

political affairs and if at any time they would become the majority they would not use force to maintain power.

It must be observed that, especially in the Scharnschlager testimony, two positions are clear before the debacle at Münster: (1) The absolute commitment to nonviolence, and (2) the deep commitment to separation between church and state. This simply shows again that the Münster tragedy did not determine the course of development of Anabaptist attitudes toward violence and church-state relations. Indeed it would seem that Münster can best be seen as the result of a situation in which Rothmann applied Bucer's ideal of union of church and state (which he had studied in 1531 in Strasbourg) to the city of Münster. It did not work in Münster because the commitment to nonviolence was virtually nonexistent and the rebellious forces were goaded on to revolt by agitators from without, an Old Testament biblicism, and by the fact that when the radicals easily won the first disputation (Aug. 7 and 8, 1533) the authorities repressed any further public discussion of the issues. What could not be discussed in the public forum then had to be battled out in the streets. There were certainly many other factors in the complex tragedy of Münster, but it is clear that it stands as a warning that state and church must be separated and that Bucer's ideal could have disastrous effects.

Leupold Scharnschlager was a well-trained Anabaptist leader who spent a part of his life teaching at Ilanz in Grisons. He is also referred to as a "soapmaker," but there is no direct evidence that he ever worked as one. He was a native of the Tirol, Austria, where he owned an estate at Hopfgarten near Kitzbuehel. When he joined the Anabaptists about 1530 he moved to Strasbourg, perhaps at the invitation of Pilgram Marpeck. While at Strasbourg he engaged in discussions with Melchior Hofmann who at his trial describes him as one of his opponents. He actively baptized and preached and for some four years was, along with Marpeck, one of the outstanding leaders of Anabaptism at Strasbourg. Both he and Marpeck gave theological and organizational leadership to the Anabaptists from 1530 to 1560 and the caliber of that leadership emerges as one studies the *Kunstbuch* where Scharnschlager is represented by six important letters and tracts. He shows continuity with the thought of Michael Sattler, to whom he ascribes the authorship of the Schleithem Confession. He cites that Confession approvingly on the matter of whether a Christian may be a politician. He also demonstrates deep affinity with Luther's position on justification by faith but at the same time seeks to meet directly the problems of second-generation Anabaptism and particularly the lessening of spiritual fervor which he detected among his fellow Anabaptists. He died in Ilanz in 1563. Little is reported about his dealings with the Strasbourg council prior to his expulsion.⁷

LEUPOLD SCHARNSCHLAGER'S WRITTEN DEFENSE
OF HIS FAITH TO THE STRASBOURG COUNCIL¹

Written just before June 16, 1534

My dearly beloved, Lords and rulers here in Strasbourg!

I respectfully and sincerely ask you for the sake of God's will to listen to me without mistrust in this writing.

Recently you spoke to me in this chamber inquiring about my faith. I gave an account, and what occurred at that time is no doubt still fresh in your memories. We both agreed to give the matter further consideration. Now my beloved Lords, even though most of what follows has previously been said to you, I think I condensed it so much that perhaps you did not adequately understand it. Consequently, before the opening and execution of the case, my conscience drives me to repeat with clearer words in part those subjects I consider necessary. I request you to receive it in Christian humility.

First, when I asked you beloved Lords, whether you were interrogating me as Christians and taking your position as elders or whether you were acting as representatives of the worldly sword, you answered that you were both. Among other things, I replied, well, then my beloved lords: First, as representatives of the government, you know that you are not allowed to rule on matters of faith, as your leaders and preachers, Luther and Zwingli have written. Their tracts citing the scriptures in which the limits of obedience to the worldly sword are described, I observe, are still found here. When the apostles were forbidden to speak or teach any longer in the name of Jesus, Peter and John answered: "You judge whether in the eyes of God it is right that we should obey you more than God" Acts 4[19]. And again they said: "One must obey God more than man" Acts 5[29]. To you as elders in the Holy Spirit, if you are that, speaking for the Christians I answer with the words of the holy and high apostle Peter: "The elders who are among you I admonish, that they tend the flock of Christ, which is among you, and oversee them not with compulsion, but voluntarily, not as those who lord it over their charges" I Peter 5:[1f].

You see, my beloved Lords, how far your actions extend in both directions. Therefore I admonish your consciences before God since you desire and hope to be saved, that you know how to act accordingly and may be protected against tyranny, which I would fervently desire for you. I think that some were offended at my statements and said I carry on in a cunning manner, which burdens my heart. For the above-mentioned words of the apostle are clear words of God and pure wisdom and not

my words or human opinions. Otherwise, Luther also is guilty of cunning when he cited various passages as he did as I remember at the time when the Testament was forbidden or everywhere ignored. If I were to call referring to passages of Scripture and to God's Word a cunning endeavor, from which may God spare me, God could give me no better recompense than that he would harden me as other mockers of the truth and blind me so much that I could no longer recognize his truth but regard it as a joke and trifle and make no distinction between God's Word and man's word and cunning. Then surely my poor soul would die and my end be already definite. I beg you, my beloved Lords, since you have permitted me to speak freely to you and to empty my heart without hypocrisy, do not be offended by it.

Further, my beloved Lords, it would be easy to demonstrate that in the beginning of their preaching and teaching Luther and his associates put greater stock in the baptism of grown-up, reasoning people than in infant baptism.² Wherever those are congregated together in one house who seriously seek to live in the will of Christ without vices, there the ban of Christ and the true baptism and other ordinances of Christ could be instituted and practiced. Since, however, people gather together openly in one big mass, it would only be a public incentive and the like, as also the same tract further asserts. Such an incentive has already existed for many years. What kind of improvement of life has come from it I invite whoever has eyes and ears to say. However, as we by God's grace take those things which they represented and taught as good in the beginning, seeking to practice them unto the salvation of our souls, testing them to see whether they are the will of God by guiding thought and deed by them, Luther and his associates have become embittered against us because of this and also have embittered everyone else against us; so that according to the Lord's word Matth. 24[9] everyone hates us for the sake of Christ's name. We would surely rejoice if Luther and his associates even today might do and desire to do what they themselves preached and taught. Either they must confess that they are disobedient to the truth of their own teaching or else that they were false teachers or prophets. If they were indeed false teachers or prophets in the beginning of their teaching and their teaching did not come from God, even though they then pleased me and many others much more because they agreed with the commands and will of Christ and also many more accepted their teaching and worked for the faith than now, what then shall we think of their teaching now when it has a much more modest appeal?

My beloved Lords, I ask you to examine yourselves, that each of you test his faith. For I am convinced that each one of you who loves the truth desires a free, voluntary access to God, to serve God voluntarily,

uncoerced, without pressure. And if someone would force you to a faith, which each of you does not find in his conscience, you could not accept this in peace of conscience, and you would desire to be free in that. Therefore I sincerely request that you remember and take to heart that this is the situation with me and my associates. I and my kind do not attempt to preserve ourselves and our faith by force or resistance, but with patience and suffering even unto physical death, by the power of God for which we pray.

My beloved Lords, you urge us to depart from our faith and accept yours. That is the same as if the Emperor were to say to you that you are to give up your faith and accept his. I leave it to your conscience: Do you think it right in the sight of God that you obey the Emperor in such a case? If so, then you might well say that in our case it would be right for us to obey you. Then you would also have to agree that you are obligated to restore all idolatrous and papal cloisters, also the mass, etc. If, however, you discover that in the presence of God it is not right that you obey the Emperor in such matters, then I as a poor Christian beseech and exhort you for God's sake and for the sake of your soul's salvation that in this matter you expand your conscience and have mercy upon us poor people.

I am convinced that you know that faith and the knowledge of faith must be without external rule and free from coercion (note, my lords, I am not speaking of freedom of the flesh and of evil but of the spirit of faith in Jesus Christ). If the faith is not to be free you would not have acted against the Emperor and against the Pope in rejecting the monasteries, images, and mass and you would be obligated to reinstitute them forthwith. If you say that we do not have the true faith but you do and therefore we ought without further ado to change to yours I answer: The Emperor and the Pope say the same thing to you. You do not have the true faith, but they do and yet you do not change from your faith to theirs. Why then should we yield to your faith?

I ask you my lords to consider the changes of faith in Lutheranism and Zwinglianism up till now. These can be found in the writings of their preachers, what they used to write and now say and write. See what has happened with Zwingli and his followers, what a terrible end he and his followers had whom he taught to promote, protect and promulgate the faith with the worldly sword! My lords, if you could approve it that Emperor and Pope (if God is for it) would drive you away for the sake of your faith, then you could also approve driving us away because of our faith. If I were to describe you as acting as Christians toward us, my dear lords, then consider on what basis I would need to declare the Emperor and Pope as unchristian towards you.

Just as also the Lord commanded Matth. 7[12] when he said: "Everything you wish that men should do to you, do ye also to them. That is the law and the prophets." Otherwise, you would become unworthy of your rights and freedom and deny it within yourselves. What would it be if I would only want freedom in matters of faith for myself but not allow it for others? If we merely want to be Christians and not also keep Christ's commandment and word, we would truly not be envied, because certainly the hearers of the words and commandments are not saved but the doers Rom. 2[17ff]. And not all who say to Christ, Lord, Lord, will enter the kingdom of heaven, but those who do his will and the will and commandments of his father Matth. 7[21]. Those servants who know his will and commandment and do not do it, will suffer a severe beating Luke 12[47]. Truly the sin which is committed against the knowledge of the truth and will of God is a severe and hard sin Heb. 10[26].

I suspect that you would undoubtedly wish that the Emperor himself might search the Holy Scriptures, to what extent he ought to rule with the secular sword, as e.g. to avenge the evil doer [Rom. 13:4], and that he would do so or study it irrespective of other people or teachers because after all he must bear his own burden and must answer for his own deeds. Likewise, it is my heartfelt wish and prayer that you too might diligently read the Holy Scriptures which bear on the extent and manner of the usage of the worldly sword, especially also the tract Luther wrote on the subject in the beginning.³ For each of you must himself appear before the judgment seat of Christ [Rom. 14:10]. That is said of worldly power, sword, and rule which alone avenges the evildoers. And you yourselves see that this worldly power in addition to its worldly sword and rule taken in one hand grasps and exercises also the sword and rule; therefore [it is clear] that it [the sword] must be handled in a manner different from that in which the worldly sword and authority and [Christ's] authority have been heretofore, and continue to try to be, fused into one. [For] you wish to be free from the Emperor. Worldly power thus always attempts to lord it over faith always using the secular sword under the guise of the spiritual thus intruding into the kingdom and domain of Christ. The result is finally, as one sees at present, that the sword of the spirit is almost neglected and hindered, and the secular sword alone lords it over both realms, first the kingdom of this world, or evildoers, next the kingdom of Christ, that is, faith.

And in such a situation, I could think of nothing better than that you yourselves might diligently read the writings and especially those of the New Testament concerning the special power, sword and rule of Christ, the Holy Spirit of the Christians and of the faith. You would find this to be clearly so, in all aspects and characteristics. And although you consider yourselves as a secular power for the vengeance of the evildoers and along-

side of it a Christian, that is spiritual power, you would find a fine blessed difference and clear account,⁴ indeed one quite useful for your souls, how one is to deal with both, and would recognize what kind of nonsense arises, and what serious mistakes one makes, when one mixes together both powers, both swords and both rules, and one seeks to establish and rule the spiritual sword and power with the secular. Concerning the secular sword and power, read Rom. 13 [1ff], Luke 22[25], Matth. 20[25], Mark 10[42], and elsewhere. Concerning the spiritual sword and power, see Eph. 6 [10, 17], 2 Cor. 10 [4ff], 13[10], Matth. 10[8], 1 Pet. 5 [1ff].

Worldly power is a distinctive power, has a peculiar function, a peculiar nature, rule and characteristic, belongs to a special people.

Christian power is a distinctive power, has a distinctive function, a peculiar nature, rule and characteristic, and belongs to a special people, which will endure to eternity. Worldly authority kills with the physical sword, Christian authority kills no one with a physical sword.

The worldly authority is obligated to protect Christians and the good people from the bad Rom. 13[4], but not to rule over them in matters of faith and the spirit nor on that account to persecute or to drive people away.

My beloved Lords, please remember these and similar words of mine and of my colleagues, which are meant to be words of Christian exhortation. Take them to heart and for the love of God have mercy upon us, who have fled to you from coercive papacy. Allow us to live in your city according to our faith in freedom and work among you, earning our bread in honorable work uncoerced in matters pertaining to the soul or forced in matters of conscience. After all we have always been willing to submit to you, to give to you support, taxes, interest and the like as government, at all times willingly and obediently just as the ordinary citizen and to live among you without suspicion, evil, slander, and licentiousness, but piously by God's grace. We hope there have been no grounds for me and my associates having been suspected of anything different. We also expect from you such wisdom, judgment, and justice, that you would not allow others to mistreat us. Your suspicion that I and my associates, should we become the majority, would immediately drive you out the door (from which may God preserve us) as you now seek to do to us—since we do not consider such as a work of the Spirit, nor as the ban, power and order of Christ, I see no possibility of our doing so. If, however, you acknowledge it as wrong, if we would do so (if God were for it), then you yourselves should not do it, otherwise you will be punished by Christ, for Christ the Lord speaks of the log in the eye Matth. 7[3].

If I and my colleagues would number even one hundred thousand it would be more useful for us before God, that we all would move away from you or allow ourselves to be driven away, rather than that we would drive you away with force and cause such a great scandal against God's love under such a guise. If you have Christian eyes of the Spirit, you will perceive well what I say. If this is the way one is to proceed in Christ, with force and scandal and offensive cases, who would win the neighbor for the Kingdom of Christ? This would not be winning but driving them away. Where would faith, love and patience of Christ remain? Indeed in this sense we would be trying to preserve the kingdom of this world, for according to the words of Christ his kingdom is not of this world: What would it profit if we were to win the whole world and lose our soul and Christ's Kingdom [Matth. 16:26]? If, however, you, my lords, call yourselves Christians and scandalize us innocent ones, how will you answer for this before God? After all Jesus pronounces a woe over those who give occasion for stumbling Matth. 18[6f.].

I beg you also, my beloved Lords, to allow all my beloved Lords in the Palatinate to read this writing. My conscience before God drives me to this, that I carry out my duty, since I have been associated with you, to render this testimony to the best of my understanding and conscience. If it is not being done as cordially as I should, I beg you my beloved Lords, not to hold it against me. If I could be of further service to you, I would be inclined to do so. If you then no longer desire me to sojourn here, I will commit you to Christ, my Lord, and by God's grace pray for you, that God may, if possible, give you insight into what you are doing. I thank you sincerely for all the good you did for me.

What would you accomplish, my beloved Lords and rulers, or I and my associates, if we were to be hypocritical and deny, thus giving an answer like you desire and pleasing to you, stating that we adhere to your faith? If in our hearts and consciences we could not support this, neither would we do it because we consider our faith a falsehood or inadequate in our conscience but only because you permit us to remain in your town and do not cast us out among the enemies, just as it happened between you and the Pope and the Emperor, if you would have answered them according to their will, to adhere to their faith. That also would have been against your conscience and done only in order that you might not be driven away.

Thus I commit myself to you, along with my comrades with this statement, respectfully for God's sake and his mercy and the sake of the Last Judgment. Keep in mind what is best for us.

Your obedient, submissive fellow-citizen,
Leopolt Scharnschlager,
Soanmaker, etc

RESEARCH NOTES

PASSENGER SHIP LISTS IN THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Compiled by JACOB A. DUERKSEN AND JOHN F. SCHMIDT

Among the most frequently used resource materials in the Bethel College Historical Library, North Newton, Kansas, are the microfilm copies of passenger ship lists of ships arriving in the United States in the years 1872-98. Searchers for genealogical information find these valuable as they usually give the names of all passengers by family groups, their ages, country of origin and the name of the ship as well as date and place of arrival.

The value of being able to consult the passenger lists for genealogical information has long been recognized. In 1949 T. R. Schellenberg, Assistant Archivist of the United States at the time of his retirement in 1963, in a letter to Cornelius Krahn of the Bethel College Historical Library, mentioned the existence of passenger lists of vessels entering and clearing at the port of New York. He wrote "If the names of the vessels could be identified, it would be a simple matter for me to obtain copies of their passenger lists."

Krahn suggested the names of various ships as he gleaned them from books and periodicals. In the fall of 1952 Schellenberg sent a microfilm roll to the Bethel College Historical Library containing a selection of twenty passenger lists with Mennonite names. Since many searchers visiting the Library mentioned names of other ships, it was soon obvious that this list was quite incomplete.

Meanwhile, the National Archives microfilmed all of the passenger lists at their disposal up to about 1910 and issued catalogs of available microfilm copies. Since some searchers asked for specific ship lists, the Library added the rolls containing these lists to its collection.

In August, 1965, Jacob A. Duerksen, living in Washington, D. C. and now retired, raised the issue of ship lists in correspondence with John F. Schmidt. Duerksen had donated the cost of some of the original microfilms and had kept notes through the years on further passenger lists. He submitted his lists to John F. Schmidt, who was thus able to isolate the lists still needed. In a continuing exchange of correspondence, Schmidt and Duerksen located more passenger lists.

To make this information more complete, Schmidt used the files of the Mennonite Board of Guardians, organized in 1873 to assist Mennonites from Russia in settling in North America, various periodicals such as *Zur Heimath*, *Bundes-Bote*, and *Herald of Truth*, all of which had extensive information on the Mennonites from Europe who were locating in the prairie states and provinces, and information provided by many correspondents.

The presence of Duerksen in Washington, D. C. provided an opportunity to make direct contact with him.