

## **Balthasar Hubmaier and the Authority of the Church Fathers**

ANDREW P. KLAGER

---

In Anabaptist historical scholarship, the reluctance to investigate the authority of the church fathers for individual sixteenth-century Anabaptist leaders does not appear to be intentional. Indeed, more pressing issues of a historiographical and even apologetical nature have been a justifiable priority,<sup>1</sup> and soon this provisional Anabaptist vision was augmented by studies assessing the possibility of various medieval chronological antecedents.<sup>2</sup> However, in response to Kenneth Davis' important study, *Anabaptism and Asceticism*, Peter Erb rightly observed back in 1976 that “. . . one must not fail to review the abiding influence of the Fathers . . . [whose] monitions were much more familiar to our sixteenth-century ancestors than they are to us.”<sup>3</sup>

Over thirty years later, the Anabaptist community still awaits its first published comprehensive study of the reception of the church fathers among Anabaptist leaders in the sixteenth century.<sup>4</sup> A natural place to start, however, is the only doctor of theology in the Anabaptist movement, Balthasar Hubmaier. In the final analysis, it becomes evident that Hubmaier does view the church fathers as authoritative, contextually understood, for some theological issues that were important to him, notably his anthropology and understanding of the freedom of the will, while he acknowledged the *value* of the church fathers for the corollary of free will, that is, believers' baptism, and this for apologetico-historical purposes. This authority, however, cannot be confused with an untested, blind conformity to prescribed precepts because such a definition of authority did not exist in the sixteenth-century, even among the strongest

admirers of the fathers. Authority for Hubmaier is set against his perception of the inflated authority of the papacy and unjustified authority of the scholastic theologians yet in compliance with a particularly stringent biblical hermeneutic. The result is a surprisingly high level of ratification of the Greek fathers specifically that has not yet been conceded among Anabaptist historians.<sup>5</sup>

### ***General Context and Conditions***

Because Hubmaier's growing humanist proclivities are in continuity with the general ethos of the Italian renaissance a generation or two before, not in intensity or comprehensiveness but in his solidarity with its methodological and ideological direction, it becomes necessary to explore the transmission of patristic texts from Byzantium into the translating flurry of the Italian renaissance and subsequently into northern Europe. In the first place, therefore, one must identify which writings of the church fathers were at least available to Hubmaier. In 1961, Paul Kristeller observed, "[I]t would be an interesting question, which to my knowledge has not yet been explored, whether or to what extent the newly diffused ideas of these Greek authors exercised an influence on the theological discussions and controversies of the Reformation period."<sup>6</sup> For our purposes, it is the events surrounding the Council of Florence-Ferrara in 1438 to 1439 and the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and in particular the translating activities in Florence, Venice, and on the island of Crete, that are most pertinent to a study of available patristic texts.

Commonly recognized as the Italian scholar most interested in translating the Greek fathers into Latin during the quattrocento, Ambrogio Traversari,<sup>7</sup> secured manuscripts from various libraries and translated treatises, letters, and sermons by Basil of Caesarea, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephraem the Syrian, Pseudo-Dionysius, and his favourite, John Chrysostom as well as John Climacus' monastic classic, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*.<sup>8</sup> Similar translating activity was undertaken by Leonardo Bruni,<sup>9</sup> the pupil of Michael Chrysoloras, and Niccolò de' Niccoli,<sup>10</sup> who was instrumental in the debates of the Council of Florence. Lorenzo Valla translated some of Basil's homilies,<sup>11</sup> and Theodore Gaza translated writings of the church fathers at the request of Pope Nicholas V.<sup>12</sup> The Cretan, George of Trebizond, translated works by Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, and Eusebius' *De praeparatio evangelica*, which was printed in Venice in 1470 bereft of any of its more Arian

undertones. Trebizond also translated works by Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil of Caesarea, and in particular his important *Contra Eunomium*.<sup>13</sup> John Argyropoulos translated the very important *Hexameron* of St. Basil,<sup>14</sup> while the homilies, orations, and poems of Gregory Nazianzen occupied the time and translating energy of both Marcus Musurus,<sup>15</sup> and the Cretan copyist, John Simeonachis,<sup>16</sup> the former's translations being printed at the famous Venetian press run by Aldus Manutius who himself printed some of Origen's homilies and John of Damascus' hymns.<sup>17</sup> Verona of Guarino, Bessarion, Michael Chrysoloras, and Pietro Balbo of Pisa, among others, took up other translating projects as well.<sup>18</sup>

Addressing the reception of such translating efforts north of the Alps, Kristeller is keen to point out that "it seems safe to infer that [Erasmus] was familiar with the precedent [that the Italian humanists and Greek émigré scholars] had established as translators of Greek patristic writings."<sup>19</sup> These connections and this precedent, as is well known, helped compel Erasmus to produce some of the most important and impressive patristic translations and editions known to that time.<sup>20</sup> As well, from 1499 to 1520, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and his circle of humanist scholars in Paris turned their attention to the fathers via Italian humanist intermediaries, as Eugene Rice contends, and made them more widely available as a result.<sup>21</sup> Two other northern humanist scholars with whom Hubmaier came into contact and corresponded and who concerned themselves with the church fathers are Beatus Rhenanus and Johannes Oecolampadius.<sup>22</sup> Beatus also interacted with the fathers by way of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and Gratian's *Decretum*, producing an edition of the latter in 1511. This is significant since both of these works contain extensive citations of the church fathers, the latter on which Hubmaier especially depended as his own writings demonstrate.<sup>23</sup>

### ***Balthasar Hubmaier's Access And Exposure To The Church Fathers***

Hubmaier was exposed to the church fathers initially while a student at the universities of Freiburg-im-Breisgau and Ingolstadt, and later through contacts with noted humanist scholars who were either interested in the fathers or who produced patristic editions of their own.<sup>24</sup> Although a markedly complicated matter, as a conduit for a specific kind of patristic awareness, humanism and the emerging *studia humanitatis* curriculum was nevertheless certainly at least a matter requiring attention at both universities from the beginning, as the university statutes, the hiring on of

prominent humanist professors, and the inclusion of humanist grammar manuals and classical literature in their library inventories can attest.<sup>25</sup> Their library indices also contain the writings of the church fathers that one might expect for sixteenth-century Roman Catholic universities,<sup>26</sup> while Hubmaier's patristic education developed predominantly under the tutelage of his mentor and eclectic theologian, Johannes Eck.<sup>27</sup> Eddie Mabry suggests that Eck familiarized Hubmaier with "humanism, scholasticism and nominalism, and late medieval Augustinianism."<sup>28</sup> Each of these Hubmaier was to either embrace or overtly reject, adding further elements to consider when evaluating his understanding of the authority of the fathers.

Humanism's imprint on Hubmaier's growing interest in the fathers and acknowledgement of their value is most palpable in the personal contacts that he accrued throughout his life. As a student at Freiburg, Hubmaier attended lectures by leading humanists Urbanus Rhegius and Johann Faber. While the cathedral preacher in Regensburg, Hubmaier met another humanist in Wolfgang Rychard, the two becoming very good friends. At Waldshut, Hubmaier wrote to Johannes Sapidus, with whom he maintained a close friendship. And, in July of 1522, Hubmaier wrote a letter to Johann Adelphi, a colleague of Rychard's in Ulm, in which he states that he had journeyed to Basel and met and struck friendships with Erasmus,<sup>29</sup> Heinrich Glarean, Konrad Pelikan, Beatus Rhenanus and other humanists.<sup>30</sup> He also corresponded regularly with both Oecolampadius and Zwingli. What is especially important here is both Hubmaier's growing interest in humanism and the possibility that he may have received editions of the church fathers from these humanists, particularly from Erasmus and Rhenanus in Basel and even more likely, acquiring copies of Oecolampadius' printed patristic editions during his sojourn in Augsburg on the way from Zürich to Nikolsburg.

As a result, Hubmaier was indebted to humanism's fascination with classical Christianity and *ad fontes* method for renewal, wherewith Hubmaier identifies the fall of the church, not with any Constantinian interference in ecclesial affairs,<sup>31</sup> but with the abuse of the sacrament of baptism, a misapplication that saw the rise of overt endorsement for the baptism of infants. For the perversion of the form of baptism Augustine was to take the fall, while, for Hubmaier, the Latin church in general seems to have played a unique role in the development of this exploitation.<sup>32</sup> Consequently, the "fall" of the church is not a matter of chronology, as it is for most Anabaptists, but a matter of geography, the

East garnering a more positive estimation.

The idiosyncratic nature of Hubmaier's *restitutio* gives content also to his perception of his own relationship to historical Christianity. While arguably somewhat artificial, Hubmaier was intent on defending his own orthodoxy and continuity with the historical Church. In his *Twelve Articles in Prayer Form*, a treatise prepared while imprisoned in the Wellenberg tower upon the fall of Waldshut, Hubmaier declares, "I . . . believe and confess one holy universal Christian church, [and] confess one Lord, one God, one faith, and one baptism."<sup>33</sup> Hubmaier also exhibits his allegiance to orthodox Christianity in his frequent rejections of various heresies of the past such as the Helvidians, Antidicomarians, Nestorians, Priscillians, Carpocratians, Novatians, and hemerobaptists, these matters conspicuously lacking any overt scriptural support by Hubmaier's standards and are in need of the voice of tradition for validation.<sup>34</sup> However, Hubmaier's insistence on altering important practices and rites of the church of his day, that of baptism being the most visible realization of this potential, somewhat overshadows his appeal to historical Christianity. It is certainly worth noting that the only heterodox figures from the past that Hubmaier invokes in support of his reforms are Donatus and Pelagius, both authors of contentious affairs surrounding rebaptism and free will respectively that Augustine expended much time and energy refuting. How Hubmaier's patristic awareness via a *restitutio* framework illuminates not when, but where he understands the church to retain a clear expression of unity is a matter to which we will now turn our attention.

### ***Hubmaier's Use And Understanding Of The Authority Of The Church Fathers***

#### *1. The Church Fathers and Scripture*

The relationship between Scripture and the fathers is a very complicated one when examining the manner in which Hubmaier discusses the two together. One must account for Hubmaier's rhetorical intentions, whether the witness of the fathers is introduced externally, and what Hubmaier's attitude is towards the person responsible for introducing the fathers into the conversation. Generally, it is true that, as Hubmaier himself states, he will trust the fathers and councils "just as far as they use the Holy Scripture, and not more."<sup>35</sup> Ultimately, however, Hubmaier does indeed desire to invoke the witness of the fathers if used in tandem with

Scripture. It is therefore not one's use of the fathers that Hubmaier is objecting to, but an indifference towards Scripture, that is, the use of the fathers without consulting the Scriptures. For instance, when Oecolampadius invokes Tertullian to prove that baptism is not a mere covenant between Christians, Hubmaier replies: "You speak to me much of Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, councils, histories, and old customs. I must somehow think that you lack the Scriptures, which do not want to come out of the quiver."<sup>36</sup>

Hubmaier's preoccupation with Scripture, I believe, is the reason why he seems to favour the patristic homilies on Scripture, all of them without exception by Greek fathers, more than he does their theological works. In his dialogue with Zwingli on baptism, Hubmaier implores Zwingli to examine commentaries by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Theophylact, and John Chrysostom.<sup>37</sup> Hubmaier's treatise, *Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil*, written specifically to conscript those church fathers and contemporary teachers who complied with his own interpretation of Scripture, cites Origen's exposition of Luke, Romans, and Exodus.<sup>38</sup> Hubmaier also invokes Basil of Caesarea's *Contra Eunomium*, which has an exposition on Anabaptism's all important scriptural proof for credobaptism, Matthew 28:19,<sup>39</sup> for which Hubmaier also references Jerome as Origen's translator.<sup>40</sup> In addition, he discusses Basil's use of the figure of the flood in the Old Testament for baptism as it is also reported in 1 Peter 3:20<sup>41</sup> and mentions Athanasius and his interaction with Hebrews 6 and the first chapter of 1 Corinthians.<sup>42</sup> He appeals to Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentary on John* and to Theophylact's commentaries on Mark and Matthew.<sup>43</sup> Elsewhere, Hubmaier paraphrases a passage from Chrysostom's *Homily on Luke* and implores Oecolampadius to consult Origen's commentaries.<sup>44</sup>

## 2. The Church Fathers and Scholasticism

Hubmaier is also consistent in his negative portrayal of the scholastic theologians, mentioning by name Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, Bonaventure, and William of Occam, and does so because their teaching "does not spring forth from the Word of God."<sup>45</sup> In his *Ein einfältiger Unterricht* printed in Nikolsburg in 1526, Hubmaier describes the innovations of the scholastics as "weed[s], thornbushes, sticks, and rocks which they have thrown in here, so that three times as much work has become necessary before one can plant and build what has long lain waste,

deserted, and fallow.”<sup>46</sup> And in his *Eine christliche Lehrtafel* published the same year, without mentioning any church fathers he describes the writings of Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Gabriel Biel, William of Occam, papal decrees, the “legends of the saints and other scholastics,” as “previously our hellish scriptures.”<sup>47</sup> When one considers that not once did Hubmaier invoke a scholastic theologian to support his own claims, as he does with the fathers, the contrast between the utility of the fathers and the futility of the scholastic dialectical and syllogistic manner of discovering truth begins to provide clues for how Hubmaier understands the authority of the fathers.

### 3. *Greek Fathers versus Latin Fathers and the Question of Augustine*

I have already noted how Hubmaier uses the scriptural commentaries of the Greek fathers to enhance his argument for believers’ baptism. But for Hubmaier, and Anabaptism as a whole, believers’ baptism is really a corollary of the freedom of the will, a subject matter to which Hubmaier devotes two significant works.<sup>48</sup> Historians have accounted for Hubmaier’s understanding of the freedom of the will by appealing to his education in nominalism<sup>49</sup> or his confluence with humanism, and his reading of Erasmus’ *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio* in particular.<sup>50</sup> While not discounting the impact of these portals of influence on Hubmaier, another possible contributing factor may help explain why Hubmaier’s understanding is, as Torsten Bergsten has observed, not exactly like Erasmus’ or Luther’s.<sup>51</sup> It proposes an anthropology different than that which is taught in nominalism. The rationale for remaining within a nominalist tradition so closely associated with the adulteration of Augustinianism and the “moderate” nominalism of Occam and Gabriel Biel, all of which Hubmaier overtly rejects in his own writings, is unclear. The problem arises when one is willing to acknowledge that Hubmaier doesn’t actually quote any nominalist works, that there is no evidence to suggest that he consulted nominalist writings while producing his own treatises, and that those elements that are found in Hubmaier and in nominalism are matters of comparable vocabulary, and this being only of a “similar” nature, as Bergsten admits. Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon the historian to consider alternative venues and sources for those so-called nominalist characteristics in Hubmaier’s understanding of the freedom of the will. It is a matter of identifying those writings that we know Hubmaier consulted, determining whether their anthropology and understanding of the freedom

of the will aligned itself with that of Hubmaier, and taking notice of Hubmaier's general attitude towards the sources identified, that is, whether it was positive. This option, I believe, is the Greek fathers as mediated by humanism and who Hubmaier quotes extensively in support of free will's corollary, believers' baptism.

Evidence that this is the case begins to emerge upon the examination of Hubmaier's use of Erasmus' *Diatribes*, and their mutual reliance on Origen as a corrective to the philosophy of Augustine. That Hubmaier consulted and depended heavily on Erasmus' *Diatribes* is beyond dispute, while his exposure to Luther's *On the Bondage of the Will* is also likely.<sup>52</sup> In this latter work, Luther endorses Augustine's substitution of "freewill" with "bondwill"<sup>53</sup> as well as his belief that "[f]reewill has no power but to commit sin,"<sup>54</sup> while alleging, "of the ecclesiastical writers, there [are] none almost, who have handled the Scriptures more foolishly and more absurdly, than Origen and Jerome."<sup>55</sup> Pipkin points out Hubmaier's verbatim quotation of Erasmus concerning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, which is in reality an argument from Origen's *Commentary on John* as Erasmus himself states. Elsewhere, Hubmaier again quotes verbatim Erasmus' argument from a passage in Ecclesiasticus in which Erasmus declares, "Even if all this cannot be proved by clear scriptural testimony, it has been expounded with good foundation by orthodox Church Fathers." Also, in his first treatise on the freedom of the will, there is ample evidence to support Hubmaier's reliance on, as Luther puts it, "Origen's fable,"<sup>56</sup> in his explication of a trichotomous anthropology and the functions of the body, soul, and spirit within the framework of his understanding of the freedom of the will. As well, in his exegesis of Philemon 13 to 14, Hubmaier implores his readers to "look at Jerome concerning these words," this probably being a reproduction of Origen's commentary.

Erasmus makes it clear that the Greek fathers espouse the freedom of the will more clearly than do the Latin fathers. After dividing the fathers into Greek and Latin, Erasmus observes, "If ingenuity and erudition contribute anything to scriptural interpretation, what could be more acute and perspicacious than the Greek mind?" while "it is obvious which men stand on the side of free will," these being the Greek fathers.<sup>57</sup> If it was not already assumed by observing his academic prowess, then it must by now be admitted that Hubmaier certainly would have understood the distinction between Greek and Latin patristic thought considering his close proximity to humanist activity and his reading of Erasmus' *Diatribes*. This reliance



on the Greek fathers was, as Henry Vedder observes, a way of escaping “the paralysing Augustinianism of Luther.”<sup>58</sup>

Internal evidence must have the final word, however, and here the support is certainly not lacking. Hubmaier is noticeably consistent in his negative portrayal of Augustine and the Latin fathers generally, that refusing to take this into account would be a mistake. In his *Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein*, Hubmaier contends that the bishop of Hippo “destroys the Scripture and violates it against [his] own understanding.”<sup>59</sup> Specifically, however, Hubmaier rejects the authority of Augustine because of the role he played in propagating the practice of infant baptism, a matter in which, as Hubmaier puts it, Augustine “greatly erred.”<sup>60</sup> In his *Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen*, Hubmaier references Augustine’s letter to Peter Diaconus in which Augustine asserts the obligation to baptize infants by appealing to the doctrine of original sin.<sup>61</sup> It is in this treatise also that Hubmaier explains the role of both Cyprian and Augustine in inaugurating a historical trajectory favouring infant baptism that apparently had no prior precedent. Hubmaier claims in his *Recantation at Zürich* that “Augustine, and many others since his time . . . have been wrong about baptism,”<sup>62</sup> and later singles out Augustine for being directly responsible for the false conception of baptism that has dominated the “past thousand years.”<sup>63</sup> Interestingly, Hubmaier declares his dissatisfaction with Augustine’s explanation of the anthropological *reasons behind* infant baptism, and enlists St. Jerome, who he refers to as, “the holy teacher,” endorsing his exposition on Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:16, which are in reality translations of Origen’s homilies and the latter a passage that Hubmaier uses in his treatise on the freedom of the will.<sup>64</sup>

Moreover, Hubmaier is noticeably uniform in his grouping of Latin fathers for the purpose of promoting caution when inciting patristic witness and his grouping of Greek fathers for affirming patristic fidelity to Scripture. Hubmaier is under the opinion that Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, in addition to papal law and the scholastics have changed the scriptures “into a rope and net of confusion,”<sup>65</sup> evidently linking the Latin fathers to the papacy and to the scholastic outlook that Hubmaier routinely rejects. In an effort to direct Oecolampadius back to the clear words of Scripture instead of relying on the fathers exclusively, Hubmaier lists Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and Origen,<sup>66</sup> the prolific Alexandrian theologian being invoked in this case only because Oecolampadius introduced him into the conversation earlier in support of the apostolicity of infant baptism. Also, it appears that in addition to Augus-

tine, Hubmaier could locate the incipient rumblings of infant baptism from the time of Cyprian,<sup>67</sup> another one of the great Latin fathers, and is far more regular in his suspicions concerning the reliability of the Latin fathers to comply with Scripture than he is with the Greek fathers.

That being the case, as evidence of his confidence in the Greek fathers, in his dispute with Zwingli on whether or not the baptism of John is the same as that of Christ and his apostles, Hubmaier declares, "I testify also to the judgment of the ancient and new teachers. Read Origen on the epistles of Paul, and on Romans 6 . . . ; Cyril on John . . . ; Theophylact on Matthew 3 and John 3; [and] Chrysostom."<sup>68</sup> Perhaps the most telling distinction Hubmaier makes between the Greek and Latin fathers is when upon disparaging the authority of such Latin fathers as Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine against Oecolampadius, Hubmaier asserts, albeit dubiously, that when applying the sacrament of baptism to infants, "the general institution of water baptism does not apply to them, also according to the understanding of Origen, Basil the Great, Athanasius, Tertullian, [and] Jerome," and confidently declares, "I want their own books to be my witness."<sup>69</sup> No doubt Tertullian is mentioned because his is, to Hubmaier, the most consistent of the Latin fathers in his belief that one should, as a rule, wait to be baptized,<sup>70</sup> while Jerome is at times an ally for Hubmaier likely because he is also the preferred father of Erasmus, particularly in his defense of free will, and on this issue is a father whom Luther opposes.

It is interesting to note given his preoccupation with Scripture that all of Hubmaier's references to the Greek fathers are to their commentaries on Scripture exclusively, save Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, a couple tracts on baptism by Basil, and a letter to Serapion by Athanasius, while all references to the Latin fathers are to their theological treatises such as Augustine's letters to Boniface<sup>71</sup> and Peter Diaconus,<sup>72</sup> and his Anti-Manichean writings,<sup>73</sup> Tertullian's *Libro de Corona Militis*<sup>74</sup> and *On Forgiveness*,<sup>75</sup> Jerome's *Against the Luciferians*,<sup>76</sup> and a report on the fourth synod of Carthage sent to Stephen by Cyprian,<sup>77</sup> as well as other various patristic citations gleaned from Gratian's *decretum*.<sup>78</sup>

### ***Conclusion: The Authority of The Church Fathers***

In closing, determining in what manner Hubmaier understands the authority of the church fathers is not a straightforward task, and it becomes quite evident that such a judgment cannot be reduced to a single statement. Notwithstanding this, when weighing all the evidence, it would appear that

Hubmaier does indeed recognize some authority in the Greek fathers, particularly as faithful exegetes of Scripture who exhibit authority in the same way that Hubmaier would acknowledge himself as an authority, while the Latin fathers, and Augustine specifically, must settle for a more cautious reception.

The potential impact on Anabaptist scholarship is significant;<sup>79</sup> one such example involves consideration of the unique tenets of Anabaptism compared to those of the magisterial Reformation, free will versus total depravity being a suitable example. As it is widely accepted that reformers such as Luther and Calvin were influenced by Augustine as mediated by late medieval Augustinianism, one begins to wonder whether the differences between Anabaptism and the magisterial Reformation can be in part explained by their preference for either the Latin or newly acquired Greek fathers as mediated through a humanistic lineage that extends from the translating effort of the Italian renaissance to its replication and spread into fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Germany.

But this investigation must also resolve the very definition of “authority.” Too often, it seems, Hubmaier’s seemingly inexhaustible dependence on Scripture will cloud the judgment of some historians who somewhat indiscriminately reject the notion that Hubmaier affirmed the fathers by juxtaposing his attitude towards Scripture with his admittedly less-pronounced reliance on patristic testimony. This assessment is unfair and largely out of touch with the common attitude towards the fathers that prevailed in the sixteenth century; indeed, even Erasmus, Beatus Rhenanus, and Johannes Eck were adamant that the fathers should not go untested. It is therefore not an authority that renders compliance as automatic, not an authority that ignores the humanity of its transmitters, but an authority that takes seriously, and that purposefully and faithfully aligns itself with, the archetypal authority, that of Christ and his bride.

### ***Endnotes***

1. The first departure from the common negative portrayal of Anabaptism was Gottfried Arnold, *Unparteyische kirchen-und Ketzer-Historie* (Frankfurt, 1699). Arnold’s more positive assessment did not gain traction until more affirming historical descriptions of Anabaptism came to a head with such twentieth-century studies as Cornelius Krahn, “A Historiography of the Mennonites in the Netherlands: A Guide to Sources,” *Church History* 13, no. 3 (September 1944): 182-209; Walther Köhler, *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des Christlichen Selbstbewusstseins, Das Zeitalter der Reforma-*

tion (Zürich: Max Niehans, 1951); W.J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem-Tjeenk Willink, 1932); Ernest Troeltsch, *Die Sociallehren der christlichen. Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912); Nanne van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952). Perhaps the study most responsible for the trajectory and historiographical framework for scholarship on the Anabaptists in the second half of the twentieth century is Harold S. Bender's 1943 presidential address to the American Society of Church History emphasizing nonviolence, discipleship, and community (*The Anabaptist Vision* [Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1944]).

2. Some more familiar examples of studies that investigate or propose a historiographical framework that affirms medieval predecessors to Anabaptism include Kenneth R. Davis, *Anabaptism and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, vol. 16 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1974); Ludwig Keller, *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien: in ihrem Zusammenhange* (Leipzig: Hirzel 1885); W.J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw*, 40-2; Werner O. Packull, *Mysticism and the Early South German-Austrian Anabaptist Movement, 1525-1531*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, vol. 19 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1977); C. Arnold Snyder, *The Life and Thought of Michael Sattler* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1984). Brief summaries of scholarship on the medieval background to Anabaptism can be found in Thomas N. Finger, *A Contemporary Anabaptist Theology: Biblical, Historical, Constructive* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 51-54; and John D. Roth, "Recent Currents in the Historiography of the Radical Reformation," *Church History* 71, no. 3 (September 2002): 523-536.
3. Peter C. Erb, "Book Review: Anabaptism and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins by Kenneth Davis," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 50 no. 3 (July 1976): 254-5. Few studies concern themselves directly with Anabaptism and the church fathers: Andy Alexis-Baker, paper presentation: "Anabaptist Use of Patristic Literature and Creeds," Anabaptist Colloquium, Eastern Mennonite University (7-8 April 2006); Geoffrey Dipple, "Just as in the Time of the Apostles": *Uses of History in the Radical Reformation* (Kitchener, ON: Pandora Press, 2005), 72-6, 123, 157-9; Irvin B. Horst, "Menno Simons and the Augustinian Tradition," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 62, no. 4 (October 1988): 419-430; Andrew Klager, "Passive Sacramentalism and Ontological Soteriology in Hans Denck and Gregory of Nyssa," *Direction Journal* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2006): 268-278; Alan Kreider, "Christendom and Conversion: An Anabaptist Perspective," Paper presented at Mennonite-Catholic International Dialogue of the Mennonite World Conference (24-30 November 2000); and Dennis D. Martin, "Menno and Augustine on the Body

of Christ,” *Fides et Historia* 20 (October 1988): 41-64.

4. The standard biographies include some early attempts to draw attention to Hubmaier’s use of the church fathers: Johann Loserth, *D. Balthasar Hubmaier und die Anfänge der Wiedertaufe in Mähren* (Brno, 1893), 143ff.; Carl Sachsse, *Doktor Balthasar als Theologe* (Berlin, 1914; rpt. Aalen: Scienta Publishers, 1973) 33-8; Torsten Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier: Anabaptist Theologian and Martyr*, ed. William R. Estep, Jr.; trans. Irwin J. Barnes and William R. Estep (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1978), 280-4, 345-5, 361-6, 392-4. Other instances can be found in Rollin Stely Armour, *Anabaptist Baptism: A Representative Study*. Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, vol. 11 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1966), 49-54; annotations in H. Wayne Pipkin and John Howard Yoder, eds. and trans., *Balthasar Hubmaier*, Classics of the Radical Reformation, vol. 5 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989) [hereafter *CRR*]; Gunnar Westin and Torsten Bergsten, eds., *Schriften*, Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer, vol. 9 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1962), 224-255 [hereafter *HS*]. The only comprehensive study closely related to my own, and one that I have not yet availed myself of other than the abstract, is a recent dissertation by Antonia Lucic Gonzalez entitled, “Balthasar Hubmaier and Early Christian Tradition” (Ph.D. Diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2008). However, from what I can gather from her abstract, Gonzalez’s study appears to differ from mine in focus, direction, methodology, and contextual considerations. Still, some significant similarities do exist, not the least of which concerns Hubmaier’s use of and attitude towards Augustine.
5. It is reassuring that within the past two decades some important studies have emerged on the reception of the church fathers during the Renaissance and Reformation: Irena Backus, “Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church,” In *Erasmus’ Vision of the Church*, ed. Hilmar Pabel (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth-Century Journal Publishers, 1995), 95-114; Irena Backus, “Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer and the Church Fathers,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 2, ed. Irena Backus (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001), 627-660; Jacques-Guy Bougerol, “The Church Fathers and the Sentences of Peter Lombard,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 113-164; Barbara Fleith, “The Patristic sources of the *Legenda Aurea*: A Research Report,” *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 231-287; Olaf Kuhr, “*Die Macht des Bannes und der Busse*”: *Kirchenzucht und Erneuerung der Kirche bei Johannes Oekolampad (1482-1531)*, Basler und Berner Studien zur Historischen und Systematischen Theologie, vol. 68 (Vienna: Peter Lang, 1999); Ann E. Matter, “The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*,” In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 83-111; Eugene F. Rice, Jr., “The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d’Étaples and his Circle,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962): 126-160; Nikolaus Staubach, James C.G.

- Greig, trans., “*Memores Pristinæ Perfectionis* The Importance of the Church Fathers for *Devotio Moderna*,” in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 405-469; and Jean Werckmeister, “The Reception of the Church Fathers in Canon Law,” *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 51-81.
6. Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strands* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), 80.
  7. Deno John Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 283.
  8. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 284-5. Compare with Charles L. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1977).
  9. Irena Backus, “The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation,” in *Early Christianity: Its Origins and Evolution to AD 600*, ed. Ian Hazlett (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1991), 298; and Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 13, 49, 281, 285-7.
  10. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 13, 56. Compare with Deno John Geanakoplos, “Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Émigré Scholars,” in *Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Albert Rabil Jr. (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 356.
  11. Geanakoplos, “Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Émigré Scholars,” 361-2. Compare with S. Camporeale, *L. Valla, umanesimo e teologia* (Florence, 1972), 429-30; and N.G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), 69.
  12. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 22, 288; and Backus, “The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation,” 297. Compare with Deno John Geanakoplos, “Theodore Gaza, a Byzantine Scholar of the Palaeologan Renaissance in the Italian Renaissance,” *Medievalia et Humanistica* 12 (1984): 61-81.
  13. Backus, “The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation,” 298; John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 69-79; and Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225-6.
  14. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 110; Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225-6; and Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 87.

15. Deno John Geanakoplos, *Greeks Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), 157.
16. Geanakoplos, *Greeks Scholars in Venice*, 50-1.
17. Geanakoplos, *Greeks Scholars in Venice*, 138. Compare with Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 141-2.
18. Compare with Backus, "The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation," 296; Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 14, 57, 62; Geanakoplos, "Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Émigré Scholars," 354-355, 359-64, 368-9; John Meyendorff, *Church and Society in the Last Centuries of Byzantium: Birkbeck Lectures, 1977* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979); and Robert S. Nelson, *Later Byzantine Painting: Art, Agency, and Appreciation* (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2007).
19. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Erasmus from an Italian Perspective," *Renaissance Quarterly* 23, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 8-9. Compare with Jan den Boeft, "Erasmus and the Church Fathers," 542; and Jozef IJsewijn, "Humanism in the Low Countries," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, vol. 2, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 156-215.
20. Compare with Backus, "Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church," 95; Lewis W. Spitz, *Luther and German Humanism* (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 1996), 400; and Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225.
21. Eugene F. Rice, Jr., "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Circle," 140. Compare with Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225-6.
22. Compare with John F D'Amico, "Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian and the Reformation: A Humanist's Critique of Scholasticism," 38-9; Natalie Zemon Davis, "Gregory Nazianzen in the Service of Humanist Social Reform," 457-8; and John Dyck, "Johannes Oecolampadius: Lighthouse of the Reformation," 25. Beatus' edition of Tertullian's *opera* included twenty three of Tertullian's thirty three works. One of them was *de corona militis*, from which Hubmaier quotes ("Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252).
23. John F D'Amico, "Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian and the Reformation: A Humanist's Critique of Scholasticism," 47. "Ein einfältiger Unterricht," *HS* 291; *CRR* 320. Hubmaier was exposed to the writings of Gabriel Biel through the influence of his mentor, Eck, with whom Hubmaier studied Biel's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, a theological textbook of the time, and of an earlier time, that contained numerous citations of the Fathers.

Eddie Louis Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 5-6, 18. Also, Hubmaier many times indicates that the source for his citations of the fathers is Gratian's *decretum*, sometimes providing the precise reference location in the treatise itself or in his marginal notes. See also CRR 252, note 24. Compare with Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, 31.

24. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, 81.
25. For general inquiries into humanist influence on university curriculum see Charles G. Nauert, Jr., "Humanist Infiltration into the Academic World: Some Studies of Northern Universities," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 4 (1990): 809-10; and Laetitia Boehm, "Humanistische Bildungsbewegung und mittelalterliche Universitätsverfassung: Aspekte zur fgozeitlichen Reformgeschichte der deutschen Universitäten," in *The Universities in the Late Middle Ages*, eds. Joseph Jsewijn and Jacques Paquet, *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia*, series 1, studia 6 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1978).
26. The library inventories also demonstrate that Hubmaier must have been exposed to the church fathers while a student with its inventory including works by Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clement of Rome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Jerome, Ambrose, Dionysius the Aeropagite, John Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea, Eusebius, Origen, Lactantius, and Cyprian, as well as patristic compilations such as Gratian's *Decretum*, Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, and the *glossa ordinaria*. Wilhelm John, "Das Bücherverzeichnis der Ingolstädter Artisten-fakultät von 1508," 389-408. For an indication of what was available while Hubmaier was a student at Freiburg-im-Breisgau, see <http://www3.ub.uni-freiburg.de/index.php?id=1113>. Additional sources include Wolfgang Kehr, hrsg., *Handbuch der historischen Buchbestände in Deutschland* (Hildesheim: Olms, Bd. 7: Baden-Württemberg und Saarland, 1994), 98-167; and Josef Rest, "Die älteste Geschichte der Freiburger Universitätsbibliothek," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 39 (1922): 7-25.
27. A definitive biography of Eck with observations highlighting his humanism is Erwin Iserloh, *Johannes Eck (1486-1543) Scholastiker Humanist Kontroverstheologe* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1985), esp. 7-20. For descriptions of the contents of Eck's personal library to which Hubmaier must have been exposed, see Theodor Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Ingolstadt* (Regensburg, 1865).
28. Eddie Louis Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church*, 6. Compare with Carl Sachsse, *Doktor Balthasar als Theologe*, 120ff; William J. Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Thought: A Bibliographical Essay," *Theological Studies* 33 (1972): 716-734; and Heiko A. Oberman,



- “Some Notes on the Theology of Nominalism with Attention to its Relation to the Renaissance,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 53, no. 1 (January 1960): 47-76.
29. For a comprehensive evaluation of Hubmaier’s encounter with and dependence on Erasmus, see the recently published doctoral dissertation: Darren T. Williamson, “Erasmus of Rotterdam’s Influence Upon Anabaptism: The Case of Balthasar Hubmaier” (Ph.D. diss., Simon Fraser University, 2005).
  30. Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier’s Doctrine of the Church*, 22-5.
  31. That the Anabaptists typically located the so-called “fall” of the church with the conversion of Constantine, thus a matter of church/state relations, is a typical view: Franklin H. Littell, *The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism: A Study of the Anabaptist View of the Church* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), esp. 65-6. Compare with Geoffrey Dipple, “Just As In The Time of the Apostles”: *Uses of History in the Radical Reformation*, 105ff; Hans J. Hillerbrand, “Anabaptism and History,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 45, no. 2 (April 1971): 107-122; Franklin H. Littell, “In Response to Hans Hillerbrand,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 45 (1971): 377-80; John Howard Yoder, “Anabaptism and History: Restitution and the Possibility of Renewal,” in *Umstrittenes Täuferium 1525-1975: Neue Forschungen*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Goertz (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), esp. 244-6. H.W. Meihuizen traced the origin of *restitutio*’s modern usage to a footnote in Karl Wilhelm Bouterwek’s *Zur Literatur und Geschichte der Wiedertäufer, besonders in den Rheinlanden*: H.W. Meihuizen, “The Concept of Restitution in the Anabaptism of Northwestern Europe,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 44 (1970): 141-3.
  32. Zwingli accuses Hubmaier of believing that Pope Nicholas II initiated infant baptism; this Hubmaier flatly denies (“Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein,” *HS* 198; *CRR* 212).
  33. “Jch glaub . . . vnnnd bekhenne ein heilige, allgmaine, Christenliche Kirchen . . . [vnd] veriehen ainen herren, ainen Gott, ainen glauben vnd ainen tauff.” (“Die Zwölf Artikel des Christlichen Glaubens,” *HS* 218; *CRR* 238).
  34. “Ein Rechenschaft des Glaubens,” *HS* 470-2; *CRR* 537-8; and “Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein,” *HS* 185; *CRR* 193; “Eine Form zu Taufen,” *HS* 352; *CRR* 391.
  35. “Von der Kindertaufe,” *HS* 261; *CRR* 280. Compare with “Eine Kurze Entschuldigung,” *HS* 274; *CRR* 300.
  36. “Von der Kindertaufe,” *HS* 267; *CRR* 290.

37. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 197; *CRR* 210. Pipkin believes that the Cyril mentioned here by Hubmaier is Cyril of Jerusalem; however, the evidence seems to point to Cyril of Alexandria. George of Trebizond translated Cyril of Alexandria's monumental *Commentary on John* into Latin, and it seems to be this commentary to which Hubmaier is referring. As for the work by John Chrysostom, Hubmaier merely says, "Chrysostom, Book 1, page 51, Book 2, page 47." It is virtually impossible to know for certain what Hubmaier is referring to here, but as George of Trebizond also translated into Latin Chrysostom's *Commentary on Matthew*, and since this commentary does indeed make reference to the distinction between the baptisms of John and of Christ, this would make it a likely candidate.
38. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 250.
39. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 250-1.
40. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.
41. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 251.
42. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 251.
43. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231-2; *CRR* 253.
44. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 244; *CRR* 265; "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 260; *CRR* 278.
45. "Achtzehn Schlußreden," *HS* 73; *CRR* 33. Compare with "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 172; *CRR* 176.
46. "Ein einfältiger Unterricht," *HS* 295; *CRR* 326.
47. "Eine christliche Lehrtafel," *HS* 309; *CRR* 343. Pipkin notes here that Hubmaier was using a pun: *Lügend* (lying) for *legend*, and *höllisch* (hellish) for *heilig* (holy) (note 11).
48. Mabry claims, "[F]or Hubmaier the freedom of the will is a corollary to the doctrine of believer's baptism." Walter L. Moore, "Catholic Teacher and Anabaptist Pupil: The Relationship between John Eck and Balthasar Hubmaier," 74. "Von der Freiheit des Willens, (1527)"; and "Das andere büchlein von der Freiwilligkeit des Menschen (1527)."
49. Compare with Walter L. Moore, "Catholic Teacher and Anabaptist Pupil: The Relationship between John Eck and Balthasar Hubmaier," 68-97; Francis Oakley, "The Absolute and Ordained Power of God in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Theology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, no. 3 (July 1998): 440-50, 453, 456, 457. In reference to the battle between the *via antiqua* (realism advocated by John Duns Scotus) and the *via moderna*

(nominalism of William of Occam), Mabry notes that through Eck, Hubmaier was educated in the later camp, that of the *via moderna* and was exposed to the “moderate school” of mainstream of late-medieval nominalism of Gabriel Biel and John Gerson (*Balthasar Hubmaier’s Doctrine of the Church*, 13).

50. Edward K. Burger, *Erasmus and the Anabaptists* (Ph.D. Diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1977); Kenneth R. Davis, “Erasmus as a Progenitor of Anabaptist Theology and Piety,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47, no. 3 (July 1973): 163-178; and Thor Hall, “Possibilities of Erasmian Influence on Denck and Hubmaier in their Views on the Freedom of the Will,” 149-170.
51. Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier: Anabaptist Theologian and Martyr*, 354.
52. Walter L. Moore, “Catholic Teacher and Anabaptist Pupil: The Relationship between John Eck and Balthasar Hubmaier,” 72. Mabry states that Hubmaier’s exposure to Erasmus’ *Diatribes* was adequately proven by both Gerd Seewald and Thor Hall.
53. Martin Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, trans. Edward Thomas Vaughan (London, 1823), 137.
54. Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, 147.
55. Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, 247.
56. Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, 58-9.
57. Desiderius Erasmus, *Discourse on Free Will*, trans. and ed. Ernst F. Winter (New York: Continuum, 2004), 15-16.
58. Henry C. Vedder, *Balthasar Hubmaier, The Leader of the Anabaptists* (New York, 1905; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1971), 193.
59. “Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein,” *HS* 184; *CRR* 192.
60. “Von der Kindertaufe,” *HS* 261; *CRR* 279.
61. “Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen,” *HS* 154; *CRR* 139.
62. “Recantation in Zurich,” *CRR* 152.
63. “Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein,” *HS* 171; *CRR* 175.
64. “Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein,” *HS* 205-6; *CRR* 221-222. Cf. “Das andere büchlein von der Freiwilligkeit des Menschen,” *HS* 414-5; *CRR* 470.
65. “Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein,” *HS* 172; *CRR* 176.

66. "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 267; *CRR* 291.
67. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 227; *CRR* 246.
68. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 197; *CRR* 210.
69. "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 267; *CRR* 292-3.
70. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.
71. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 138; *CRR* 119.
72. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 154; *CRR* 139.
73. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 228; *CRR* 247.
74. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 244; *CRR* 265.
75. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.
76. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 197; *CRR* 210. The only connection Hubmaier makes between a Latin father and Scripture is Jerome's interaction with Matthew 28:19, but this is Jerome's Latin translation of Origen's homily on Luke 3: "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.
77. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 244-5; *CRR* 266.
78. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 138, 153-4; *CRR* 119, 138-9; and "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 247; *CRR* 269-270.
79. Although alleging that much of Hubmaier's theology "was by and large bypassed by Anabaptists as something it would be better not to indulge in too deeply," a claim that continues to be reassessed especially in light of research into the Moravian brethren (37), Robert Friedman observes, "Hubmaier was a special type, greatly esteemed by Christian radicals but not really emulated and followed after. Many of his theological ideas crept into Anabaptist thinking, such as, for instance, his doctrine of the freedom of the will, or his teachings concerning the two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper." If Hubmaier's impact on Anabaptism can be observed from the dissemination of his comprehensive teachings on the freedom of the will, the implications of a study of his use of the Greek fathers are significant (*The Theology of Anabaptism: An Interpretation* [Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1973], 19).