Both oral and written renditions have invoked the family as a central feature of Mennonite communities. To quote from The Mennonite Quarterly Review in 1928, “Mennonite religion was a family religion.” In 2001 an article in the same journal notes that “virtually all of the groups related to the Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition have come to regard family ties as being at the very center of individual identity and spiritual formation.” Another description of early Anabaptist families, however, also argued that they “reflect[ed] the prevailing milieu” and described most contemporary Mennonite families as “conventional and Western.” Sociological works from the 1950s to the 1990s lament the lack of an empirical study of the Mennonite family. One historian notes the absence of historical studies of Mennonite family ideologies. In contrast, Mil Penner reflects on a Mennonite family farm in Inman, Kansas, and closes with a reverie on “the generations . . . there with me . . . they were pleased with what they saw.” Poet Julia Kasdorf limns another strand of family life in central Pennsylvania’s Big Valley.

Contrasts yield valuable historical understandings of Mennonite families. But to avoid facile framing of renditions of Mennonite family life as simply contradiction between praise and criticism, let me suggest common ground. American historian Richard White’s moving portrait of his mother, an early twentieth-century Irish immigrant woman, emerges from conversations between her memories and his historical research. That conversation, I think, speaks both to Men-
Mennonites gathering stories that build community life and to historians and other academics who often appear to "haul pieces into the present" from the "junkyard of the past." "I imagine a past," White writes, in which some truth lies. This past is a place that yields a dense, almost impenetrable, imaginative growth. Historians can only hope to tap this fertility and trim and discipline what grows so luxuriantly. . . . History cannot afford to dismiss its rivals . . . or history will weaken its own ability to understand the strange worlds we live in.7

The past conceived as a conversation takes note of the richness of historical sources on Mennonite families. Published works by individuals researching their own families go back to the mid-nineteenth century and maintain vitality in the contemporary period.8 Autobiographies, memoirs, and biographies of Mennonite leaders abound. Attention to personal life and to years outside the productive and public ones may be frustratingly slim but asides, omissions, and silences themselves are suggestive.9 Intergenerational families are at the center of literary renditions of Mennonite experience, from epic historical novels to imaginative biography to the distilled images of poetry or the even more compact folk sayings.10 Families described by artists are messier than those of biography or family genealogy, pointing the direction in which family historians are more ponderously headed.11

Sociological surveys and interviews, most collected since the mid-twentieth century, reveal recent demography of Mennonite families. Official denominational statements suggest ideological stances.12 More recent Mennonite women's and gender history sometimes emphasizes the family. Making women's experiences visible, seeing the community with their eyes, and documenting unequal power between Mennonite women and men requires attention to the institution of the family.13 This work has been instrumental in challenging undifferentiated and idealized families.14

With these sources in mind, let me turn to six areas of study in current family history—life course, diversity of family composition, family ritual life, families and social position, neighbors, and nation building.15 My organization provides an opportunity to profile suggestive and seminal works on Mennonite families, to draw on my own research, and to note areas of Mennonite family history I see as largely unstudied but fruitfully probed.
Life Course

Family life might be best symbolized as a river. The post-World War II emphasis on a father, mother, and their children is, in fact, a snapshot, frozen in time. The term life course conceives of the family as a continual reconfiguring of relationships from birth to death. Much of the sociological study of Mennonite families has been from the perspective of adult parents with dependent children, yielding few clues on how children might experience family life. Similarly, youth are more apparent in adult dreams and fears than in their own shaping experiences. Not only Mennonites have slighted the young as historical actors. Perhaps, however, the central Anabaptist doctrine of adult faith and membership, “a great strain on the Mennonite family,” in Calvin Redekop’s words, has accentuated fears of “the uncertain group” rather than interest in its particulars. The wonder, yearnings, and fears of children and young people, however, are significant within community life. Anna Barr, remembered her early nineteenth-century childhood in Lancaster County: “Father . . . [h]aving plenty of land . . . gave the children plenty to do. . . . I liked to work in the garden and in the field. . . . Yes . . . I loved the earth. I loved to put seeds in it and take good care of them.” Novelist Ingrid Rimlaud, remembers the 1943 to 1945 retreat of Mennonites from the Soviet Union with the Wehrmacht as the boredom and “inner hunger” of a child under ten. Writer Laura Weaver, growing up as a plain child in the same period, remembers noticing her doll’s worldly clothes and inventing imaginary radio programs to match those that her classmates recounted.

Similarly, over the years, Mennonite youth have troubled adults not only in their search or lack of search for God but also, in John Ruth’s words, “in youth’s other great drama of finding a mate,” two searches, he notes, which are not unconnected. Ruth makes the comment in his discussion of eighteenth-century courtship, marriages, and elopements in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The literary societies of Dutch-Russian Canadian Mennonite youth in the interwar years suggest other searches that also concerned some church leaders. Might the documents of these organizations also be mined for community life from the eyes of youth? In the 1960s and 1970s, Lancaster County Mennonite youth culture included road rallies, nighttime pranks, and run-ins with the police. How did such youthful vitality and indiscretion mark Mennonite history? In sum, what did it mean to be eighteen and a Mennonite in the 1820s, the 1930s, and the 1970s?

Moving to the other end of the life course, what can we learn from the ordinary days, the dreams, and the disappointments of the patriarchs and matriarchs so prominent in family genealogical history? What is the relationship between the “Daddy house” and the retirement
community? What is the significance of courtship and marriage in the later years?24

Intertwined with an individual’s life course are the shifting relationships of mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, siblings, adults and their parents, grandparents and grandchildren. Interestingly, two recent fine-grained portraits of Mennonite men by their daughters—one a biography in Steinbach, the other, a fictional rendition in Lancaster—depict fathers as vulnerable mentors.25

Diversity of Family Composition

Attention to life course suggests the fluidity of family life but also points to diversity of composition. Mennonite historians have become increasingly attentive to complexity in the origins, spread, and historical particulars of diverse Anabaptist and Mennonite groups. By and large, a standard strong and independent intergenerational family or its converse, a family in decline or dominated by an authoritarian patriarch, has been posited across this great historical expanse.26 The institution of the family, however, has housed amazingly diverse aspects of human life—sexuality; gender expectations; friendships; economic production; nurture and care of the young, the old, the hurt; intergenerational pathways of wealth; and symbols of group identity and prowess.27 Given these tasks, the chance of finding actual families that are anything other than a bewildering mix of particularities is slim.

Historian Marlene Epp’s detailed attention to one group of Mennonite families illustrates what we might find if we look closely. Epp’s study of Mennonite families—dismembered first in the Soviet Union, then as refugees in World War II—follows reconstituted immigrant families in Paraguay and Canada. The new families—often headed by women and sometimes established without certain knowledge of the fate of older family members—were at odds with postwar North American domesticity and with Canadian Mennonite leadership.28 How might the church’s history change if we study with similar care other apparently atypical families: complex families divided and united by death, discord, divorce, remarriage, race, migration, conversion, sexual orientation, and denominational affiliation; farm and artisan households with hired help; families on national and denominational frontiers; female-run families of church leaders; educated families that encouraged familiarity with the arts and literature, and single parent families.29 Taken together, these diverse families suggest flexibility necessary in persistent communities.
Family Ritual

Intertwined with family composition are the symbols and rituals of families and the intangibles of sentiment. Despite all the measurable changes in structure, “the family and the home . . . remain at the center of daily experience.” As such, families are key to transmission and interpretation of ethnic identity and religious belief. In my work on the persistence and the loss of the Brethren in Christ peace witness over three generations, for example, untidy families served as key conduits in both cases. What appears incoherent may, in fact, reflect lack of attention to the symbolic life of families. Family historian John Gillis writes—and here he is writing to academic historians—“Family legends, rites of passage, and icons have been treated as the ephemera of an ephemeral subject.” We pay attention to these aspects of life in other cultures but not in our own, where, he contends, relatively new rituals have deepened the importance of family time.

Two family rituals have received sustained attention among Mennonites: family worship and prayer before meals. Pamela E. Klassen’s 1990s interviews with two Mennonite immigrant women presents “domestic religion” as much more extensive. For women—who do much of the ritual work of families—but also for men, Klassen argues, such religious ritual is as important as that practiced in church structures. “In their homes, their food is blessed by God, they are watched over in their sleep, and they offer hospitality and love to visitors. In their kitchens and living rooms, they sing hymns, they pray, and they praise and critique their church and community.” Klassen’s list is interesting in that it includes critical thinking, along with worship and hospitality, as central to religious life. She has hit on an important, amorphous, and little-studied aspect of families: how they conceptualize difference and conflict within the family itself and within the church. One Kansas woman noted that her parents avoided “serious subjects” with the children, “so we did not learn to speak up about things.” In interviews for a 1992 study on domestic abuse in Mennonite families in Lancaster County, inevitable disagreements and unequal decision-making power were key ingredients in a process leading to abuse. One woman who grew up Mennonite remembers “learn[ing] very well from my father how not to express all of my understanding of the spiritual life, lest I offend more traditional believers.” The Dutch-Russian maxims collected in Western Canada suggest other approaches—humor, understatement, and affection—in daily symbolic life in the family.

The material world of family ritual life might also shed light on Mennonite history more generally. Home furnishings, the accouterments of weddings, birthdays, holidays, funerals, vacations, and
entertaining help to define family life. Much study of material life among Mennonites has focused on items that were forbidden and on church objections to the amassing of material goods in general. What was allowed has been less studied. When Bethel College's Kauffman Museum surveyed visitors on their memories of early twentieth-century home furnishings, particularly in parlors, many responses reflected a common North American desire to own modern industrially produced household items.

**Family and Society**

Perhaps those common aspirations reflect the fact that Mennonites have always had non-Mennonite neighbors. While North American Mennonites have often understood the world in terms of the large forces of individualism, militarism, and nationalism, for many Mennonites the world was no farther away than the non-Mennonite neighbors and relatives or the more liberal Mennonite relatives and neighbors. My use of Brethren in Christ obituaries made clear the loosening of boundaries in the face of death. Once I noticed the mixed company at gravesides, its omnipresence in daily life became unmistakable. Laura Weaver's childhood play included trying out a worldly identity by dressing up in her Lutheran cousin's clothes. Anthropologist Elmer Miller remembered the relatives "who . . . smoked cigars, attended movies, and participated in state and local politics." These checkered worlds existed in families long before Mennonites left farms, moved to cities, or pursued advanced degrees. Three deeply researched historical works on Mennonites establish these intimate worlds in different times and settings. John Ruth's narrative of the Lancaster Mennonite Conference presents evidence, more than analysis, of consistent interaction between Mennonites and non-Mennonite families over three centuries. Steven Nolt's suggestive study of Mennonites within the larger eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Pennsylvania German culture considers the makings of family life as well as intellectual and political moorings. Dialect, dress, demeanor, folk artistry, marriage partners, holidays, domestic architecture, food preparation, child rearing, healing rituals, and law and order established by extended families tied these particular Mennonites to other Pennsylvania Germans and to a region. Finally, Royden Loewen's work on a variety of Mennonite communities in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century connects them to a variety of neighbors. In both the United States and Canada, other rural families and other ethnic communities were neighbors who constituted the world and with Mennonites faced larger economic and political forces.
Amid the diversity of family cultures and family practice, one particular distinction includes wealth and status among Mennonite families. Anyone working for any amount of time in Mennonite history will quickly spot notable intergenerational families: those prominent in church institutions, on farms, and in businesses. Failure in business or simply failure to prosper marked other families. In addition, the growth of Mennonite denominations has reached into much less prosperous areas than those of the North American Mennonite heartlands.

Who hired domestic and business help and who served as that help in households and in commercial ventures? How often did marriages serve as ladders up or ladders down? Who led in local congregations and in denominational structures? All of these areas might serve as arenas in which to consider the ability of Mennonite families to pass on wealth and status. In my research on the Brethren in Christ, discomfort with the wealth of certain families informed the debate on a paid pastorate. In 1919, one writer argued that in an unpaid system, church leaders were largely wealthy farmers who did not set their hands to the plough but rather had inherited wealth and sons who did the actual farming. Less prosperous farmers were disenfranchised.

On the other hand, Royden Loewen’s work on a variety of Mennonite communities in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century suggests that partible, bilateral inheritance maintained a rough equality in the community, gave women economic resources, and symbolized religious beliefs. His conclusions are important in light of his sustained attention to the daily life of families and communities. He has done the long slow work of immersing himself in the documents of the everyday life. He has considered a multitude of overlapping contexts from the 1820s to the 1930s, giving an embodied sense of daily practice. His detailed empirical work, which charts the way for other time periods and other Mennonite communities, yields a complex portrait of persistent cultural distinctiveness enmeshed in diverse host societies.

To return to inheritance practices and prosperity, neither has yet been adequately studied in North American Mennonite history. The inheritance practices placed land-hungry Mennonite families at the heart of a main prong of European conquest—that advanced through settler societies. Those earlier Mennonite families are not immaterial at the start of the twenty-first century. Many contemporary North American Mennonite families are lodged in the comfortable classes of Canada and the United States and in a miniscule elite in terms of world population. Studies, such as Loewen’s, help to detail how Mennonite families reached those positions.

Like Mennonites, nations are vitally interested in their families, as producers, symbols, and enforcers. Across North America, Mennonites
share much culturally but live in two nations, which have had distinct visions of the proper role of government, pluralism, immigration, national security, internationalism, marriage rules, and family policy. These distinctions have impact on Mennonite families and are important to probe in a history that will combine and compare the national experiences. Let me briefly list three examples. In 1980, Canadian and American Mennonite divorce rates mimicked differences in national averages, those of the former lower than those of the latter. Canadians Mennonites have come to accept governmental family allowances that go to all families. I have not seen any studies, but I would guess that very few American Mennonites applied for the means-tested Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Similarly, U.S. society placed on a permanent war footing since 1948 and undergirded by a militarized foreign policy has created a very particular challenge to the Mennonite peace witness, its practice often worked out in families.

Conclusion

This cursory look at possible approaches for capturing the centrality and the daily lives of families might, I hope, lead to a more thorough study of North American Mennonites. May whatever pieces such study might haul out of the “junkyard of the past” shed light on the strange worlds in which Mennonites have persisted.
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