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Abstract

This article deals with the link between Anabaptists of the 16th century with Pentecostalism of the 20th Century. Spiritual counter-culturalists, separatists and radicals, individualists and Biblicists, tongues-speakers and prophets, the ethos of the Anabaptists has similarities with Pentecostals and yet did not flourish as have Pentecostals.

Introduction

The nine reasons given by the Swiss Anabaptists at the Zofingen Disputation of 1532 for not attending the Zwinglian Reformed churches are a succinct contemporary record replete with numerous examples of theology, worship and behaviour very comparable to the early twentieth-century Pentecostal models. They insisted that the manifestations of the gifts of the Holy Spirit be present in any true Christian church. The appearance of Pentecostal phenomena among the Anabaptists began very early in the Swiss Reformation as numerous instances of the manifestation of the pneumatic gifts of the Spirit were documented particularly in St. Gallen. However the occurrence of aberrant and heretical behaviour cut short any acceptance of the operation of the gifts by Luther and Zwingli, as well as the Anabaptists themselves. Notwithstanding their attempts to control the misuse of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, many Anabaptists continued to practise them insisting that they were still a necessary part of the life of a Spirit-filled Christian church.

1 An edited version of this article was initially read at the Sixteenth Centuries Studies Conference in Atlanta, Ga. Anabaptist Spirituality session on October 21, 2005.

2 Contact details: historicusstudium@verizon.net
Modern Pentecostalism has experienced more than 100 years of worldwide growth and sustained success. Notwithstanding the steady and increasing acceptance of this twentieth century phenomenon, it has a long and rich historical heritage dating back to the Day of Pentecost as recorded in the Book of Acts. A particularly intriguing part of this legacy dates back just 500 years. During the European Reformation of the sixteenth century, the radical reformers of Switzerland referred to as the Swiss Brethren, probably the first group to be called Anabaptists, practiced a form of spirituality that was very similar to the modern movement’s experience in nature, character and form. This paper argues that an analysis of the reasons presented by the Anabaptists at the Zofingen Disputation in 1532 for not attending Reformed churches established that Swiss Anabaptist spirituality does in fact reflect Pentecostalism in the modern sense of the term. The importance of the Zofingen Disputation is based upon its unique character in that it is a rare documentation of the theology, nature and form of Anabaptist spirituality. It reveals worship practices and scriptural interpretations that are analogous to the Pentecostal phenomena that occurred in early twentieth century America not the least of which was requiring evidence of the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Additional contemporary documents to include personal letters, articles of confession and chronicles will also be used to support this opinion and establish a historical background.

A history of Pentecostalism normally focuses on the appearance in the early twentieth century of a spiritual phenomenon which incorporated the manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit as described in the book of Acts and in I Corinthians 12 and 14. Speaking in unknown tongues, glossolalia, was the most prominent and delineating gift manifested, setting the movement apart from traditional Christian denominations of the time as well as various contemporary Holiness movements. ‘Pentecostalism’ is a modern term that generally refers to believers who manifested the gifts of speaking in tongues, interpretation of tongues, prophecy, healing, and other gifts mentioned by the Apostle Paul in I Corinthians 12 and 14, all through the power of the Holy Spirit. The term was initially coined as early as the late nineteenth century in the Holiness movements of America. But when the Pentecostal movement began to spread, it had theologically equated speaking in tongues with being filled with the Holy Spirit, thus replicating what had happened on the Day of Pentecost. They spoke of the restoration of the apostolic faith as once delivered to the saints on that day and accepted
the term Pentecostal in their speech and literature. What started in a small Topeka, Kansas Bible school and evolved into a viable movement from the Azusa Street prayer meeting and revival in Los Angeles, California in 1906, has grown to represent over 25% of current Christendom according to some accounts.

Walter J. Hollenweger characterized early Pentecostal spirituality with five distinctives: (1) an emphasis on the oral aspect of liturgy, (2) narrative forms of theology and witness, (3) maximum participation thus forming a reconciling community, (4) visions and dreams were included in personal and public spirituality, and (5) ‘...an understanding of the body/mind relationship which is informed by experiences of correspondence between body and mind ... (healing).’ Their strength was in what happened to them in their liturgies. In addition to practising the gifts of the Holy Spirit they believed that speaking in tongues was the initial evidence of the baptism or indwelling of the Holy Spirit. They had a strong belief in the primacy of the Bible, in a personal salvation that reflected the life of Christ in the life of the believer by acts of love, and the empowerment of the individual by the Holy Spirit to live a pious life in this world. The movement began in small Bible studies and schools, prayer meetings and house churches. However, the history of the movement is primarily examined outside the context of Church history before the nineteenth and twentieth century. This is probably because, notwithstanding evidence of sporadic appearances of similar manifestations of spirituality since the Day of Pentecost, none of them were sustained or as successful as the current movement. It should be noted that Pentecostal was never used in its modern sense in the Bible, the first Church or succeeding generations of Christianity nor was it ever used during the Reformation to describe or define those Christians who practised and insisted upon the operation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit as a normal part of meetings, worship, and spirituality in general.

3 The Apostolic Faith Movement, ‘The Apostolic Faith’, Volume 1, Number 1, Los Angeles, California, September, 1906, 2 in Like As Of Fire; A Reprint of the Old Azusa Street Papers, (collected by Fred T. Corum, Wilmington, Massachusetts,1981).
Early in the development of their reformation theologies, both Luther and Zwingli, the founder of the Swiss Reformation, acknowledged the work and presence of the Holy Spirit in a very personal way in the lives of Christians. Initially Luther was greatly influenced by the mystical writing of John Tauler as well as the *Theologia Germanica*. Both taught that each Christian could and should experience God within themselves outside the parameters of intellectual understanding and the clergy. A Christian, ‘... was transformed from a thinker about the nature of God into a reborn being, a new character, one who lived in the Spirit.’ 7 Zwingli believed as well that, ‘God the Father himself speaks through his Spirit to a human being; in order to receive Him, one has to trust the taking-place of this spiritual connection, pray to receive the Spirit and abandon one’s own reason.’ 8 Consequently, these ideas took on a life of their own in the works and beliefs of some of the more radical followers of both men.

Andreas Karlstadt, Thomas Müntzer and Caspar Schwenckfeld were all close friends, adherents and or supporters of Luther and Zwingli in the beginning. Each, however, in their own highly spiritualistic and perhaps mystical way encouraged the estrangement of the more radical elements of the Reformation from the magisterial concept of reform and ultimately, if not unknowingly, contributed to the eventual establishment of Anabaptism. All three believed in the efficacy of the work of the Holy Spirit in the personal lives of Christians, an inner word (spirit) juxtaposed with the outer word (ordinances). Each taught that if one were truly Christian, their individual lives should reflect such faith. Daily activities and actions should be a visible conformity to the life of Christ. Politically, the idea that the state should have any control or influence over the church was adamantly rejected by most radicals. However, certain fatal heresies developed out of some of these teachings in Luther’s mind, such as Müntzer’s adult baptism and his spiritualism.9 What separated these spiritualists and mystics from mainstream Protestantism was their tendency to interpret the work of the Holy Spirit in terms of new revelation. Christian traditions, institutions, and by some, the Bible itself were considered to be part of the past and of little or no use to a newly reformed if not chiliastic Church. Some historians have

classified them as revolutionary spiritualists.\textsuperscript{10} Luther, stated that the Spiritualist spoke very easily about, ‘…Geist, Geist, Geist, and then ’kicks away the very bridge by which the Holy Spirit can come…namely, the outward ordinances of God like the bodily sign of baptism and the preached word of God.’\textsuperscript{11}

Zwingli had similar problems with some of his closest followers. Notwithstanding his earlier positions on the work of the Holy Spirit within the believer’s life, he alienated Conrad Grebel, Felix Mantz, George Blaurock and others of like mind when he insisted on a state controlled church and rejected infant baptism. They believed that infant baptism was contrary to the Word of God, insisting that one became a Christian only after making a conscious decision as an adult to follow Christ and only then was water baptism appropriate. Additionally they objected to the large role that Zwingli was giving to the government in the life of the church. They believed that the church was to be a separated entity led by the Holy Spirit and uninvolved in politics.\textsuperscript{12} Zwingli’s intent, however, was to conduct a more gradual and less traumatic reform of the Church by continuing infant baptism and other rituals, thus maintaining the continuing support of the city council of Zurich.\textsuperscript{13} Finally, in 1525, the group separated themselves from Zwingli. Conrad Grebel and his followers baptized each other, thus committing a fatal heretical error in Zwingli’s mind.\textsuperscript{14} A mandate was issued by the city council of Zurich forbidding the practice of Anabaptism. The penalty for being rebaptized was death. Subsequently the radicals were expelled from the city of Zurich and fled to the more rural areas of Switzerland. This marked the beginning of the Swiss Brethren or Anabaptist movement in Switzerland. The Anabaptists were considered radical Protestants by the Catholic Church, the Zwinglian reformed church and the Lutheran church. They were constantly summoned to disputations and inquisitions to defend or explain their beliefs regarding infant baptism as well as their concept of a separated and spiritual church. Consequently they
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were persecuted, arrested, ostracized, jailed, and many were executed. In response to the persecution they were forced to meet in secret conventicles or small house churches to study the Bible, worship, and practise their beliefs, thus avoiding participation and attendance at local Reformed churches. It was in these conventicles that the gifts of the Holy Spirit were manifested in much the same way as Pentecostalism at the turn of the twentieth century.

The establishment of Anabaptism in the St. Gallen and Appenzell regions of northern Switzerland immediately saw manifestations of gifts of the Holy Spirit. The baptism of adults by Grebel and others of the initial group of Swiss Brethren from Zurich can be traced back to the conventicles already being convened there since 1523 to promulgate the Zwinglian reform. From the very inception of the Swiss Reformation, conventicles (meetings held outside the control of the official church) were held and greatly encouraged by Zwingli. Although St. Gallen and Appenzell were forty miles to the east, lay leaders conducting the same types of Bible reading conventicles were already in place teaching Zwinglianism which continued to insist on a high level of personal spirituality.\textsuperscript{15} Initially the support of the city council of St. Gallen for these gatherings was forthcoming and enhanced their success. Joachim von Watt, called Vadian, a humanist scholar, teacher and friend of Zwingli, was the burgomaster in St. Gallen. He supported the conventicles and the Reformation in general.\textsuperscript{16} Johannes Kessler, the resident school master of St. Gallen and author of a chronicle that documented the manifestations of the gifts of the Holy Spirit among the Anabaptists, was one of the first influential leaders of a conventicle. He led a group in a private home that grew in size to require a large guildhall.\textsuperscript{17} It was through the conventicle that Zwinglian ideas came to St. Gallen. Popular evangelical preaching, systematic readings, meetings, and discussions like those of Kessler and others who would follow, effectively prepared the way for the Reformation. However, the prior existence of the conventicles also made it possible for the Anabaptists to convince many of the validity of their beliefs thus taking control of the conventicles.\textsuperscript{18}

Manifestations of the gifts of the Holy Spirit began to occur within the
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context of Anabaptist led prayer and worship. As Anabaptism spread throughout the region it took on the appearance of a Pentecostal revival. There was speaking in tongues, weeping, and confession of sin, followed by water baptism. However, there also began to appear incidents of aberrant behaviour such as in Appenzell where adherents, ‘...became as little children, babbling and playing in the dirt.’\textsuperscript{19} In St. Gallen women spoke in unintelligible languages and prophesied under the guise of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{20} Margaret Hottinger of Zollikon came to St. Gallen and became a spiritual leader in one of the conventicles. According to Kessler she spoke in tongues and languages that no one could understand. She lived a disciplined way of life and was highly regarded by the Anabaptists who believed that those who spoke as she did were the most devout and immersed in God.\textsuperscript{21} Notwithstanding occasional aberrant behaviour among those who manifested such Pentecostalism, there was an apparent spirituality that was accepting of the gifts of the Spirit not unlike that of the first church as described in I Corinthians 12 and 14. There are many other examples of Pentecostal behaviour particularly of the gift of prophecy both forthtelling and foretelling. The most influential aspect of the prophetic gifts was the chiliastic emphasis placed by many Anabaptist prophets and groups on the coming of Christ and the end of the world. The chiliastic influence of Thomas Müntzer who believed and taught that he was living in the Last Days was probably the source of the strongest apocalypticism.\textsuperscript{22} Kessler also identified Magdalena Muller as a prophetess who gathered a following to herself with prophecies of future events, however, aberrantly and of dubious theological and spiritual value.\textsuperscript{23}

There was no written liturgy for an Anabaptist conventicle, however, there was order and structure patterned after Paul’s instructions to the Corinthians. In the conventicle setting a reader or preacher would either preach a sermon or lead a group discussion based on a Biblical passage.
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either case, time would be allowed for participation by the attendees. The preachers and leaders were not necessarily trained theologians by any means but were literate, students of the Bible, and generally respected in the community. The practice of open participation also encouraged the exercising of the gifts of the Spirit as outlined in I Corinthians 12 and 14 in an appropriately scriptural manner. Paul’s instruction in I Corinthians 14: 29-32 regarding the gift of prophecy allowed a time for others to judge what was spoken. The practice was referred to as the Lex Sedentium or in German, Sitzerrecht, the right to speak out in the face of the opened scripture. 

Unfortunately, during these same meetings while the gifts of the Holy Spirit were being manifested properly, aberrant and less than edifying events occurred. Kessler, Vadian, and other chroniclers, including the city records, registered the most outrageous of incidents. Accusations of sexual misconduct and even a fratricide became identified with Anabaptist conventicles along with the manifestations of the gifts of the Spirit. These records are of a less than objective nature and must be read with caution but they have provided us with negative examples of the abuse, misuse and aberrant behaviour in St. Gallen. They do, however, record the prolific nature of Pentecostal behaviour such as speaking in tongues or ecstatic language, prophecy, private conventicles or prayer meetings where these things occurred, as well as the confession of sins with much contrition and weeping. They also describe a people that were living upright, holy, morally clean, ethical, and Christ-like lives in their communities.

In 1527 the Anabaptist themselves began to see that the spiritual extremists identified within their movement were a real threat to any future existence. Michael Sattler, a former monk and Anabaptist leader from Freiburg in Breisgau, Germany, authored the Schleitheim Confession, the first statement of fundamental beliefs for the Anabaptist. Its primary purpose was to document the tenets of their faith that all had agreed upon up to that time; baptism, the ban (church discipline), communion, separation, election of pastors, pacifism and no oath taking. However, the confession was not addressed to the magisterial reformers, Lutheran or
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Zwinglian, but to the free thinking or libertine Anabaptists, specifically to, ‘... certain false brethren among us ... in the way they intend to practice and observe the freedom of the Spirit and of Christ.’ The ‘false brethren’ was a reference to those in St. Gallen and similar places who had obviously misunderstood the freedom of the Spirit, not unlike the Corinthian church of the New Testament, and given themselves over to self-indulgence of the flesh, thinking that faith and love permitted all kinds of behaviour. Sattler made reference to this abuse in the letter he wrote to the believers at Horb while he was awaiting execution in Rothenburg, having been convicted of being an Anabaptist. He stated that the love Paul spoke of in I Corinthians 13 had been,

...adulterated by some of the brethren (I know who they are); they have not been willing to edify one another by love, but are puffed up and unprofitable with the vain knowledge and understanding of things which God would have remain hidden to all but Himself alone. I Corinthians 8:1. I do not censure or reject the grace and revelation of God, but the puffed up make use of this revelation. What would it profit, says Paul, if I should speak with the tongues of men and angels, and understand all mysteries and knowledge, and have all faith, tell me, what profit is all this, if love be not exercised? You have experienced what such presumptuous speaking and ignorance has produced; you still daily see their false fruits, though they have given themselves to God.

Sattler goes on to exhort his beloved brethren not to forget to assemble themselves together for that is where they would uncover the hearts of the false brethren. It is evident that he was referring to the use or misuse and abuse of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. His reference to speaking in tongues, and an unwillingness to reject the grace and revelation of God, referring to the gift of prophecy in all probability, as well as his insistence that the
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believers at Horb continue to assemble themselves together in order to continue to edify and correct each other in love (Sitzerrecht), all confirm the manifestation of the pneumatic gifts of the Holy Spirit in Anabaptist meetings.

A most invaluable insight into how these meetings were conducted and what was expected of the participants for the purpose of this study was provided by Henry Bullinger. He was a prominent Swiss reformer, successor to Zwingli and church historian who published the text of a previously unpublished, anonymous, and unpreserved Swiss Brethren tract in his work written against the Anabaptists in 1560. 33 The themes, language and date appear to place the document’s origination between the disputation between Zwinglian theologians and the Anabaptists at Zofingen in July 1532 and the disputation that occurred at Bern in 1538.34 The tract was probably written at least five years after Sattler attempted to gain control and establish some order regarding the operation of the gifts of the Spirit as well as some consistency of belief among the Anabaptists at Schleitheim. The contents of the tract were first presented at the Zofingen disputation in 1532. The purpose of the document was to record the reasons why Anabaptists did not attend the Reformed churches. The reasons set forth give us a relatively detailed idea of how Anabaptists conducted their meetings and worship services and subsequently provide us with direct evidence of the Pentecostal nature of Anabaptist worship and belief. Of the nine reasons given for nonattendance, reason number one is most pertinent to this discussion:

‘Here Follows a Résumé of the Above-Named Reasons Why We Do Not Attend Their Preaching: -


34 Peachy, p.5.
The First Reason

Item: The first reason is that they do not observe the Christian order as taught in the gospel or the word of God in I Cor. 14, namely, that a listener is bound by Christian love (if something to edification is given or revealed to him) that he should and may speak of it also in the congregation, and again thereupon be silent, according to the text which reads: ‘How is it then brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying,’ etc. And again, ‘Let one or another prophet speak (that is prophesying), and the other judge. If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted. And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints,’ etc. It thus further appears that Paul spoke to the church of God, yea to all Christians whom he in the beginning of the chapter admonished to seek after spiritual gifts, yet most of all, that they may prophesy, prophesying meaning that they receive the meaning from God to share with others (for edification, exhortation and comfort).’

Anabaptists’ understanding of Paul was that conventicle attendees were bound by love to speak out to edify the church using psalms, doctrine, tongues, interpretation, revelations, and prophesies. Paul encouraged Christians to seek after spiritual gifts and especially that all would prophesy - meaning that anyone who had received understanding from God on some matter should share it with the others including the leader ‘(for edification, exhortation and comfort)’ and then allow it to be judged. This was to be done in a seemly, convenient and orderly manner for when the congregation assembles it is a temple of the Holy Spirit where the gifts or the inner operation of the spirit in each one serves the common good.

So Paul in the end of the chapter commands that they shall not forbid speaking in tongues, which, according to the beginning of the chapter serves to the edification of the congregation. How much less authority has one to forbid prophesying, teaching, interpreting, or admonition to the edification of the congregation?
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35 Peachy, p.10.
36 Peachy, p.10.
37 Peachy, p.11.
38 Peachy, p.11.
The Anabaptist specifically objected to the Reformed practice of only allowing one person to speak in worship services. If only one speaks and no one else is speaking or prophesying how could anyone confess that the congregation was spiritual according to I Corinthians 14 and that God was dwelling and operating through his Holy Spirit with his gifts? Forbidding others to exercise the gifts was tantamount to frustrating and impeding the work of the Holy Spirit whose role it was to edify the church and the salvation of souls ‘...so that men might recognize the congregation as spiritual.’\(^39\) It is interesting to note that notwithstanding the name Anabaptist which refers to the rejection of infant baptism and the rebaptism of consenting adults upon confession, the first reason for not attending the Reformed churches was their lack of spirituality based on Paul’s instructions in I Corinthians 14. It would appear that to the Anabaptists the presence of the Holy Spirit, as evidenced initially through the working of His gifts within the congregation, was the mark of any true Christian church not just an Anabaptist church.

The next eight reasons for avoiding Reformed churches were based on the first reason, the absence of the presence of the Holy Spirit. The second reason accused the Reformed of falling away from their former position of resisting the rulers and constrainers of the evangelical faith, such as authorities, popes, emperors and princes in matters of faith but now using those same authorities to compel men to faith against their former teaching and the word of God.\(^40\) The third reason indicts the Reformers for using the magisterial system of justice to defend themselves and their faith with the use of violence as opposed to the sword of the Spirit and other weapons described in Ephesians 6.\(^41\) The fourth reason points out that by using the magisterial system of justice in matters of faith, the Reformers provide evidence that they do not have sword of the Spirit, ‘...and because they do not have it, it is manifest that they also lack the Holy Spirit as he who should wield that sword in and through them.’\(^42\) The fifth reason was they did not use the Christian spiritual ban to maintain spiritual order within the church. ‘Why? Because, as indicated, they lack the Holy Spirit, while such [discipline] is commended and possible only to those who have the Holy Spirit, according to John 20.’\(^43\) They argued that if the Reformers had the
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Holy Spirit they would not be reliant upon magisterial justice. The sixth reason was,

‘... because they...are no established, separate church of God, nor body of Christ (through the Holy Spirit, as Spirit is love, yes Spirit and love of God, both of which they lack) baptized of Christ, I Cor. 12; Matt.3. [And] also as indicated [they] transgress the gospel, and also live in sin against divine love, so we cannot regard their supper as the Lord’s supper.’

Here is the first mention of baptism of any kind, however, it is a reference to the qualifications for those participating in the communion. I Corinthians 12 and Matthew 3 both refer to Christians being baptized in the Holy Spirit not water. Therefore if partakers are not baptized, i.e., newborn spiritual persons who live in faith and the Holy Spirit before taking the Lord’s supper, they eat and drink judgment to themselves.

It is only in the seventh reason that water baptism is mentioned. They accuse the Reformed preachers of not maintaining the evangelical order as written in Matthew 28 and Acts 2. In those scriptures they believed that Christians were instructed to teach the unbeliever first and then baptize them after a confession of faith. ‘And they have inverted the order and practice, that they baptize first, and namely the young...something that is a perversion of said evangelical order.’ The eighth reason refers to early Reformed teachings which instructed Christians to forsake all for the cause of Christ. But now they were teaching the opposite in that they were trying to compel Anabaptists to abandon their beliefs for the sake of family, farm and home. The Anabaptists claimed that they were holding to the original evangelical teaching and now were being killed for it.

The ninth and final reason consists of an explanation of why Anabaptists could buy and sell from Reformed Christians but not be involved in spiritual matters with them. They stated that Christians can have fellowship with the world, apart from sin, for the sake of bodily nourishment but to use the world in such a manner was not forbidden. ‘This, however, does not mean that we have fellowship in their matters of faith.’

**Conclusion**
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Anabaptist spirituality as outlined above is very similar to and thus reflects the Pentecostalism of the early twentieth century. The manifestations of the gifts of the Holy Spirit began to appear in both instances within the context of private prayer meetings in homes, small Bible studies and schools or in the case of the Anabaptists conventicles. The primary gifts manifested in both movements were speaking in tongues and prophecy and in the absence of such there was no evidence of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. They both believed that a Christian was bound by love to share their spiritual gift for the edification of the whole body notwithstanding who might be the designated leader. The idea of a separate people and church is another shared principle. They both conceived the church as being separate from any political institution, state government or the unsaved world in general.48 The manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit was seen by both as confirmation that they were indeed reinstituting the Apostolic church of the New Testament. It is beyond the scope of this paper to expound on the theological origins of the Pentecostalism of the Anabaptists. There is, however, much in the way of contemporary literature that gives us a picture as to where and how these beliefs were derived, not the least of which are the early works of Luther and Zwingli. Many radical Reformation leaders were former priests, monks, and theologians in their own right. They had studied the Church Fathers, particularly Tertullian who Stanley Burgess has called ‘the first Pentecostal theologian’.49 The influence of Müntzer, Karlstadt, Schwenkfeld and others in regard to their insights into the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in an individual Christian and the difference between being baptized in the Holy Spirit and being baptized in water cannot be overestimated. Why Anabaptism did not succeed as the modern Pentecostal movement has is another area of inquiry that is not within our scope. The impact of aberrant behaviour, misuse, and abuse of the gifts took its toll as the reactions of the mainline reformers and Anabaptists themselves at Schleitheim attest. However, five years later the Anabaptists still insisted that the manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit defined a true Christian church. There is much more research to be done on the spiritual nature, character, and form of this great Reformation movement that so highly prized the efficacy and work of the Holy Spirit in order to establish their proper historical place and significance in the history of Pentecostalism.
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