

# Mennonite Scholars and Mennonite Fundamentalism

Nate Yoder, *Eastern Mennonite Seminary*

The recounting of Mennonites' interaction with Protestant fundamentalism has passed through several stages. It began with an uncritical celebration by key participants, continued through an overdrawn juxtaposition of fundamentalism as antithetical to Anabaptism, and moved on into the early stages of a more nuanced understanding. Until several decades ago, the chorus of affirmation for the benefits of the "awakening" describing developments among New Mennonites in the mid nineteenth century and among Old Mennonites at the turn of the century, was virtually a unison performance. Revisionist readings that emerged after mid-century called forth more nuanced understandings, both of the traditions derided by leaders of a more activist inclination and of the sweeping changes captured by the rubric of the awakening. These late-twentieth-century scholars who recast the awakening in more critical terms frequently went on to whistle fouls against those early-twentieth-century activists who introduced themes now perceived as dissonant to Anabaptist harmony. While it is premature to summarize the scholarly developments during the past several decades with finality, one detects themes from yet another generation of scholars who are less compulsive in needing to juxtapose fundamentalism and Anabaptism so starkly.

George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 1980

Two books, both published twenty-five years ago, have had particular influence upon historical discussion of the interaction between Mennonites and fundamentalism from early in the century. The one, *Fundamentalism and American Culture, the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925*, by George M. Marsden, was part of the maturation of evangelical Protestant scholarship.<sup>1</sup> The other, *Gospel Versus Gospel: Mission and the Mennonite Church, 1863-1944*, by Mennonite historian Theron F. Schlabach, proved to be an appetizer to the outpouring of work on Mennonites in North America which his generation of scholars would produce. This work culminated with the

four-volume Mennonite Experience in America and the three-volume Mennonites in Canada series.<sup>2</sup>

According to Marsden's interpretation, American fundamentalism was a movement made up of conservative Christians who made theological claims that actually guided their lives and needed to be taken seriously. This interpretation revised common depictions of fundamentalism as little more than a backwater inhabited by persons who were socially maladjusted, psychologically paranoid, intellectually ignorant, culturally backward, and most likely southern and rural.<sup>3</sup> The key to Marsden's revisionist interpretation was that he rooted the theological claims made by these individuals in their historical context. Biblical inerrancy propounded by Presbyterian theologians at Princeton Theological Seminary, dispensationalism promoted at prophecy conferences, revivalism, and Keswick-based holiness were all streams feeding into that part of conservative American Protestantism which then rallied in militant opposition to modernism.

Buried in the footnotes of the historiography of American fundamentalism is the significant role that Mennonite scholar C. Norman Kraus played in this recovery of the theological moorings of fundamentalism. Kraus's master's thesis from Princeton was published as *Dispensationalism in America* (1958). Kraus both granted theological motivation for dispensationalism's claims and criticized the movement for lacking historical and literary sensitivity. His insights proved seminal to Ernest Sandeen's further explication of fundamentalism as a serious religious movement, an influence Sandeen himself acknowledged in conversation with Kraus at a professional conference. Sandeen's book *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* was published in 1970 and prompted Marsden to write the book which earned him prominence as the authority on the movement.<sup>4</sup>

Work by Marsden and others in his wake continues to set the parameters for discourse about fundamentalism in the United States.<sup>5</sup> These scholars contend that fundamentalism is both a theological and a cultural phenomenon. Hence, study of the movement must attend to doctrinal matters such as inspiration of the Bible, eschatology, and soteriology within the context of the ambivalence in fundamentalists' self-perception evident in their sense of being both at the core and on the margins of American culture. On the one hand, fundamentalists frequently act intensely aggrieved over their sense of being displaced from a privileged position in American culture. On the other hand, they mouth the rhetoric of withdrawal from the sinful world, implying that cultural displacement is a sign of religious faithfulness.<sup>6</sup>

However much fundamentalists may stress adherence to theological absolutes and cultural constants, the movement itself

has evolved through several stages. According to Marsden's reading, early-twentieth-century fundamentalism is best understood as a movement or coalition of diverse streams coalescing around the concern to stem the influence of liberal understandings and expressions of Protestant Christianity. The implication is that those who consider the movement historically must do exactly that—consider the movement historically. The tone of fundamentalism has varied across time. Late nineteenth-century fundamentalism, as typified by the missionary training schools, exuded the confidence of progressives, intent upon developing institutional methods by which to have a positive impact upon their neighborhoods and the wider world. In the wake of the Great War, this expansive mood gave way to an embattled retrenchment more commonly associated with the Bible Institutes upon which a generation of fundamentalists relied as bastions of orthodoxy in a world that had marginalized them. Joel Carpenter's chronological sequel to Marsden's work highlights the inner dynamism of a fundamentalism publicly discredited after the Scopes trial of 1925 yet resilient in the two decades of withdrawal before its re-emergence as the neo-evangelicals of a subsequent generation.<sup>7</sup>

### Theron F. Schlabach, *Gospel versus Gospel*, 1980

As the title of the book suggests, Mennonite historian Theron Schlabach discerned a confrontation between competing renderings of the gospel brought on by the much celebrated and so-called Mennonite awakening at the turn of the century among Old Mennonites. Although not the first to suggest that fundamentalist currents had adulterated Anabaptist-Mennonitism, Schlabach presented the most sustained, historically grounded articulation of this argument. Admittedly, Schlabach's study of Mennonite Church missions was not pan-Mennonite in its focus. However, his subsequent role as editor of the Mennonite Experience in America series put him in an influential position to introduce the results of his interpretation into the broader Mennonite story. In many ways *Gospel Versus Gospel* cleared hagiographic reverence for the awakening and opened the way for Schlabach's own highly sympathetic treatment of the more traditional piety of nineteenth-century Mennonites and Amish in *Peace, Faith, Nation: Mennonites and Amish in Nineteenth-Century America*, the second volume of the MEA series.<sup>8</sup> In revisiting nineteenth-century Mennonitism, Schlabach traced patterns of vital piety and community. There, in the tradition which the awakeners had decried as restrictive and cumbersome, he found a heritage which nurtured a deep spirituality. Primary among its virtues were emphases on humility and community.<sup>9</sup>

Schlabach's chastened view of Mennonites' fuller engagement with American evangelicalism and his appreciative depiction of traditional piety yielded a bracing critique of what he portrayed as the fundamentalist infiltration of the Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition in the early twentieth century. He and others who shared in this critique argued that discussion of the importance of Scripture shifted from a focus upon obedience within the community of believers to a set of rationalistic arguments aiming to prove a trustworthiness earlier assumed. Revisionists faulted awakeners for associating salvation more with a single crisis conversion in which God forgave the individual than with a commitment to being a life-long disciple within the church community. From the revisionist perspective, so-called "aggresso-conservatives" made peacemaking an appendage among other "restrictions" rather than granting its traditional place as a key hermeneutical principle. Bible teachers early in the century, revisionists maintained, had altered anticipation of the kingdom of God from a focus on the church living out the ethic of Jesus to debate over future fulfillment of prophecy. Revisionists faulted fundamentalists for truncating appreciation for the totality of human experience to preoccupation with the more limited scope of correct belief and legalistic practice.

The scholarly and theological revision to which Schlabach was party followed on the heels of a seismic shift in the attitude within denominational structures, particularly in the Mennonite Church, toward the influence of fundamentalists in the immediately preceding decades. Mennonite fundamentalists felt keenly the sting of their displacement from denominational influence. The fact that conservative controversialist George Brunk II singled Schlabach out as one of his targets in the twenty-four-page booklet *A Crisis Among Mennonites—In Education—In Publication* evidences his awareness of the shift promoted by *Gospel Versus Gospel*. Schlabach's much less sympathetic revisiting of the awakening marked and abetted the turning of the denominational tide against the fundamentalists.<sup>10</sup>

The relationship between Schlabach's and Marsden's books as they relate to the study of Mennonite fundamentalism is ironic. Schlabach's treatment did point to the theological impact of broader interaction with fundamentalism. Yet the larger contribution of his work was to place these theological themes, many of which had already been treated by other Mennonite scholars, into their historical and cultural context. Marsden's treatment of fundamentalism, meanwhile, relied upon taking theological claims much more seriously than they had been taken by scholars preoccupied with a cultural interpretation. Furthermore, the fundamentalist subjects of Marsden's study were persons perceiving themselves as being displaced from their cultural lodgings, while the Mennonites about whom Schlabach wrote were

actively seeking ways to engage with the broader culture in which they had been living as a largely separatist ethno-religious sub-group.

### **Mennonite Fundamentalism as Infiltration**

In an essay interpreting broader fundamentalism gone underground during the 1930s and 40s, evangelical historian Joel Carpenter refers to the movement as leaven or yeast, invoking a metaphor used earlier by Norman Kraus to depict the influence of dispensationalism.<sup>11</sup> For scholars seeking to understand the impact of militant conservative Protestantism upon American Christianity, the image is a helpful one. The metaphor of yeast signifies an agent invisibly permeating and influencing a much larger mass. A further advantage of this metaphor is its possibilities for understanding the influence of fundamentalism as a coalition both encompassing and exerting a surprisingly wide range of influences and groups.

When Kraus turned from his study of dispensationalism as a force within the broader fundamentalist movement to developments among Mennonites, he transposed the fundamentalism-as-leaven motif into fundamentalism-as-infiltration:

In the early 1900's a small but extremely significant group of emerging leaders in the Mennonite Church allied themselves theologically with the cause of Fundamentalism and for a generation guided the denomination in that theological direction. This loose alliance introduced into the Mennonite tradition a strain of religious expression that was alien to it both theologically and ethically.<sup>12</sup>

This infiltration motif became the guiding interpretive principle for Mennonite scholarship which considered the encounter with fundamentalism.

The authors of the 1972 "Church Member Profile" constructed scales for "fundamentalist orthodoxy" and "Anabaptism" which assumed contradiction rather than mutuality. The fundamentalist orthodoxy scale was premised upon the assumption that fundamentalism focused on propositional defense of "the authority of the Bible." Consequently, respondents were given only a single opportunity to express their confidence in Scripture, and when they responded positively they were interpreted as having been highly influenced by fundamentalism rather than by Anabaptism. The Anabaptist scale, meanwhile, assumed such confidence in Scripture while directly addressing only issues relating to interpretation and application. The report of the study made clear

that the researchers intended to determine where “fundamentalist infiltration has been greatest” among the Anabaptist-related denominations they studied.<sup>13</sup>

The infiltration motif’s weakness actually proved to be the inverse of the leavening motif’s strength. Leavening has worked for the study of broader fundamentalism because it has both arisen from and stimulated serious study of the movement. Infiltration, on the other hand, has obscured the nature of Mennonites’ interaction with fundamentalism at several levels. First, infiltration turns ahistorical when it idealizes a pristine or sanitized version of Anabaptist origins. Second, infiltration ignores historical flux within and without the tradition from its Anabaptist origins until the present. Third, the infiltration paradigm’s portrayal of the outside influence as corrupting has so discredited fundamentalism that the very portrayal has frequently nullified serious probing of the actual interaction.

As twentieth-century Mennonites became increasingly aware of their Anabaptist roots they began appealing to their origins out of contemporary concerns. Although study of Anabaptism was only a secondary concern to Mennonite awakeners such as John F. Funk, his agenda in the latter decades of the nineteenth century included introducing readers of his *Herald of Truth* to the church’s history. At the turn of the century the progressive historian C. Henry Smith interpreted Anabaptism in the individualistic terms palatable to theological liberalism. About the same time, John Horsch’s wholehearted embrace of fundamentalism was giving him the categories and vocabulary with which he interpreted Anabaptist history. Harold S. Bender drew from sources including his study at Princeton and in Europe to craft his orthodox vision of Anabaptism, which became the foundation of a post-purge denominational bureaucracy. Many of Bender’s students went on to critique his assumptions about both denominational development and theological orthodoxy for looking more Presbyterian than Anabaptist.

John Howard Yoder’s “Anabaptist Vision and Mennonite Reality” proved seminal for juxtaposing the twentieth century against the sixteenth to the discredit of contemporary Mennonitism. Yet few of Yoder’s disciples match the candor of his methodological confession. Writes Yoder, “What is meant here by the label ‘Anabaptist’ is not a century but a hermeneutic. It is represented for certain types of discussion by the 16th century movement, but it can be valid apart from that particular period.”<sup>14</sup> This makes clear that Yoder did not mean to propose the sixteenth century as a perfect realization of the ideals; yet many later writers have confidently projected “pristine Anabaptism” as a historical reality.

The portrayal of fundamentalism as an agent of corruption has engaged what might be called a comparative non-equation. The first

component has been a version of Anabaptism which *excludes* the movement's extremes, the Peasants' War and Münster. The second are versions of fundamentalism and evangelicalism *characterized* by the extremes of those movements. Even though Mennonite revisionists such as Kraus at mid-century appropriated neo-evangelical views, they did so without acknowledging the source of those views, thereby denying to fundamentalism/neo-evangelicalism the same benefit of self-correction by which they had created Anabaptism's pristine strain. Thus Kraus could fault an evangelical scholar for describing "the ideal rather than the historical reality," then launch into his own contrast of Anabaptism with evangelicalism employing the same tactic.<sup>15</sup> The result has been portrayals of fundamentalism and evangelicalism that many self-professed Mennonite adherents to those movements would not have recognized.

Infiltration prompted a twin interpretation—victimization—which failed to portray Mennonites as actors in their own history. The assumed disparity between Anabaptism and fundamentalism implied that Mennonites were duped into polluting their pure stream. In this body of scholarship, infiltration from outside came to entail victimization within. Writers summarizing the 1972 "Church Member Profile" referred to the Mennonite Church being "especially vulnerable to fundamentalist dogma" and reported that "much of the MC [Mennonite Church] was captured by it."<sup>16</sup> In *Gospel Versus Gospel*, Schlabach applied such a reading to the awakening itself. He wrote that the "late nineteenth century's newly activated Mennonites imposed the drum-beat of revivalistic Protestantism onto the quiet Mennonite faith."<sup>17</sup> Kraus argued that "in their uncritical acceptance of a fundamentalistic definition of biblical authority" conservative leaders early in the twentieth century "saddled the Mennonite Church with concepts which were not endemic to it."<sup>18</sup> Schlabach describes what developments in the first half of this century "did for (or to) Mennonite Church people" rather than highlighting the role Mennonites themselves played in shaping those developments.<sup>19</sup>

Writing shortly after Marsden's and Schlabach's books were published, Paul Toews noted "a growing tradition of scholarship" by writers who were moving

the discussion from a concern for characterizing fundamentalism as an alien ideology that intruded from the outside and displaced an authentic Mennonite religious virtue with something less valued[,] to a concern for more analytical frameworks that seek to understand the nature and shape of M[ennonite] C[hurch] fundamentalism.<sup>20</sup>

Even as Schlabach mouthed some of the rhetoric of the infiltration interpretation, he has also been a leader in the transition to more nuanced readings of fundamentalism. As editor of the four-volume *Mennonite Experience in America* series, published from 1985 to 1996, he steered a project engineered by a group of historians at the peak of their scholarly careers. The four writers in the series have since completed their formal teaching careers and moved on into active and productive retirements.<sup>21</sup>

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

Various topics, some already under study, suggest promise for continued work on the interface between American fundamentalism and any number of non-conforming traditions. James Juhnke's note on the nature of social change is applicable for understanding such influence:

The story of American Mennonites is not simply one of how Mennonites in general became Americanized or modernized. Instead, it is a complex account of how groups related to each other and to the outside world as they made widely differing choices, or similar choices but at different times. The choices were about where to draw the lines of accepting and rejecting change. Often they were painful and controversial. Some cases represented stagnation and attrition. But for most Mennonites the encounter with American society did not destroy communal religious vitality. Instead, it brought a diverse renewal of the Mennonite heritage in response to changing American conditions.<sup>22</sup>

The following are suggestions toward academic inquiry which sheds light upon the possibilities for such diverse renewal. These recommendations are meant to point toward both the interests of intra-Mennonite understanding among North American groups and of nurturing a global Mennonite consciousness.

First, scholars describing the interaction between Mennonites and fundamentalists do well to heed their grammatical constructions. Students of fundamentalism have shown the pervasive nature of that movement, and clearly as a movement it acted upon other traditions and individuals. However, depictions of fundamentalism as the primary actor—therefore repeatedly being the grammatical subject of sentences—beg the question of what particular Mennonites found attractive about the movement. Such attention to grammatical

construction provides a helpful antidote to the pitfall of victimization as interpretation.

Second, students of Mennonite fundamentalism need to attend to change and consistency. Fundamentalism itself is a dynamic movement which has undergone several permutations in its history. The shift within fundamentalism itself from the progressivism of the 1890s to the retrenchment of the 1920s is only the most obvious example. Study of Mennonites' interactions with the movement needs to be attentive to the state of fundamentalism itself at that particular time. Similarly, the preoccupation with Mennonite borrowing from fundamentalism must be balanced by an awareness of themes, such as reliance upon the authority of the Bible, which are already present in the tradition.

The interface between Anabaptists' version of two-kingdom theology and fundamentalists' suspicion of political activism continues to be a fruitful topic for inquiry, not yet adequately summarized. Recent emphasis upon the impact of fundamentalist sectarian language upon Mennonites' political quietism<sup>23</sup> needs to be balanced by acknowledging a longstanding reticence to activism in the tradition.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, an understanding of the appeal dispensationalism has had for many Mennonites should include an acknowledgement that the Plymouth Brethren who have been one of the main promoters of this eschatological schema share a radical or believers' church identity with the Mennonites.<sup>25</sup> A 1999 believers' church conference on eschatology showcased the tendency to distinguish Anabaptism from dispensationalism on ideological grounds without acknowledging believers' church impulses which point toward apocalyptic conclusions.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, the assumption that it was American fundamentalism which imposed premillennialism upon Mennonites needs to be balanced with an awareness of such currents in other global contexts.<sup>27</sup>

Third, scholars will also do well to revisit the role that the charge of liberalism at Goshen College, Indiana, has played in shaping the discussion of fundamentalism. The purge associated with the reorganization of Goshen anathematized anything labeled as liberal. That Mennonite fundamentalists after the purge continued to label virtually any resistance to their agenda as modernism by the 1950s prompted doubts as to whether liberalism's tide had in fact ever reached old Goshen. Loyalists to Goshen now asserted that during the 1920s Mennonites were not dealing with bona fide modernism so much as with a cultural lag associated with being a rural people. The conventional wisdom citing the "so-called 'modernism' in the church" discredited the fundamentalists' ability to discern.<sup>28</sup> My own research suggests that even as the fundamentalists did overextend their application of the charge of liberalism, substantive elements in the curriculum at Goshen in the 1910s deserved the label of liberal.<sup>29</sup>

Fourth, linear continuums are inadequate for conceptualizing either the changes North American Mennonites experienced early in the twentieth century or the relationships of Mennonite groups to each other. Schlachach's contention on this matter is particularly insightful for that period at the turn of the twentieth century when Mennonite activists of various stripes were sorting out their diverse theologies and social understandings, some of which came to be in direct conflict with each other. One might manage to depict the postures these activists took in some sort of helpful linear fashion, yet, when faced with those old order groups who had recently opted for a more traditional stance which looked askance at the whole range of activist positions, it becomes clear that one needs at least a two-dimensional model with options for points beyond a single continuum for representing these relationships.<sup>30</sup> However conservative the theology of the fundamentalists might appear, they were strong advocates for using progressive means of communication and persuasion to pursue their agenda. Traditionalist Old Orders they were not.

Finally, we do well to acknowledge candidly that, at least for those scholars intending in some way to serve Mennonite faith communities, comparative study of Mennonitism and fundamentalism involves legitimizing denominational identity. Fulfilling this aspect of the scholarly calling does at times prompt the sharpening of distinctions between fundamentalism and Anabaptism out of a concern to clarify an identity. At other times contextual discernment calls forth an acknowledgement of compatibility, building bridges which reinforce shared values. A key argument of this essay has been that for some decades Mennonite scholars have leaned so heavily on the side of dichotomy as to risk distortion. The case for distinguishing an Anabaptist perspective from that of fundamentalism is in fact enhanced by a fair and charitable treatment of both sides.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture, the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism: 1870-1925* (Oxford, 1980).
- <sup>2</sup> Theron F. Schlachach, *Gospel Versus Gospel: Mission and the Mennonite Church, 1863-1944*, (Scottsdale, PA, 1980).
- <sup>3</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 199.
- <sup>4</sup> C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development* (Richmond, VA, 1958); Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 239 n8, 43 n11; Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* (Chicago, 1970), 287.
- <sup>5</sup> Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York, 1997).
- <sup>6</sup> Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 6-7.

<sup>7</sup> Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*.

<sup>8</sup> Theron F. Schlabach, *Peace, Faith, Nation: Mennonites and Amish in Nineteenth-Century America*, (Scottsdale, PA, 1988).

<sup>9</sup> As part of Schlabach's effort to remove blinders imposed by the term *awakening* with its accompanying interpretation of the pre-awakening period as a sort of Dark Ages, he replaced the label *awakening* with *quickenings*. See Schlabach, "Reveille for Die Stillen im Lande: A Stir Among Mennonites in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 50 (1977), 213-226; id. "To Focus a Mennonite Vision," in *Kingdom, Cross, and Community: Essays on Mennonite Themes in Honor of Guy F. Herschberger*, ed. J. Richard Burkholder and Calvin Redekop (Scottsdale, PA, 1976), 15-16; id., *Gospel Versus Gospel: Mission and the Mennonite Church, 1863-1944* (Kitchener, ON, 1980), 31-53; id., *Peace, Faith, Nation*, 295-321, esp. 300.

Nearly three decades following Schlabach's first introduction of the term *quickenings*, continued application of this innovation is proving more problematic than helpful. On one hand, Schlabach implies that a quickening signifies an increase in pace rather than a change in substance. Yet his own critique details a transition far more profound than a heightened rate of activity. Schlabach correctly observes that the term *awakening* implies arousal from slumber and lethargy. Yet for a tradition steeped in Scripture, the term *quickenings*, as used in the Authorized Version, is even more pejorative, denoting resurrection from the dead (Ephesians 2:1).

The strongest evidence against the "quickenings" label is the way in which it has generated confusion rather than clarity in contemporary scholarship. Some writers avoid the use of either "quickenings" or "awakening;" see Cornelius J. Dyck, *An Introduction to Mennonite History: A Popular History of the Anabaptists and the Mennonites*, (Scottsdale, PA, 1993); James C. Juhnke, *Vision, Doctrine, War: Mennonite Identity and Organization in America, 1890-1930* (Scottsdale, PA, 1989). Another refers to the "quickenings," but actually describes a process of appropriation and adaptation, which is more profound than what Schlabach says he means by that term; see J. Denny Weaver, "The Quickening of Soteriology: Atonement from Christian Burkholder to Daniel Kauffman," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 61 (1987): 5-45. Others continue to use the term *awakening*; see Beulah Stauffer Hostetler, *American Mennonites and Protestant Movements: A Community Paradigm*, (Scottsdale, PA, 1987), 188. An even larger group of historians acknowledge both terms, implying they are interchangeable; see James O. Lehman, *Creative Congregationalism: A History of the Oak Grove Mennonite Church in Wayne County, Ohio* (Smithville, OH, 1978), 118; Joseph C. Liechty, "Humility: The Foundations of Mennonite Religious Outlook in the 1860s," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 54 (1980): 11-12; Willard H. Smith, *Mennonites in Illinois*, (Scottsdale, PA, 1983), 222. That still others add yet another label—the "Renaissance"—referring to "the so-called Mennonite 'Renaissance,' 'Awakening,' or 'Quickenings,'" reflects the confusion in nomenclature; see J. Lawrence Burkholder, "Institutions, Church," in *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, Vol. 5; and Leonard Gross, "Harold S. Bender and the Anabaptist Vision," *Mennonite Yearbook & Directory* (Scottsdale, PA, 1994), 9.

Given such confusion, it is time to acknowledge Schlabach's valuable insights for appreciating the vitality of nineteenth-century Mennonitism, and then to return to the *awakening* with a properly chastened understanding of the term as signifying the turn-of-the-century adaptation and appropriation which Mennonites were making of their heritage. For a precedent in using the term *awakening* in a sense related to the one proposed here, see William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change in America, 1607-1977* (Chicago, 1978).

<sup>10</sup> George R. Brunk II, *A Crisis Among Mennonites—In Education —In Publication* (Johnstown, PA, 1983); Linden M. Wenger, "Fellowship of Concerned Mennonites," in *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, Vol. 5.

- <sup>11</sup> Joel A. Carpenter, "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942," *Church History* 49 (1980): 62-75; Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America*, chapter two, "The Leaven of the Plymouth Brethren."
- <sup>12</sup> C. Norman Kraus, "American Mennonites and the Bible, 1750-1950," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 41 (1967): 309.
- <sup>13</sup> J. Howard Kauffman and Leland Harder, *Anabaptists Four Centuries Later: A Profile of Five Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Denominations* (Scottsdale, PA, 1975), 101-17.
- <sup>14</sup> John H. Yoder, "Anabaptist Vision and Mennonite Reality," in *Consultation on Anabaptist Mennonite Theology*, ed. A. J. Klassen (Fresno, CA, 1970), 5.
- <sup>15</sup> C. Norman Kraus, "Evangelicalism: A Mennonite Critique," in *The Variety of American Evangelicalism*, ed. Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston (Downers Grove, IL, 1991), 188.
- <sup>16</sup> Kauffman and Harder, *Anabaptists Four Centuries Later*, 108.
- <sup>17</sup> Schlabach, *Gospel Versus Gospel*, 52.
- <sup>18</sup> Kraus, "American Mennonites and the Bible," 309.
- <sup>19</sup> Schlabach, *Gospel Versus Gospel*, 111.
- <sup>20</sup> Paul Toews, "Fundamentalist Conflict in Mennonite Colleges: A Response to Cultural Traditions?" in *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 57 (1983), 245.
- <sup>21</sup> Richard K. MacMaster, *Land, Piety, Peoplehood: The Establishment of Mennonite Communities in America, 1683-1790* (Scottsdale, PA, 1985); Schlabach, *Peace, Faith, Nation*; Juhnke, *Vision, Doctrine, War*; Paul Toews, *Mennonites in American Society, 1930-1970: Modernity and the Persistence of Religious Community* (Scottsdale, PA, 1996).
- <sup>22</sup> Juhnke, *Vision, Doctrine, War*, 31.
- <sup>23</sup> Perry Bush, *Two Kingdoms, Two Loyalties: Mennonite Pacifism in Modern America* (Baltimore, 1998), 39-44; Rodney James Sawatsky, "The Influence of Fundamentalism on Mennonite Nonresistance, 1908-1944" (M. A. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1973), 28, 137.
- <sup>24</sup> Nathan E. Yoder, "Mennonite Fundamentalism: Shaping and Identity for an American Context" (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1999), 52-63.
- <sup>25</sup> John Driver, *Radical Faith: An Alternative History of the Christian Church* (Kitchener, ON, 1999), 283-93; Donald F. Durnbaugh, *The Believers' Church: The History and Character of Radical Protestantism* (New York, 1968), 161-72.
- <sup>26</sup> Loren L. Johns, ed., *Apocalypticism and Millennialism: Shaping a Believers Church Eschatology for the 21st Century*, (Kitchener, ON, 2000).
- <sup>27</sup> Fred R. Belk, "The Emergence of Millennialism among the Russian Mennonites," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 49 (1975); J. B. Toews, "Mennonite Brethren Identity and Theological Diversity," in *Pilgrims & Strangers: Essays in Mennonite Brethren History*, ed. Paul Toews, (Fresno, CA, 1977), 133-54.
- <sup>28</sup> Kauffman and Harder, *Anabaptists Four Centuries Later*, 109.
- <sup>29</sup> Yoder, "Mennonite Fundamentalism", 192-207.
- <sup>30</sup> Theron F. Schlabach, introduction to *Mennonites in Illinois*, Smith, 16-17. For additional examples of Schlabach's penchant for analyzing options in clusters of three, see Schlabach, *Peace, Faith, Nation.*, 86, 127, 140, 221.