleitheim Confession.8

The Schleitheim Confession

Scholars have been divided about the primary focus of this meeting and subsequent writing of the Schleitheim Confession. Some believe that the focus of the meeting and Confession was to address dissension and differences within the Anabaptist movement. Another interpretation suggests that the Confession concentrated on those points on which the Brethren differed from the rest of Protestantism.9 The Schleitheim Confession was not intended to be a balanced catechism or comprehensive creed and there are no strictly theological concepts directly asserted in it. Concepts or topics such as God, humanity, the Bible, salvation, the church, and eschatology are not addressed.10

The Anabaptists and the State Church

All Anabaptists believed that they were called to establish God's kingdom on earth. In the sixth article of the Schleitheim Confession, early Anabaptists, such as Michael Sattler and his fellows, pledged themselves to pacifism.11 Other Anabaptists, like Melchior Hoffman and the Münster group of Anabaptists, were willing to use military means to
effect their notion of establishing "God's Kingdom" on earth. John Leiden, a Dutch tailor, along with a group of followers, managed to seize the city of Münster and held it "...for a year as the Zion of the new dispensation." Münster was recaptured by a Roman Catholic Bishop in 1536 and Leiden, together with neighbouring lutheran forces, and most of the leaders of the rebellion, were executed. Even though Leiden and his followers were not typical of most of the Anabaptists, the reputation of the Anabaptists suffered by this association.

It was this very confusing period in the fledgling Anabaptist movement, that gave rise to the leadership of Menno Simons. His leadership effected a moderate course and clearer vision for the early Anabaptists. The followers of this movement became known as "Mennists" or "Mennonists" and later as the "Mennonites".

The Schleitheim Confession emphasized the conviction that the Christian was to be separate from the world. Specifically targeted were all "popish and anti-popish" (Protestant) works, church attendance and civic affairs, among other prohibitions.

The Anabaptists believed that baptized adults could achieve a state of grace; where there existed the possibility of the individual living free from sin, in a "pure church". Zwingli supposedly considered this nothing less than the
"spiritual arrogance of pseudo-heavenly beings". Zwingli understood the church to be a community of imperfect brothers and sisters, a church that would be mixed until the end of time.

In a tract Zwingli wrote in response to the Schleitheim Confession, it was clear that he grouped together the peaceful, pacifist Anabaptists along with their militant "relatives". Both groups were conceived as being separatist or sectarian, convincing Zwingli that they were as much a danger to the state as they were to the church.

The sixth article of the Schleitheim Confession also stated that it was wrong for the Christian to accept a position as a magistrate. Zwingli asserted that secular authority was in no way purely a function of "the world and the flesh", but pious and godly judges made the best judges. In response to the Anabaptist aversion to the taking of oaths (Schleitheim: Article 7), Zwingli's position was that oaths were necessary for the orderly maintenance of the civic community and were simply an appeal to God to witness the truth of whatever declaration was being made. It was for these reasons that the government felt that they had to act against the "peaceful" Anabaptists as well as the militarists. As a consequence of the introduction of the Reformation into the Swiss cities, the Anabaptists began to be persecuted and expelled by the new religious authorities.
By 1525, Anabaptists in Zurich were imprisoned, tortured and fined. The first death penalty imposed by a Protestant government, was the drowning of Felix Manz, in Zurich, in January of 1527. In August of 1527, the Swiss cities of Zurich, St. Gall and Bern issued mandates against the Anabaptists. This was the beginning of systematic punishment and attempts at extermination of Anabaptists by the government of Bern. At times only the Anabaptist leadership was targeted for punishment while in other instances this punishment reached further. In Bern in 1535, Anabaptist prisoners who would not renounce their faith within eight days, were exiled. If they returned they received an immediate judgement; the men were put to the sword and the women were drowned. In 1567 a law was passed that declared that anyone who was not married by the state church would be considered to be living in adultery. They were to be expelled and their children would be considered illegitimate. This sort of law, regarding marriage, would manifest itself in various forms, in Switzerland, even until the 19th Century. These laws regarding marriage, would also prove to be a source of grief for Fröhlich and his family.

Even though Zurich had been an early centre for the Anabaptist movement, by 1648, the only Anabaptist groups that remained were in the rural cantons of Zurich and Bern. As a result of the strong emphasis by the Swiss on military
preparedness and the subsequent pressure on nonresistant Anabaptists, many either gave up their faith or emigrated. While the death penalty was no longer applied during the 17th century, severe measures were still taken against them. Some were sent to sea as galley slaves, others were branded on the forehead to identify them as undesirables, and Mennonite children were still considered illegitimate and had no rights before the law. Those who emigrated were welcomed in Southern Germany and Prussia because of their agricultural skills.24

By the middle of the 18th century we see a degree of tolerance shown to the Anabaptists and banishment had become primarily the device used to control the Anabaptists. Those who would not leave were imprisoned unless they recanted or accepted the Reformed faith. As in the past, marriages that had not been performed by a Reformed minister were not recognized and children were considered illegitimate.25

While the eighteenth-century was a period of further persecution and migration for Anabaptists, the end of the eighteenth-century was the beginning of a period that would set the stage for freedom and recognition for the Swiss Anabaptists. The French Revolution spilled over into Switzerland, and supposedly overturned many of the old "institutions". All those who did not have religious freedom and recognition in the past were now accorded it, by a new
constitution. While religious freedoms and recognition might have been mandated by the new laws, they were not fully realized until some fifty years later. The state-church government had certainly grown more tolerant in the latter eighteenth century, but the notion of complete religious freedom was something that was completely foreign to its thinking. The irony of the situation was that religious freedom was to come as a result of the French Revolution, a non-religious movement.
The Impact of the French Revolution on Switzerland

Introduction

The events of the French Revolution, and its influence on the rest of Europe are important for understanding the political and religious climate at the time of Fröhlich. Because of what transpired during this period, persecuted groups such as the Anabaptists had a glimpse of what might be, namely the opportunity to exercise their religious belief in complete freedom. When detained, fined or otherwise punished by the civil-authorities/state church, Fröhlich and other Anabaptists would appeal for consideration based on mandates "legislated" in the Helvetic Constitution, but to no avail.\(^28\)

The persecutions Fröhlich and other Anabaptists experienced served to foster the animosity between them and the "recognized church".\(^29\) These persecutions perpetuated or enforced Anabaptist doctrines that taught that Christians were to be "separated" from the world and its institutions, that is, the "state" or "recognized" churches. This section of the chapter demonstrates the dynamics of the political and religious climate of the period in order to show how and why the Swiss Anabaptists were treated as they were and offers a brief survey of those events that led to "religious freedom" in Switzerland and Europe. In Switzerland this "officially" took place in 1874 with the enforcement of Article 49 of the
Constituion which guaranteed freedom of faith and conscience. This freedom came too late for Fröhlich, who died in Strassburg on January 15, 1857, at the age of 53.

The French Revolution

The French Revolution, like all major historical events, was complex in its origins, being effected by various religious, political and economic circumstances, both in France and outside of its borders. France was profoundly affected by the success of the American Revolution (1776-1783). The United States was the first large nation with a fairly large population to establish an enduring republic, after having expunged rule by monarchy. It was also the first nation that treated religion as a personal matter and formally separated the church and state.

These developments were closely watched by the American's European allies and especially by the French people, who were becoming increasingly disenchanted with the monarchy, privileged classes, and the church. These experiments in America attracted attention, because they were based on ideas that had been advanced by various European philosophers. In France, Voltaire championed Deism and attacked creeds, injustice, the church and clergy and "(h) e abhorred Roman Catholicism as a massive deceit, bitterly scorning it for its exploitation, superstition,
intolerance and persecution." Well known Deists in America were Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's "Social Contract", published in 1762, asserted that laws and government were to be based on the general will of the people they governed, and society was to be based on a social contract to which its members consented. The idea of individual freedom, combined with just government in the interests of the majority, was the kind of thinking that paved the way for both the American Declaration of Independence and the French Revolution.

France also actively supported the rebellion of the British colonies, and its extensive financial support of the rebellion against Britain in North America, led to the bankruptcy of France and was a major contributing factor of the French Revolution, some six years later.

France's precarious financial position was also a result of other military forays and expensive tastes of the monarchy and aristocracy. There was no real distinction between the monarchy's personal finances and that of the nation. Shortfalls were collected by taxes imposed mostly on the peasantry and bourgeoisie while the nobility and clergy were largely exempt.

In response to growing discontent the French National Assembly attempted to address the inequities through national
reformation. In 1789 a mob attacked the Bastille in the first serious violent attack of the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{39}

The first great achievement of the National Assembly was the legal destruction of feudalism, serfdom, and class privilege. The second achievement was similar to America's Declaration of Independence, and in France took the form of a Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. This document proclaimed that all were born free, were to remain free and have equal rights. Religious toleration and freedom of speech were also affirmed.\textsuperscript{40}

The French Republic was declared in 1792 and the king was executed the following year. The established churches were attacked and plundered. It was then declared that "...no other national religion was now required but that of liberty, equality, and morality."\textsuperscript{41} The Christian faith was replaced by a "cult of Reason", whose symbolic head was a "goddess" (the wife of a local printer), and Notre Dame cathedral became known as the "Temple of Reason".\textsuperscript{42}

Surrounding countries and monarchies, fearful of these libertarian developments in France proclaimed intentions to militarily re-establish the monarchy in France but France prevailed against the Austrians and Prussians relatively easily. Emboldened with these successes, the National Convention declared that it would treat as enemies, any country that refused liberty and freedom to its citizens.\textsuperscript{43}
By 1789 France was still at war with Austria, Sardinia, and Great Britain.

During this period Napoleon Bonaparte was consolidating his power. By 1793, at the age of twenty-four, Napoleon was promoted to brigadier general, as a result of his role in the liberation of Toulon from the British. By 1797 he had defeated Italy and in an attempt to crush the British Empire he sailed to Egypt. Napoleon's exploits made him the most famous person in France.44

By 1799, financial disorder caused the downfall of the Directory (highest legislative body), much like it had brought down the monarchy. The militarism of the French Revolution had found a hero in Napoleon Bonaparte who quickly seized control. France, in the space of less than ten years, overthrew a monarchy, established a parliamentary government and then became a military dictatorship.45

By 1799, France had conquered many of their foes and had established a number of "puppet" republics. Included in this latter group was the establishment of the Helvetic Republic in Switzerland where the individual cantons were abolished as sovereign states in favor of a united state.46

The Helvetic Republic in Switzerland

The Helvetic Republic was never accepted as the national Swiss government. The individual cantons had their own interests and it was only the French military that kept the
continual revolts quelled; for a short period anyway. The Helvetic government collapsed in 1802. Before its demise, the Helvetic government was able to introduce some "novel" ideas such as the equality of all citizens in law, equality of languages and freedom of belief and speech.47

The new Republic also did not allow for any superior ecclesiastical authorities or any arbitrary prohibitions against marriage.48 Even though there was recognition of the freedom of religion, the state as the highest authority was to control the churches, but promised not to interfere in the internal affairs of religious organizations so long as they offered no threat to the public order.49 It was for precisely this reason that Fröhlich and similar evangelicals were ostensibly prevented from meeting and practicing their beliefs.

After the "rejection" of the Helvetic Republic, the French army re-entered Swiss territory in 1803 and Napoleon summoned representatives of the cantons and proclaimed the Act of Mediation. This restored the ancient cantons and also restored their traditional institutions and granted the cantons a degree of sovereignty. While this meant that there was a modicum of internal unity and equality among the cantons, the Swiss still did not have independence from France.50
While maintaining control over their internal affairs, the new confederation of cantons joined on matters war, peace and alliances. Privileges of place, birth, and family were abolished and Swiss citizens were supposedly now guaranteed freedom of movement and settlement. Religious toleration was too great a step for some to accept. It was incomprehensible to the Roman Catholic or Reformed church that the Anabaptists would be equal with them, and they looked for ways to circumvent these new laws. The rights of citizenship were only granted to individuals who had been baptized by the Reformed church clergy and marriages were considered legal only if they had been performed by the Reformed church clergy.

This return to the status quo would not bode well for evangelical Anabaptists like Fröhlich and other like minded Mennonites. In some cantons "torture chambers" were reopened and a number of cantons still would not even tolerate different religious creeds. With the French domination of Swiss affairs had also come the hope of toleration for Anabaptists. It would not be until some time later in the 19th. century that religious freedom for Anabaptists was finally and permanently realized. In retrospect, it was the French influence, that was the genesis for this development.

The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, secured and guaranteed the independence and neutrality of Switzerland. The cantons
obtained even more autonomy than they had in the previous agreement. Freedom of movement and settlement in other cantons was not guaranteed and the new Federal Pact had little more to say about the freedom of religion than did the previous Act of Mediation.\(^{54}\)

In summary, as early as 1529 the Anabaptists were no longer considered dangerous in Switzerland, but "...their faith remained technically proscribed in every canton until 1798".\(^{55}\) There was a glimpse of freedom of religion in subsequent years due to the influence of France's revolutionary ideas and ideals. The Federal Constitution of 1848 ended the virtual sovereignty of the individual cantons, offered freedom of religion and protected the rights of "recognized" Christian creeds.\(^{56}\) The Constitution of 1874 finally guaranteed freedom of creed and religious observance in the widest measures.\(^{57}\) This was a little too late for Fröhlich and many elements of his movement since Fröhlich passed away in 1857.

**Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich**

Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich was born on July 4, 1803 in Brugg, a city in the canton of Aargau. Fröhlich's family was descended from those Huguenots (French Calvinistic or Reformed Protestants) who escaped France after Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1685.\(^{58}\) The *Edict of Nantes*
(1598) which ended the French wars of religion some twenty six years after the St. Bartholomews Day Massacre of 1572 (the massacre of a large number of Huguenots), had granted the Huguenots the freedom to practice their religion. After the Edict was revoked, many Huguenots escaped to England and America while the De Joyeau family fled to Switzerland. They later changed the family name to "Fröhlich", translated as "joyful".

Given his background, religion was a natural part of his upbringing. It appears that it was his parents intention that he devote himself to the ministry, as his life occupation. He later wrote that he never thought to question this decision, but approached the situation as one might when learning a trade. Fröhlich claims he did not have any inkling as to what the responsibilities of this vocation entailed.

After some preparatory schooling in Brugg, Fröhlich at age seventeen moved to Zurich (1820) and was accepted at the Collegium Humanitatus. After one year Fröhlich advanced to the Gymnasium Carolinum a college for the arts and sciences that dated back to the 15th. century. Fröhlich spent about four years in Zurich where he said he pursued his "...studies mechanically...without any real interest; however not without absorbing the principles of theology and rationalism." Upon returning home on vacation, Fröhlich recalled that he drove his mother to tears when he flaunted
"new teaching" that among other things, proclaimed there was no devil and no hell.

Near the latter part of 1823, Fröhlich entered the University in Basel and studied under the Protestant theologian Wilhelm De Wette. Fröhlich stated that initially he was "...utterly carried away by the "idealism" with which he [De Wette] treated the scriptures". Fröhlich did not offer any additional explanation pursuant to this comment so it is therefore difficult to understand clearly what he meant.

Fröhlich was quite enamored with De Wette and stated that at the time he "...honoured him [De Wette] almost as a god. I felt no need of the 'living God' and I had no thought of conversion from my sins." During this period Fröhlich stated that he also was without the knowledge of Christ and without knowledge of himself. These comments of course did not reflect his lack of theological training.

Upon arriving in Basel, Fröhlich had been introduced to a group of students, some of whom belonged to the Community of Brethren. This group gathered weekly to read and discuss the Greek New Testament. Fröhlich was disenchanted with this group from the outset simply because they were inclined toward the Community of Brethren and he opposed them at every turn. When the group decided to conclude their weekly meetings with song and prayer, Fröhlich became angry, stayed away and persuaded enough others to do likewise causing the
group almost to disband. Fröhlich stated that the Community of Brethren, "...were distasteful to me from their very name, without knowing any other cause".71

Fröhlich had been introduced to this group of students by a pastor in Basle. He had been recommended to this pastor by an official of the state church in his hometown of Brugg. When visiting with this pastor in Basel, Fröhlich said he was always greeted with the following question: "Well how are things going in the most important matter of all?"72 Fröhlich states that he was always embarrassed by this question because he had no idea what the pastor meant and he certainly did not have an answer. The pastor took these opportunities to preach to Fröhlich, entreaties that he considered foolish and vexatious at the time. While confessing to profess an ignorance of what he was being told, Fröhlich still attempted to record the pastor's main thoughts in his diary of 1824.73

Fröhlich spent his Easter vacation of April, 1825 in his hometown of Brugg. During this period in Brugg, Fröhlich expressed that he was anxious, "empty", and could not find peace of mind. At this time he experienced what he called the "first period of my awakening". He came under the conviction that he must "change" or he could not become a minister.74

Fröhlich returned to Basel at the end of April, 1825 and the first item he happened to read upon his return, was Fenelon’s Religious Works.75 Upon reading this work he stated:
"In it I found for the first time a name for my spiritual condition, for up to this time I had been to myself an inexplicable riddle... Especially did I believe to recognise myself in the fourteenth chapter of the first part..."76 In this chapter, Fenelon stated that there were a number of factors that prevented the individual from surrendering completely to God's will. One must overcome pride, self-confidence, and self-love in order to know God's will. Apparently, Fröhlich recognized these attitudes in his own life, and was startled by this revelation.

At this point in time, Fröhlich experienced what he described as inexpressible mental suffering, anguish and despair. "All theological or rationalistic lectures became an abomination to me, for I was in another school" and his state of mind was such that he reported, "My sisters feared that I was losing my mind because the tone of my letters was so radically different from what it had previously been."77 Fröhlich describes himself as being in this very unsettled state for quite a period of time.

In 1825, Fröhlich had a religious experience which finally produced a calm in his life. He wrote of the experience: "...at length, faith in Jesus Christ the Crucified brought me rest, peace, and light, and made place within me for a new creation."78 Fröhlich described this experience as his conversion from "darkness to light". In
October of that year, Fröhlich left Basle and returned to his fathers home in Brugg because of financial constraints.

Shortly after returning to his father's home, Fröhlich applied to take the examinations required of candidates for the ministry in the Reform state-church of Switzerland. The examinations began in May 1826 and included the preparation of a trial sermon and a Latin dissertation on the theme De Verbo Dei tamquam Medio Gratiae \(^7^9\) (About the word of God as a mediator of grace). \(^8^0\) Fröhlich failed these examinations and was delayed one year from entering the ministry. He reports that the church council was very unfavorably disposed towards his work on these two compositions because of the principles he chose to discuss (We are given no other particulars).

Fröhlich fared no better in an assessment of his work, after a sermon he was compelled to preach in the church of a member of the church council. He was chastised for his errant doctrine and teaching and warned that he must present new sermons that were of a different "tone". Fröhlich states that this latest setback was reported to his parents, who were already troubled by his progress. He describes the situation as follows: "That [referring to this latest sermon] was the occasion that also in my case the saying should be fulfilled: 'A man's enemies will be the members of his own household'". \(^8^1\) Fröhlich says no more on the relationship with his parents but the implications seem obvious.
Fröhlich's parents urged him strongly to change the content of his sermons, being concerned he would fail in his attempt to be approved for the ministry. The pressure from these various quarters was so stifling that Fröhlich became depressed and for a time he was not able to compose sermons. This took place in the fall of 1826, the same time that he was afflicted with respiratory ailments.

In May of 1827, Fröhlich passed his oral examinations, and was finally ordained to the ministry. In August of 1828 he was transferred to Wagenhausen in Thurgau and in December of the same year he became the vicar at Leutwil, canton Aargau. He described this church of 1800 members as follows: "...the members of my new congregation even had in general the reputation before all men of being an ungodly and degraded people." Fröhlich explains that he was substituted for the previous pastor who had been convicted of "deeds of shame". (These deed are not explained)

Fröhlich claims that a "great awakening" took place in this congregation about the time of his arrival, and many people came from other places to attend services. Fröhlich stated that many neighboring vicars accused him of attracting members from their congregations "...and of generating confusion and unrest through my fanatical sermons. The old jealousy in the breasts of the church council members awakened anew."
The church council now made Fröhlich hand in his sermons for "inspection", to be circulated among the other pastors and any "obnoxious" parts were marked in red. During this period, Fröhlich noted that while teaching the catechism, he came to a new understanding or conviction about baptism. He does not elucidate about this "new" understanding at this point in his letter, but says that he was vigorously attacked concerning this conviction.

In retrospect, it can be assumed that Fröhlich was referring to arguments against infant baptism, a conclusion that may be derived from the content of letters he wrote to the Baptist Continental Society. In May of 1832 Fröhlich wrote to the Baptist Continental Society at their request to answer a series of questions they had posed. The third question enquired as to Fröhlich's understanding of baptism. He forcefully stated his conviction that according to his understanding of the Bible it was wrong to baptize infants and baptism was to be administered only to adults who believe.

At this point in his life Fröhlich is quite clear as to his ecclesiastical inclinations and allegiances. While he claims that the Roman Catholic Church is in error on this issue, he clearly suggests that "Protestant Reformed Church", when compared to the Roman Catholic Church is "...perhaps merely a humble residue: for, if anything, there is more of
abomination and offense in the teaching and life of the Protestant Reformed Church than in the Catholic.\textsuperscript{90} The events noted above occurred shortly after Fröhlich's "falling out" with the church council. In September of 1830 Fröhlich was summoned before the church council to answer to a number of charges. Fröhlich states that he was informed that his sermons were considered to be poor and that he had issued tracts whose contents were objectionable. He was especially criticized for not using a new catechism for children, that had been introduced (Easter of 1830), in place of the Heidelberg catechism.\textsuperscript{91} On October 22 Fröhlich was "recalled" and forbidden to preach in the church of Leutwil.\textsuperscript{92} Fröhlich attributed his recall to opposition from the Reformed consistory "...which suffered from dead formalism" and was opposed to any "...teaching which demanded regeneration through repentance, faith and baptism."\textsuperscript{93}

In June of 1831, Fröhlich was called before the district magistrate of Brugg (Fröhlich's hometown). He was informed of decisions regarding his status as a clergyman as mandated by the government of canton Aargau. The magistrate stated the following:

1) He [Fröhlich] is removed from the list of the Aargau clergy;

2) All churchly functions, i.e., teaching, baptism, holy communion, are strictly forbidden him;
3) All officers of the Canton, Protestant and Catholic, have received strict orders, if he enters their jurisdiction, to have him reprimanded and sent back to his home [state-church] congregation.\(^9\)

With this decision by the government, Fröhlich's break with the Reformed church was complete. At this point Fröhlich was invited to preach at a church in Wilhelmsdorf in Württemburg, Germany that had left the state-church.\(^9\)\(^5\) This congregation still subscribed to the baptism of infants and had only withdrawn from the state-church over differences over the baptismal liturgy. The relationship between Fröhlich and this congregation proved to be short-lived since Fröhlich could no longer accept the doctrine of infant baptism.\(^9\)\(^6\)

Following this experience, Fröhlich worked as a private tutor and began preaching in Mennonite circles.\(^9\)\(^7\)

Beginning in April of 1832, Fröhlich set out on what has been described as four different "missionary" journeys.\(^9\)\(^8\) On the first journey Fröhlich returned to his former congregation in Leutwil where he preached and baptized a number of individuals. The authorities arrested him for preaching on a number of occasions, and he narrowly escaped being jailed by the magistrate in Aargau.\(^9\)\(^9\) As a result of his work in this area, Leutwil became the first congregation of the Evangelical Baptists.\(^10\)\(^0\)

In November of 1831, Fröhlich applied to the Baptist
Continental Society of London hoping for financial support and sponsorship as a "... diaspora preacher in the Rhine Country..." Through the Society Fröhlich became acquainted with a pastor named Ami Bost. Bost had also been expelled from the state-church and worked in the Geneva area as a "missionary" for the Society. In February of 1832, Fröhlich was baptized with sprinkling, by Bost.

Following this event Fröhlich traveled to Bern and the surrounding areas. In August of 1832, Fröhlich travelled to the Emmental after contacting a Mennonite pastor by the name of Christian Gerber. Gerber ministered in the Mennonite church of Langnau, in the canton of Bern. Langnau had long been an Anabaptist centre and even today is the oldest Mennonite congregation in the world.

Fröhlich and the Mennonites

Fröhlich does not specifically cite or acknowledge who influenced his theology, but he is quite clear about his movement away from Reform theology. The Mennonites on the other hand suggest the following about the influences on Fröhlich's theology and doctrines:

Without doubt, the Emmental Mennonite Church had considerable influence on Fröhlich's religious views. Christian Gerber, an elder in the Mennonite Church at Emmental, called Fröhlich's attention to the fact that his written statement of belief did not cover military service, and so objection to military service in a combatant capacity became one of the church's tenets of faith.
While Fröhlich generally does not claim to follow any particular tradition and envisions himself as simply an interpreter of the Bible, in a letter written in February of 1836 to the Baptist Continental Society in London, Fröhlich does state that he is a Anabaptist, and as such his movement would be considered a late-Anabaptist variation.  

The denomination that was founded through the work of Fröhlich became known in Switzerland, Germany and Austria as the Gemeinschaft Evangelischer Taufgesinnter or "Community of Evangelical Baptists".  

While there is no apparent attribution to the Mennonites in Fröhlich's writing, it is fair to assume that the Anabaptist character of the Evangelical Baptists came substantially as a result of Fröhlich's relationship with the Bernese Anabaptists.  

Fröhlich in the Emmental  

According to Ruegger, Fröhlich first visited the Mennonite congregation in Langnau, canton Bern on August 22, 1832 and met with Christian Gerber after finding that he was in agreement with the Mennonites on the subject of baptism. Fröhlich then met with a group of ministers and deacons and by way of introduction gave them a copy of a May 14, 1832 letter in which he had answered some questions and stated his
beliefs for the English Continental Society. Fröhlich was permitted in the pulpit of the Mennonite church in Langnau. He began holding regular meetings and by September was preaching to groups of up to 400 people.

Fröhlich's teaching found approval with two disgruntled ministers of the Mennonite church in Langnau, namely Christian Baumgartner and Christian Gerber. They were troubled and complained about "...the indifference and laxity of the ministry". Gerber especially wished to instill new life into a congregation where he felt "The old outward form remained, but there was little inner and spiritual life". Fröhlich had little respect for some of the old Anabaptist customs and began introducing "innovations" such as weekly communion.

While these innovations attracted many people they also began to cause divisions in the Mennonite church in Langnau. Over time, two groups began forming in this church and eventually the two groups were meeting separately. The division became even greater after Fröhlich sent a young man, named George Steiger, to the Emmental. Steiger is said to have declared that all who had not been baptized by immersion were spiritually dead and that church discipline was lax.

Steiger baptized Gerber and Baumgartner as well as 65 other Mennonites. They were joined by a similar number of converts from the Reformed church who then formed a new
Anabaptist church. This group came to be known as the Neutaufer while others called it after its founder, the Fröhlichianer. By March of 1835 the Swiss Mennonite leadership had expelled Gerber and Baumgartner, an act which completed the division of this church. Those that remained in the Mennonite church in Langnau became known as the Alt-Taufer. The Evangelical Baptist or Neutaufer church in Langnau became one of the first churches in the Evangelical Baptist denomination.

Delbert Gratz observes that even though the Neutaufer group was composed of far more former Reformed church members than those of Anabaptist origin, "...doctrinally it has remained definitely Anabaptist." Fröhlich's followers were quite evangelistic and were able to found churches in Anabaptist settlements which drew followers from among the Anabaptists, but for the most part the members came from the Reformed and Lutheran churches.

Fröhlich's Activities in Switzerland - Cont’d.

In October of 1832, Fröhlich set out on what Ruegger called his fourth missionary journey. He began in Zurich, travelled through Thurgau and St. Gall. In Hauptwil, canton Thurgau he became acquainted with the Brunschwiler family. Fröhlich eventually (1836) married Susette Brunschwiler, a daughter of this family.
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In January of 1833 Fröhlich visited London at the invitation of the Continental Society.\textsuperscript{122} The Society recommended that he start mission work in Strassburg but due to its uncertain financial position was not able to offer support to Fröhlich or Bost and in fact was dissolved later that year for lack of funds.\textsuperscript{123} Fröhlich continued his work on his own and by 1834, 200 persons were attending his meetings in Hauptwil, where he had begun his activities. Ruegger reports that this response attracted opponents who attacked Fröhlich from pulpits and in newspapers. On occasion, meetings were attacked by individuals bearing clubs and throwing stones. At one point a mob of several hundred destroyed a house and, as a result, Fröhlich became known throughout Switzerland. He was expelled from Thurgau and his passport was noted with the fact that he had been expelled as a "sectarian".\textsuperscript{124}

**Persecution of the Anabaptists**

The "novel" concepts and laws allowing for freedom of religion were forced on Switzerland by the French Revolution and the institution of the Helvetic Republic. But, "Acts" that should have implemented these new mandates, for religious toleration, simply were not passed by the Swiss.\textsuperscript{125}

The sixth article of the Helvetic Constitution (1798) came to be called the Act of Religious Toleration and
essentially this law would have elevated the Anabaptist church from the status of illegality to that of equal status with the Reformed church. It was incomprehensible for the Reformed church that the Anabaptists would be on an equal basis with them. The Reformed church and civil government were still intertwined in many functions. Births were not recorded unless the rite of baptism had been administered by the Reformed clergy and rights of citizenship were only accorded to those who could show proof of state-church baptism. Only those marriages that had been performed by the state-church clergy were considered legitimate and any children of couples that had not been married by Reformed clergy were considered illegitimate.¹²⁶

When a group of Anabaptist leaders in 1810 appealed to the government for recognition of their rights according to The Act of Toleration, they were informed that this law did not apply to Anabaptists or any other denomination that evaded the laws of the country. The governments rationale was that the Anabaptists were the progeny of the the Münsterites. It did not seem to matter that the Münster debacle had occurred almost 300 years prior and that by reputation the Anabaptists were good, honest and pious.¹²⁷

Even still, the Reformed ministry in the canton of Bern complained that the Anabaptists had been given too much freedom and recognition, and as a result of their complaints
some new "rules" were established in 1823. The third rule stated that Anabaptists were to announce the time and place of any meetings to the district official and the host of any meeting would be liable to punishment if there was any "disobedience". The fourth rule demanded that Anabaptists completely refrain from making proselytes. If an individual from a non-Anabaptist background wished to join the denomination, they would have to be reported to a district official who would then direct them to the state church minister of the local parish. This minister would "examine" the person and was to attempt to prevent them from joining the "sect".

These proclamations regarding, meetings, proselytizing, marriage and children would prove to very detrimental to Fröhlich's activities and personal circumstances.¹²⁹

Persecution of the Evangelical Baptists

There are numerous examples of persecution of the Evangelical Baptists and Fröhlich in particular. For example, in Zurich, in 1837, the Evangelical Baptists had been warned by the authorities not to hold meetings. When they did, these meetings were interrupted, participants were beaten and fined. Some preachers were banned from the territory and newly baptized people were beaten with staves and almost drowned.¹³⁰ In Canton Zurich as late as 1839, Any Anabaptists
who did not have their children baptized were forced to leave their homes.\textsuperscript{131}

In 1843 in the city of Rohr, a law was proposed that imposed a penalty of three years imprisonment on those who did not baptize their children and a sentence of nine years for those couples who did not marry in the state-church.\textsuperscript{132}

In canton Aargau, Ruegger reports that between 1846 and at least until 1853, the Evangelical Baptist’s meetings were repeatedly disrupted and the police often led the preachers away in handcuffs.\textsuperscript{133} In the city of Bachenbuelach in 1850, two fathers were forced to appear in court because their daughters did not attend the Sunday services in the state-church. The girls were arrested and forced to receive "instruction" from the state-church until they agreed to co-operate.\textsuperscript{134}

As a result of the harsh treatment of Anabaptists in general and in this instance, the Evangelical Baptists, Fröhlich and his followers were very cynical about the government because it appeared to be so closely aligned with the Reformed church. The civil government was an instrument that enforced the dictates of the church. In one essay Fröhlich protested the status quo and stated: "The Protestants deprive us of our civic rights just on account of these human decrees,..."\textsuperscript{135} The "human decrees" that Fröhlich
referred to were infant baptism, communion, confirmation, marriage, ordination, and absolution. They are referred to as human decrees in this instance because Fröhlich feels that they were abrogated from their earliest form and meaning and were now used as instruments to maintain power.¹³⁶

Fröhlich's Personal Circumstances

Samuel Fröhlich had married Susette Brunschwiler of Hauptwil in August of 1836. This marriage did not take place in the state-church and consequently was not recognized by the civil authorities in Hauptwil. When the couple returned to Fröhlich's hometown of Brugg, canton Aargau, the local church denied Susette citizenship. When the couple attempted to deposit a residence certificate for the both of them, they were issued one for Samuel alone. This had the effect of removing any appearance of legitimacy for the marriage.¹³⁷

Susette returned to Hauptwil where she gave birth to a son early in 1841. Fröhlich was not allowed¹³⁸ to go to his wife on the occasion of the birth and the local pastor demanded that Susette start paternity proceedings against Samuel. When Fröhlich's young daughter became very ill in June of 1841, he rushed to her side but was not allowed to remain in town overnight. The young child died the following month during a period in which Fröhlich was forced to stay away from Hauptwil. When another son was born the following
year, Fröhlich was jailed, and his wife was fined. In 1844 Fröhlich made an attempt to bring his marriage "papers" into order and was informed that if he would allow his children to be baptized and confirmed, his marriage would be recognized. His personal convictions would not allow this so Fröhlich moved to Strassburg where his marriage was finally officially recognized in 1846, after a separation from his family of some seven years.

Denominational Growth - Overview

Fröhlich began establishing churches in 1831-1832. By 1840 there were 55 churches and by 1850 there were 110. In spite of the persecution of Fröhlich and his followers the Evangelical Baptists established congregations not only in Switzerland, but also in Germany, Austria and France. The movement also spread to Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Romania where they became known as the "Nazarenes." In some areas the movement grew quite quickly. Another significant expansion occurred when members of the movement first came to North America in 1847.

In the 20th. century the movement has spread to South America (Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay), Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Australia, Japan, Ghana, Puerto Rico and India. The expansion of churches are often the result of individual missionary efforts or immigration. Other than in Brazil and
Papua New Guinea, for the most part, the denominations presence in these countries is quite small. There are fairly dynamic "church planting" efforts centred in the Brazilian Amazon, as well as the highlands of Papua New Guinea. These efforts have resulted in a denominational population that now possibly consists of more non-Europeans than those of European ancestry. This is probably a situation that Samuel Fröhlich never would have imagined, but probably would have approved of, given his evangelical inclinations.

North America

The Fröhlich movement was introduced to North America by a young Evangelical Baptist elder named Benedict Weyeneth in 1847. The movement was not introduced to North America because of any concerted evangelistic effort, but came as a result of a request by Amish Mennonites in Lewis County, New York who had written to Samuel Fröhlich requesting that he mediate and help resolve internal problems among the Amish Mennonite community in that area. Fröhlich had been recommended to this Amish Mennonite community by a former member of Fröhlich's Evangelical Baptist Church in Europe.149

The first Evangelical Baptist Church was established in Croghan, New York in 1852.150 A number of the first members of the Evangelical Baptist Churches were from the Mennonites and Amish.151 In fact even today some of these churches are known
as the New Amish as a result of having originally been located in Amish Mennonite communities and receiving a considerable number of adherents from them.¹⁵²

Even though the Evangelical Baptists in America were sometimes known as the New Amish there has never been any substantial Amish influence on them. This situation is similar to that in the Emmental in Switzerland where Mennonites who joined with the Evangelical Baptists were called Neu Taufer as opposed to the Alt Taufer who remained in the Mennonite church. The difference in this instance is that the Emmental Mennonite Church had considerable influence on Fröhlich's religious views.¹⁵³

By the turn of the century there were congregations of Evangelical Baptists in 13 states (USA). In the 1920's, churches were established in Chicago, Illinois and Phoenix, Arizona. Until this time most of the churches had been established in rural areas or small towns. Small congregations were also started in Ontario about this time.

The Apostolic Christian Church - North America

In many countries in Europe, those churches that were a part of the Fröhlich movement were known as Evangelical Baptists except in countries such as Hungary, Yugoslavia and Romania where they came to be known as Nazarenes. The early churches of the movement in North America were also known as
Evangalical Baptists.

The church in North America became concerned that the name Evangalical Baptist would imply a relationship with the various Baptist denominations in America. The church wanted it to be clear that they were distinct from the Baptist tradition. Prior even to 1900, many of the churches began to refer to their congregations by some variation of the name "Apostolic Christian".154

About the time of World War I, it became necessary for the denomination to register a common name that could be used by the young men of the church who were registering for the draft. About 1917-1918 it was decided that the "basic" name of the movement would be the Apostolic Christian Church.155

North American Schisms

In the twentieth century there have been a number of schisms among the Apostolic Christians in North America. The largest schism took place in about 1906-1907. Put simply, the churches in North America divided between those groups that had come from an Amish or Mennonite background and others who had been exposed to the teaching of the Evangelical Baptists in Europe, but whose religious background was Catholic, Orthodox or Protestant.156 Those who did not have an Amish or Mennonite heritage apparently did not readily accept many of the practices, doctrines and traditions that were a part of an Anabaptist heritage that was already some three centuries
old. Whereas many of those who came from an Anabaptist background were content to live a "quiet", rural life, their counterparts were often from urban areas, better educated, and were more evangelistic.\textsuperscript{157}

Those from the Amish and Mennonite background became the larger group, known as the Apostolic Christian Church of America.\textsuperscript{158} This group until very recently, had little to do with the movement in Europe and its leadership was North American. The other group, maintained close ties with the European movement and was under the auspices of European leaders for many years. This latter group is known as the Apostolic Christian Church (Nazarean).\textsuperscript{159}

The Hungarian, Yugoslavian, and Romanian churches allied themselves with the "Nazarean" group in North America. There also were a number of German and Swiss members who remained with this group.

A number of attempts at a reconciliation between the Apostolic Christian Church (Nazarean) and the Apostolic Christian Church of America have been unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{160} In terms of doctrine and theology, the differences between the groups are minor.\textsuperscript{161} Differences are more apparent in cultural traditions and customs. Even though there is little "official" contact between the two groups they do co-operate in charitable and relief efforts.
CHAPTER II

The Nazarenes of Eastern Europe

If one can point to any significant influence or developments that can be said to be a result of the legacy of Samuel Fröhlich, one would probably have to mention the growth of the movement whose adherents were called the Nazarenes and their practice of nonresistance. Cornelius J. Dyck, has written that the Nazarenes have managed "... to retain many of the early Anabaptist emphases in a remarkable way...They are the only Slavic people knowing Anabaptist doctrine and seeking to follow it..."¹

The Evangelical Baptist movement was introduced to Hungary in 1839 by a couple of locksmiths who had travelled to Switzerland to find work. During their stay they came into contact with the Fröhlich movement and accepted his doctrines and were baptized.² Their return to Hungary and subsequent evangelistic activities marked the beginning of the Evangelical Baptist movement in Hungary and among the Slavic people.

In the early days of the Evangelical Baptist movement, churches in Hungary and Yugoslavia grew quite quickly. In Hungary the Nazarenes were largely a rural sect and most of the members were peasants and illiterate, especially at the outset of the movement.³ One source states that prior to World War I, there were 236 congregations, including about 86,000
members in Hungary. With the changing borders after the war, the influence of communism after the Second World War, and losses due to emigration, by 1984 there were only about 39 congregations remaining with a membership of approximately 2100 and 1000 children. Another source states that by 1927, in Yugoslavia, there were 225 Nazarene churches with a total of about 25,000 members. By 1997 there were about 180 churches remaining with a membership of 3470. Many of these churches today have less than 10 members and these consist almost entirely of old people. Since the onset of war in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990's, it is reported that some of these churches are growing again, and younger people are once again attending, a phenomenon that was highly discouraged during the communist era.

Non-Resistance and Pacifism among the Nazarenes

The Nazarenes and Apostolic Christian Church have always been relatively small in number. In terms of their influence on religion in general and society at large, they have been quite inconsequential and non-influential in most aspects of their doctrines and theology. One area where this may not be true is the denominations stand on pacifism and their experience as pacifists. The persecution the Nazarenes suffered as conscientious objectors was quite well documented in the courts and newspapers of Hungary, Yugoslavia and also in Czech.
The North American (Apostolic Christian) Church, did not experience the same degree of persecution for refusing to take up arms as did the Nazarenes. There are recorded incidents of conscientious objectors, in the United States, being beaten and imprisoned for refusing to bear arms. These incidents occurred about the time of World War I, when the United States still did not have a policy in place regarding the treatment of conscientious objectors.

In Apostolic Christian and Nazarene churches today, baptismal candidates are required to commit themselves to pacifism and also make a verbal public declaration or promise regarding this commitment. If drafted into the military they will agree to serve their country, but only in a non-combatant capacity that does not require the bearing of arms.

Anabaptist Nonresistance and Pacifism

The Anabaptist aversion to warfare was first expressed in the (1527) Schleitheim Confession. A notable exception to this stance was the position taken by the fringe group in Münster (1534-40) but this movement was shortlived and atypical. Anabaptists throughout Europe suffered for centuries for refusing to serve in the military and swear oaths. Many examples of these incidents are recorded in volumes such as T.J. van Braght's Martyrs Mirror which was first published in 1660.
In Anabaptist history, the term "nonresistance" has come to indicate the conviction of those who believe it is God's will that warfare and any other compulsive means for furthering social or personal ends must be renounced. The term "pacifism" is derived from the Latin for "peacemakers" as found in the words of Jesus in Matthew 5:9 "Blessed are the peacemakers". Generally, Christian pacifism is synonymous with, or identical in meaning to nonresistance.

What we mean by "Christian" pacifism can be understood by examining the following distinctions. In general, the term pacifism may be used to cover different varieties of peacemaking which may or may not be Christian in their orientation or are based upon philosophical or political considerations that are not based upon New Testament ethics. Where pacifism often sees peace as an end in itself, the New Testament gospel suggests that peace is not only "social and political reconstruction", but a radical change in the human heart.

The touchstone for Christian pacifism is the example and words of Christ in - Matt. 5:39a, "But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil".

While the terms pacifism and nonresistance are often used interchangeably in Anabaptist traditions, quite often we find the term pacifism associated with warfare. The term nonresistance is also used in this respect, as well as in those instances that apply to personal relations with the
understanding that nonresistance has implications for every phase of one’s life, and first of all, in interpersonal relations. For example, in 1941 the Mennonite Church issued a declaration of the principle of nonresistance, as applied to industrial relations. "We believe that industrial strife and unjust practices by employers or employees, and every economic and social condition and practice which makes for suffering or ill will among men is altogether contrary to the teaching and spirit of Christ and the Gospel." This statement is one relatively contemporary expression of the practical manifestation of the principal of nonresistance.

**Nazarenes and Nonresistance**

From an early stage, nonresistance became an important aspect of the doctrine of the Fröhlich movement. An elder in the Mennonite Church at Emmental pointed out to Fröhlich that his written statement of faith did not cover military service. The Mennonite claim is that it was from this point on, that objection to military service became a doctrine of the Fröhlich movement. 

While the history of Anabaptist nonresistance and pacifism in countries such as Switzerland, Germany and Russia is reasonably well known and chronicled, the history of Nazarene nonresistance is one of the least known in Anabaptist history.
Nazarenes and Nonresistance in Hungary

There is evidence of Nazarenes objecting to military service in Hungary as early as the 1850's. Even though Nazarene nonresistance closely paralleled that of Mennonite nonresistance, the treatment the Nazarene's received when they objected to military service, was harsher than the treatment received by Mennonite objectors at that time. Not only were Nazarenes imprisoned for lengthy periods (up to 15 years), there are instances where Nazarenes were retried, resentenced, and reimprisoned for refusing to take up arms even after serving their original sentence. Military authorities would also punish them with beatings and other deprivations. In some instances the military would tie rifles to those prisoners who refused to handle them and force them to stay in small cells in this condition.

Though there were provisions that allowed for exemption from the actual bearing of arms, this exemption was withheld from Nazarene objectors and granted to the Mennonites even though the Nazarenes had agreed to undertake non-combatant duties in the army. One explanation for the discrepancy in treatment between the Mennonites and Nazarenes is that the latter were a visible proselytizing group. The Mennonites by this time had lost much of their missionary zeal and were not always "visible". It was possibly the Nazarene's potential
for expansion and not necessarily their nonresistant principles that was the primary cause for their more severe treatment.25

It appeared that as long as the Nazarenes maintained their missionary drive, their lot as conscientious objectors was difficult.26 Nazarene activities were centred in an area of social and ethnic tension, and converts were drawn from both the peasant class and various national minorities, two groups that often overlapped.

The Hungarian government was concerned with establishing control over the various ethnic groups within its borders. The Nazarenes appeared to be a channel for rural protest against an oppressive agrarian system that appeared threatening to the landowning nobility and so the Nazarenes implied a threat to the existing order.27

One other important reason for the ill-treatment of Nazarene conscientious objectors was the perception by the government that individuals were becoming members of the sect in an attempt to evade military service. Many of the young Nazarenes became members of the church one or two years prior to the age when they became eligible for military service. This, made the government suspicious, and in 1875 it drafted a new regulation which made it necessary for Nazarenes to bear arms and not merely to be drafted for alternative service. The Nazarenes responded that they would be willing
to work in non-combatant positions, but would not train with a weapon or use one against another human being.\textsuperscript{28}

Even in the twentieth century, the situation for Nazarene conscientious objectors in Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Romania, was very difficult. At the turn of the century many were imprisoned, some for up to 12 years.\textsuperscript{29} During World War I some objectors were executed. During the period between the wars, and then in the post World War II communist regimes, Nazarenes were still imprisoned for long periods of time.\textsuperscript{30}

**Nazarenes and Nonresistance in Yugoslavia**

The plight of Nazarenes in Yugoslavia was similar to their experience in Hungary. The Yugoslavs were incorporated into Austro-Hungary in 1867\textsuperscript{31} and the Serbo-Croatian-Slovene Kingdom of Yugoslavia was proclaimed in 1918.\textsuperscript{32} At various times during these periods, the government demanded that men serve in the armed forces. The Nazarenes kept few records, so much of their nineteenth century experience as conscientious objectors is not documented. This is not to say that their experience was unknown in the public domain. At one point there were so many reports and newspaper articles about the plight of Nazarene conscientious objectors, that they caught the attention of Tolstoy, who then came to their defence.\textsuperscript{33}

Tolstoy cited those Nazarenes who were imprisoned for refusing to take the oath and bear arms as the sort of people through whom "salvation" would come. This comment was made in
the context of a discussion about who was most capable of transforming society. Tolstoy said the following about Nazarene conscientious objectors:

Salvation, I believe will come neither from the workmen who are socialistically inclined nor from their leaders, but only from people who will accept religion as their only guide in life, as the Nazarenes in Serbia and others in certain places in Austria do--namely, that hundreds of them refuse to take the oath and do military service and are condemned for this to spend years in prisons and fortresses. It is only from such men as these who are ready to give up their lives for their convictions that salvation will come.34

In September of 1924, all men of military age (ages 20 to 50) were required to join the army. A 1926 document, from the archives of the court section of the "Yugoslav Ministry of War and the Navy" specifically addresses the treatment of Nazarene military recruits.35 In this report they are described as being a sect who are misled by "fanatical dogmas" who do not perform their "sacred" duty as citizens toward their king and country. They are accused of refusing to take the oath36 and refusing to bear arms. By not performing their duty as citizens and soldiers they were perceived as being harmful and dangerous to the state and the army. Nazarenes were to be punished and imprisoned until "...this harmful sect is actually and thoroughly suppressed."37

Similar to the experience of the Nazarenes in Hungary,
some of the Yugoslavian Nazarene conscientious objectors were repeatedly imprisoned. As mentioned above, the Yugoslavian army did not only draft young recruits but also men between the ages of 30 to 50. There were instances where 50 year old men who had already served up to 12 years in prison for refusing to take the oath and bear arms were sentenced to an additional 10 years in prison. Nazarene prisoners were sometimes sentenced to hard labour, were beaten, and tortured. One account describes how sandbags were piled on prisoners until they almost suffocated, after which they were beaten.

According to Yugoslavian government records, there were Nazarenes who submitted to the authorities. It is unclear from the document cited here, whether or not these Nazarenes actually took the oath, took up arms or what their level of co-operation was. A statement in this document says only that they completed their military service to the satisfaction of their superiors and goes on to say that "...there are still a large number of imprisoned fanatics left, who persist in their obedience to the bitter end".

The treatment of Nazarene conscientious objectors has improved in the latter parts of the twentieth century. At the time of the events mentioned above (1920's), the Nazarene situation was addressed at meetings of the League of Nations in Brussels. At one point an American law firm was retained
to research the laws regarding the treatment of conscientious objectors in other European countries with the goal of establishing policies in Yugoslavia that were acceptable to the government and the Nazarenes.46

As good as these intentions might have been, the communist era brought with it new tensions and persecutions for the Yugoslavian and Hungarian Nazarenes. Once again, many Nazarenes were imprisoned for their convictions. Since the demise of communism in Europe, Nazarenes are no longer imprisoned for not taking the oath or bearing arms but are permitted to serve in non-combatant capacities.47

The experience of the Nazarenes in Europe as well as the Apostolic Christians in America is still a very vivid legacy in the collective memory of the denomination. The baptismal catechism still assumes that the government may call the members of the denomination to serve in the military against their will and asks that the members commit themselves to the ideal of nonresistance and pacifism. This commitment is traced to the Anabaptist influence on Samuel Fröhlich and his subsequent imprint upon the movement he founded.
Anabaptist Theology and the Traditional Systematic Theological Categories

Introduction

Samuel Fröhlich's writing does not explicitly state which individuals or traditions largely influenced and informed his theology. Chapters III and IV of this work will analyse Fröhlich's writing in order to determine whether theologically speaking, Fröhlich is within the Anabaptist tradition. This will be accomplished by examining early and traditional Anabaptist approaches to theology, in order to affirm whether or not this was also Fröhlich's "approach" to theology. Fröhlich's theology will then be compared to "typical" Anabaptist theology, and Protestant and Catholic theologies, in order to determine whether Fröhlich best fits into the Anabaptist or "mainline" traditions.

A reading of the early Anabaptist writings quickly reveals that other than Balthasar Hubmaier¹ there were no trained theologians among the various Anabaptist writers.² Being a trained theologian, Hubmaier often expressed his convictions by utilizing the traditional theological categories, but he was atypical of the other early Anabaptist writers.³
Among Anabaptists, there is an old and almost universal perspective that is distrustful of theology. The Anabaptist rejection of academic theology was based on the view that theological speculation and disputation were a type of rational intellectualizing that was divorced from the Anabaptist emphasis on piety, holy living, "newness of life" and discipleship.

This view was reinforced among early Anabaptists who suffered bitterly at the hands of Lutheran, Reformed and Catholic theologians. In the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, theologically trained clergy were often the harshest critics of the Anabaptists and their writings typically condemned their theology.4

Fröhlich expressed a similar reservation about theological training in a comment about Christ's response to Peter in Matthew 16: 17,18. "Jesus does here not praise the studied, mechanical, rote-taught, systematic learning that he is Christ the Son of the living God, but rather the inward revelation of this mystery from God..."5

Theology, as a system, was considered to be of no real value in helping humanity cope with their "earthly" predicament. One rendering of this Anabaptist view suggests that this dynamic might be understood by differentiating between what has been called implicit and explicit theology.
Implicit or implied theology consists of those basic convictions that were the basis of Christ's parables and sermons as found in the Gospels. Anabaptist theology has traditionally been the attempt to understand and express the "message" of the Bible and especially the New Testament, as it applied to daily life. The Church Fathers, scholars and especially scholastic theologians, then developed specific systems and theological terms from these basic convictions which at one point had been more a part of religious life than religious thought.

It has been suggested that when Christianity encountered Greek philosophy, it became theology. A contemporary expression of this distinction may be the relationship of theological to existential thinking. One Mennonite claim is that:

Ever since the days of the apostolic church, Anabaptism is the only example in church history of an existential Christianity" where there existed no basic split between faith and life, even though the struggle for realization or actualization of this faith into practice remained a perennial task.

In terms of the "classic" theological points of historic Christianity, the Anabaptists were in basic agreement with the major Protestant groups. It is probably insufficient to state that Anabaptism was only Reformation Protestantism with
an emphasis on concepts such as believers baptism, and the "free" church, but:

"...Anabaptism is theologically a major type of Protestantism with a theological focus of its own alongside of Lutheranism and Calvinism. It is related to both the latter positions, but through its emphasis on the Lordship of Christ, obedient discipleship, and the visible church, it is more closely related to Calvinism".¹⁰

The greatest diversity or divide between Anabaptism and Protestant theology and Catholicism for that matter was in the doctrine of the church. Anabaptists did not accept the medieval concept of Christian social order (the state church). They were the first to insist upon a free church, separate from the state and the "world", consisting only of a community of committed disciples, where there was no ecclesiastical hierarchy, but all were responsible for maintaining a disciplined life in the church.

The Anabaptist doctrine of the two kingdoms, suggested that one kingdom was the kingdom of Christ and the other kingdom was the kingdom of this "world" which is ruled by Satan. This served to draw a line between the church (Anabaptist perspective) and the general social order. In this instance the state was in this general social order and "outside the perfection of Christ".¹¹

The "church" also understood itself as being a suffering
body attempting to maintain a holy community while suffering as a result of its conflict with the kingdom of this world. The notion of the suffering Christian being persecuted by the "world" is a common Anabaptist motif. Fröhlich identified quite closely with this perspective. He believed that the true Christian must suffer, as Christ also suffered at the hands of the ecclesiastical establishment. In Fröhlich's case the persecution he experienced was at the hand of the church-state alliance and to him this was a fulfilment of the suffering experienced by the believers of the Bible. From Fröhlich's perspective, like Christ, "...our way leads through suffering to glory."

Finally, one should not expect a "complete" systematic theology from Anabaptist stalwarts such as Hubmaier or Menno Simons, let alone Samuel Fröhlich. Their extant writing typically consist of their written responses to critics, exhortations to churches they were in contact with, letters to contemporaries, copies of sermons, etc.

Fröhlich, like many Anabaptists, never set out to construct comprehensive theological systems. The following insights of Fröhlich, Hubmaier and Simons on the traditional theological categories, represent only what could gleaned from their extant writing on these categories. Their writing did not in any way provide, what could be considered a complete systematic theology.
Fröhlich's Theological Anthropology

Theological anthropology has been defined as "...the systematic study of what the Christian message of salvation and theological reflection on it teach about man's nature, history and human destiny; of its own it constitutes a science of man." Theological anthropology does not set aside sciences such as anthropology proper, psychology or sociology but purports to draw on them for a deeper or different understanding.

The topic of Fröhlich's theological anthropology will be engaged by comparing his anthropology, to anthropologies of persons who are representative of Anabaptism. Robert Friedmann in his Theology of Anabaptism suggests that in general, Hubmaier's anthropology "...is also general Anabaptist teaching concerning the nature of humanity as found nearly everywhere in Anabaptist writings, whether by Grebel or Marpeck, by Rutter or Menno Simons..." Fröhlich's anthropology will be compared with aspects of Balthasar Hubmaier's and Menno Simons' anthropologies in order to demonstrate that Fröhlich's anthropology was quite clearly compatible with typical Anabaptist anthropologies.

In the first part of this chapter this comparison will be effected by comparing Fröhlich's understanding of the relationship between the "body, soul and spirit with
Hubmaier's understanding of this relationship. The second part of this chapter will be comprised of a discussion on "sin and human nature" as understood from the writing of Menno Simons and Fröhlich. This section will include a discussion on the nature of "sin in children" and "their culpability for sin".

Hubmaier and Fröhlich's Theological Anthropology

Balthasar Hubmaier was a German priest and doctor of theology who became a close friend and co-worker of Zwingli in Zurich. While initially showing little sympathy for the young Reformation movement, he eventually became an outspoken Reformer. Hubmaier's relationship with Zwingli became estranged as a result of Hubmaier's rejection of infant baptism. Hubmaier, and about 60 others, were baptized in 1525 and Hubmaier was soon recognized as a leader of the Anabaptists. Hubmaier's anthropology is found substantially in a tract written in 1527 entitled, On Free Will.

Fröhlich's anthropology is for the most part found in an article entitled Soul and Spirit. This discourse was part of a sermon on Psalm 6:1-3 that was presented in June of 1838. The topic is also broached in a number of other instances, usually within the confines of notes on various sermons. The article "Soul and Spirit" appears to be a
summary of Fröhlich's understanding of the relationship between body, soul and spirit.

Fröhlich concludes this short piece with the comment that his discussion constitutes "...the main features of real anthropology". In a way this is a fair assessment in that Fröhlich's anthropology is by no means a fully developed argument. This article is simply an outline of the main features of his anthropology, outlined in the context of the notes of a sermon. This anthropology is typical of the time and genre in that it examines the unity and relationship of the body, soul and spirit.

Body, Soul and Spirit

From the outset, Fröhlich acknowledges the problem of distinguishing the difference between, or the relationship of the body, soul and spirit. He observes that in some instances the physical or animal existence of the body is referred to as the soul and other times as the spirit. In other instances this animal existence is called the body and the term soul is then referring to the locus of human intellectual and emotional activity. In either case, Fröhlich's use of the terms body, soul and spirit, is comparable to Hubmaier's. Any differences in discussions centred about the use of these terms are not about definitions but in how Hubmaier and Fröhlich perceive their relationship.
Hubmaier posits a tripartite anthropology that is suggested in Genesis 2:7 and 1 Thessalonians 5:23, where three elements are distinguished: the body, soul, and spirit. Hubmaier's translation of the Greek names of the three elements is quite typical or universal.¹⁹ This is not to say that Hubmaier's or Fröhlich's understanding of these terms diffuse the ambiguity between the uses of the terms soul and spirit or soul and body, which in the New Testament, as well as in the Old Testament, seem to be used interchangeably, on occasion.

For our purposes we will use the following definitions, as they are compatible to both Fröhlich and Hubmaier. From the Greek, soma is translated as the body, being the physical or animal existence of the person. Psyche is the soul; that which animates the body. In the Bible this term is used variously to indicate the "location" or "seat" of the sentient element in humans, namely being that by which the individual perceives, reflects, feels, desires etc.²⁰, or it is on this level of human experience that we encounter intellectual and emotional activity.

Pneuma primarily denotes "wind" or "breath" and in the New Testament is usually translated as "spirit".²¹ Unlike the soul, where the intellect may be meager, and the emotions confused, the spirit is more than just psychological, it is the foundation for the psychological. The spiritual aspect of
humanity is the domain of personhood; where we believe, love, and exhibit self-awareness. A person's spirit is that component that allows for the possibility of transcendence and the possibility of relating to God who is spirit.  

**Fröhlich and Hubmaier on the Body, Soul and Spirit**

In Hubmaier's synthesis of the relationship between body, soul, and spirit, the body is made by God "of the earth" and the spirit was aroused by God breathing into Adam's nostrils. The soul in this instance is between the body and spirit, but in most instances is in servitude to the body.

This perspective serves to allow for a positive interpretation of human existence where the spirit remains "upright" and "intact", before, during and after the Fall. Hubmaier has a tool for blaming the soul for any "corruption" while exonerating the spirit of all blemish. In this way there is no such thing as total depravity, for the very core of humanity has remained uncorrupted and is able to understand God's grace and goodness. This conception of spirit is the connection by which humans are able to grasp the divine and be restored.

Fröhlich is not as positive about the "spirit" as is Hubmaier. According to Fröhlich, the spirit has been foreordained or its destiny should be to "...have fellowship with God, know Him, love Him and seek after that which is
But, the spirit finds itself the servant of the soul, where the spirit "...devotes its sagacity and all its powers to the service of vanity, the passing, sinful things in this visible world". Sin is that which effects the servitude of the spirit to the soul; it was in order to enable the freedom of the spirit that Christ came. Here Fröhlich cites a portion of Heb. 4:12 that states that "...the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit..."

When this separation has taken place the spirit can be truly free of any undo influences of the soul, and now has the capability to resist further corruption of the spirit. This is not a battle that was only once fought, but is a war that is engaged daily, wherein the inner person is continually renewed.

The Nature of Sin in Fröhlich and Menno Simons

Menno Simons was a key figure in the Anabaptist movement, and as such, a survey of his anthropology and understanding of the nature of sin will assist in demonstrating that Fröhlich's understanding of these themes locates his thought quite squarely among the Anabaptists. Simons is useful at this juncture because of his relatively
expansive discussions on the nature of sin, and especially his detailed observations on the "categories of sin".

This portion of the chapter will open with some comments on Menno Simon's anthropology and will be followed by a survey of the notion of "original sin" in Simons and Fröhlich. This will be followed by a comparison of Fröhlich's and Simon's understanding of the various "categories of sin". This chapter will conclude with a discussion on "sin and children". The Anabaptist position represented by Fröhlich and Simons will be compared to the Roman Catholic understanding of sin and children.

**Menno Simons on Original Sin**

The first booklet Simons wrote after his denunciation of Roman Catholicism was entitled *The Spiritual Resurrection*. From this discussion we can understand Simons' perception of the human condition before the individual takes part in what Simons describes as the two resurrections. Simons explains that the Scriptures teach of two resurrections, namely a "...bodily resurrection from the dead at the last day, and a spiritual resurrection from sin and death to a new life and a change of heart". Our interest at this point will be with the latter issue and the understanding of the "old" life and "heart". Simons describes this condition as a body of sin that must be destroyed and buried.
Simons is not very positive about the "unresurrected" individual and says that according to our "natural birth", we are "...nothing but unclean slime... conceived and born in sin..." Our "common parents", Adam and Eve, were created in the image of God and were pure and righteous until they became impure and subject to corruption as a result of their disobedience. Adam and Eve were driven from Paradise. If they wished to eat they had to labour. Childbearing for Eve and her daughters was now done in pain and they were to be in subjection to their husbands.

From this point on, Adam and Eve and all their descendants have been under the curse and servitude of death and the devil. We are "...all born of unclean seed" and through the "earthly Adam" have become "...wholly depraved and children of death and hell". Simons states that "all creatures bring forth after their kind" and that all creatures take on the "properties, propensities, and dispositions" of their origins. Having the sinful nature of Adam, being carnally minded and born "out of earth through corruptible seed", we cannot understand spiritual things and are hostile to God. We are by "nature a child of the devil" and the fruit of a "devilish seed", this fruit being the inherited sinful nature.
Fröhlich on Original Sin

From I John 2:2, Fröhlich understands human culpability for "original sin" as follows: "The vicarious death of Jesus on the cross lay in the eternal counsel and will of God, in order to reconcile God with us from the sin of Adam ... so that the world is now without blame of the original sin." Fröhlich makes it clear that it is God's will that all can experience salvation.

We are not unconditionally chosen or rejected. No one is condemned because of Adam, but only on account of one's unbelief. "...on God's part no man is excluded - predestined for damnation - unless man excludes himself from this redeeming power."

From Adam and through birth we have received a sinful nature but are not guilty of Adam's sin. Original sin can and must be separated from humanity. All humanity following Adam are guilty only of their own sin, but can be justified for Christ's sake and redeemed from sin itself. Original sin is not something we need to be forgiven of, since we have not incurred the guilt of original sin upon ourselves but have inherited it.

Fröhlich does not wholly denigrate our "body" but offers a particularly positive perspective. He acknowledges the sometimes lamentable demands and desires of our human nature which can manifest themselves as pride, haughtiness, vanity.
He states that: "We shall, however, on the other hand, also not consider and call our body contemptible as many do through false humility, but we shall keep it honorable as a temple of the Holy Ghost, and shall consider that our body is too good, too holy for us to give it up to the service of sin and impurity." 39

**Sin Categorized**

In Menno Simons' rendition of the various sorts of sin, he describes what he calls sin of "the first kind" namely a corrupt and sinful nature which is inherited at birth by all the descendants and children of "corrupt, sinful Adam". Simons states that this condition "is not inaptly called original sin." 40 To be "Adam-like" or of the "first birth of man" is to be carnally minded, unbelieving, disobedient and blind to divine things, the end of which is damnation and eternal death. 41

The "second kind of sin" or actual sin is the "fruit" of the first sin. Simons identifies these as: adultery, fornication, avarice, dissipation (wasteful), drunkenness, hatred, envy, lying, theft, murder, and idolatry. These "actual sins" are the fruit of the "mother" or original sin. The Apostle Paul also called these sins "works of the flesh" (Gal. 5) having their origin in the corruption and sinfulness of Adam. 42
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Simons describes a "third kind of sin" which are those human frailties, errors and "stumblings" characterized by careless thoughts, words and unpremeditated lapses in conduct. This aspect of the human condition is described as one that affects also "saints and regenerate ones", the difference being that those who are unchanged from their "first birth" are blind or do not know or recognize their sinful condition. Those who are "born from above" realize their errors and are involved in a daily fight against "their weak flesh".43

Simons' fourth category of sin describes the condition where one willfully renounces their knowledge of God and the grace of God after they have "...received the true knowledge of Christ and His holy Word...tasted the heavenly gifts... and is born of God".44

Fröhlich's approach to "categorizing" sin does not take the form of Simons' "system", nor would he agree with Simons' conclusions. In general it can be said that Simons and Fröhlich are in accord with what Simons calls his first category of sin namely that of the original sin. If there is any difference in this category we find it in the nature of the original sin in children. This will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. In general, Simons simply states that infants and children do not require baptism because of the grace of God. While Fröhlich agrees with this
claim, his approach is different in that he is quite expansive with arguments that differentiate the nature of Adam's sin from the culpable guilt of Adam's sin.

Fröhlich is generally in accord with Simons' third category of sin, namely those situations where one sins not out of habit, but more out of carelessness or in some unguarded moment. Fröhlich also acknowledges the impetuousness of youth and concedes that a "false step" can even be excusable in those instances in which we might not excuse a mature adult as readily.

In terms of Simons' second (original sin) and fourth (willful renunciation of God's grace) categories of sin, Fröhlich makes some distinctions that are not accounted for by Simons. In terms of Simons' fourth category, both are in agreement that there can exist that position where one willfully turns away from God's grace after having once experienced it. In the Anabaptist tradition this is represented by a baptized adult who willfully turns away from God's grace. Fröhlich at this point is quite particular as to which sins represent this willful turning away.

In Simon's second category he lists a number of sins that are the "fruits" of our inherited nature or the original sin. Fröhlich would agree with this premise but finds that some of these belong in a special category. Fröhlich takes his direction from 1 John 5:16, a scripture that refers to
"sins unto death", sins that Fröhlich describes as being of a sort that cannot be forgiven. While Fröhlich's explanation of the nature of sins unto death is similar to the sin of Simon's fourth category he claims the following. Sins unto death are actions such as murder, adultery or fornication, sins that were punished by death under the "law" in the Old Testament. Simons does not take this step, but includes these sins along with actions such as envy, lying, theft and idolatry.

Culpability of Sin in Children

In regard to the nature of the original sin of Adam and its effect upon children, Catholic theologians and teachers have not always been in complete agreement but generally have agreed that children "receive" the guilt of Adam (The arguments for the mode of transmission will not be broached here).

From the Council of Trent we understand that both bodily sin and death have been transmitted to all of Adam's descendents. This original sin is defined by Aquinas as the "culpable privation of original justice" where justice is both integrity and grace. From Trent we also understand that the deprivation of grace has two aspects: in the first instance the nature of sin is an aversion from God and there
is a "penalty" in that humans now do not have the means and power to attain the end to which they were destined.\textsuperscript{52}

In terms of children, unbaptized children do not share in humanities "true end" and are deprived of grace or the "beatific vision of God"\textsuperscript{53} or to state the position bluntly "...it must be clearly understood that the child dying without baptism is definitely lost. He is not in some midway point between salvation and damnation."\textsuperscript{54} It is recognized that the child itself is not rebellious, nor does it hate or blaspheme God, but in this perspective, this does not absolve the child from the words of Christ to Nicodemus: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God", John 3:5.

In terms of the "pain of sense" of the child who dies unbaptized, there are differing perspectives. While admitting that he was unsure on this issue Augustine thought that there might be some sort of "positive pain" but that it would be very light and easy to bear while Aquinas explained that any punishment would be proportionate to the sin. Another Catholic perspective suggests that the child's condition would be one of "true peace and natural happiness".\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{Children and Sin in Simons and Fröhlich}

Menno Simons confronts those who claim that little children are "born of Adam with a sinful or wicked nature"
and therefore must be cleansed of their "original guilt". Simons disagreed with this understanding, his claim being that this teaching was contrary to Scripture.\textsuperscript{56}

Simons' reasoning on this issue would probably be more apt to be included in a discussion on soteriology. In his discussions on children and their culpability for Adam's sin, Menno focuses on the biblical injunctions that require the baptismal candidate to desire baptism as a result of personal faith, the argument being that the infant is not capable of this.\textsuperscript{57} Simons also utilizes the familiar criticism that infant baptism is not found explicitly in the Bible.\textsuperscript{58} In his article entitled "Christian Baptism", Simons simply states that unbaptized infants or children, "...have the promise of everlasting life, out of pure grace."\textsuperscript{59}

Fröhlich's position is similar to that of Simon's in that there is agreement that we all are born with the "curse" of Adam's sinful nature but we do not "inherit" Adam's guilt. Any guilt that is attributed to our account is a result of our own volition and actions after that time that is variously termed "the age of accountability". Simons uses the term "age of discretion"\textsuperscript{60} while Fröhlich describes this as "the age of the knowledge of self".\textsuperscript{61}

Fröhlich's understanding of the nature of sin in children and their culpability or accountability is similar to that of Menno Simons and like Simons he takes issue with
doctrines that would have children guilty of Adam's sin. This traditional aspect of Anabaptist anthropology is in contrast to that of Catholicism and those mainline Protestant denominations that retained infant baptism.

Fröhlich explains that because of Christ, humanity is not culpable for the sin of Adam, but humanity is forgiven because Christ died for all on this account, (11 Cor. 5.). Fröhlich states that, "Sin and guilt are separated from each other. We have inherited sin, but not the guilt of it..."62 Especially in the case of children, before one becomes personally guilty for any sin, it must first develop. Infants or children are saved without having faith or being baptized because "...sin has not yet entered their conscience and has not yet become a deed..."63 Christ has died for the reconciliation of all, but while the guilt of Adam's sin is not imputed to children (while acknowledging that they have a sinful nature) who do not have faith, the reconciliation of Christ is of no effect for those who can understand but do not demonstrate faith.

Fröhlich suggests that the individuals "knowledge of self" or culpability for sin occurs at that point when one is able to recognize the sinful nature they have inherited from Adam. Fröhlich's position once again is that "...the children of Adam sin not in the same way as Adam himself sinned, knowingly and voluntarily, but natural man sins blindly out
of inborn habitude and ignorance of God." Recognition of sin comes, and is "imputed" with the coming of the "law". The "law" being the medium through which sin and unrighteousness are recognized before one realizes atonement and redemption from sin through Christ, is a familiar theme in Fröhlich's writing.
CHAPTER IV - Soteriology

This chapter will compare Roman Catholic and Protestant notions of "baptism" and "grace" with Fröhlich and typical Anabaptist perspectives of these themes. These themes will be introduced with a short outline of the historical context of Anabaptist baptism and the "three Baptisms" of Anabaptism. Infant baptism will be briefly surveyed in the Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed traditions and a more detailed examination of infant baptism in Catholicism will then be contrasted to Fröhlich and the Anabaptist position. This will be followed by a discussion of "grace" which will outline the premises the various traditions utilize to substantiate their stand on baptism. The chapter concludes with an examination of Brethren and Mennonite claims of influence on Fröhlich's baptismal theology and practices.

Anabaptists on Baptism

The Anabaptists' "Radical Reformation" was something more than just a distancing or a matter of relative moves from the Protestant Reformation. There were fundamental differences between the Reformers and those who felt that the Reformers had not moved far enough from the Roman Church and were not being true to what the Bible said of baptism.

The first three articles of the Schleitheim Confession help to clarify the Anabaptist understanding of church
membership through agreement on Baptism, the ban and the Lord's Supper. The section on Baptism in the Confession begins with the following:

"Baptism should be administered to all those who have been instructed regarding repentance and the amendment of life, who truly believe that their sins are taken away through Christ and who desire to walk in the resurrection life of Jesus Christ..." And a few lines further we read: "This excludes all infant baptism, the highest and chief abomination of the pope."¹

The Anabaptist insistence on believers baptism had three underlying components. First was their Biblicism. They concluded from their reading of the New Testament that baptism was inextricably tied to repentance and faith, and as such infants could not be baptized. Second, their concept of church was one of a voluntary fellowship consisting of those who had experienced a "conversion" and were committed to discipleship. Third, an essential aspect of Christianity was articulated as the application of the "Lordship of Christ" to all phases of life, which "...required a type of personal commitment and intelligent discrimination that only adults could have. Believers baptism was thus essential to Anabaptism..."²

While believers baptism was an essential component and event for the Anabaptists, it was their conviction that
baptism was not a singular event. An early Anabaptist, Hans Hut, suggested that "baptism is a lifelong struggle with sin" or in other words, "Christian life for the Anabaptists was a lifelong baptism".3

In attempting to articulate the "lifelong cross of baptism" the Anabaptists took their direction from I John 5:6-8 which speaks of three Baptisms: spirit, water, and blood. The process begins with the "baptism of the Spirit" which "cleansed the person of sin and gave him the power to live the Christian life." This renewal occurred instantly for some while for others this baptism which "was the gift of salvation itself..." renewed the individual through a lengthy process.4

The Spirit baptism is a "pledge of obedience to the Father in imitation of Christ, who was obedient unto death."5 If one is able to "surrender" completely to God, this is a sure sign of the Holy Spirit in one's life. This "inner pledge" can only be made with the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

Through the "baptism of water" the believer witnesses to the birth of the Spirit in their life and proclaims their fellowship with the church. Water baptism has been called the "seal of faith and the inner covenant of God."6 This baptism is not only a testimony of the baptizand but is also a witness by the Christians to the baptizand to confirm the
baptizand's inner belief "...for baptism, like a seal on an envelope is given only when one knows the contents". By bestowing baptism on the individual the church announces their recognition of that person's "...membership with them in Christ." 

The "baptism of blood" was both that of mystics and martyrs. Anabaptists believed that as disciples of Christ and like Christ they:

"...would know suffering and affliction. This would sometimes be the inner suffering of guilt and despair. And, if the consciences of some may not have been sensitive enough to have created the expected trials within, the officials of the civil order were certain to create trials without".

Roman Catholic and Protestant Baptism

From the beginning of Christian history, baptism was an important ordinance or sacrament, (for the liturgical churches) being the ceremony of initiation into the church as originally instituted by Christ in the "Great Commission".

The Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation taught that baptism was efficacious for the washing away of sin and was therefore essential for salvation and should be administered to infants as soon as possible. In Catholicism, a "chief premise is that baptism is God's enacted promise to be faithful to us, not our promise to God. Baptism, then, is God's free gift, not contingent upon us or our worthiness."
Everything turns on what God's gracious self-giving has done for us through the Church.

This suggests that the individuals understanding of infant baptism is closely tied to their ecclesiology. The observation is made that for groups like the Mennonites the church is a gathered, pure, holy sect of saints and as such believers' baptism is a 'natural consequence'. This is in contrast to the "pattern of most of America's larger churches" such as Catholics where the church encompasses Christians who are "...both lukewarm and deeply committed, a congregation both of saints and sinners. They are churches, not sects."¹¹

Being a Catholic is much more than being ethically or religiously converted and even more than being converted to Christianity.

It means accepting Christ as he is mediated through a historic tradition of some twenty centuries and a sequence of cultures. It means both coming to know about Christ, and coming to know him, through a church that calls itself Catholic because historically and culturally it is catholic.¹²

The suggestion is that those who subscribe to a "sectarian mentality" in order to safeguard the purity of the church do so "...at a horrible price, the exclusion of their own children".¹³ It is just as unnatural to treat one's own children as outsiders to the body of Christ until they are
old enough to receive believers baptism as it would be to say that your children are not American until they are old enough to vote.\textsuperscript{14}

It would have been most unnatural in a Jewish atmosphere to treat children as if they were outside of the parents covenant community. There is no evidence that the early church did not baptize infants and current evidence suggests that child baptism was not considered unusual as early as the second century and then did not essentially come into question until the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{15}

It would seem to be inconsistent to include children in the Christian family but exclude them from membership in the body of Christ since Christianity is more than theology. "It is a way of life, a network of relationships of love."\textsuperscript{16} In baptism our lives are changed within the context of loving community relationships as expressed in both the family and the church. This is therefore something deeper than just intellectual cognition. Since baptism is not solely contingent upon our maturity or cognitive abilities, the question is asked, whether we would exclude from baptism those who are feeble-minded simply because their cognitive capabilities are not fully developed.\textsuperscript{17}

Luther and the Lutherans changed the meaning of baptism slightly making it conditional upon the faith of the recipient. Since the infant could not exercise faith it was
claimed that the infant had a "sleeping faith" given by God or a substitute faith that was exercised for the infant by the godparents. The Reformed churches, influenced by Zwingli and Calvin required the baptism of infants but said that baptism was only a symbol of acceptance into the church. The ritual itself had no power to convey grace.18

Even though the meaning of baptism was different for these traditions, they all required the baptism of infants. In one sense the practice was "politically" expedient. This was an effective means to continue and establish national or mass churches.

The Biblical Foundation for Infant Baptism

Part of the reason for the differences in understanding of baptism among various traditions is that the New Testament is not really clear on exactly who should be baptized. Even though there is no explicit case of infant baptism in the N.T., those who support it find evidence in the N.T.

Zwingli's contemporary, Martin Bucer, offered four reasons for Biblical support of infant baptism: 1) There are reports of 'whole households' being baptized and it is assumed that these households included children. 2) Christ blessed the children, affirmed that they belonged in the kingdom of God and all who wished to enter must become like them. 3) Paul stated that children were made holy by their parents (I Corinthians 7:14) 4) The parallel is also drawn
between the covenental initiation rites of baptism of the N.T. and circumcision of the O.T.\textsuperscript{19}

With the emphasis on Scriptural authority that was recovered in the Reformation, the notion of covenant became very important for theology. Zwingli contended that on issues of contention the Church was always to follow the Bible. If the answer was not clear in the N.T. one turned to the O.T. Infant baptism was one of these issues. When the O.T. was consulted he found the precedent of infant circumcision. The N.T. text found in Colossians 2:11,12 seemed to indicate that Christian baptism is the counterpart to the old covenant circumcision.\textsuperscript{20}

Reformed "covenant theology" emphasized the covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17. This was to be the model for the relationship between God and the Christian. Zwingli made the "covenant" the main argument for the Reformed understanding of infant baptism. Calvin in his Institutes and other writings, made extensive use of the idea of covenant in discussions on the unity of the O.T. and N.T. and on the mutuality and conditionality of the covenant.\textsuperscript{21}
Fröhlich and the Anabaptists on the Baptism of Infants

One perspective on "conversion" in Anabaptist thought suggests:

that the Anabaptist position can best be understood by relating conversion and the church as cause and effect. A believers', or voluntary church presupposes believers who have a relationship of faith in Christ. For the Anabaptists the call of grace was to an experience of conversion, confirmed by the Spirit of God by an act of regeneration. This made them members of the body of Christ and thereby responsible members in a brotherhood of believers.22

In Anabaptism we find the emphasis on the "new life in Christ" rather than on church doctrine. Instead of the church being a community where both the regenerate and unregenerate are counted as members, an Anabaptist church is to be a voluntary community of believers comprised of individuals who have been baptized after conversion.

Another Anabaptist expression of the meaning of conversion is the following, by Conrad Grebel, an early Anabaptist leader.

The Scripture signifies that, by faith and the blood of Christ, sins have been washed away for him who is baptized, changes his mind and believes before and after; that it signifies that a man is dead and ought to be dead to sin and walks in the newness of life and spirit, and he shall certainly be saved if, according to this meaning, by inner baptism he lives his faith.23

In Menno Simons writings we also find this appeal for a conversion or inner-transformation which was to manifest
itself in the individual becoming a "new creature" whose entire life is expressed in discipleship. In Anabaptism this new life was a "fruit of the Spirit" where "(t)he entire life of the believer is a work of grace, and is the demonstration of an inner regeneration."24

The Anabaptist concern is that there will be a visible change and definite commitment to a life of discipleship. Anabaptists believe that it is possible to discern a believer from an unbeliever and this is emphasized by Manno Simons who is "very positive as to the individual's way of life being the evidence of conversion or lack of conversion."25

A believers church then is a group of committed disciples of Christ who demonstrate through the "fruit" of regeneration, a genuine conversion. This sort of following of Christ is not just "an imitation of him but an identification with him in all its spiritual meaning."26

Early Anabaptists rejected the suggestion that infants may be baptized on the basis of their "future faith" in Christ. They cited the "Great Commission" of Matt. 28:19,20 where Christ instructed his followers to go into the world and make disciples of all nations and then baptise them and finally instruct those who have been baptised.

This passage in Scripture is also used to support the baptism of infants. If one follows the word order, one is to "make disciples" by first baptizing, and then teaching them.
The Anabaptist response is that faith comes from hearing the Word and the subsequent inner transformation is a move an infant cannot make since they do not know good from evil.\(^{27}\)

In his interpretation of these verses in Matthew 28, Fröhlich also does not allow that infants can of themselves or through the mediation of others exhibit a life changing faith. He also cites the example of Paul who taught a gospel wherein the individual was responsible for their decision to, turn to or away from God.\(^{28}\)

Fröhlich allows that defenders of infant baptism accept faith as a necessary component of baptism, but claims their understanding is misplaced. He states that it is in baptism where one in faith takes hold of the power and promises of God and that baptism (Titus 3:4,5) represents the renewal and regeneration of the individual.\(^{29}\)

Fröhlich commented that if the baptism of John could not be received conditionless or without repentance, infant baptism is unacceptable since an infant is not capable of fulfilling any condition. To "make" disciples is contrary to the letter and spirit of the gospels. Paul's directive (1 Cor. 1:17) was to proclaim the gospel to those who then had the choice to accept or reject it.\(^{30}\)

Fröhlich placed considerable importance on the individuals "spiritual preparation" for baptism. He stated that this enterprise was imperative, and an impossibility in
the process of infant baptism. In making his case, a recurring theme in his soteriology is his understanding of baptism as taught by John and how this relates to the baptism of Christ.

The crux of his argument is that the conditions that were required of one wishing to partake in the baptism of John were insufficient for the individual wishing to be baptized in Christ. If the spiritual preparation or conditions for John's baptism were insufficient, how much less prepared is the infant who is baptized.31

Frohlich stated that the baptism of John was for the forgiving of sin and described it as a "preliminary purification" of sin and of the accusatory conscience. In terms of original sin, Frohlich claimed that the baptism of John did not free the individual from the power of original sin, something that could be only accomplished through faith in the crucified Christ and the baptism of Christ.32

Frohlich takes issue with those who justify the baptism of infants by arguing that children in the womb can receive the Holy Spirit as John the Baptist did. Frohlich points out that John felt the baptism of repentance was insufficient and expressed the desire to be baptized by Christ, a baptism of fire and of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:11). "If John had not possessed that spirit, necessary to regeneration and renewal...he would not have desired to be baptized of Christ..."33
Grace and Baptism

A cornerstone of Protestant theology is that the justification of the sinner comes by grace, and Luther said by grace, through faith alone. Dietrich Bonhoeffer in *The Cost of Discipleship* criticises this position. He names "cheap grace" that which teaches "justification in sin" or acquittal even while one remains an unregenerate sinner. "Costly grace" is "justification out of sin" where there is an actual spiritual change in the individual and persistent effort to overcome sin.34

Fröhlich's position is in one sense similar to Bonhoeffer in that he does not allow for any "...easy way of becoming a disciple of Christ."35 His aversion centres about those who have been "made" Christians by having been baptized as infants. Those who were made Christians "...without their knowledge and without struggle have followed another way..." than did the first Christians who followed their convictions and on occasion paid with their lives.36

Even though the grace is a basic biblical term and it has not always been a highly developed concept in Anabaptist theology, they do make the following distinction. Anabaptists distinguish between Gerechterklärung (to pronounce as just) and Gerechtmachung (to make just or right). The former is "forensic" in nature, such as when a judge has the right to acquit someone no matter if they are right or wrong. The
latter describes a change in the character of an individual who no longer is or at least intends not to sin. The Anabaptists believe that, "A forensic view of grace, in which the sinner is forgiven and undeservedly justified, is simply unacceptable to the existential faith of the Anabaptists." The suggestion is that in Catholicism, grace is an objective force or a substance (of which the Church has a reservoir), which is dispensed through the sacraments. In Protestantism, grace is "favor" like the grace of a sovereign, which signifies the forgiveness of sin or "the mercy which is promised for Christ's sake." In this manner it is soteriological in that it is a "justifying grace" or a favor of God towards the understanding sinner.

For Anabaptism, the suggestion is that grace is not a soteriological term which points to the favor and readiness of God to forgive, but grace signifies creative love, which is the very essence of God. In this conception, God's grace then does not begin "...as the reconciliations and forgiveness of sin, but at creation. The human race is created by Jesus Christ out of grace." This view of grace as the term for God's sovereign creative love is "...the internal foundation for typically Anabaptist views of faith. It is, for instance, reflected in true repentance and the new life."
Frohlich states that the grace of Christ not only covers all sin since the dawn of creation but also has the power to outweigh and devour it. In Frohlich's words:

...grace is not only an imputation of the righteousness of Christ, but also a powerful working of it in us, a conquering of sin. Therefore we dare not remain stationary in the mere faith, but we must be baptized in Christ. There the grace of God first reveals clearly its victorious power over sin. Where faith unto justification has paved the way, there baptism fully does away with sin.42

According to Frohlich, grace is not merely a covering of sin, but the individual who has in faith been baptized into Christ's death also arises with Christ into a newness of life that is empowered by the Holy Spirit. This newness of life, "death" to sin or effective working of God through baptism is not found in the province of the baptism of infants. The infant cannot testify to being "dead" to sin. If this experience is integral to the baptism of Christ, then those who have not made it, cannot claim this same baptism.43

Anabaptist baptism symbolizes all the basic tenants of the Anabaptist understanding of the Christian life including the experience of regeneration through the Holy Spirit, the conception and nature of the church, and their understanding of the sort of life the Christian is to lead.44

Every facet of the Anabaptist's life and faith "from conversion to resurrection and from Christian life to
eschatology" is "...bound together in a unity that could be encompassed metaphorically under the rubric of baptism."\textsuperscript{45} Anabaptist baptism is a sign of hope and redemption that witnesses to the baptizand's resurrection to a new life in Christ and victory over the "powers of evil in the world". Even more importantly it is the hope of future participation in salvation through the final redemption in Christ.\textsuperscript{46}

Fröhlich observed that "Jesus' baptism was both the climax and the crisis of John's baptism".\textsuperscript{47} The baptism of Jesus is described as being the same character as ours. "Jesus' baptism with water and Spirit was the ensample of that baptism which He had ordained for those who believe in Him."\textsuperscript{48}

**Influences on Fröhlich's Baptismal Practices**

Fröhlich sheds little, if any light, or is seldom explicit about who or which tradition influenced his theology; but an inquiry into the issue of "baptismal form" may prove to be enlightening. A discussion of the form or mode of baptism is typically not a central issue in a general discussion of baptism. It is a little more interesting in this instance since it not only demonstrates who may have "historically" influenced Fröhlich in an aspect of his baptismal theology, but it also sheds some light on those who influenced Fröhlich's theology in general.
For purposes of this discussion, when we are referring to the "form" of baptism, the focus is on whether one is baptized by immersion or affusion, either by pouring or sprinkling water.49

Baptism in Anabaptist Traditions

Historically, the "form" of baptism in the Mennonite tradition has varied. The typical differences are as to whether immersion or affusion are preferred or are even normative.50

The first baptisms performed by Balthasar Hubmaier were by affusion where a milk pail served as a container for the water. Hubmaier composed a formal description of baptism entitled Eine Form zu Taufen, but did not include particulars about the method or form of baptism.51 Melchior Hofmann recorded nothing about the form of baptism, but there is one record of him baptizing others. According to this account Hofmann baptized some three hundred people "out of a barrel" the assumption being that the form was affusion.52 Pilgram Marpeck also did not leave a formal description of baptism, but his writings mention both immersion and pouring. The impression is that Marpeck was partial to the practice of immersion.53

Harold S. Bender in an article on the mode and ritual or form of baptism noted that, while baptism by immersion may have been common in the early and Medieval church, by the
time of the Reformation, pouring was commonly used. Pouring has continued to be the standard form among Mennonites except in some Mennonite groups where immersion has been introduced.54

Bender states that the pervasive use of baptism by immersion among Mennonites, occurred when the Mennonite Brethren organized in South Russia in 1860. Bender also cites a number of groups who have adopted the form of immersion in their baptism ritual. Bender includes in this group the Apostolic Christian Church or as they were known in Mennonite circles as the New Amish, Neutaufer or Frohlichianer.55

The Brethren Influence on Fröhlich

Brethren sources take credit for influencing and convincing Fröhlich of the veracity of immersion as the proper form of baptism.56 According to Brethren sources the specific form that Fröhlich supposedly adopted was that of "trine" immersion or baptism57, which is dipping three times forward in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.58 This attribution may be overly optimistic when examined in the light of Fröhlich's other activities at the time. While it may be true or cannot be discounted that in some isolated cases, individuals were baptized after the "Brethren form",59 trine immersion has never been commonly used, if at all, by the Evangelical Baptists, Nazarenes or
Apostolic Christians. The only form used is that of immersion; dipping once backwards.\textsuperscript{60}

Fröhlich himself was baptized with sprinkling by the former Reform Pastor, Amil Bost in February of 1832.\textsuperscript{61} In a letter Fröhlich wrote in May of 1832, he discussed his understanding of baptism in response to an inquiry. His response included some comments about the "form" of baptism.\textsuperscript{62} Fröhlich's response acknowledged the "controversy" between immersion and sprinkling. Fröhlich's interpretation of Biblical accounts of baptism indicated that immersion was the original form of baptism. But he also commented, "I would not choose to maintain, however, that the form itself was of great importance in the sight of God..."\textsuperscript{63} He preferred the practice of immersion, but stated that sprinkling was acceptable since the primary interest was the faith of the baptizand.\textsuperscript{64}

In 1832 Fröhlich began preaching among the Mennonites in Langnau in the Emmental. By January of 1835, this church had divided into the Alttaufer and Neutaufer, with the Neutaufer being led by a protege of Fröhlich's named George Steiger. Steiger insisted that anyone who had not been baptized by immersion was spiritually dead.\textsuperscript{65}

The implication here is that Steiger's work was sanctioned by Fröhlich and would consequently reflect Fröhlich's doctrines, that is insistence on baptism by
immersion. In a letter written in May of 1832, Fröhlich was not adamant about the form of baptism, but the events that transpired during the 1835 schism in the Mennonite Church in Langnau seem to indicate a firm position on the matter.

In a rather lengthy piece by Fröhlich entitled "Baptismal Truth" he discusses baptismal form. Unfortunately this work is not dated so it is not helpful in following the development of Fröhlich's thought on this issue. On the one hand Fröhlich seems to indicate that immersion was preferable, but in another instance the indication is that immersion is assumed.

If Fröhlich's followers were baptised by immersion in 1835 it presents some difficulties for the Brethren claim. The purported Brethren influence on Fröhlich's baptismal theology was said to be the result of the work of a Brethren elder named Henry Kurtz. Kurtz was born in 1796 and emigrated to the United States in 1817, was baptized in 1828 and placed in the ministry of the Brethren Church in 1830.

In December of 1838, Kurtz returned to Europe to visit his parents. While travelling in Europe, Kurtz searched for opportunities to preach and eventually contacted Fröhlich's group, or the Neutaufer, in the canton of Zurich. Kurtz convinced a number of individuals in this group of the necessity of baptism by immersion and in April of 1839 he baptized nine people including George Rothenberger, a...
A Brethren account states that "This caused the man Fröhlich to became his bitter enemy. He was persecuted very severely and had his faith tried in many ways." Fröhlich is said to have also opposed Kurtz, calling him an imposter and then winning back some of his followers.

Despite this acrimonious relationship, the Brethren accounts claim that as a result of their contact with Fröhlich, he adopted trine immersion as the "proper" form of baptism. This is somewhat problematic in that Fröhlich's followers were seemingly adamant about baptism by immersion as early as 1835 while the events in the Brethren accounts took place in 1838 (Rothenberger) or 1839 (Kurtz).

From the information available it is difficult to understand what events took place and when. Fröhlich's extant letters do not record the Brethern or Mennonite accounts of contact with Fröhlich or his followers.

As the Brethren accounts suggest, it is entirely possible that some baptisms were conducted among the Evangelical Baptists utilizing the common Brethren form. As demonstrated, Fröhlich was not quite as rigorous about the form of baptism as for example, the Nazarenes and Apostolic Christians who baptize, using immersion. In the early periods of the denomination the evolution of these practices could well have been in flux. In consideration of the above,
it is still an open question as to when "simple" immersion became the accepted baptismal form in the denomination.

Considering the minimal, explicit information regarding those Anabaptists that influenced Fröhlich, the claims of the Brethren are very useful for understanding who may have introduced Anabaptist theology, doctrine and practices to Fröhlich and his followers, since Fröhlich himself, is not very forthcoming on the issue.
Chapter V
Fröhlich's Doctrine of God

Theology

This last chapter will survey Fröhlich's theology, (doctrine of God) focusing especially on his notions of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit and his Christology. Fröhlich's views on these subjects will be compared to those of Menno Simons, in order to determine whether Fröhlich's perspective was or was not typically Anabaptist.

There are few topics within the doctrinal theology of the Anabaptists that are as uncomplicated or plain as what might be called theology proper or the doctrine or theory of God. In this case it would be acceptable to conclude that Anabaptists were in line with most other Christians, whether they were Catholic, Orthodox or Protestant in also accepting the Apostles' Creed as a starting point concerning the foundations of the Christian faith. Anabaptist renditions of the doctrine of God were more or less elaborate versions of the Apostles' Creed.¹

Menno Simons takes pains to preface his theological claims with statements that variously explain that he believes, understands, and deduces only from Scripture, any particular notion or sense of the nature of God. According to

¹ Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
John Wenger, "Menno does not try to be philosophical and profound; he seeks rather to be plain and Biblical."²

In terms of a discussion of the doctrine of God, we find that Fröhlich's conclusions are quite similar to the Anabaptist view as represented by Menno Simons. Fröhlich also does not engage in any protracted philosophy or speculation regarding the doctrine of God, for that is not his real concern, or a focus of his writing. The focus of Fröhlich's sermons, commentaries and writings is on the soteriological and most other observations are ancillary to this focus, and are included to buttress his arguments. Therefore, there is not an abundance of material on the subject of the doctrine of God, nor are his insights and comments on the subject are particularly profound.

Simons and Fröhlich on the Trinity

Menno Simons' ideas and reflections about God are quite apparent throughout his writing, but those comments which might be characterized as his most expansive insights, are found in a booklet whose short title is "Confession of the Triune God". This tract makes a simple claim, that it is Biblical truth, that the eternal God exists in three persons; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Menno concludes that these "...three names, activities, and powers, namely the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit...are one...indescribable, Almighty, holy, eternal, and sovereign
God.” They are one and "...can no more be separated from each other than the sun, brightness, and warmth... The one must exist with the other or else the whole divinity is denied."³

The Son does not work without the Father and Holy Spirit, nor does the Spirit do anything without the Father and Son. All must remain with each other or "else there must be an imperfect God." Any denial of the deity of Christ or the existence of the Holy Spirit is to create a "counterfeit God" who is without wisdom, power, life, light, truth, and Word.⁴

In accounting for the notion of the Trinity, Fröhlich suggested that the account of the baptism of Jesus in Luke 3:21,22 was the "...occasion the whole Trinity of God was revealed."⁵ In this account, the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ. Fröhlich understood that the baptism of Jesus in this account was a model for baptism in general and as such we are to be "...baptized in the triune name of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit...not as an empty form, but as the setting up of a covenant between God and ourselves."⁶

Other than this sort of comment about the Trinity, as expressed above, Fröhlich says or speculates very little about the notion of the the Trinity as a whole. He is more forthcoming about the relationship between certain aspects of the Trinity, in this case, the relationship between God the Father and Christ the Son. Fröhlich understood that the
firmament or earth was created by Christ, the incarnation of God where, "...before Jesus Christ came in the flesh He was God from all eternity and Creator of the worlds". Christ is the "image" of the invisible God, through which the "works and deeds" of the Father are revealed and the visible world and "the realm of invisible spirits" are created.

Simons warns against any speculation regarding the eternal God who by His very deity is incomprehensible to mortals. Among other attributes, we find Menno often describing God as being "ineffable, incomprehensible, and indescribable." God is an eternal Spirit, who created heaven and earth and is the ever-ruling King, a God above all gods, whose power and dominion is eternal and shall endure forever.

In a sermon on Psalm 68, Fröhlich focused on the theme of humility, as realized when one attempts to comprehend the eternal nature of God. He states that just as all the heavenly bodies with all of their inhabitants are innumerable the earth virtually disappears in the universe. While acknowledging that the visible heavens are infinite to our understanding, Fröhlich understood that this still was not where God was "located." Even though these spaces are apparently infinite, "...God is not bound to time and space, for He was before all times, and is beyond all spaces. Space
and time are only certain forms of manifestation of God..."\textsuperscript{11}

In our present "state", Fröhlich says we are incapable of comprehending the infinite and therefore this should teach us humility, and that in order for us to begin to comprehend God we must be transformed. "The arrogant and obstinate, eternally come not to the understanding to learn to know God; for how will he grasp the heavenly who has not understood the earthly, namely the relationship of the earth to the other firmament and of men to God."\textsuperscript{12}

Menno Simons was not particularly verbose about his understanding of the Holy Spirit. Simons describes the Spirit as being real and personal but still mysterious, incomprehensible and indescribable like the Father and Son. Simons understands that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son but is never separated from the "being" of the Father and the Son (I take Simons' explanation to mean, that the relationship is "linear" as opposed to being "triangular"). The Holy Spirit is a dispenser of the gifts of God and guides us in all truth, cleanses, comforts, cheers, reproves and assures us. The Spirit is received by all who believe in Christ. We are admonished by Paul to not grieve the Spirit. According to Christ, whoever sins against the Spirit will not be forgiven. Through the "good pleasure of the Father" the Spirit frees us from sin, and makes us cheerful, pious and holy.\textsuperscript{13}
Similarly to Menno, Fröhlich speaks of the Holy Spirit as an entity that was sent by Christ, rather than God the Father and the Spirit operates as a "substitute" and an interpreter.\(^\text{14}\) Once again this relationship appears to be linear, or, from God, through Christ.

Fröhlich, like Simons, ascribes mysteriousness and incomprehensibility to the person of God, but he quickly differentiates between our lack of understanding as to how God operates and our ability to understand God's will. Through the guidance of God's Spirit (i.e. Holy Spirit), God's will is revealed to all "spiritual" individuals in a "...plain and simple-hearted manner..."\(^\text{15}\) The highest purpose for God's enlightenment to humanity is "... namely our sanctification through the renewal of our minds, enabling us to prove what is the good, acceptable and perfect will of God".\(^\text{16}\)

While God's methods are incomprehensible, we can have a certain confidence that God will be revealed to us. This is conditional upon our being open to the Holy Spirit, as evidenced by a sincere and humble mind. At this point one is easily able to distinguish the "voice" of the Holy Spirit.

One is not able to correctly interpret the Bible without having the Holy Spirit as the "expounder" as "...God's word and the Spirit are always in agreement."\(^\text{17}\) Fröhlich also emphasizes the Holy Spirit's role in teaching the Bible and
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the role of revelation. "None but the Holy Spirit can preach the Gospel of Christ and he who has it by revelation (not by knowledge through study); but this revelation must harmonize fully with the written word." Fröhlich goes on to say that this sort of revelation is different from preaching which is done only from the "...learned letter, that is, entirely without effect unto the conversion of men ...and such a one can be lost even if he preached ever so beautifully". These comments by Fröhlich betray a typical Anabaptist position that is apprehensive and distrustful of theological training.

Simons and Fröhlich on Christology

Overall, Fröhlich's approach to formulating a Christology is similar to the Anabaptist approach to devising a theology or "theory of God". In terms of Christology, a typical Anabaptist response was, "All speculative, basically 'Hellenic' sophistication of patristic theology is left behind. Christ is 'the Lord', and that alone mattered".

Like the early Anabaptists, we find that Fröhlich also avoids any protracted speculation on the nature of Christ. Fröhlich's opinion of the theological enterprise in general, and in this case "speculation" as to who Christ was, is revealed in the following comments made about Matt. 16:13-18. In this passage, Christ is complimenting Peter for having
recognized Christ as "...the Son of the living God". (Matt.16:16b). Fröhlich commented that, "Jesus does here not praise the studied mechanical, rote-taught, systematic learning that He is Christ the Son of the living God, but rather the inward revelation of this mystery from God..."21

Therefore, Fröhlich's recorded conclusions and insights on Christology are relatively limited. Having asserted this premise, we do find that some aspects of a Christology are revealed through the course of his notes and commentaries, but they do not purport to be a complete or systematic theology.

**Christ's Human/Divine Nature**

When surveying Anabaptist "confessions", one finds a number of typical themes and approaches in their Christology, and Fröhlich appears to align his insights with them. Both the divine and historical attributes of Christ as the Son of the triune God focus on his redemptive function but the overall christological orientation appears to be more soteriologically and less metaphysically focused.22

In terms of the Christology of early Christian creeds, it would appear that Fröhlich would join with the Anabaptists who "unreservedly" accepted the basic doctrines of Chalcedon.23 Even though some of the Greek words in the "Chalcedonian formula" continue to provoke theological discussions,24 the "formulations" for the "problems" of the
Trinity and the dual nature of Christ are acceptable. While Menno Simons does not refer to Chalcedon in his writing, on a number of occasions he refers to the Nicene Creed. In one letter he states, "...where the Spirit, Word, sacraments, and life of Christ are found, there the Nicene article is pertinent".

Fröhlich, like Simons, utilized the O.T. character of King David to draw parallels to the person and work of Christ. Both emphasized that Christ was literally the son of David, as understood from the genealogy in First Matthew. They both made use of the figure of King David as a metaphor for Christ, which is a fairly conventional use of this metaphor.

In a response to interpreters of Hebrews 1:4,5 who use these verses to substantiate a claim that the fourth verse indicates that Jesus was "made" or "became" superior to angels, Fröhlich makes clear his understanding of the nature of Christ. "The unbelievers ... say that Jesus was merely deified, whereas the Word of God teaches that God was humanized (became man) in Jesus."

Fröhlich stated that Jesus Christ as God's Son was also God, who has been from all eternity and is in all eternity and as such was involved in the creation of this world. Christ is the "image" of the invisible God and it is through Christ that "...the Father reveals Himself in works and
words". In his attempt to come to terms with, and understand the divine nature of Christ, Fröhlich said the following: "For what Christ is in his divinity and oneness with the Father lies beyond our present scope. We have heard of it and believe it, but we do not yet understand it." While the divine aspect of Christ may have been infinitely durable, Fröhlich understands that the man Jesus was susceptible to the temptations of Satan, to the extent that Jesus consciously weighed Satan's offer to him for "all the kingdoms of this world". Jesus rejected evil because of his love for humanity.

In his attempt to understand the character of the human/divine nature of Christ Fröhlich felt that it was more important to simply accept that Christ took on humanity's sinful nature and reconciled humanity to God as a result of his obedience to God. Unlike Menno Simons, Fröhlich avoids speculation on the "mechanics" of the Incarnation and for the most part acknowledges that the relationship is beyond what we are able to know.

Fröhlich believed that Christ came in a form that was "needed", in order not to discourage those individuals who were materially and spiritually impoverished, and who may have been discouraged from approaching a more regal or imposing figure. In the same instance Christ attempted to demonstrate that he was the long-awaited Messiah of Jewish
tradition. He was able to bridge this gap with "signs and wonders" and help for anyone who approached him.\textsuperscript{35}

**Christ as the Redeemer**

Fröhlich's perspective on "Christ as the Redeemer" is quite conventional, as he explains that Christ, as the Son of God, descended from heaven, to reconcile humanity with God, redeem humanity from sin, and to restore the image of God within them.\textsuperscript{36} Christ was able to do this because of two qualities that were "united" in Christ but in no other person. In the first instance Christ was like us, constituted of "flesh and blood", but he was also righteous and did not sin. By being like us, he could die like us, but being righteous, he could also die for us.\textsuperscript{37} By being "obedient" to death on the Cross, Christ becomes our mediator, through the forgiving of our sins if we believe and "...our Redeemer from indwelling sin if we are baptized".\textsuperscript{38}

In Fröhlich's attempt to account for Christ's human dimension, and as the Redeemer for humanity, he seemingly ascribes circumcision with a unique effectual property. Fröhlich explains that since Christ was not sinful by birth, it was necessary that "...(h)e might be put under the law"\textsuperscript{39} in order "...to take and bear our sin upon Himself and take it away from us...".\textsuperscript{40} Therefore Christ was "put under the law" by circumcision eight days after his birth.\textsuperscript{41} It may be that Fröhlich was speaking allegorically in this instance, but a
plain reading of the text describes the effectual nature of circumcision on Christ. This does not appear to be a typical notion in Anabaptist theology.

In his notes of June 4, 1851, Fröhlich states that "Jesus demands faith in Himself, in his person, as no human being can demand it..." Fröhlich argues that either Jesus was a mere man and therefore the greatest fanatic that ever lived and believing in him is fanaticism, or He was God as the Son of God and faith in Him is our "sacred duty". He explains that if someone is to believe that Christ was the Son of God "...everything depends on our faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ".
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Conclusion - Fröhlich's Legacy

Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich has never been well known in a historical sense and may never become well known, even though there were some newspaper accounts of his altercations with the authorities and at one point his followers multiplied quite rapidly. Any academic interest has come from historians or Anabaptist, Mennonite and Brethren scholars who by and large are attempting to "fill in the gaps" in their own histories and provide more context in order to understand the dynamics that occurred in the development of their respective traditions. A number of these scholars have recognized the relative significance of the experience of the Nazerenes as pacifists, the contribution of the Evangelical Baptists and Nazerenes to 19th. and 20th. century Anabaptist history and the little known history of the introduction of Anabaptism, by the Evangelical Baptists, to the Slavic countries.¹

Fröhlich was very evangelistic and focused on the conversion and baptism of adult believers in Christ² and their personal conduct and "sanctification" but he also wrote about, and spoke out against, what was happening in society at the time. He was especially troubled by the state church/civil government alliance and its treatment of those who wished to exercise religious freedom, but this was not his main focus.
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Currently, in the European and North American branches of the denomination, evangelism is not a primary focus, and certainly not to the degree that Fröhlich and his contemporaries were evangelistic. The denomination today, typically expends its energies struggling with differing perspectives and agendas within the denomination. The denomination does not take a public stand on social issues and only addresses them within the confines of the tradition when "detrimental" aspects of society appear to be making inroads into the tradition.

A notable exception to this stance is the efforts expended by the Nazarenes of Europe and the Apostolic Christians in North America in defense of their pacifist practices and doctrines.

Fröhlich's influence in the denomination today, is not as a result of his writing and especially not from any profound theological insights. Fröhlich, through enormous strength of will and character, forged the beginning of a new religious denomination. He inspired his followers and their progeny to take life very seriously and follow a sort of Biblicism that inspired the individual to a lifestyle and morality that was very Biblically focused. Unfortunately a sense of tradition and custom evolved that some feel took precedence, leaving some adherents frustrated with the
rigorous demands for adherence to traditions that no longer appeared to be relevant or not explicitly based on the Bible.

Fröhlich warned against this sort of focus on traditions, or "externals" as he called them in comments he made about the Mennonites who "...allowed a formalism to take the place of the inner spiritual life, and drove the youth to lukewarmness and worldliness." In the same place Ruegger quotes Fröhlich as having stated that "(t)he insistence upon externals and forms is the best weapon for the destruction of the congregation of God, and what the foe cannot do by means of outward force and persecution, he succeeds in doing by such sly artifices, whereby one runs after a shadow and fights about words and loses the substance." 4

Some Nazarenes and Apostolic Christians have responded by forming into factions that would maintain the status quo. Others have formed conferences that would be in the parlance of the tradition, of "conservative" or "liberal" persuasion. Individual congregations have left the tradition to join other denominations or establish themselves as independent churches.

To be clear on the matter, the focus on "externals" is not the sole source of disenchantment among the various groups, but is a major factor. There are a number of corollaries to this dynamic. Some have a high regard for tradition, since it is viewed as one means to maintain the
unity and integrity of the community. This is a common theme among Anabaptists, where the maintenance of the community is paramount, in the face of the churches confrontation with the "world". In Anabaptist/Mennonite circles this theme is expressed as "nonconformity" with the world.

The experience Fröhlich and his followers as "non-conformists", is still a vivid memory of the legacy of Fröhlich and his confrontations with the state church. His early followers' experience with the state church/civil government alliance, was followed closely by the experience of the Nazarenes and the persecution they suffered as conscientious objectors. Many of those who suffered as Nazarene conscientious objectors are still living today. For them and those of their generation, traditions assist in maintaining a cohesive separation from a "world" that has been hostile to them.

Another corollary of the supposed focus on "externals" is a perception by some that this focus breeds a certain lack of "spiritual depth", a concern that Fröhlich certainly warned about. These groups, in seeking for fulfilment, turn to other denominations and theologies for direction and insights, a problem partially compounded by the tradition's lack of this sort of direction, especially in the realm of theology. The tradition at this point, has for the most part composed only "statements of faith" which simply outline the
major doctrines of the tradition. A few policy statements have been issued in response to questions within the traditions, but for the most part, other than the writings of Fröhlich, doctrine and policies have been maintained through an "oral tradition".

This "oral tradition" itself is a remarkable legacy of Fröhlich's adoption of Anabaptism. Cornelius Dyck, editor of the 1981 Introduction to Mennonite History, observed that the Nazarenes of Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia have managed "...to retain many of the Anabaptist emphases in a remarkable way" (The Nazarenes are that section of the tradition that is officially united with the Apostolic Christian Church (Nazarean) in North America).

Before being accepted for baptism, baptismal candidates are required to provide a testimony of their understanding of doctrines and practices that the tradition has historically deemed as important. Until about 1989 these doctrines and practices were "remembered" as a part of an oral tradition, at which time they were set out in an Appendix to the 1987 "statement of faith" of the Apostolic Christian Church (Nazarean).

What is most interesting is that this Appendix, as the collected memory of the tradition, focuses on all of the seven points of the Schleitheim Confession (1527), plus a few points from the German Mennonite/Amish, Dordrecht Confession...
(1632), such as doctrines regarding marriage.¹⁰ This observation of the Schleitheim/Dordrecht and Nazarene/Apostolic Christian connection is not a conclusion that has been reached by a thorough historical investigation, but an observation of the remarkable similarities between the baptismal "catechism" of the Nazarenes and Apostolic Christians (Nazarean).¹¹ Even though this work has demonstrated that Fröhlich’s doctrines and theology were clearly Anabaptist, a thorough investigation of this similarity may assist in identifying and understanding the specific Anabaptist influences on the Fröhlich movement. This is a project that is still waiting to be thoroughly investigated.
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3 The Apostolic Christian Church (Nazarean) produced a “Statement of Faith” (1987) entitled We Believe, as part of an overall effort to find, and agree on common ground between the various factions among the Nazareans. At this point in time, the Nazareans are quite divided and a majority of
Nasareans have formed what is known as the "Conservative Conference". The Apostolic Christian Church of America is apparently more united on a national scale. Dissenting groups are usually individual congregations as opposed to larger factions that would be composed of groups of congregations. Both Nasareans and ACC of America hold their own annual meetings, to address concerns within their respective groups. These meetings are focused on doctrine and internal issues. Evangelism is not a prominent issue in these forums.

Ruegger, pp. 189,190, the "externals" in this example were "...the zeal for and the clinging to the old garbs with hooks and eyes, and the long beards...", p. 190; See also, Gratz, "Bernese Anabaptists" who reports that Fröhlich: "...held little respect for some of the old Anabaptist customs but brought new spirit and life that appealed to many.", p. 114, We are not informed as to which "old Anabaptist customs" Fröhlich was specifically referring to in this citation.

For a good general overview of the principle of "nonconformity" in the Anabaptist/Mennonite tradition, see Harold Bender and J.C Wenger's article in the Mennonite Encyclopedia, S.v. "Nonconformity" pp. 890-897. See especially pages 891,893,896; See also, Walter Klassen, "The Anabaptist Understanding of the Separation of the Church", Church History. Vol. 46, Issue "D", (1977), see especially the section entitled: "Reasons for Anabaptist Separation", pp. 429-436, The focus of this article is on the notion of "separation" in early Anabaptism (1523-1540).
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From those extant writings of Fröhlich, that comment on the doctrines that Fröhlich feels baptismal candidates should know, Fröhlich lists five points that are taken from Romans 6, see Fröhlich, "Evidence", pp. 68,69; Fröhlich's "requirements" were apparently not nearly as comprehensive as those that are accepted and taught currently.

"We Believe", See "Appendix A", the section entitled "Suggested Testimony Format". Baptismal candidates are asked to testify to their knowledge and acceptance of the various points outlined in this Appendix.

A direct connection between Fröhlich, the Schleitheim Articles, and the Nazarenes and Apostolic Christian Church (Nazorean), probably cannot be made without a thorough investigation. Delbert Gratz, observes that more contacts were made with the Bernese Anabaptists by leaders of the early Evangelical Baptist movement than by Fröhlich himself. It is possible that some of these contacts introduced the various Anabaptist Confessions to the Evangelical Baptists. See, Delbert Gratz’s review of: Garfield Alder’s, ”Die Tauf- und Kirchenfrage in Leben und Lehres des Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich”, p. 258; Also, the Apostolic Christian Church of America does not publish a specific baptismal catechism. (per an interview with Perry Klopfenstein, the author of ”Marching to Zion”, the history of the Apostolic Christian Churches of America), In his work, Klopfenstein does mention that the entire Schleitheim Confession ”would find great support” in the Apostolic Christian Church of America as well as certain points from the Dordrecht Confession. (no specific points are cited)
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