

A TESTIMONY AGAINST THE UNFOUNDED CHARGES OF ANABAPTISM

by Greg Price

The following article is appendix A excerpted from *Saul in the Cave of Adullam* by Reg Barrow

When theological and historical knowledge sinks so low that those who walk in the good old paths of their covenanted forefathers of the First and Second Reformations are smeared with the names of heresies their forefathers vigorously attacked (which is simply a contemporary case of historical revisionism), it becomes necessary to answer such unfounded allegations for the sake of the truth as found in holy Scripture. It seems as though it has become a popular way of debating in some "reformed" circles to accuse a person or church of being "anabaptistic" (of course, without supplying any historical evidence that would tie the heretical views of the Anabaptists to faithful descendants of the reformers). All too often, such **ad hominem** arguments focus upon the unlawful separatism and perfectionism practiced by the Anabaptists (for which the Anabaptists and all walking in their paths should rightly be condemned). However, we must not stoop to the tactics of the world who falsely label a person or church "racist" and "homophobic" simply because they condemn affirmative action and sodomy. Neither should a person or church be falsely labeled "anabaptistic" simply because they condemn ecclesiastical toleration of false doctrine, unauthorized public worship, and unbiblical church government. The warning of Calvin alerts us to the danger of such misapplied labels:

Thus, the wickedness of many is still the reason why the Church is troubled by divisions, and why contentions are kindled. **Yet those who disturb the peace, throw the blame on us, and call us Schismatics**; for the principal charge which the Papists bring against us is, that our doctrine has shaken the tranquility of the Church. Yet the truth is, that, if they would yield submissively to Christ, and give their support to the truth, all the commotions would immediately be allayed. But when they utter murmurs and complaints against Christ, and will not allow us to be at rest on any other condition than that the truth of God shall be extinguished, and that Christ shall be banished from his kingdom, they have no right to accuse us of the crime of schism; for it is on themselves, as every person sees, that this crime ought to be charged. We ought to be deeply grieved that the Church is torn by divisions arising among those who profess the same religion; but it is better that there are some who separate themselves from the wicked, to be united to Christ their Head, than that all should be of one mind in despising God. **Consequently, when schisms arise, we ought to inquire who they are that revolt from God and from his pure doctrine.**¹

Thus, let us clearly distinguish between the heresy of the Anabaptists and the orthodoxy of the Reformers (and those who own the biblical truths for which the reformers stood), and thus shun the sin of calling evil good and good evil:

Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! (Is. 5:20).

Anabaptism is indeed rampant throughout the ecclesiastical landscape of the present era. Like a cancer, anabaptism has infected the modern church (including many churches that profess to be reformed), and its malignancy continues to spread. But unless we can accurately diagnose this heresy in its various forms, we will not be able to destroy it by means of the Spirit and the truth. To the end that this ancient heresy might be exposed and removed from the Church of Christ, the following contrasts between the positions of the Anabaptist and Reformed churches are made. Anabaptism has generally shunned confessional formulations (one exemption to this general rule however is the The Schleithem Confession, also known as The Seven Articles of 1527):

They [i.e. the anabaptistic Brethren movement-GLP] emphasized believer's baptism (as opposed to infant baptism) and **shunned creeds and "statements of faith"** due to the possibility of over-emphasizing some teachings or beliefs, and minimizing or ignoring others. **They took the entire New Testament as their creed.**²

Thus, it is not always a simple task to identify the "distinctive" beliefs and practices of the Anabaptists, for they were far from a monolithic system. In fact, the Anabaptists at times differed as much amongst themselves as they did with those who were within the Reformed Church (a covenanted uniformity in doctrine, worship, and government was not one of the distinctives of anabaptism, though it was a distinctive of the Reformed Church particularly of the Second Reformation). Although all of the positions cited below may not be representative of every anabaptist church, nevertheless, there has been made a serious attempt to catalogue some of the prominent errors embraced by various historical representatives of Anabaptism.

1. The Incarnation

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Though Christ was fully God, he lacked a true human body (i.e. a human body that was derived from the Virgin Mary). Christ's body was no different than that of angelic appearances in the flesh.

He is called, they [the Anabaptists-GLP] say, the "Son of David," not because He has taken anything from the Virgin Mary or was made man from her substance, but only because she carried Him in her body, **as water passes through a tube.**³ This same woman [i.e. the Virgin Mary-GLP] conceived in her womb the aforementioned seed [i.e. Christ-GLP], which is God's Word, **not from her body nor of her body**, but of God, by the power of the Holy Ghost, through faith. . . . The Word [i.e. Christ-GLP]. . . was not Abraham's natural flesh and blood. . . . For Christ Jesus, as to His origin, is no earthly man, that is, a fruit of the flesh and blood of Adam.⁴

(2) This is simply the ancient heresy of the Valentinians who denied that Christ's human nature was derived from the virgin Mary.

As the divinity of Christ was attacked by the fury of various heresies, so Satan has raised up many enemies against his humanity. . . . The Valentinians held that indeed he had a body, but one sent from heaven, not one received from the virgin. They also believed that the body of the virgin was like a channel through which the body of Christ passed. . . . Treading in the footsteps of all these, the modern Anabaptists deny that Christ took flesh and blood from the substance of the blessed virgin.⁵

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) It was absolutely essential that Christ should receive a real body and a reasonable soul in order to become a mediator between God and man who could redeem us from the fall of the first Adam.

Furthermore, **the matter was necessary for our redemption:** that the disobedience which was committed in our nature might also be repaired in the same. For this reason our Lord Jesus became **true man**, presenting Himself as in the person of Adam, whose name He also assumed (Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:47), in order to pay the price of sin in the flesh in which it was committed.⁶

Q.37. How did Christ, being the Son of God, become man?

A. Christ the Son of God became man, by taking to himself **a true body**, and a reasonable [i.e. rational-GLP] soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, **of her substance**, and born of her, yet without sin.⁷

Q.39. Why was it requisite that the Mediator should be man?

A. It was requisite that the Mediator should be man, that he might advance our nature, perform obedience to the law, suffer and make intercession for us in our nature, have a fellow-feeling of our infirmities; that we might receive the adoption of sons, and have comfort and access with boldness unto the throne of grace.⁸

2. Salvation

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Divine election is conditioned upon the foresight of God in knowing all those who would first choose to believe in Him.

For with the Pelagians and Papists, **ye [Anabaptists-GLP] are become teachers of free will**, and defenders of your own justice.⁹

(2) Salvation or corresponding punishment are only for sins personally committed rather than for original sin imputed and inherited from Adam.

They [i.e. Anabaptists-GLP] deny that the posterity are guilty on account of the fall of their first parents.¹⁰

(3) Good works are necessary to justification . Schaff notes that the Anabaptists rejected Luther's theory of forensic, solifidian [by faith alone-GLP] justification.¹¹ Balthasar Hubmaier, one of the early pillars of Anabaptism, articulated this subjective view of salvation when he represented God as stating, Man, help yourself, and then I will help you.¹²

(4) True believers may finally fall from grace and true faith.

The question concerning perseverance is agitated by us with old and new Pelagians and Semipelagians, who agree in opposing and denying it. Such are the Romanists, Socinians, **Anabaptists** and Remonstrants, **who, on this point (as in the others concerning grace), depart from the orthodox doctrine and were condemned by the Synod of Dort in Article 5** (Acta Synodi Nationalis . . . Dordrecht [1619-20], 1:311-17).¹³

(5) These errors are rampant in Arminianism (which promotes a thoroughly man-centered salvation).

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Divine election is not conditioned upon foreseen faith in man or any merit found in man, but rests entirely in the freedom of God's sovereign will.

Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, **without any foresight of faith or good**

works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace.¹⁴

(2) Justification is an objective, judicial act of God whereby He forgives all those who believe in Christ and declares the believing sinner righteous on the basis of the righteousness of Christ alone. Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, **only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone.**¹⁵

3. The Scriptures

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Though the Old Testament is of divine inspiration, it was given only to the Israelite nation as a rule. It is the New Testament alone that is the rule for the Christian, for only the New Testament manifests the perfection of Christ. [T]hey rejected the Old Testament as equal with the New Testament **as a basis for faith and practice.**¹⁶

This question [concerning the authority of the Old Testament-GLP] brings us into collision with Anabaptists who reject the books of the Old Testament from the canon of faith, as if they had not the least reference to Christians and as if they should not draw from them doctrines of faith and rules of life. **The Mennonites in their Confession (Article 11) teach that "all Christians, in matters of faith, ought to have recourse necessarily only to the gospel of Christ"**¹⁷

The second question treats of the morality of the Sabbath-whether the fourth commandment, sanctioning the sanctification of the Sabbath, is moral and perpetual; or only ceremonial and constituted for a certain time The second [view-GLP] asserts that it is merely ceremonial and so entirely abrogated by Christ. **This was the opinion of the ancient Manichaeans and of the Anabaptists and Socinians of the present day (who hold that it was so abrogated as to pertain in no way to Christians).**¹⁸

According to Anabaptists,

The Old Testament was given to the Jews alone and had no authority for Christians. The Old was therefore especially inferior to the New, because the hope of everlasting life was lacking.¹⁹

(2) This error has been (in substance) propounded by modern day dispensationalists.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) All of Scripture (Old and New Testaments) is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16). The moral law found in the Old Testament binds the consciences of all men, even as that same moral law does that is revealed in the New Testament.

The Old Testament in Hebrew, (which was the native language of the people of God of old,) **and the New Testament in Greek,** (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations,) being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; **so as in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal**

unto them.²⁰

There are not therefore two covenants of grace differing in substance, **but one and the same [covenant of grace-GLP] under various dispensations [i.e. Old Covenant and New Covenant-GLP].**²¹

4. The Church

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Only those who profess faith in Christ and have reached a demonstrable level of sanctification are eligible to become members of the Visible Church. Thus, the Visible Church is a body composed of a regenerate membership.

Its [Anabaptism's-GLP] characteristics were. . . a "pure" church **consisting of the "truly" converted** who desire a "holy community" separated from the world.²² Although we think true believers alone are [truly-GLP] members of the church, we do not on this account favor the error of the Novatians, Catharists and Donatists, or of the modern Anabaptists (which the Romanists calumniously charge us with doing), **who hold that the church consists of those who are perfectly sanctified.** For besides the fact that in the external communion hypocrites are mixed with true believers, the elect (who alone formally belong to the mystical body of Christ as long as they live on earth) are always exposed to various stains and sins (1 Jn. 1:8); as the moon never shines in such a way as to be without various spots.²³

(2) There is no formal connection between separate congregations. Thus, there is no church court higher than the independent congregation to whom the congregation must submit.

(3) This humanly instituted form of church membership and church government may be observed in various independent and congregational churches.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) The visible church consists of all those who profess (in the judgment of charity) the true religion together with their children. Within the membership of the visible church are both regenerate and unregenerate. God addeth such as should be saved to the visible Church by baptism, because the adjoining to a visible Church is a way to salvation, **but it followeth not that all whom God addeth to the visible Church are saved ones**, for then the visible Church should consist only of believers, which only Anabaptists teach.²⁴

(2) There ought to be a formal constitutional connection between individual congregations, and higher ecclesiastical courts to which individual congregations must submit in the Lord.

It is lawful, and agreeable to the word of God, that the church be governed by several sorts of assemblies, which are congregational, classical [presbyterial-GLP], and synodical **It is lawful, and agreeable to the word of God, that there be a subordination of congregational, classical, provincial, and national assemblies, for the government of the church.**²⁵

And it is so obligatory to all persons, states and degrees, that none ought to be exempted from that Church-government which is jure divino [by divine right-GLP], nor to be **tolerated** in another Church-government, which is but jure humano [by human right-GLP]; nor ought any Christian to seek after, or content himself with any such Exemption or **Toleration.**²⁶

For in so doing, inventions of men are [would be] preferred before the ordinances of God; our own wisdom, will, authority [would be] before the wisdom, will, [and-GLP] authority of Christ. . . . **That the Law of God holds forth a subordination of a particular Church to greater Assemblies, consisting of several choice members, taken out of several single Congregations, which Assemblies have authoritative power and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction over that particular Church by way of sentencing in and deciding of Ecclesiastical causes.**²⁷

5. Worship

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Baptism (according to Anabaptists) should only be administered to those who sincerely profess their faith in Christ and give evidence of genuine repentance. Since infants can neither believe in Christ nor repent of sin, they cannot receive Christian baptism.

Baptism shall be given to all those who have learned repentance and amendment of life, and who believe truly that their sins are taken away by Christ, and to all those who walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and wish to be buried with Him in death, so that they may be resurrected with Him and to all those who with this significance request it (baptism) of us and demand it for themselves. This excludes all infant baptism, the highest and chief abomination of the Pope.²⁸

This is simply the unbiblical view of Baptists today who exclude the children of believers from the blessings of the covenant.

(2) Furthermore, Anabaptists composed some of the earliest Protestant [uninspired-GLP] hymns in the German language. . . . They dwell on the inner life of the Christian, the mysteries of regeneration, sanctification, and personal union with Christ.²⁹

In composing uninspired hymns to be used in worship (contrary to the universal practice of the Reformed Churches), the Anabaptists find expression in most twentieth century churches (regardless of denominational label) who have departed from the Regulative Principle of Worship.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Baptism is rightly administered to all who profess faith in Christ and to the infant children of one or both believing parents.

Q.95. To whom is baptism to be administered?

A. Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church, till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him; **but the infants of such as are members of the visible church are to be baptized.**³⁰

[T]hose infants who derive their origin from Christians, as they have been born directly into the inheritance of the covenant, and are accepted by God, are thus to be received into baptism.³¹

(2) The spiritual descendants of Calvin and the Westminster Assembly have steadfastly maintained that God is only to be worshipped according to His own revealed will. This is known as the Regulative Principle of Worship and is simply

an articulation of the Second Commandment.

So let us hold to this rule, that all human inventions which are set up to corrupt the simple purity of the word of God, and to undo the worship which he demands and approves, are true sacrileges, **in which the Christian man cannot participate without blaspheming God**, and trampling his honour underfoot.³²

Now, if you will prove that your ceremonies proceed from faith, and do please God, **you must prove that God in expressed words has commanded them**; or else you shall never prove that they proceed from faith, nor yet that they please God; but they are sin, and do displease him, according to the words of the apostle, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."³³

But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, **or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture**.³⁴

But what Augustine says is true, that no one can sing things worthy of God, unless he has received them from Himself [i.e. from God-GLP]. Therefore, after we have sought on every side, searching here and there, we shall find no songs better and more suitable for our purpose than the Psalms of David, dictated to him and made for him by the Holy Spirit. . . . it should accustom itself hereafter to sing **these divine and heavenly songs** with good King David.³⁵

The reading of the Scriptures with godly fear; the sound preaching, and conscionable hearing of the word, in obedience unto God, with understanding, faith, and reverence; **singing of psalms with grace in the heart**; as also the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ; **are all parts of the ordinary worship of God**.³⁶

It is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly, **by singing of psalms** together in the congregation.³⁷

With one word, we judge this and other novelties, in these carefree days a useless hindrance. This we also say of the introduction of new hymn-books, and present day ditties, which we do not find in God's Word; as also the playing and peeping of organs in the Church. The former are all against the decrees of our Synods. See about singing in the Church, the National Synod of Dordt held in 1578, art. 76; the National Synod held in Middleburg, 1581, art. 51; the National Synod held in the Hague, 1586, art. 62; **at which gatherings hymns not found in Scripture are expressly forbidden**.³⁸

It is known from Church history, that those who are after novelties, by introducing man-made hymns and errors, have corrupted the Congregation. . . . The statement made by the Synod of Dordt, 1574, art. 50, needs our special attention; where we read, "**Concerning the use of Organs in the Congregation, we hold that according to 1 Cor. 14:19, it should not have a place in the Church.** . ." To know the reason why Organs should be kept out of the church, read our learned theologians and their polemics about Organs against the Lutherans and Papists.³⁹

6. Separation

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) It is warranted and justified to separate from a church due to the toleration of moral corruption within the life of members of the church. Where scandalous sin is evident in the life of professing members of a church, such a church is not perfected in Christ and cannot be a true church. Like the Novatians and the Donatists of old who would not allow repentant sinners back into the fellowship of the church until they had manifested years of fruitful repentance, so the Anabaptists required a pure membership in the visible church. From this we should learn that everything which is not united with our God and Christ cannot be other than an abomination which we should shun and flee from. **By this is meant all Catholic and Protestant works and church services.**⁴⁰

The debate is over this: they [the Anabaptists-GLP] think that wherever this order [i.e. the ban or excommunication- GLP] is not properly constituted, or not duly exercised, no church exists, and it is unlawful for a Christian to receive the Lord's Supper there. **Thus they separate themselves from the churches in which the doctrine of God is purely preached, taking this pretext: that they do not care to participate in the pollution committed therein, because those who ought to be excommunicated have not been banished.**⁴¹

(2) This is the error practiced by true schismatics and sectarians.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) It is warranted and justified to separate from a church due to an habitual and notable defection from the truth in doctrine, worship, or government. However, separation is not justified merely on the grounds that a church tolerates sin in the members of its congregation.

This is undoubtedly a warning highly necessary, in order that when the temple of God happens to be tainted by many impurities, we may not contract such disgust and chagrin as will make us withdraw from it. **By impurities I understand the vices of a corrupt and polluted life. Provided religion continue pure as to doctrine and worship, we must not be so much stumbled at the faults and sins which men commit, as on that account to rend the unity of the Church.** Yet the experience of all ages teaches us how dangerous a temptation it is when we behold the Church of God, which ought to be free from all polluting stains, and to shine in uncorrupted purity, cherishing in her bosom many ungodly hypocrites, or wicked persons. From this the Catharists, Novatians, and Donatists, took occasion in former times to separate themselves from the fellowship of the godly. **The Anabaptists, at the present day, renew the same schisms, because it does not seem to them that a church in which vices are tolerated can be a true church.** But Christ, in Matth. xxv.32, justly claims it as his own peculiar office to separate the sheep from the goats; and thereby admonishes us, that we must bear with the evils which it is not in our power to correct, until all things become ripe, and the proper season of purging the Church arrive.⁴²

When the greatest part of a Church maketh defection from the Truth, the lesser part remaining sound, **the greatest part is the Church of Separatists.**⁴³ **The blame of Schism must not be upon those who forsake such as have forsaken Christ, and the ancient Faith, but upon those who have thus forsaken Christ, and his Truths:** Yea farther, if they impose that which is not necessary, (tho' in itself not sinful) and will not bear with the Weaknesses of such as think it to be evil; **if, upon that, they be forced to withdraw, in this the Governors are the Schismatics, because the Rent is in them.**⁴⁴

7. Perfectionism

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Christians are saints, and as those who are holy, they are not to have any contact with those who are polluted and corrupted with sin. Christians should withdraw from the corruption in this world and live in their own communal societies.

A separation shall be made from the evil and from the wickedness which the devil planted in the world; in this manner, simply that **we shall not have fellowship with them.**⁴⁵

Once the Novatians stirred up the churches with this teaching, but our own age has certain Anabaptists (not very different from Novatianists) who are lapsing into the same madness. **For they feign that in baptism God's people are reborn into a pure and angelic life, unsullied by any carnal filth.**⁴⁶

The same question [concerning perfectionism-GLP] was renewed in this century by the Neopelagians, Romanists, Socinians and **Anabaptists**, who, to pave the way for the merits of works, **maintained that the law can be perfectly fulfilled by the renewed.**⁴⁷

(2) This is the dangerous error of Wesley and Finney who taught that Christians can (through a second work of grace) reach a perfect state of entire sanctification in this life.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Christians are saints by calling and are being conformed by the power of the Word and Spirit into the image of Christ. However, sanctification is gradual in this life, and the remnants of sin remain within every Christian. Although the Christian cannot remove himself entirely from sin and sinners in this life, yet he is not to consent (in thought, word, or deed) to the sin around him. Furthermore, establishing and guarding purity in doctrine, worship, and government as a part of a church's true constitution is not perfectionism, but simply faithfulness to Christ. This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life; there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part.⁴⁸

No man that takes due care of his salvation, can join himself to it [i.e. to a church-GLP], when the fundamentals of religious worship are corrupted or overthrown, **it is absolutely unlawful to join unto, or abide in any [such-GLP] Church.**⁴⁹

However, when we categorically deny to the papists the title of the church, we do not for this reason impugn the existence of churches among them. **Rather, we are only contending about the true and lawful constitution of the church, required in the communion not only of the sacraments (which are the signs of profession) but also especially of doctrine.** . . . To sum up, I call them churches to the extent that the Lord wonderfully preserves in them a remnant of his people, however woefully dispersed and scattered, and to the extent that some marks of the church remain-especially those marks whose effectiveness neither the devil's wiles nor human depravity can destroy. But on the other hand, because in them those marks have been erased to which we should pay particular regard in this discourse, I say that everyone of their congregations and their whole body lack the lawful form of the church.⁵⁰

8. Civil Government

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Civil government is outside the realm of Christ's kingdom and, and thus no Christian should serve in a civil capacity. War, capital punishment, judicial retribution, nor self-defence have any place in the life of a Christian. Therefore, there will also unquestionably fall from us the unchristian, **devilish weapons of force**-such as sword, armor and the like, and all their use (either) for friends or against one's enemies-by virtue of the Word of Christ. Resist not (him that is) evil.⁵¹

Shall one be a magistrate if one should be chosen as such? The answer is as follows: **They wished to make Christ king, but He fled and did not view it as the arrangement of His Father. Thus, shall we do as He did**, and follow Him, and so shall we not walk in darkness.⁵²

(2) The civil magistrate should not establish by law the Reformed Church (or any other church) nor a reformed and presbyterian creed (or any other creed) as the official church and creed within a nation. Rather a civil government should establish a position of liberty of conscience with regard to all religions. From this we should learn that everything which is not united with our God and Christ cannot be other than an abomination which we should shun and flee from. **By this is meant all Catholic and Protestant works and church services, meetings and church attendance**, drinking houses, civic affairs, the oaths sworn in unbelief and other things of that kind, which are highly regarded by the world and yet are carried on in flat contradiction to the command of God, in accordance with all the unrighteousness which is in the world.⁵³

Wherefore we condemn **the Anabaptists**, and all those troublesome spirits, **which do reject higher powers and magistrates, overthrow all laws and judgments**, make all goods common, and, to conclude, do abolish and confound all those orders and degrees, which God hath appointed among men for honesty's sake.⁵⁴ Gillespie provides a very helpful summary of the three major positions concerning established religion and liberty of conscience. **The Papists** believed that the civil magistrate should put all heretics to death (and promoted the use of many abominable means of torture in order to compel confessions and recantations) without making any distinction amongst the various degrees or obstinacy of heresy. **The Anabaptists** believed that the civil magistrate should tolerate all religions, even legally protecting the free exercise of false religions (this is the position endorsed by not only evangelicals today, but also the position propounded by Reformed Churches as well). **The Reformed Churches** offered a mediating position wherein the civil magistrate should legally establish the one true Reformed Religion, protecting and defending it from all heresy, schism, and false worship. Although not tolerating false religions, the magistrate, nevertheless, should make distinctions amongst heresies as to the degree of seriousness and as to the degree of obstinacy in the heretic (i.e. all heretics should not be punished to the same extent).

The first opinion is that of the Papists, who hold it to be not only no sin, but good service to God, to extirpate [i.e. uproot-GLP] by fire and sword, all that are adversaries to, or opposers of the Church and the Catholic religion. . . that all heretics without distinction are to be put to death.⁵⁵

The second opinion [which represents the position of the Anabaptists,

Independents, and other sectaries-GLP] falls short, as far as the former exceeds: that is, that the Magistrate ought not to inflict any punishment, nor put forth any coercive power upon heretics or sectaries, but on the contrary grant them liberty and toleration.⁵⁶

The third opinion [which represents the position of the Reformed Churches-GLP] is that the Magistrate may and ought to exercise his coercive power, in suppressing and punishing heretics and sectaries, **less or more, according as the nature and degree of the error, schism, obstinacy, and danger of seducing others, requires.** . . . And lest it be thought that this is but the opinion of some few, that the magistrate ought thus by a strong hand, and by civil punishments suppress heretics and sectaries: let it be observed what is held forth and professed concerning this business, by the Reformed Churches in their public confessions of faith. **In the latter Confession of Helvetia (cap.30)**, it is said that the magistrate ought to "root out lies and all superstition, with all impiety and idolatry." And after, "Let him suppress stubborn heretics." **In the French Confession (art.39)**, "Therefore he hath also delivered the sword into the hands of Magistrates, to wit, that offenses may be repressed, not only those which are committed against the second table, but also against the first." **In the Belgic Confession (art.36)**, "Therefore hath he armed the Magistrate with the sword for punishing them that do evil, and for defending such as do well. Moreover it is their duty not only to be careful and watchful for the preservation of the civil government, but also to defend the holy ministry, and to abolish and overthrow all idolatry, and counterfeit worship of God." **Beza (De Hareticis)**, tells us in the beginning, that **the ministers of Helvetia** had declared themselves to be of the same judgment, in a book published of that argument. And toward the end he cites **the Saxon Confession, Luther, Melancthon, Brentius, Bucerus, Wolfgangus Capito, and Bullinger. The Synod of Dordt (ses.138)**, in their sentence against the Remonstrants does not only interdict them of all their ecclesiastical and academical functions, but [does] also beseech the States General [of the Netherlands-GLP] by their secular power to suppress and restrain them.⁵⁷

(3) Herein we find the ever popular heresy of religious pluralism (or religious toleration) which legally protects (and therefore promotes) all false religion (contrary to the First Table Commandments), thus subverting the true Reformed religion, the truth of Christ, and the unity of faith.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Civil government is an ordinance of God established for God's glory and and the welfare of man. To that end God has entrusted into the hands of the **lawful** magistrate the sword. It is lawful for Christians to serve as magistrates in a **lawful** government in order to exercise capital punishment, just wars and judicial recompense to the guilty.⁵⁸ It is also lawful for a Christian to exercise self-defence after all other options to preserve one's life have been exhausted.

We condemn the Anabaptists, who, as they deny that a Christian man should bear the office of a magistrate, so also they deny that any man can justly be put to death by the magistrate, or that the magistrate may make war, or that oaths should be performed to the magistrate, and such like things.⁵⁹

We do clearly protest, that, together with all other doctrines which are directly contrary to the sound and pure doctrine of Jesus Christ, we do not only not receive, **but, as abominations and blasphemies**, reject and condemn those strange and erroneous doctrines, which the spirits of hurlyburly [i.e. commotion-GLP] among other damnable opinions do bring forth, **saying, &c. that magistrates**

cannot be Christians. And, in the margin:-The magistrate doth then shew himself to be a good magistrate, when he is a true Christian.⁶⁰

(2) A Christian may even serve and hold civil office in an unlawful government provided no sinful act is required in order to hold office, such as an oath of allegiance to an immoral constitution.

It is, I grant, often God's decree revealed by the event, that a conqueror be on the throne, but this will [i.e. God's providential will-GLP] is not our rule, **and the people are to swear no oath of allegiance contrary to God's Voluntas signi, which is his revealed will in his word regulating us.**⁶¹

And I have never been able to satisfy myself, how it was consistent, in those who profess Presbyterianism, to swear an oath [e.g. when assuming a civil or military position-GLP], which involves the supporting of idolatry [by means of constitutionally protecting false religions-GLP], &c., while, at the same time, in their creeds and church constitutions, they solemnly recognize their obligation, in their respective stations, to remove every monument and vestige of it from the land [as expounded in "The Larger Catechism", Q. 108, i.e. in the original Larger Catechism of 1648-GLP].⁶²

The friends of truth cannot justifiably persevere in supporting the British Constitution as the ordinance of God. . . . The friends of truth under the present government should say to it in such a manner as not to be misunderstood,--We will obey your good laws, because they are good; **but by oaths or otherwise we will not recognize your authority as of God.**--We will co-operate with you in doing what is good; **but so long as you continue to support evil, we cannot swear allegiance to you.** Abolish all oaths of allegiance, and we will act along with you in every right matter.--Were all those who hold the truth in the united kingdom to do so, would not the request extort regard? And might not rulers see the propriety of yielding? Were such oaths to the present government abolished, then those who love the truth might enter parliament, and act without being responsible for the evils of the civil constitution and of the administration, and at the same time lead to essential political reformation; and the people could with a clear conscience return to parliament such men as might be possessed of proper character, and be of known attachment to the truth. Were a door opened in this manner for men consistently uttering their voice in the councils of the nation, then means should be assiduously used, on the part of the people and on the part of their representatives, for scripturally reforming the State, and for giving to true religion that external countenance and support which is due it.⁶³

(3) It is the duty of civil magistrates to suppress all false religion and to establish the true reformed religion (in doctrine, worship, and government) by law within his realm.

Yet civil government has as its appointed end, so long as we live among men, **to cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine of piety and the position of the church,** to adjust our life to the society of men, to form our social behavior to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote general peace and tranquility.⁶⁴

Moreover, to kings, princes, rulers, and magistrates, **we affirm that chiefly and most principally the conservation and purgation of the religion appertains;** so that not only they are appointed for civil policy, but also for maintenance of **the**

true religion, and for suppressing of idolatry and superstition whatsoever: as in David, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, and others, highly commended for their zeal in that case, may be espied.⁶⁵

The orthodox churches believe also, and do willingly acknowledge, that every lawful magistrate, being by God himself constituted the keeper and **defender of both tables of the law**, may and ought first and chiefly to take care of God's glory, and (according to his place, or in his manner and way) **to preserve religion when pure, and to restore it when decayed and corrupted**: and also to provide a learned and godly ministry, schools also and synods, as likewise to restrain and punish as well atheists, blasphemers, heretics and schismatics, as the violators of justice and civil peace.⁶⁶

All pious fatherlanders rejoiced when the States General [of the Netherlands-GLP] in the great Assembly of 1651 declared, "**That each in his own province must keep and maintain the Reformed religion**, as it is presently preached and taught publicly in our Churches, as was established by the National Synod held at Dordt in 1619." They also decided that "**the before mentioned religion**, by the provinces, as well as by the States General in the provinces under their jurisdiction, **shall be maintained with the law of the land, without allowing anyone ever to make any changes.**" Synod of Dordt, Article 1 and 2.⁶⁷

Q. 108. What are the duties required in the second commandment?

A. The duties required in the second commandment are, the receiving, observing, and keeping pure and entire, all such religious worship and ordinances as God hath instituted in his word. . . **as also the disapproving, detesting, opposing, all false worship; and, according to each one's place and calling, removing it, and all monuments of idolatry.** . . .⁶⁸

Q. 109. What are the sins forbidden in the second commandment? A. The sins forbidden in the second commandment are, all devising, counselling, commanding, using, **and any wise approving, any religious worship not instituted by God himself; tolerating a false religion.** . . .⁶⁹

9. Oaths

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) All oaths (personal, ecclesiastical, and civil) are forbidden to the Christian, because his own word is sufficient to bind him to his duty.

The oath is a confirmation among those who are quarreling or making promises. In the Law it is commanded to be performed in God's Name, but only in truth, not falsely. **Christ, who teaches the perfection of the Law, prohibits all swearing to His (followers), whether true or false.**⁷⁰

(2) Anabaptism denies a biblical warrant for personal and social covenanting in this age, thereby denying the perpetual obligation of personal, ecclesiastical, or national covenanting.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Covenanting (whether personal, ecclesiastical, or national) is a moral duty binding all men under the New Covenant even as it did under the Old Covenant. Oaths required on certain solemn occasions are lawful provided that the matter of the oath is agreeable to the Word of God and is able to be performed.

Calvin's first objective was to obtain, at a meeting attended by the whole city, **an oath forcing the entire population to abjure the papacy and adhere to the Christian religion and its discipline, as comprehended under a few headings.**⁷¹

Register of the Council of 24 - November 12, 1537. It was reported that yesterday the people who had not yet made their oath to the reformation were asked to do so, street by street; whilst many came, many others did not do so. No one came from the German quarter. **It was decided that they should be commanded to leave the city if they did not wish to swear to the reformation.**⁷²

26 November 1537. Some people have been reported to have said that it was perjury to swear to a confession which had been dictated to them in writing . . . [Farel or Calvin] replied that if the contents of the written confession were studied carefully it would be seen that this was not so, but that it was a confession made according to God. Examples from holy Scripture (in Nehemia and Jeremiah) proved that the people should all be assembled to swear to keep faith with God and observe his commandments.⁷³

To swear to the true religion, the defence and maintenance thereof is a lawful oath; as to swear to any thing that is lawful, and to lay a new band on our souls to perform holy duties, where we fear a breach, and find by experience there hath been a breach, is also **a duty of moral and perpetual equity;** therefore such a sworn covenant is lawful.⁷⁴

(2) The Westminster Assembly, the Church of Scotland, and the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland (and "**all his Majesties dominions**") swore the Solemn League and Covenant on behalf of not only their living posterity, but also on behalf of all their national, ecclesiastical and individual posterity who would follow them.⁷⁵

We Noblemen, Barons, Knights, Gentlemen, Citizens, Burgesses, Ministers of the Gospel, and Commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland, by the providence of GOD, living under one King, and being of one reformed religion. . . **after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn League and Covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most High GOD, do swear.** . . we shall each one of us, according to our place and interest, endeavour that they may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union **to all posterity**⁷⁶

Note who the "all posterity" (as mentioned in the Solemn League and Covenant) includes by the language of the Westminster divines in their letter to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1644):

Those Winds which for a while do trouble the Aire, do withall purge and refine it: And our trust is that through the most wise Providence and blessing of God, the Truth by our so long continued agitations, will be better cleared among us, and so our service will prove more acceptable to all the Churches of Christ, but more especially to you, while we have an intente eye to our peculiar Protestation, **and to that publick Sacred Covenant [i.e. the Solemn League and Covenant- GLP]** entered into by both the Kingdomes [Ireland is not formally omitted here, but is

omitted only because this English Assembly is addressing the Scottish General Assembly-GLP], for Uniformity **in all his Majesties Dominions**.⁷⁷

Not only did the Westminster Assembly understand the posterity bound by the Solemn League and Covenant to be "all his majesties dominions", but the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland also officially declared the same to be true in their letter (1648) to Charles I:

As we do not oppose the restitution of your Majesty to the exercise of your Royall Power; So we must needs desire that that which is GODS be given unto Him in the first place, and that Religion may be secured before the settling of any humane interest; Being confident that this way is not only most for the Honour of GOD, but also for your Majesties Honor and Safety. And therefore as it was one of our Desires to the High and Honourable Court of Parliament that they would sollicite your Majesty for securing of Religion, **and establishing the Solemn League and Covenant in all your Dominions** [the Solemn League and Covenant having been sworn and made law by the Parliaments of England and Scotland, it was required that Charles I swear to establish it and to enforce it in all his dominions before he would be allowed to return to his throne and to exercise his royal authority-GLP].⁷⁸

Is it possible to know which nations were bound as posterity by the Solemn League and Covenant (1643) and included in "all his majesties dominions?" Clearly, it was all the subjects and the dominions under the Crown of Great Britain (including the United States and Canada both of which were then designated as "the dominions in America").

The first colonial Charter issued by the English crown (1606) was for the settlement of Jamestown in Virginia. Here it is noted that the colony of Virginia is declared to be one of the kings "Dominions" as much as any other royal dominion, and its members are considered by James I to have the same rights as those living in the "Realm of England." It provided that all . . . Persons, being our Subjects [i.e. subjects of the Crown of England-GLP], which shall dwell and inhabit within . . . any of the said Colonies and Plantations, and every [one] of their children, which shall happen to be born within any of the Limits and Precincts of the said several Colonies and Plantations, shall Have and enjoy all Liberties, Franchises, and Immunities, **within any of our other Dominions**, to all Intents and Purposes, as if they had been abiding and born, within this our Realm of England, **or any other of our said Dominions** . . .⁷⁹

In 1663, Charles II granted a charter to eight English gentlemen who had helped him regain the throne of England. The charter document contains the following description of the territory (then designated Carolina) which the eight Lords Proprietors were granted title to:

All that Territory or tract of ground, situate, lying, and being within **our Dominions in America** . . .⁸⁰

In a document written by Thomas Jefferson entitled "A Summary of the Rights of British America", the following brief reference to an Act from King George III demonstrates that even those living in America understood they were a dominion of his majesty.

One other act passed in the 6th year of his reign [George III-GLP], entitled "An

Act for the better securing dependency of **his majesty's dominions in America** upon the crown and parliament of Great Britain.⁸¹

The following excerpts occur in the newspaper that Benjamin Franklin published in Philadelphia (The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser) wherein reference is made to colonies in what is now Canada and the United States as being dominions of the Crown.

In considering of these questions, perhaps it may be of use to recollect; that the colonies were planted in times when the powers of parliament were not supposed so extensive, as they are become since the Revolution: - - That they were planted in lands and countries where the parliament had not then the least jurisdiction: -- That, excepting **the yet infant colonies of Georgia and Nova Scotia**, none of them were settled at the expence of any money granted by parliament: That the people went from hence by permission from the crown, purchased or conquered the territory, at the expence of their own private treasure and blood: That these territories thus became **new dominions of the crown**, settled under royal charters, that formed their several governments and constitutions, on which the parliament was never consulted; or had the least participation. Jan. 6, 1766.⁸²

The Colonies had, from their first Settlement, been governed with more Ease, than perhaps can be equalled by any Instance in History, **of Dominions so distant**. February, 1773.⁸³

Whereas Anabaptist churches have not viewed themselves as being bound by such national covenants as the Solemn League and Covenant, Reformed churches have rightly viewed such historical covenants as obligating their posterity even as biblical covenants bound the posterity of the fathers who swore them. Francis Turretin (1623-1687) of the Academy of Geneva has declared concerning such national covenants that **covenants once sanctioned are to be kept**, as they bind the magistrate no less than the people⁸⁴

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1649) declared without reservation that even unfaithfulness on the part of any one kingdom could not free another covenanted kingdom from its obligation to the Solemn League and Covenant.

Although there were none in the one Kingdome who did adhere to the Covenant [i.e. The Solemn League and Covenant sworn by the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland in 1643-GLP], yet thereby were not the other Kingdom nor any person in either of them absolved from the bond thereof, **since in it we have not only sworne by the Lord, but also covenanted with him. It is not the failing of one or more that can absolve others from their duty or tye to him; Besides, the duties therein contained, being in themselves lawfull, and the grounds of our tye thereunto moral, though others do forget their duty, yet doth not their defection free us from that obligation which lyes upon us by the Covenant in our places and stations**. And the Covenant being intended and entered into by these Kingdoms, as one of the best means of stedfastnesse, for guarding against declining times; It were strange to say that the back-sliding of any should absolve others from the tye thereof, especially seeing our engagement therein is not only nationall, but also personall, every one with uplifted hands swearing by himself, as it is evident by the tenor of the Covenant.⁸⁵

a. The view of Anabaptists

(1) Christ will reign bodily upon the earth for a thousand years.

It appears that Calvin was well informed about the preference for chiliasm [premillennialism-GLP] on the part of the Radicals [from the Anabaptist movement-GLP]. **[C]alvin named Muntzer, Melchior Hoffman, and Storch, all of whom were chiliasts, as leaders of the Anabaptist movement.**⁸⁶

(2) "Some [Anabaptists-GLP] believed in the sleep of the soul between death and resurrection."⁸⁷

It is renewed in this age by the milder Socinians and **Anabaptists** who, pressing in their footsteps, presume to defend at least **a night of the soul (viz., that souls either sleep and are without all sense or are extinguished until the resurrection).**⁸⁸

(3) The one thousand year reign of Christ upon the earth after His coming is the error of the premillennialists.

(4) The doctrine of soul sleep is prevalent among those cults (e.g. Jehovah Witnesses) who deny the immortality of the soul.

b. The view of the Reformers

(1) Christ will reign from heaven over all nations for an extended period of time. This glorious era will be evidenced by the success of the gospel, the calling of the Jews, the uniformity of one faith throughout the world, national covenanting (and covenant renewal), and both civil and ecclesiastical governments working together for biblical reformation.

The coming of Christ to reign here on earth a thousand years is, if not a groundless opinion, yet so dubious and uncertain as not to be admitted a place in the analogy of faith to regulate our interpretation of Scripture. . . .⁸⁹

(2) At death the souls of the righteous immediately ascend to enjoy conscious rest in God, while the souls of the wicked immediately descend to endure conscious torment in hell.

[F]aithful souls immediately after death experience some enjoyment of the heritage that has been promised to them, but inasmuch as the glory of Jesus Christ their king has not yet appeared and the heavenly city of God has not yet been established in its fullness, they must wait until that day arrives.⁹⁰

The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption; **but their souls, (which neither die nor sleep,)** having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the scripture acknowledgeth none.⁹¹

The heresy of Anabaptism lives today! It has infected the modern church with its cancerous errors and heresies: anti-creedalism, arminianism, dispensationalism, independency (sectarianism), anti-paedobaptism, will-worship (anti-regulativism), perfectionism, societal escapism, religious pluralism and tolerationism (anti-establishmentarianism), denial of the perpetual obligation of social covenanting,

pacifism, pietism, socialism, premillennialism, and a refusal to recognize **lawful** civil government as the ordinance of God. These unbiblical positions of the Anabaptists were not tolerated by the Reformed Churches of the First and Second Reformations, and neither should they be tolerated by any Church today that claims to be Reformed or Presbyterian.

To those who would mindlessly hurl anabaptistic stones at churches espousing the biblical principles of the Reformers (as found in the citations above), the words of our Lord should be carefully heeded:

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again (Mt. 7:1,2).

Thus, let us all remove the anabaptistic beam from our own eyes before we seek to pull out the anabaptistic mote from our brother's eye. Moreover, Reformed and Presbyterian Churches must repent of their defection into anabaptistic tendencies and affirm again the biblical views of their reformed forefathers in the following areas: the regulative principle of worship, biblical unity founded upon the truth, biblical separation from all churches who are constitutionally committed to false doctrine and worship, and covenanted uniformity in doctrine, worship, and government (through means of a faithful covenant as exemplified in the Solemn League and Covenant, sworn and emitted by the Westminster Assembly in 1643). Finally, we must be willing to buy the truth of Christ and sell it not, even when it appears to the majority that we are too few in number to be committed with the truth. Let us never forget that it was to the two spies (Joshua and Caleb) and not to the ten spies that Jehovah our God entrusted His precious truth. Remember, God warns us that we are not to follow the majority (multitude) to do evil (Ex. 23:2).

It is an offense to a great many people that they see almost the whole world opposed to us. And indeed the patrons of a bad cause do not neglect their own advantage, using a strategem like this so as not to upset the ignorant and weak, that it is extremely absurd that almost the whole Christian world is disregarded, **so that the faith is to be possessed by a few men.** But, in particular, to destroy us they defend themselves with the sacred title of "the Church" as if with a mallet. . . . If anyone perhaps objects that we are not excused by the example of Noah, if we separate ourselves from that crowd which keeps the name of "the Church," **Isaiah [Is.8:12-GLP], when he gave orders to abandon the conspiracy of men and follow God alone, was referring not to strangers but to those who were at that time glorying exceedingly in the name of the people of God.**⁹²

Endnotes

1. John Calvin, Commentary on John 10:19, *Calvin's Commentaries* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979), XVII:411. Emphases added.
2. Cited from the World Wide Web page entitled "Anabaptists." Emphases added.
3. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 110. Emphases added.

4. Menno Simons, *Incararnation* [1496-1561], cited by Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed., *Treatises Against the Anabaptists* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), pp. 114,115, footnote 58. Emphases added.
5. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 2:306. Emphases added.
6. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 114. Emphases added.
7. *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Question 37. Emphases added.
8. *Ibid.*, Question 39.
9. John Knox, *Works*, V:121-122, cited by Kevin Reed, ed. in *A Warning Against the Anabaptists* (Dallas, Texas: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1984), p. 4. Emphases added.
10. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 1:614.
11. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (AP&A, no date), VIII:38.
12. Ray Sutton, "The Baptist Failure," *Christianity & Civilization*, James B. Jordan, ed. (Geneva Divinity School, 1982), p. 156.
13. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 2:593,594. Emphases added.
14. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 3:5. Emphases added.
15. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 33. Emphases added.
16. Kenneth Ronald Davis, *Anabaptism and Aceticism* (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1974), p. 72. Emphases added.
17. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 1:98. Emphases added.
18. *Ibid.*, 2:83. Emphases added.
19. Willem Balke, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981), p. 310. Emphases added.
20. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 1:8. Emphases added.
21. *Ibid.*, 7:6. Emphases added.
22. Ray Sutton, "The Baptist Failure", *Christianity & Civilization*, James Jordan, ed., (Geneva Divinity School, 1982), p. 152. Emphases added.
23. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 3:23. Emphases added.
24. Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right Of Presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), p. 261. Emphases added.
25. *The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government* [1645] emitted by the Westminster Assembly. Emphases added.
26. *The Divine Right of Church-Government* originally asserted by the Ministers of Sion College

- (London: December, 1646), pp. 7,8. Emphases are in the original text.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 238. Emphases added.
28. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 1. Emphases added.
29. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (AP&A, no date), VIII:40.
30. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 95. Emphases added.
31. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960) IV, xvi, 24:1347. Emphases added.
32. John Calvin, "The First Sermon, On Psalm 16:4", cited by Kevin Reed, ed., *Come Out From Among Them-The 'Anti-Nicodemite Writings of John Calvin* (Dallas, Texas: Protestant Heritage Press, forthcoming), p. 141. Emphases added.
33. John Knox, *Works* (Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club, 1846), I:195,196. Emphases added.
34. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 21:1. Emphases added.
35. John Calvin, Opera, VI:171, cited by Michael Bushell, *The Songs of Zion* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Crown and Covenant Publications, second edition, 1993 [1977]), pp. 181,182. Emphases added.
36. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 21:5. Emphases added.
37. *The Directory For The Publick Worship Of God*, "Of Singing of Psalms," emitted by the Westminster Assembly. Emphases added.
38. Abraham Van De Velde, *The Wonders Of The Most High or Indication of the causes, ways and means whereby the United Provinces [of the Netherlands-GLP], against the expectation of the whole world, were elevated in such a marvelous way from their previous oppression to such great, awe inspiring riches and acclaim. As related by several eminent historians, and which after the manner of the time are compiled to a necessary and profitable use* (c.1674, first English translation forthcoming), p. 125. Emphases added.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 125,126. Emphases added.
40. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 4. Emphases added.
41. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), p. 57. Emphases added.
42. John Calvin, "Commentary on Psalm 15:1", *Calvin's Commentaries* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979), IV:204. Emphases added.
43. Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right Of Presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), p. 255. Emphases added.
44. Voetius, cited by James Fraser, *The Lawfulness and Duty of Separation from Corrupt Ministers and Churches* (Edinburgh: George Patton, 1744), pp. xxxi,xxxii. Emphases added.
45. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession* [1527], Article 4. Emphases added.
46. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), IV, i, 23:1036. Emphases added.
47. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 2:694. Emphases added.

48. *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, 14:2.
49. John Owen, *Inquiry into the Nature and Communion of Evangelic Churches*, p. 180, cited by Andrew Clarkson, *Plain Reasons for Presbyterians Dissenting from the Revolution-Church in Scotland* (1731), p. 214. Emphasis added.
50. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), IV,II,12:1052,1053. Emphases added.
51. Michael Sattler, *The Schleitheim Confession* [1527], Article 4. Emphases added.
52. *Ibid.*, Article 6. Emphases added.
53. *Ibid.*, Article 4. Emphases added.
54. *Belgic Confession*, Article 36. Emphases added.
55. George Gillespie, *Wholesome Severity Reconciled*, cited in *An Anthology of Presbyterian & Reformed Literature* (Dallas, Texas: Naphtali Press, 1991 [1645]), 5:179,180,181. Emphases added.
56. *Ibid.*, 5:180. Emphases added.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 181. Emphases added.
58. For a more detailed discussion of biblical civil magistracy, consider the author's recent book, *Biblical Civil Government Versus The Beast; & The Basis For Civil Resistance*, also available through Still Waters Revival Books.
59. *The Second Helvetic Confession* [1566], Chapter 30, "Of Magistracy." Emphases added.
60. *The Confession of Basle* [1532], Article 11. Emphases added.
61. Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex, or The Law And The Prince* (Harrisonburg, Virginia: Sprinkle Publications, 1982 [1644]), p. 40. Emphases added.
62. Samuel Wylie, *Two Sons Of Oil; or, The Faithful Witness For Magistracy And Ministry Upon A Scriptural Basis* (Pottstown, Pennsylvania: Covenanted Reformed Presbyterian Publishing, 1995 [1803]), pp. 36,37.
63. John Cunningham, *The Ordinance of Covenanting* (Glasgow: William Marshall, 1843), p. 392. Emphases added.
64. John Calvin, *Institutes*, John T. McNeill, ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), IV,XX,2:1487. Emphases added.
65. *The Scottish Confession of Faith*, Chapter 24. Emphases added.
66. George Gillespie, *Works* (Edmonton, Alberta: Still Waters Revival Books, 1991 [1846]), 1:12. Emphases added.
67. Abraham Van De Velde, *The Wonders Of The Most High or Indication of the causes, ways and means whereby the United Provinces [of the Netherlands-GLP], against the expectation of the whole world, were elevated in such a marvelous way from their previous oppression to such great, awe inspiring riches and acclaim. As related by several eminent historians, and which after the manner of the time are compiled to a necessary and profitable use* (c.1674, first English translation forthcoming), p. 157. Emphases added.
68. *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Question 108. Emphases added.
69. *Westminster Larger Catechism*, Question 109. Emphases added.

70. Michael Sattler, *The Schleithem Confession*, Article 7. Emphases added.
71. Pamela Johnston and Bob Scribner, *The Reformation in Germany and Switzerland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 138. Emphases added.
72. Ibid. Emphases added.
73. Ibid. Emphases added.
74. Samuel Rutherford, *The Due Right Of Presbyteries* (London: E. Griffin, 1644), p. 134. Emphases added.
75. For further information about the binding obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant upon the United States and Canada, please consult the author's forthcoming work which is available through Still Waters Revival Books, *Are the United States and Canada Covenant-Breaking Nations?*
76. *The Solemn League and Covenant* [1643-GLP]. Emphases added.
77. *The Acts Of The General Assemblies Of The Church Of Scotland: From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive*, 4 June 1644, Session 7, "The Letter from the Synod of Divines in the Kirk of England, to the General Assembly", pp. 231,232. The original spelling and punctuation have been retained. Emphases added.
78. Ibid., August 12, 1648, Session 40, "The Humble Supplication of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland unto the Kings Most Excellent Majesty", p. 439. The original spelling and punctuation have been retained. Emphases added.
79. Cited by Clarence Carson, *Basic American Government*, (Wadley, Alabama: American Textbook Committee, 1993), p. 126. Emphases added.
80. Cited on the World Wide Web page entitled, "State Library of North Carolina," <http://HAL.DCR.STATE.NC.US/ncslhome.htm>. Emphases added.
81. Cited from the World Wide Web page at: gopher://gopher.vt.edu:10010/02/106/8. Emphases added.
82. Cited from the World Wide Web page at: gopher://gopher.vt.edu:10010/02/85/28. Emphases added.
83. Cited from the World Wide Web page at: gopher://gopher.vt.edu:10010/02/85/28. Emphases added.
84. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 3:327. Emphases added.
85. *The Acts Of The General Assemblies Of The Church Of Scotland: From the Year 1638 to the Year 1649 Inclusive*, 6 August 1649, Session Ultimate, "A Brotherly Exhortation from the Generall Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to their Brethren in England", pp. 474,475. The original spelling and capitalization have been retained. Emphases added.
86. Willem Balke, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1981), p. 297, emphases added.
87. Philip Schaff, *History Of The Christian Church* (AP&P), VIII:40.
88. Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, James T. Dennison, Jr., ed. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing), 3:327. Emphases added.
89. John Owen, *Works*, 20:154, emphases added.
90. John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Benjamin Wirt Farley, ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1982), pp. 138,139, emphases added.

91. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 32:1, emphases added.

92. John Calvin, *Concerning Scandals* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 109,110, emphases added.

Still Waters Revival Books

4710-37A Ave., Edmonton, AB, Canada T6L 3T5

(Reformation resources at great discounts!) E-mail: swrb@swrb.com

Home page at: <http://www.swrb.com> (FREE BOOKS here too!)

Contact us today for your FREE mail-order catalogue!

Voice: (780) 450-3730