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Perhaps the most helpful contributors to this conversation have been the more ambivalent ones, due to their being genuinely sympathetic to the concerns of both Catholic and Mennonite perspectives. Bauerschmidt and Finger demonstrate an understandable partiality to their respective churches’ positions on baptism that is offset by a very real sensitivity to the concerns that these positions raise. Kauffman and Schlabach, having embraced an explicitly dual identity, are in a sense uniquely equipped to speak to and from either perspective from their position at the Mennonite-Catholic crossroads.

Lest these voices paint too rosy a picture of how far Mennonites and Catholics have come in relation to each other, certain others remind us how far we still have to go, calling attention to remaining unresolved issues too significant to be ignored. The role of historical Christendom remains a particularly tangled sticking point.

Kreider is representative of many Mennonites in the tenacity with which he holds to the connection of individualism. Lapp, pondering the same phenomenon, reflects, “In an ecumenical epoch and a time of growing secularism, perhaps the time and mode of baptism is less significant than during the past five centuries.” Kavanagh, along with other representatives of the “mature adulthood school” in postconciliar Catholicism, appeals directly to the early church and Vatican II and indirectly to Anabaptist ideals in order to call Catholics beyond a tridentine conception to a broader view of baptism, not merely as individual reception but as church-wide disciple-making.

Chauvet helpfully points to the perils of both “Christendom” and “believers’ church” models of ecclesiology, splitting the horns of the conformity/individualism dichotomy mentioned earlier with a paradoxical view of Christian initiation that avoids the weaknesses of either model by holding their strengths together in tension, most importantly in terms of the vital interdependence between sacramentality and ethics.
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