SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE AND CHURCH HISTORY:
A CASE STUDY

To introduce the spectre of sociology at this meeting of Canadian church historians may be deemed heretical, or at least retrogressive, by some. But, if legitimation is required, it should be remembered that when the late H. H. Walsh decried the undue devotion among religious analysts to certain sociological constructs, the issue was one of reductionism. It was his belief, for example, that the church-sect typology so dominant in Canadian church historiography limited the understanding of religious "enthusiasm".[1]

The concern of this paper is not to simplify by the introduction of sociological explanation but rather to underline just one factor in historiographical analysis. The larger framework for this discussion is historical relativism which assumes with Carl Berger that history invariably "reflects and incorporates the ideological climate of the period in which it was conceived and composed".[2] The narrower focus is ethnic historiography recently raised to consciousness in Canada by French-Canadian nationalism and in the United States by both Black Power advocates and a generally malfunctioning melting pot.[3] The sociology of knowledge especially as articulated by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann[4] provides the analytical perspective with the case in point coming from the Mennonite study of Anabaptism as critiqued most notably by James M. Stayer of Queen's University.[5] Given the imprecision inherent in this form of theoretical procedure, this paper may best be seen as an excercise in methodological probing.

I

The "social construction of reality" is, according to our sociologists, a dialectical process of externalization, objectification, and internalization. For present purposes it is sufficient to interpret this "sociologeze" to mean that man, because of his peculiar biological nature, creates an environment of society and culture in which his humanity is completed and defined, this social environment most notably in its language gains the status of objective reality, and this reality in turn is owned by the individual as internal facticity through socialization to the extent that "the structures of this world come to determine the subjective structures of consciousness itself".[6] Despite the "real" status of this objective world, its fragile nature in the face of chaos requires legitimization through a "Weltanschauung". Because religion plays a decisive role in the construction and maintenance of these "realities", the sociology of religion becomes an integral partner of the sociology of knowledge.[7]

Even if this system deserves criticism especially where the empirical sociology as Van Harvey argues tends to drift off into philosophical speculation,[8] it proves most suggestive to church historians. For one, under the broadened definition of religion offered, the vast variety of new and pseudo- religions within our pluralistic society which alongside traditional religions serve the legitimating function, deserve inclusion under the aegis of religious history, if not of church history more narrowly defined.[9] Then too, this perspective places a large question mark after the concept of secularization insofar as that term refers to dereligification.[10]

The interest here in this "relationship between social structure and consciousness", however, focusses rather on the necessity for historical

study to perceive the interaction between society and thought in both the
era under research and the historians own ideation. Parenthetically, before
pursuing these dual aspects, two caveats are required lest we once again
drift into a simplistic reductionism. To begin, the assumption here is of
a mutual interaction between the thought world and social situation rather
than a one way determinism.[11] And further, to speak of historical relativism
in this sense does not exclude the possibility of at least comparative
historical objectivity (and truth?) but rather should serve as a step towards
that "noble dream". Speaking from within the historicist tradition which
strongly influenced the sociology of knowledge, F. H. Bradley suggested that
"it is when history becomes aware of its presuppositions that it first becomes
truly critical and protects itself (as far as is possible) from the caprice
of fiction".[12]

There is of course a limit to the historical applicability of the
sociology of knowledge. As Peter Berger noted in appropriate humility "There
can be no satisfying sociological explanation of why Hegel thought what he
did" although, he added, "sociology is relevant in seeking to explain the
impact of a thinker of Hegel's stature".[13] James Preus, an historian of
Christian thought, argues that the area preserved as sacrosanct from the wiles
of sociology is, however, much too large. An epistemological dualism
fostered by Hegelian idealism, according to Preus, is exhibited by most
historians of Christian thought, who accordingly operate as though ideas
float entirely free of a societal base.[14] Historians more interested in the
institutions and common piety of the church possibly avoid the epistemological
trap Preus identifies by operating more closely to those less lettered in
feigning ahistorical "truth". .

But even if church historians do perceive the relation between society
and ideas in their historical subjects, the social rootedness of their own
work deserves much more serious consideration than has been evidenced, at
least overtly, heretofore. A notable exception is a most provocative essay
on The Myth of Christian Origins in which the author, Robert L. Wilken, adopted
the Berger-Luckmann perspective to speak of the "historical constructions of
the past". It is his thesis that "what memory is in the lives of individuals,
history is for groups - organizations, institutions, religions or nations",[15]
and that "historical memory contributes to the social construction of reality".[16]
Accordingly, "to speak of historical constructions of the past is to speak of
the way the memory of the past is formed by the experiences of a community,
and kept alive as the community reproduces these memories in its ongoing life".
"Someone living outside of the community", he adds, "may have quite a different[17]
perception of the same historical event."

This community rootedness and functionality of history is echoed in the
report of the History Panel delegated by the Survey of the Behavioral and
Social Sciences conducted under the auspices of the National Academy of
Science. According to this significant study of the current status of
historical studies in America, history is defined as:

> first of all, the custodian of the collective memory and as such
> performs the important function of nourishing the collective ego.
> Second, it is in all societies a primary vehicle of the socialization
> of the young, teaching them the past so that they may know who they
> are and behave appropriately in the present. Third, it is the branch
> of inquiry that seeks to arrive at an accurate account and valid under-
> standing of the past.[18]

Interestingly, that part of this definition which seeks to emphasize historical
"objectivity" uses normative terminology such as "valid understanding" which
is in itself community determined.

A ready example of interest to church historians in which the history
created by a community is supremely socially functional is suggested by
Kenneth Murdock's study of Puritanism. Witnessing their seemingly insatiable
appetite for historical writing, Murdock concluded that:

"the Puritan wrote and read biography and history partly because they
helped him in his effort to establish his relation to the traditions,
symbols, myths, common experience, common sensibility and common
culture of the world outside his little province. If he could establish
this relation, he could ease his feeling of isolation and his worries
about his 'status' and 'belongingness' in the whole human community.
If he read lives and histories diligently enough he might better under-
stand himself and his intimates in the village, and be more confident
of his dignity and 'identity' and theirs." [19]

These lengthy quotations conclude the attempt to suggest that among the
various insights the sociology of knowledge offers to history, it is of
special importance at least for this essay, that history writing is rooted
in community and is functional towards the identity definition of that
community. "Identity" as here understood obviously moves beyond biography
to embrace, in continuity with the work of Erik Erikson, the concept of a
"group ego", or if you will a "community ego", i.e. the very stuff of History. [20]

II

North American society can be defined in terms of the criss-crossing
of two sets of social stratification - the one based on class and the other
on ethnicity. [21] Sociologists of knowledge in the tradition of both Marx and
Mannheim have been impressed by the functionality of horizontal social
differentiations in the formation of varying "realities". [22] Without denying
the role of class in the social construction of reality, it is here suggested
that in North America especially, "ethnicity" is an important variable in
historical consciousness. [23]

Studies of New York City focussed upon the Age of Jackson [24] and the
present alike [25] underline the ethnicity variable in American self-identity
and self-interest. Thus ethnic block voting continues to provide major
leakage to, if not actually shattering, the proverbial melting pot. Similarly
John Porter's monumental study of Canadian society insists that class interest
cannot vitiate, even if frequently assimilating, the facts of ethnicity. [26]

In keeping with the definitional direction established by E. K. Francis, [27]
Milton M. Gordon attributed the concept "ethnic group" to "any group which
is defined or set off by race, religion, or national origin, or some combina-
tion of these categories". [28] Ethnicity thus moves beyond kinship relationships
to embrace the associational dimensions of peoplehood and Gemeinschaft. [29]
Recently Andrew Greeley, in a most provocative interpretation of American
religion, argued that in the face of the "impersonality of the industrial
metropolis", American denominations emerged as "quasi-ethnic" entities to
fulfill the need for belonging. [30] The vertical groupings in American society
based on ethnic differentiations are accordingly not only the vestiges of
divergent heritages imported into America but also the ongoing associations
in which the individual is embraced in a group ego. [31]

Accepting these definitions, historians will find interesting Gordon's
conclusion that the ethnic group is "likely to be the group of historical
identification". [32] That is, the group established by race, religion or
national origin in which or to which the individual has been socialized
supplies his historical memory and historical identity. Thus Michael Novak

offers this fascinating suggestion. "What is an ethnic group?", he asks.
"It is a group with historical memory, real or imaginary. One belongs
to an ethnic group in part involuntarily, in part by choice. Given
a grandparent or two, one chooses to shape one's consciousness by one
history rather than another. Ethnic memory is not a set of events
remembered, but rather a set of instincts, feelings, intricacies, expect-
ations, patterns of emotion and behavior; a sense of reality; a set of
stories for the individuals - and for people as a whole to live out."[33]

Novak is reaching for an understanding of ethnicity very similar to
Clifford Geertz's definition of religion. According to Geertz a religion is:
"(1) a system of symbols which acts to
(2) establish powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and
motivations in men by
(3) formulating conceptions of a general order of existance and
(4) clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that
(5) the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic." [33b]
For Novak, ethnic identity serves a religious function; it establishes
"a sense of reality; a set of stories for the individuals - and for the
people as a whole to live out;" it establishes "moods and motivations".
Thus, Novak not only agrees that the ethnic group is of utmost importance
in the social construction of reality, but also emphasizes that the unique
historical "reality" of an ethnic entity is less a matter of historical
chronology than of "mood".
     It is within this context that ethnic and denominational historiography
must be seen. Such history is written from the vantage of the "reality" to
which the historian has been socialized. Thus, "ingroup" and "outgroup"
interpretations will likely vary if not in fact at least in mood. The "ingroup"
historian writes for his own and his community's identity, whereas the
"outgroup" historian writes, in part, to incorporate the ethnic entity under
study into his own and his community's self-understanding. Accordingly,
Vincent Harding insists that white American history must be entirely recon-
ceived to include the Black experience in every facet. Only then can it
begin to be the Black man's history - and for that matter, an honest white
man's history.[34] But even then, as is symbolized in the debate over William
Styron's The Confessions of Nat Turner, Black and white historiography will
vary according to their particular worlds of "reality".[35] A similar example
could be cited regarding the divergence between French and English interpre-
tations of Canadian history.[36] These cases of differing historical readings
are thus not simply a matter of bigotry, apologetics or propoganda nor
necessarily of disagreements on historical "facts" - although these frequently
emerge - but rather of honest differences based upon divergent "realities".
Refereeing between varying historical interpretations, or in other words,
relative historical objectivity is possible only when the social construction
of diverse realities is realized, and to the extent possible, superceeded.
According to Mannheim, this ought to be the task of the intellectual.[37]
     Contrary to Mannheim's fondest hopes, the intellectual remains a human
animal and thus cannot, at least in any absolute sense, escape the social
conditioning of his ideation.[38] However, the intellectual frequently occupies
a social situation which allows him to offer a unique perspective and which,
in turn qualifies any monolithic emphasis upon ethnicity in the social
construction of reality. As Milton Gordon theorizes, intellectuals found
largely in the university and arts professions tend to be "marginal men" in

the sense that they have weakened traditional ethnic identities and, therefore, tend to look to each other for their primary group relations, forming thereby a subsociety of their own. 9 Accordingly as subsociety membership shifts so does the "reality" modify in the new situation.

The implications of the intellectual community as a unique subsociety - or "ethnos" if you will - are most relevant to the subject at hand but for now can only be hinted at from a distance. It might be suggested, for example, that the professor of religion or history writing primarily for fellow referents of the intellectual subsociety is working from a different "reality" than the church historian writing from within the "reality" of his ethnic group. In the U.S. this distinction is institutionalized, although only in shades of gray, in the history division of the American Academy of Religion and the American Society of Church History. The church historian straddling several such subsocieties, as many do, must in some way sort out his "realities" for the health of his historical product.

A further modification, lest we reduce North American society to a static series of parallel ethnic groups, hinges on the dynamic nature of ethnic "reality" resultant upon a vast complex of subsocietal interaction. Common religious, educational, economic, political, entertainment and mass media influences minimize divergent realities and push towards varying degrees and modes of acculturation. In similar fashion the history of the dominant groups - the "charter" or "core" ethnics - is passed on to the minority groups as normative in identity definition.[40] The extent to which this "standard" history is adopted by the minorities as their history and results in amnesia with regard to their own unique stories, assimilation has taken place.[41]

Yet the maintenance of ethnic identities for a variety of reasons and by diverse mechanisms denies total assimilation. Geographical, cultural, social and ideological differentiations acting separately or in varying combinations to continue to define distinct ethnic identities, although these identities are frequently redefined to accommodate the acculturation forces undermining traditional self-understanding.[42] Not least, ethnic ideologues most frequently through ethnic history, offer the group ideological alternatives to absolute assimilation.[43] Thus, the variations in historical perspective resulting from the ethnic construction of reality, remain an important variable in historical analysis.

III

Mennonite historiography, especially in its recent quest of the Anabaptist vision, exemplifies rather forcefully the ideological function of both ethnic and denominational history.[44] This historiography may not be typical for as James Nichols noted:"The Mennonites have exhibited in this generation a vigor in historical studies unequaled, in proportion to their size, by any other Christian tradition in America.... (This movement) seems to have arisen in part from the international crisis of identity of the Mennonites and their need to identify a viable tradition."[45] But even if the Mennonite case is unique, it may at least prove suggestive in the study of other American religious bodies. Any adequate understanding of Mennonite historiography and the social context to which it responded requires detailing which is in process elsewhere.[46] Suggestions as to the direction of such an analysis offered here obviously carry the risks of inaccuracy inherent in all such abbreviations.

The crisis of identity, correctly   isolated by Nichols, climaxed after the first World War and resulted from a confluence of a series of factors. Anxiety arose with: the end of significant geographical and cultural differentiation, the inability to join the American nation in the Great War, the lack of an adequate written ideology, the growing body of University-trained scholars, the unsatisfactory flirtations with both the Fundamentalist and Modernist parties, and the disgrace of their forefathers at the hands of church historians from other traditions. The solution pressed by the Mennonite ideologues was to share in the renewed emphasis on theology among church historians[47] by translating the Anabaptist research begun in late nineteenth century Europe into a viable theological identity for twentieth century American Mennonites.[48] The concrete manifestations, all of which related to Harold S. Bender - the major architect - in some way, culminated in the Mennonite Quarterly Review, the Mennonite Encyclopedia, numerous source publications, dissertations, monographs and a Bender Festschrift. The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision, which included his American Society of Church History presidential address "The Anabaptist Vision" - a virtual paradigm of the movement.

These Anabaptist studies which emerged to serve as a new formulation of Mennonite ideology have recently come under repeated criticism.[49] James Stayer, for example, although admitting his own indebtedness to Mennonite scholarship and noting recent exceptions to the rule, found unwarranted "the premise fostered above all by American Mennonites, that something called 'Evangelical Anabaptism' had a historical existance that began in Zurich in 1525 and that gave rise to the Swiss Brethren, Mennonites and Hutterites".[50] Stayer objected primarily to the isolation of a systematic theology from an essentially diverse and dynamic movement.[51] The offense of this operation to sound history, according to Stayer, was the imposition of a normative definition from another era upon a historical movement in which theological flux rather than stasis prevailed.[52]

In his focus "upon interacting groups and sects rather than on a unified movement",[53] Stayer's treatise represents a most impressive and legitimate revisionism in Radical Reformation research. Given the confessional needs of Mennonites in the era not coincidentally paralleling that of neo-orthodoxy in American theology, Mennonite ideologues did define sixteenth century Anabaptism to fit their particular situation. Clearing away what appear to be errors in historical judgement from a post mid-century perspective obviously is necessary for "ingroup" and "outgroup" historians alike to facilitate the formulation of a new history for a new day. However, in his commitment to intellectual history to the almost complete exclusion of a sociology of historiography, Stayer begs to be questioned on both his critique of Mennonite historians and his own conclusions.

Stayer, for one, assumes that their ideological usage of Anabaptism blinded Mennonite historians to sixteenth century reality.[54] The truth in this needs to be balanced with the real possibility of a unique mitgefuehl of those who stand in the very ethnic tradition established by certain Anabaptists, who find their own identity in an interpreted version of that sixteenth century aberration, and who episodically at least experience shades of the same ostracism resultant upon rejection of society's majority position. If Mennonites like Blacks and other ethnics bring a unique mood to their history because of their peculiar socialized "realities", then historians need to pause before judging that reading wrong although different from the perspective of their ethnos.

Still within his analysis of Mennonite historiography, Stayer
complements those of us Mennonites who accept his revisionist stance in
Anabaptist studies by exulting that this development "is heartening evidence
that the perspectivist nature of the historian's enterprise does not preclude
rationality and progress of knowledge".[55] Such an explanation despite its
flattery is only partly adequate. Rationality hopefully plays its role but
it is also significant that contemporary Mennonites no longer find necessary
the defense of Anabaptism as a viable Christian tradition. Furthermore, by
the 1960's the ideological needs of Mennonites were no longer served by a
statically formulated systematic theology of "evangelical Anabaptism".
Consequently, not only was it possible and necessary to reintroduce the
revolutionary Anabaptists into the fold but also the reality of a diversified
and acculturated Mennonite denominationalism rendered ready translation of
a monolithic Anabaptism into the twentieth century increasingly frustrating
and suspect.[56] A new interpretation of Anabaptism followed.[57] Interestingly,
in America "ingroup" and "outgroup" redefinitions are proceeding apace
suggesting that the dynamics requiring new insights are broadly shared.[58]

Even though an "outgroup" historian of the Anabaptists, Stayer cannot
escape his own ideology which is undoubtedly related to his peculiar ethnos.
He is, his readers are appropriately informed, "a profane historian with a
liberal perspective"[59] who "can better identify with the realpolitical ethic
of Zwingli and Hubmaier than with that of any of (his) other protaginists".[60]
This biographical revelation offers some indication as to the source and
definitions of the categories "crusading", "realpolitical", "apolitical
moderates", and "radical apoliticism"[61] which do not appear in the sixteenth
century literature, and according to some interpreters, are foreign intrusions
into the world of that century.[62] To make Zwingli into the image of John C.
Bennett seems as inappropriate from one perspective, as creating Pilgram
Marpeck in the image of modern day Mennonites from another. But then each
of us works from the "mood" of our unique ethnic identity.

This exploitation of James Stayer's excellent study for present
purposes obviously does not exhaust the issue of a sociology of Mennonite
historiography. A possible direction in the application of the insights of
the sociology of knowledge to church history, however, is hopefully established.

NOTES

[1] H. H. Walsh, "Canada and the Church: A Job for the Historians", Queen's Quarterly, LXI (Spring, 1954), 78; and "The Challenge of Canadian Church History to its Historians", Canadian Journal of Theology, V (1959), 163.

[2] Carl Berger, "Introduction", in Approaches to Canadian History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), vii.

[3] A good introductory summary of this new awareness, which in itself provides evidence of the sociology of knowledge in operation, is provided by Martin E. Marty, "Ethnicity: The Skeleton of Religion in America", Church History, XLI (March, 1972), 5-21.

[4] Most notably in their: The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., Anchor edition, 1967).

[5] James M. Stayer, Anabaptists and the Sword (Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1972).

[6] Peter L. Berger, The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., Anchor edition, 1969), 15.

[7] See especially: Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, "Sociology of Religion and Sociology of Knowledge", Sociology and Social Research, XLVII (July, 1963); Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy; and Thomas Luckmann, The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society (New York: The Macmillan Co., Paperback ed., 1970).

[8] Van A. Harvey, "Some Problematical Aspects of Peter Berger's Theory of Religion", Journal of the American Academy of Religion, XLI (March, 1973), 75-93.

[9] This suggestion was earlier made with reference to Canadian religious studies by N. K. Clifford, "Religion and the Development of Canadian Society: An Historical Analysis", Church History, XXXVIII (Dec., 1969), 506-523.

[10] See esp. Luckmann, op. cit.

[11] Following a rereading of F. Engels, some recent Marxist historiography has also modified a rigoristic ueberbau-unterbau determinism. e.g. "Die Vorstellungen der Menschen der Menschen sind nicht mechanistisch aus der jeweiligen Klassenkampfsituation abzuleiten", Gerhard Zschaebitz, Zur Mitteldeutschen Wiedertäuferbewegung nach dem Grossen Bauernkrieg (Berlin: Ruetten und Loening, 1958), 17.

[12] F. H. Bradley, Collected Essays (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935) I, 20, as quoted by Van A. Harvey, The Historian and the Believer (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), 70.

[13] Peter Berger, "'Sincerity' and 'Authenticity' in Modern Society", The Public Interest, XXXI (Spring, 1973), 84.

[14]James S. Preus, "Toward a Redefinition of the History of Christian Thought", an unpublished paper presented at Andover Newton Theological School, 1969. See also his attempts to move beyond this epistemological trap via the sociology of knowledge: "The Political Functions of Luther's Doctrina", Concordia Theological Monthly, XLIII (October, 1972), 591-599; and "Theological Legitimation for Innovation in the Middle Ages", Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies, III (1972), 1-26.

[15]Robert L. Wilken, The Myth of Christian Beginnings: History's Impact on Belief (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., Anchor edition, 1971), 5.

[16]Ibid., 13.

[17]Ibid., 14.

[18]David S. Landes and Charles Tilly, ed., History as Social Science (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), 5.

[19]Kenneth B. Murdock, "Clio in the Wilderness: History and Biography in Puritan New England", Church History, XXIV (Sept., 1955), 136.

[20]"One can only conclude that the functioning ego, while guarding individuality, is far from isolated, for a kind of communality links egos in a mutual activation. Something in the ego process, then, and something in the social process is - well, identical." Erik H. Erikson, Identity: Youth and Crisis (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968), 224. This is but one reference to a concept Erikson develops here and elsewhere. Church historians weill be especially acquainted with his: Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1958).

[21]This notion is most ably set forth by: Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

[22]For a quick review of sociology of knowledge theories see the relevant article in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, VIII (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1968), 428-435.

[23]This position is implicit in Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958 ed.).

[24]Lee Benson, The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1970 ed.), 331.

[25]Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City (Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press, 1963).

[26]John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), esp. ch. III.

[27]E. K. Francis, "The Nature of the Ethnic Group", The American Journal of Sociology, LII (March, 1947), 393-400; and "The Russian Mennonites: From Religious to Ethnic Group", The American Journal of Sociology, LIV (Sept, 1948), 101-107.

[28]Assimilation in American Life, 27.

[29]Ibid., 38.

[30]Andrew M. Greeley, The Denominational Society: A Sociological Approach to Religion in America (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972), 114.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Assimilation in American Life, 53.

[33] (a) Michael Novak, The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics: Politics and Culture in the Seventies (New York: The Macmillan Company,   ), 47 and 48.

        (b) Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System", in Michael Banton, ed. Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion (New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1966). 4.

[34]Vincent Harding, "The Afro-American Past", motive (April, 1968) reprinted in Martin E. Marty and Dean G. Peerman, eds., New Theology No. 6 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969), 167-177.

[35]See: John B. Duff and Peter M. Mitchell, eds., The Nat Turner Rebellion: The Historical Event and the Modern Controversy (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971).

[36]See: Marcel Trudel and Genevieve Join, Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study (Ottawa, Ontario: Queen's Printers, 1970); and Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book II Education (Ottawa, Onta io: Queen's Printers, 1968), chapter XVII.

[37]Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1936), 161-164.

[38]See for example: S. N. Eisenstadt, "Intellectuals and Tradition", Daedalus (Spring, 1972), 1-20.

[39]Assimilation in American Life, 56-59, 224-232; and "Social Class and American Intellectuals", American Association of University Professor's Bulletin, XL (Winter, 1954-55), 517-528.

[40]Joshua A. Fishman, "Childhood Indoctrination for Minority-Group Membership", Daedalus (Spring, 1961), 329-349.

[41]Assimilation in American Life, 62.

[42]These unique ethnic identities frequently undergo major redefinition in order to accommodate both acculturation and ethnicity. See: Vladimir C. Nahirny and Joshua A. Fishman, "American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generations", The Sociological Review, XIII (November, 1965), 311-326; John J. Appel, "Hansen's Third Generation 'Law' and the Origins of the American Jewish Historical Society", Jewish Social Studies, XXIII (January, 1961); and Nathan Glazer, "Ethnic Groups in America: From National Culture to Ideology" in Morroe Berger, et. al., Freedom and Control in Modern Society (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1954), 158-176. For a sustained study of such an accommodation see: Marshall Sklare, Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955). On general ethnic maintenance see: Joshua A. Fishman, et. al., Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966).

[43]Without necessarily accepting all the implications of Parsons' analysis, an appropriate definition of "ideology" as here used is "a system of beliefs, held in common by the members of a collectivity, i.e., a society, or a sub-collectivity of one - including a movement deviant from the main culture of the society - a system of ideas which is oriented to the evaluative integration of the collectivity, by the interpretation of the empirical nature of the collectivity and of the situation in which it is placed, the processes by which its members are collectively oriented, and their relation to the future course of events" in Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951), 349. The Theoretical framework for my understanding of ideology is informed by: Clifford Geertz, "Ideology as a Cultural System", in David E. Apter, ed., Ideology and Discontent (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 47-75.

On the ideological function of ethnic, including denominational, history see: John J. Appel, "Immigrant Historical Societies in the United States, 1880-1950" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1959); William G. Andrews, "A Recent Service of Church History to the Church", Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1899, Vol. I (1900), 389-428; and Jacob R. Marcus, Studies in American Jewish History (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1969).

[44]The Mennonites share both ethnic and denominational characteristics. See: Francis, "The Russian Mennonites: From Religious to Ethnic Group", op. cit.

[45]James H. Nichols, "The History of Christianity" in Philip Ashby, ed., Religion (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), 188. Compare: "Of the smaller denominations none has been more active in recent years in cultivating their history than has the Mennonite." William W. Sweet, "Church Archives in the United States", Church History, VIII (1939), 49; and Franklin H. Littell, From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), 141-144.

[46]The writer's doctoral dissertation in progress at Princeton University. "History as Ideology: The Identity Struggle of an American Minority - the Mennonites" (tentative title).

[47]George H. Williams, "Church History" in Arnold S. Nash, ed., Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), 147-180.

[48]See "Historiography: Anabaptist", Mennonite Encyclopedia, II (Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1956), 751-765.

[49]See for example: Gordon Rupp, Patterns of Reformation (London: Epworth Press, 1969), 157, 335; Zschaebitz op. cit., 9-21; and Claus-Peter Clasen, Anabaptism: A Social History, 1525-1618 (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1972).

[50]Anabaptists and the Sword, 8-9

[51]Ibid., 13-14.

[52]Ibid., 21.

[53]Ibid., 20.

[54]Ibid., 10.

[55]Ibid., 20.

[56]See: John H. Yoder, "Anabaptist Vision and Mennonite Reality" in A. J. Klassen, ed., Consultation on Anabaptist-Mennonite Theology (Fresno, California: Council of Mennonite Seminaries, 1970), 1-46; and Paul Peachey, "Identity Crisis Among American Mennonites", Mennonite Quarterly Review,

[57]Especially in the work of Walter Klaassen. See his: "The Nature of the Anabaptist Protest", Mennonite Quarterly Review, XLV (October, 1971), 291-311.

[58]The work of Bainton, Williams and Littell generally shared the earlier Mennonite interpretation, whereas Stayer's reading is very similar to that of Walter Klaassen, op. cit.

[59]Anabaptists and the Sword, 6.

[60]Ibid., 22.

[61]Ibid., 3.

[62]e.g.: Walter Klaassen, op. cit.