

## Prologue: The Virtue of Scholarly Hope

Rodney J. Sawatsky

Scholarship at its best is much more than the pursuit of truth; it is the quest for wisdom. But what is wisdom? Who is wise? For Christian scholars, and for their Jewish and Muslim colleagues, wisdom is grounded in God. Wisdom is the fear of God, says the wisdom literature; it is the love of God and neighbor, the law declares; and it is doing justice, loving kindness, and walking humbly with your God, the prophets clarify. Wisdom requires careful thought, but it is much more than intellectual knowing. It embraces emotions and actions, and indeed our entire being. Such wholeness of heart, soul, and mind lifts wisdom above mere cognitive truth.<sup>1</sup> Christians believe wisdom is defined by the harmony, integrity, and unity of the divine *logos* made flesh in Jesus of Nazareth. Wisdom is truth incarnate. The incarnation is then the alpha and omega of Christian scholarship.<sup>2</sup>

Christian scholarship is a wonderful and even holy calling. The words and metaphors employed to describe the dynamics of being both Christian and scholarly tend also to prescribe. At best our language opens the imagination to ever greater creativity and possibility; at worst it narrows the vision and limits the promise. The task of this book is to enrich Christian scholarship both descriptively and prescriptively by considering existing vocabularies and by exploring expanded metaphors. We hope to enlarge the conversation by hearing more voices and by encouraging the participants to listen to each other and to learn from each other.

The conversation regarding Christian scholarship is between and among countless Christians who deem themselves scholars and scholars who are or would be Christians. These scholars are affiliated with

many different denominations or, as is becoming increasingly common today, with no denomination at all. Within the conversation there is a rich diversity of theological voices. Many participants are located in private and public universities and colleges that today have no religious affiliation. Others pursue their scholarship within an intentionally Christian academic community, be it Roman Catholic or Protestant. These institutions are strongly committed to encouraging Christian scholarship, so this conversation often engages entire institutions as well as individual scholars.

The pervasive metaphor of integration cannot help but be central to this conversation, as in “the integration of faith and learning.” In the essays that follow, my colleagues reflect on the strengths and limitations of this particular way of shaping the conversation and propose promising complementary formulations. Here I only wish to draw attention to the word “faith” in the foregoing phrase. On the one hand, “faith” is often a simple synonym for being Christian, as in “the Christian faith.” On the other hand, faith can be seen as only one dimension of Christian being. The Apostle Paul used three words to describe the full contours of Christian identity: faith, hope, and love. Christian scholars need to pay more attention to that three-part formula—a holistic formula for wisdom—and not limit their metaphors to faith alone.

Too often, Christian scholars have focused too exclusively on faith—not hope or love—and thereby have narrowed their definition of faith to mean religious beliefs about God, the world, and humankind, or a worldview embracing all these ideas. Faith as a verb, faith understood as trust or “seeking and discovering meaning,” unfortunately is not usually part of the conversation.<sup>3</sup> When we speak of the integration of faith and learning, the noun form of faith is typically what is meant: how do Christian beliefs about the nature of reality compare, contrast, and integrate with assertions made by the various academic disciplines? This is surely an important question to ask, but it is not the only question.

Christian scholarship also necessarily involves love and hope. We might then speak about the integration of love and learning and of hope and learning. The connection between love and learning is relatively easy to understand. Many Christian scholars undertake their work out of a profound love for God’s creation, a deep desire to serve all that God pronounced good. In fact, the concern to apply knowledge morally and ethically must be present in some way for that scholarship, no matter how abstract, to be considered Christian. Parker J. Palmer, a Quaker philosopher of education, even argues that love is the origin of knowledge: “The deepest wellspring of our desire to know is the passion to recreate the organic community in which the world was first created.” The goal of this knowledge “arising from love is the reunification and reconstruction of broken selves and worlds.” Education shaped by Christian spirituality, says Palmer, has an incarnational understanding of truth and an incarnational purpose.<sup>4</sup>

Hope is equally essential to a definition of Christian scholarship. Hope is the deep-seated confidence that this is God's world and that the future, including the future of scholarship, need not be feared, for God's kingdom will come, and God's will will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Students and the larger society are often fearful and hopeless, and too often Christian scholarship fails to offer an alternative. Even Christian scholars have been lacking in hope—sometimes to the point of being pathologically pessimistic, almost always to the point of being overly defensive.

Whence comes this defensiveness and lack of hope? The metaphor of integration does not encourage hopelessness. Instead this lack of hope is derived from another dominant theme in Christian higher education, namely a reading of American religious history that says the decline of Christian higher education is virtually inevitable. More than anything else, this myth of declension has cramped our thinking and narrowed our reflection on the nature and character of Christian scholarship. If we truly want to enlarge the conversation, we must first revisit this reigning mythology.

### The Limits of Declension

The decline of Christian privilege and power in the American academy is by now well established. The massive transition over the past centuries of America's leading private and even public colleges and universities from their original Christian foundations, affiliations, and vocations to pluralistic and secularized institutions has recently been subject to extensive analysis, especially by George M. Marsden and James T. Burtchaell.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, this metamorphosis of higher education can be seen as one of the clearest examples of secularization in American history.

Nevertheless, the declension thesis must be significantly qualified. A common conclusion and prevailing fear that Christian colleges today continue on an inevitable slippery slope leading them ever further away from their original edenic purity is inaccurate and counterproductive. True, many schools have abandoned and others may well still abandon their Christian heritage. But surely even Father Burtchaell, who exhaustively documented this trend in his *Dying of the Light*, is not a historical determinist, despite his unfortunate use of the term "inexorable" to describe this pattern.<sup>6</sup> In fact, the overwhelming reality today is that both Christian colleges and Christian scholarship are thriving. Intentionally Christian colleges are experiencing rapid growth not only in enrollments and facilities but also in academic quality.<sup>7</sup> And it can be argued that some American colleges and universities are actually becoming more Christian. These success stories have been documented by Richard Hughes and William Adrian in their *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-First Century* (1997) and Robert Benne in his *Quality*

*with Soul: How Six Premier Colleges and Universities Keep Faith with Their Religious Traditions* (2001).<sup>8</sup> Declension is clearly not the whole story!

Even in universities and colleges now thoroughly secularized, religion generally and Christianity specifically have far from declined into oblivion. Secularization has not resulted in unmitigated secularism. A recent study of four such campuses argued, versus the proponents of declension, that the patterns of religious change at these institutions “seem more clearly to add up to the declericalizing, de-denominationalizing, and, in some cases, de-Christianizing of campuses than to their secularization or their marginalization of religion.”<sup>9</sup> The authors rightly contend that scholars today are debating the very notion of secularization, recognizing thereby the continuing, and perhaps even increasing, strength of spirituality (if not always institutionalized religion) in America and on the nation’s college campuses. Their conclusion “that the ethos of decentered, diverse, religiously tolerant institutions of higher education is a breeding ground for vital religious practice and teaching”<sup>10</sup> rightly qualifies an overanxious version of declension.

Craig Dykstra of the Lilly Endowment has similarly argued that many colleges and universities that seem secular on the surface still possess convictional traits that, properly understood, are supportive of rather than antithetical to religious faith.<sup>11</sup> And Robert Wuthnow, the premier sociologist of religion in America, says much the same. He writes: “I take issue with those who emphasize the inexorable processes of secularization in dealing with church-related higher education.” Acknowledging recent tensions between liberal and conservative subcultures in America, Wuthnow says: “Church-related colleges are for the most part a force in the middle. They include not only conservatives, but also liberal—and even secular—tendencies. And public universities are not only secular, or liberal, but contexts in which the sacred is evident as well.”<sup>12</sup>

Yet the fundamental fact remains that spirituality on most contemporary college campuses is highly subjectivistic and individualistic. It is often distinguished from and even hostile to “institutionalized” religion. Christian faith, however it might have been engaged as an overt conversation partner with the scholarly essence of the academic enterprise in years past, does so only rarely today. Pursuing connections between faith and scholarship is simply not on the agenda except in overtly faith-based colleges and universities. Indeed in the wake of religion’s academic disestablishment, Christian perspectives and interpretations sometimes struggle to gain a place at the academic table. George Marsden has led those Christian scholars who insist that this situation must be rectified, that the postmodern academy of today ought to welcome Christian interpretations of reality into the conversation alongside other alternatives if it is to be true to its own pluralist claims.<sup>13</sup>

But is the problem only one of Christian scholarship not being granted a seat at the academic table? Not so, says Daryl Hart.<sup>14</sup> He argues that Marsden’s experience of feeling excluded from the “secular” academy is also a function

of his own peculiarly Reformed and Kuyperian definition of what constitutes legitimate Christian scholarship. For Marsden and other like-minded Reformed scholars, Christian scholarship tends to be different from and in some sense necessarily opposed to secular scholarship. Hart paraphrases Marsden to say: “Christian faith causes believers to see things differently, and this difference leads, or at least should lead, to scholarship from believers that is distinct from the learning of non-believers.”<sup>15</sup> How could one hold such a view and not feel estranged at least to some degree from the larger academy? Hart says that in order for Christians to enter more constructively into the world of mainstream scholarship, they will need to adopt “an understanding of the university that is less antagonistic and more accommodating.” His suggestion is that a more “Lutheran notion of the paradoxical relation between the affairs of man and the ways of God may prove to be a better approach for [Christian] scholars than the Reformed notion of taking every thought captive for Christ.”<sup>16</sup>

We do not need to adjudicate between these two academicians and their respective approaches to Christian scholarship. It is sufficient to note that Christian scholars are actively debating how their Christian commitments should inform their scholarship. Certainly different theological traditions and scholarly dispositions will respond differently to this challenge. The declension metaphor, however, tends to slant the conversation toward more defensive and even adversarial perspectives instead of opening the dialogue to include more hopeful and irenic views and voices.

But the language of declension is also problematic for another reason: it implies a questionable moral judgment. Declension is a falling away from an ideal, but from whose ideal or, more accurately, from what mix of ideals and less-than-ideal realities? Individuals will differ in their assessments of these matters. Marsden admits to his own ambivalence in this regard. Thus even while he asserts that “we are not using *secularization* naively as equivalent to *decline*,” he adds that “most of us see the change in the role of religion in modern higher education as *in some ways* a loss.”<sup>17</sup> Nonetheless he qualifies his remarks by saying that his critique of American education “is far different from arguing that there was a lost golden age to which we should return.” Marsden recognizes that correction was needed, even if an overcorrection resulted: “The old colleges and their predecessors were part of a Christian establishment that provided Christianity with an unjustly privileged social and political position and attempted to promote the faith by associating it with power and coercion. Although these institutions had many good features as well, they needed to be disestablished.”<sup>18</sup> And disestablished they were. But how is this disestablishment to be evaluated?

The social ethicist Ernst Troeltsch, writing in the early twentieth century, offers a helpful perspective.<sup>19</sup> He argued that Christians tended to organize and function within history in three typical ways. The first mode he called “church.” Here the goal was the Christian control of the entire culture, with the state

church as its natural expression. He labeled a second type of Christian self-consciousness "sect." Sectarrians believed that the ideal form of Christian existence was found in the purity and love of the local community of faith. Any desire to control the larger culture was jettisoned. They celebrated religious freedom, separation of church and state, and voluntarism. Pluralism was assumed, not feared. Troeltsch's third approach to Christian faith and life, the one he rightly predicted would become increasingly significant, he labeled "mysticism," for here the individual, interior experience of God predominates.

In American history, the "church" approach to Christianity flourished most strongly in Puritan New England. This vision surely influenced the founding of Harvard profoundly, as well as many other church-related colleges thereafter. By contrast, sectarian and mystical forms of faith flourished in places like Pennsylvania, where Anabaptists, Quakers, Pietists, and other dissenters found religious freedom and erected their own colleges. Scholars attracted to the declension thesis invariably take their cues from New England; those less troubled by the disestablishment of religion tend to be more oriented toward a Pennsylvanian view of faith and society. Indeed, pietism is often blamed by students of declension as a major force undermining the Christian identity of church-related colleges and universities.<sup>20</sup>

Today Pennsylvanian-style sectarianism, alongside mysticism, defines much of American culture. Religious pluralism is thriving, and educational pluralism is gaining increasing recognition. But New England churchliness, with its passion for a unified Christian culture and worldview shaped by well-formed Christian minds, still has a powerful voice. What we are seeing now is an emerging recognition within the world of Christian higher education of legitimate and valuable alternative visions. Some scholars and schools that historically were more sectarian in orientation are developing a greater sense of public responsibility and cultural engagement, and other scholars and schools that historically were more churchly are recognizing the realities and possibilities of religious and educational pluralism. The time is surely ripe for the conversation that this book seeks to encourage and facilitate.

Learning from the past is a necessary part of our conversation, and those who remind us of that story deserve our gratitude. Yet the past dare not overwhelm the present or the future. A focus on maintaining what theoretically *was* limits the potential of *what yet may be*. Good things have been lost, and some should be recovered, but we must not forget what has been gained. Even though controlled by churches and privileging Christian language, so-called Christian colleges and universities of the past were in many ways profoundly un-Christian. Consider only their attitude toward African Americans. Historically few, if any, explicitly Christian schools led the way in battling racism and championing integration. And without major spiritual renewal that pattern will continue into the future, according to the excellent Christian scholarship of Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith.<sup>21</sup> If we consider other ethical issues,

such as attitudes toward women, the same general pattern prevails. With all due respect for those who champion the declension thesis of Christian higher education, might it not be better to engage the future with hope rather than grieve a questionable past?

### The Importance of Hope

A more adequate formulation may be to speak in terms of becoming ever more fully a Christian scholar or a Christian college rather than recovering or preserving an uncertain past. The language then shifts away from defensiveness toward the purpose, the end, the *telos* of Christian scholarship. Christian academicians often view the past as the basis for the present, by grounding their scholarship in a rich theology of creation. Complementing this with an eschatological orientation—a biblical vision of the future in which peace and righteousness will flourish and learning will result in wisdom—might be a helpful, appropriate, and even necessary counterbalance to what can become a nostalgic and anxious fixation on the past.

A hopeful posture toward the future is not uniquely Christian. For example, the Jewish scholar Neil Postman argued that to avoid the *end* of education, education must have an *end*, that is, “a transcendent, spiritual idea that gives purpose and clarity to learning.”<sup>22</sup> “Similarly, a Hindu friend of the late Christian missiologist Lesslie Newbigin said: “You cannot have hopeful and responsible action without some vision of a possible future. To put it another way, if there is no point in the story as a whole, there is no point in my own action. If the story is meaningless, any action of mine is meaningless.”<sup>23</sup>

Combining *telos* and *praxis* or, even better, grounding *praxis* in *telos* is central to all education, but especially to Christian education.<sup>24</sup> Meaningful scholarship must be inspired by a purpose, by an ideal end toward which it strives. Ernest Boyer said it well in *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*: “Education for what purpose? Competence to what end? At a time in life when values should be shaped and personal priorities sharply probed, what a tragedy it would be if the most deeply felt issues, the most haunting questions, the most creative moments were pushed to the fringes of our institutional life.” Boyer concluded: “The undergraduate experience at its best will move the student from competence to commitment.”<sup>25</sup>

As for more explicitly theological understandings of hope and *telos* in higher education, certain Roman Catholic scholars seem to be at the forefront. Walter J. Ong, for example, explicitly challenged the declension obsession with the past in his Marianist Award lecture at the University of Dayton, saying:

The Catholic Church builds on the past, of course, on tradition. But the faith is not retroactive. As I have earlier suggested, there is no

way to recover the past, even if we wanted to. And who would want to? I have never met anyone who knows in scholarly detail any age of the past who would prefer that age to the present, however threatening and dangerous and ugly many things in the present may be. If you know the past in detail, it was in its own ways threatening and dangerous and ugly as well as beautiful and consoling. Tradition builds on the past but it always faces not into the past but into the future.<sup>26</sup>

Rather than seeking to restore the past, Ong suggests we forge into the future. He says that if scholarship is truly Christian,

it will keep itself moving on a quest which is impossible to realize entirely but which is promising always, and often exhilarating. . . . We have a faith that seeks understanding—*fides quaerens intellectum*, as St. Anselm, in his learned humility, put it some 900 years ago. Our quest for understanding lives in Christian hope, a hope in Jesus Christ, who became incarnate in this world. . . . Since all this world is God's creation, all learning not only about God but also directly about this world can further our quest to understand our faith.

Ong is no glassy-eyed optimist. He knows that the path to the future, as in the past, will be laced with "overwhelming human suffering and evil." But he holds fast to hope nonetheless, explaining:

For much evil, there is no human answer at all, but for the Christian, if there is not a simple answer, there is a response, in God's own response. The response is that we must counter evil with good. In the incarnation of the Son, in Jesus Christ, the infinite God responds to evil by entering into the human condition, with its suffering and its subjection to evil, to overcome suffering and evil by good, culminating in the obedience that Jesus expressed on the cross.<sup>27</sup>

Grounded in this spirit of realistic hope, Christian scholarship seeks not only to understand and to celebrate the creation as it is but also to participate in God's work of restoring and transforming the world. Thus Christian scholarship will evoke and provoke creativity, curiosity, and imagination. Like prophecy of old, it dreams dreams and sees visions. Inspired by the biblical promise that some day all things will be made new, Christian scholarship can and should be both deeply optimistic and simultaneously shamelessly realistic. The Apostle Paul admonished: "Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds, so that you may discern what is the will of God—what is good and acceptable and perfect."<sup>28</sup> Christian scholars



will take this advice seriously, identifying with and, by grace, contributing to God's will that all be made new. Christian faithfulness invites us to embrace the future with hope, as well as faith and love, in and through our scholarly work and calling.

The vocation of Christian scholarship, like the mission of the Christian college, is thus situated teleologically, in the context of Christian hope. Christian scholars are a community of pilgrims on a journey into a hope-filled future. On our scholarly journey we are often tempted to stop and settle down, claiming to have arrived at the sum of truth that others still seek, or at least, ought to seek. Such triumphalism is a constant temptation, especially for Christians. But following the model of Jesus, we are called to humility. Certainly as Christian scholars we have unique understandings of reality, important perspectives to bring to the academy, and significant insights to offer the churches. Yet our calling is to undertake our work with a spirit of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, patience, forbearance, forgiveness, love, peace, and thankfulness, for these are the virtues through which knowledge becomes wisdom.

It is this journey of hope, tempered by genuine humility, that requires us to enlarge the conversation concerning the nature of Christian scholarship. None of us by ourselves sees the world in all its fullness the way it is, much less what it might yet become. Thus we need the insights of others to complement and complete our own. We need to enlarge the conversation about Christian scholarship because scholarship is by definition an ever-enlarging conversation. By bringing the wisdom of the past into creative dialogue with the ever-widening horizons of emerging knowledge, we anticipate the future with hope. The Russian literary critic and Orthodox Christian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin<sup>29</sup> understood the dialogic character of scholarship and its connection to history and eschatology as well as anyone. He described the human conversation toward truth in the context of "great time" as follows:

There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future). Even past meanings, that is, those born in the dialogue of past centuries, can never be stable (finalized, ended once for all)—they will always change (be renewed) in the process of subsequent, future development of the dialogue. At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue's subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a new context). Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival.<sup>30</sup>

While time endures, the work of scholarship will never be complete, and neither will the task of Christian scholarship. Let us, then, enlarge the dialogue

to embrace all who are called to this wonderful vocation, no matter what their disciplines, denominations, or dispositions. And let us invite others to the table as well. In the great conversation of scholarship, Christians have nothing to fear and much to learn and contribute. Our calling is to seek wisdom at the many points where our faith, hope, and love intersect with our learning and to share that wisdom with all other seekers after truth.

## NOTES

1. Ellen T. Charry, in "To Know, Love and Enjoy God," *Theology Today* 59, 2 (July 2002) says: "Modernity created a new understanding of the truth that divorced truth and knowledge from goodness, beauty and wisdom, that is from psychological and moral flourishing" (174).
2. Incarnational theology, in which Jesus as the incarnate God reveals the truth by being the truth, is central to many Roman Catholic as well as Anabaptist approaches to Christian higher education. See George D. O'Brien, *The Idea of a Catholic University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002). See also Rodney J. Sawatsky, "What Can the Mennonite Tradition Contribute to Christian Higher Education?" in *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Richard T. Hughes and William B. Adrian (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 187–99.
3. See Sharon Daloz Parks, *Big Questions, Worthy Dreams: Mentoring Young Adults in their Search for Meaning, Purpose and Faith* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000), 7. Parks writes: "Faith is more adequately recognized as the activity of seeking and discovering meaning in the most comprehensive dimensions of our experience. Faith is a broad, generic human phenomenon. To be human is to dwell in faith, to dwell in the sense one makes out of life—what seems ultimately true and dependable about self, world and cosmos (whether that meaning be strong or fragile, expressed in religious or secular terms)."
4. Parker J. Palmer, *To Know As We Are Known: Education As a Spiritual Journey* (San Francisco: Harper, 1993), 8, 14.
5. George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); *The Secularization of the Academy*, edited by George M. Marsden and Bradley J. Longfield (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); and James Tunstead Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from their Christian Churches* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998). See also Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); and Douglas Sloan, *Faith and Knowledge: Mainline Protestantism and American Higher Education* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1994).
6. James T. Burtchaell, "The Alienation of Christian Higher Education in America: Diagnosis and Prognosis," in *Schooling Christians: "Holy Experiments" in American Education*, edited by Stanley Hauerwas and John Westerhoff (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1992), 132.
7. See *Professing in the Postmodern Academy: Faculty and the Future of Church-Related Colleges* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2002).

8. Robert Benne, *Quality with Soul: How Six Premier Colleges and Universities Keep Faith with Their Religious Traditions* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001).
9. Conrad Cherry, Betty A. DeBerg, and Amanda Porterfield, *Religion on Campus* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 4–5.
10. Cherry, DeBerg, and Porterfield, *Religion on Campus*, 295.
11. See Craig Dykstra, *Growing in the Life of Faith: Education and Christian Practice* (Louisville, Ky.: Geneva Press, 1999), esp. chapter 9, “Love’s Knowledge and Theological Education.”
12. Robert Wuthnow, “Struggling to Manifest the Sacred,” in *The University through the Eyes of Faith*, edited by Steve Moore (Indianapolis: Light and Life Communications, 1998), 138.
13. George M. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). See also Warren A. Nord, *Religion and American Education: Rethinking a National Dilemma* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).
14. D. B. Hart, “Christian Scholars, Secular Universities, and the Problem with the Antithesis,” *Christian Scholar’s Review* 30, 4 (summer 2001), 383–402.
15. Hart, “Christian Scholars,” 384.
16. Hart, “Christian Scholars,” 385. For another non-Lutheran voice encouraging a more Lutheran understanding of Christian scholarship, see Richard T. Hughes, *How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001).
17. Marsden, introduction to *Secularization of the Academy*, 5.
18. Marsden, “The Soul of the American University,” in *Secularization of the Academy*, 12.
19. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, vols. 1 and 2 (1911; New York: Harper and Row, 1960).
20. See James Turnstead Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light*, 838–46, and Benne, *Quality with Soul*, 36–38.
21. Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith, *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religions and the Problem of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
22. Neil Postman, *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), 4–5.
23. Lesslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989), 91.
24. For a fine discussion of this dynamic see Steven Garber, *The Fabric of Faithfulness: Weaving Together Belief and Behavior during the University Years* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1996).
25. Ernest L. Boyer, *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1987), 283–84.
26. Walter J. Ong, S.J., “Realizing Catholicism: Faith, Learning and the Future,” in *Faith and the Intellectual Life*, edited by James L. Heft (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996), 41.
27. Ong, “Realizing Catholicism,” 40.
28. Romans 12:2.

29. See Ruth Coates, *Christianity in Bakhtin: God and the Exiled Author* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

30. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, translated by Vern W. McGee, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 170.

# Scholarship and Christian Faith

*Enlarging the Conversation*

DOUGLAS JACOBSEN AND  
RHONDA HUSTEDT JACOBSEN

*With essays by*

Rodney J. Sawatsky

Crystal L. Downing

Edward B. Davis

David L. Weaver-Zercher

Susanna Bede Caroselli

Kim S. Phipps

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2004

**OXFORD**

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford New York

Auckland Bangkok Buenos Aires Cape Town Chennai

Dar es Salaam Delhi Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi Kolkata

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai Nairobi

São Paulo Shanghai Taipei Tokyo Toronto

Copyright © 2004 by Oxford University Press, Inc.

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.

198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Scholarship and Christian faith: enlarging the conversation /

Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-19-517038-5

1. Church and college. 2. Learning and scholarship—Religious aspects—Christianity. 3. Education (Christian theology) I. Jacobsen, Douglas G. (Douglas Gordon), 1951– II. Jacobsen, Rhonda Hustedt.

LC383 .S33 2004

378'.071—dc21 2003008369

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America  
on acid-free paper