

## CHAPTER THREE

# Scholarship and the Varieties of Christian Faith

*Christian scholars live in a world rich with traditions of both faith and learning. While Christian scholars are not controlled by the religious ways of life they have inherited or by the academic schools of thought with which they have come to align themselves, their work will almost always be shaped to some degree by those commitments. Different traditions of faith and inquiry provide us with different questions to pursue, different hunches about where relevant information may be found, and different sentiments regarding which answers to those questions seem more appropriate than others.*

As scholars, and especially as Christian scholars, it is important to be aware of the traditions that have shaped and continue to shape our academic work.<sup>1</sup> On one level, this is a matter of simple self-consciousness. Our scholarship will probably be better if we understand the ways our own tradition-nurtured instincts and perceptions affect our research, analysis of data, and creative efforts. None of us works in a traditionless void; no one does purely neutral scholarship. Even if we decide to set aside some aspects of the traditions of faith we acquired in our youth or if we have cast off approaches to our disciplines that we imbibed from our graduate school mentors, those traditions and approaches often still shape our life and work. Sometimes this takes the form of continuing affirmation; sometimes it takes the form of overt criticism of former ways of thought. Almost invariably the shaping power of the traditions of our youth affect us for the rest of our lives even if and as we fight against them. Thus one of our friends says he will be a Dutch Calvinist until the day he dies, even

though he really does not want to be one anymore. Some of our Mennonite and Roman Catholic colleagues have said basically the same thing. It is probably true of us all to some degree.

There is nothing wrong with the fact that our academic work is shaped by the traditions of faith and learning that have shaped us as persons. In fact, the particularities of our traditions can be construed as scholarly assets that allow us to discover or create things that others simply cannot see or do because their traditions are less attuned to those areas. The Russian literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin argued that our experiences, located in the particularities of time and space, enable us to see some things that those around us cannot see but simultaneously block our view of other realities. Bakhtin used that fact to argue for a dialogic approach to knowledge. Take, for example, a room filled with people in conversation. While everyone can see part of the room, no one can see what takes place behind their backs. However, when everyone's vision is brought together—when everyone's "surplus of seeing" (what each individual sees that no one else can see) is added to each other's—the result is a much fuller view of reality. Our traditions, then, become part of our "surplus of seeing," illuminating the blind spots of other scholars, just as our own myopias are clarified through the perspectives of those "other" to ourselves.<sup>2</sup>

When we recognize the traditioned nature of our thinking, we can perhaps engage more fruitfully in discussions and debates with others, fulfilling Bakhtin's call for dialogism. Conversation is a necessary aspect of the academic life, and we learn various things from different kinds of scholarly conversations. Discussions with those with whom we basically agree often have a focusing impact on our academic work, helping us to fine-tune our arguments and perspectives. Conversations with like-minded peers can energize us for the hard work that good scholarship always entails. Knowing that others are chipping away at comparable problems and knowing how their work might dovetail with our own efforts can provide us with a sense of synergy that will make us much more productive in our own projects. Dialogue with those with whom we disagree, or from whom we simply differ, provides something else: a critical assessment of our academic work that, taken seriously, will help keep our scholarship honest, preventing us from mistaking our own views as unalloyed truth. Conversations with "the other," a phrase Bakhtin helped to make fashionable, sometimes give us new clues of understanding that can either augment or rearrange the elements of data and interpretation that make up our own views. Traditions are not impermeable; they can creatively interact with each other. And, of course, when people find another tradition ultimately more compelling than their own, they sometimes convert.

Conversions of this kind—switches of perspective—can take place within the purely academic realm in the same way they can take place in the world

of faith. The lore of most disciplines contains the academic equivalent of Saint Paul's Damascus Road experience, when some famous practitioner suddenly "saw the light" and assumed a new theoretical paradigm or, even more shocking, switched disciplinary allegiance. Construing our allegiance to an academic discipline or theoretical perspective as a "tradition" may perhaps be a bit unsettling, but it points toward a reality that we all understand. Within academia, various schools of thought—some old and some brand new—vie with each other for prominence and power. They compete with each other for faculty appointments and research dollars. One of the most astute observers of this phenomenon was Imre Lakatos, who argued that virtually all the disciplines contained within themselves competing research programs oriented around divergent core theories, slightly (or significantly) differing bodies of relevant data, and divergent aesthetic criteria of plausibility and attraction. He argued that it was very hard to predict which of those divergent approaches would ultimately be the most fruitful, so he recommended that competing projects be supported and explored until each finally exhausted its vision or was proven wrong.<sup>3</sup> To the degree that Lakatos's understanding of the academy is accurate, it would clearly be helpful for scholars to be aware of the specific programs of research with which their own work has most resonance. Many such research projects will be discipline specific, but others will cross disciplinary boundaries or combine disciplines in novel ways (just as individual Christians sometimes combine divergent traditions of faith in their own lives). These hybrid projects are often as interesting as, or more interesting than, projects that fall wholly within one or another of the disciplines.

Most academicians are well aware of their scholarly allegiances; graduate school taught them to be methodologically self-aware and cognizant of how they situate their work amid competing schools of thought in the various disciplines. While some Christian scholars have a similar awareness regarding their religious identity, many do not. Granted, most Catholic scholars know they are Catholics and most Lutherans know they are Lutherans, and so forth, but only a relative minority of Christian scholars have any detailed knowledge of how the spiritual and theological resources of their traditions might affect their scholarship.<sup>4</sup> This chapter is designed as a kind of field guide to some of the most common Christian options. A few of these options grow directly out of church traditions and theology; some fall within the domain of spirituality; others are more political or ideological in orientation. It is hoped that this survey of alternatives will help individual scholars understand more accurately where their own inclinations and affinities may lie (regardless of what denominational labels they may or may not presently wear) and simultaneously assist them in their attempts to understand and dialogue with persons from other traditions.

### The Catholic Intellectual Tradition

Roman Catholic thinking about faith and learning is both ancient and dynamic. Its roots go back to the earliest centuries of Christian history, yet some of its most dramatic developments have taken place in the last fifty years. While the Catholic tradition is much too diverse and expansive to define in detail, it is possible to highlight certain characteristics or sensibilities present in almost all Catholic discussions of scholarship and faith.<sup>5</sup>

Terrence Tilley, a theologian from the University of Dayton, has argued that the Catholic intellectual tradition has been largely determined by its “analogical imagination” (as opposed to the “digital or dialectical imagination,” which is much more prominent in Protestant circles). He explains that analogical thinking “seeks to discern the similarities or the unities that exist among events, entities, or states of affairs that seem different . . . [treating] dilemmas or paired types as ‘both/and’ in contrast to the ‘either/or’ of the digital imagination.”<sup>6</sup> The University of Chicago sociologist and Catholic priest Andrew Greeley has said much the same thing, arguing that the analogical imagination “stresses the ‘like’ of any comparison (human passion is like the divine passion), while Protestantism . . . stresses the unlike.”<sup>7</sup>

Following the logic of analogical thinking, Catholic models of Christian scholarship have stressed connections, continuities, and paradoxical relationships more than distance, difference, and opposition. For Catholics, nature and grace commingle. The human and divine penetrate each other. The sacred and the secular are not opposites, but complements. In the language of Vatican II, “nothing genuinely human fails to raise an echo” in the Christian heart, and that is why, the document goes on to argue, the Christian “community realizes that it is truly and intimately linked with [all the rest of] mankind and its history.”<sup>8</sup> Church and society exist in synergistic relation to each other. Reason, when it is operating properly, leads one to faith, and faith, when it is operating properly, drives one to reason. Viewed through the lens of analogical imagination, the world is a vast web of connections upon connections. Thus faith and learning do not have to be brought together (as if they existed in separate spheres); one needs only to discover the connections that already exist between them.

Analogical thinking taken to its logical conclusion implies the unity of all truth. If everything is in some way connected to everything else, every particular truth is also in some sense linked to all other truths. The nineteenth-century theologian John Henry Newman articulated that hypothesis as clearly as anyone when he wrote in *The Idea of a University* “I lay it down that all knowledge forms one whole, because its subject-matter is one; for the universe in its length and breadth is so intimately knit together, that we cannot separate off portion from portion, and operation from operation, except by a mental

abstraction.” For Newman, this unity of all knowledge includes assertions about God because God had “so implicated Himself with [the world], and taken it into His very bosom, by His presence in it, His providence over it, His impressions on it, and His influences through it, that we cannot truly or fully contemplate it without in some main aspects contemplating Him.”<sup>9</sup> The Apostolic Constitution *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* (1990) says virtually the same thing, arguing that one of the main roles of the Catholic university is “to promote dialogue between faith and reason, so that it can be seen more profoundly how faith and reason bear harmonious witness to the unity of truth.”<sup>10</sup> What makes Catholic scholarship Catholic, then, is not merely the integration of some Christian notions with some of the ideas of this or that academic discipline. What makes Catholic scholarship Catholic is that it aims to understand the world whole.

Two corollaries derive from this commitment to the unity of truth. First, any scholarly activity that seeks to break down “the rigid compartmentalization of knowledge within the individual academic disciplines”<sup>11</sup> can be seen as a form of Christian scholarship or, at the very least, it is the necessary foundation of Christian scholarship. Thus a book like *Creating Interdisciplinarity* (2001), by Lisa Lattuca, might be seen by many Catholics as profoundly religious, even though it hardly mentions faith at all.<sup>12</sup> The ultimate goal, of course, is “to work toward a higher synthesis of knowledge” that will locate “each of the various disciplines within the context of a vision of the human person and the world that is enlightened by the Gospel.”<sup>13</sup> Even the smallest interdisciplinary steps toward the unity of truth are, however, to be honored as contributing to that goal. The Notre Dame philosopher Mark Roche bluntly says: “Collaborative work across the disciplines is a moral imperative” for Christian scholars.<sup>14</sup>

The second corollary has to do with the limits of individual scholars and the concomitant importance of what might be termed institutions of long duration. It is obviously impossible for any human being to know everything that can be known about everything and to understand all the relations that exist between and among those bits of knowledge. That task would be infinite and could never be completed. Although we each have our work to do, our contributions to the whole will always be merely small parts of the picture. Taking that insight seriously, very few treatments of Catholic scholarship have zeroed in on the work of individual scholars. Instead, the conversation has typically focused on the Catholic university as the locus of Christian scholarship. It is the Catholic university in its entirety that seeks to embody the holistic search for truth. It is in the university that the disciplines are both “studied in a systematic manner” and “brought into dialogue for their mutual enhancement.”<sup>15</sup> The efforts of individual scholars are crucial, but the task of Christian scholarship is ultimately a communal effort—that is, communities of scholars working together within the structures of enduring institutions that can sup-

port the task of Christian scholarship in both its interdisciplinary aspects and its multigenerational continuity.

For Catholics, the scholarship of the present is merely one moment in the long and slow simultaneous discovery/revelation of truth. Thus in his encyclical *Fides et Ratio*, Pope John Paul II links the common human struggle to arrive at reasonable truth with the slow advance of revelation, saying that "for the people of God . . . history becomes a path to be followed to the end" as the Church "constantly progresses toward the fullness of divine truth."<sup>16</sup> This pattern of combining developing new human insight with the revelatory work of the Holy Spirit is paradigmatic for Catholic scholarship.<sup>17</sup> Human knowledge, whether of worldly subjects or divine, is always a work in process. While the Catholic notion of tradition requires that proper respect be shown to what has already been discovered/revealed, tradition also understands that the truth is being pulled into the future by what John Henry Newman called "leading ideas" that broach new questions and seek new answers.<sup>18</sup> The Catholic perspective has been oriented toward the long term instead of the immediate. Catholics know from their centuries-old experience as a church that the path of progress toward truth is slow and can often head off on side tangents or bend back on itself. That is to be expected; that is the way life works. It is the overall direction, averaged out over many years, that matters.<sup>19</sup> Thus Catholic conversations about Christian scholarship have typically been much more paced and patient than their Protestant equivalents, where the discussion has typically focused on the immediate challenges of the present.

The patience of the Catholic tradition is connected to the assumption that the thoroughly human quest for truth, goodness, and beauty will ultimately lead to faith if it is pursued with appropriate vigor and breadth of vision. The goal of Christian scholarship understood from a Catholic perspective is not to judge or evaluate the findings of secular scholarship but to encourage scholars, whether they are people of faith or not, to pursue their studies until they finally and necessarily bump up against the sacred. In somewhat poetic terms, John Paul II speaks about how reason when it is tenaciously followed can "rise beyond what is contingent and set out toward the infinite."<sup>20</sup>

In more prosaic but perhaps also more academically helpful language, the theologian David Tracy uses the concept of "limit situations" to argue basically the same thing. He says that in certain human experiences and at certain points in the scholarly quest we run headlong into questions that rational inquiry cannot by itself address. For example, in the sciences questions of meaning, value, and commitment sometimes present themselves in the midst of one's research. Those questions, which cannot be answered on the basis of science alone, point beyond science to a realm of human concern that can validly be called sacred.<sup>21</sup> And, for the Catholic tradition, the obverse is true as well. Not only does scholarship point toward faith but faith points toward scholarship.

It is a Catholic truism that "faith seeks understanding." Belief alone is not faith; it is mere fideism. True faith weds belief to knowledge. Thus the Jesuit educator Michael Buckley argues that just as learning raises questions that point toward faith, faith raises "questions that lead naturally into the sciences and arts." The end result of this mutual convergence of faith and learning is not that the two blend into each other and lose their separate identities, rather they are combined in a manner that might be called "hypostatic"—a term theologians have traditionally used to describe the connection of the human and divine in Christ. Buckley explains:

Jesus is the union of God and humanity. So also—similar, but also very dissimilar—the Catholic university is a union of faith and all human culture. . . . Divinity does not become humanity; faith does not become culture. But if they are not identified; neither are they separate. . . . The Catholic university knows that religion does not substitute for the sciences and arts. Physics does not become theology and business is not piety; law remains forever itself and mathematics has its own autonomy. Faith and culture are distinct, but not separate. In the university, they are united but not identified.<sup>22</sup>

It is this open-ended sense of the sacred-secular encounter that defines the core of Catholic scholarship. The questions of faith do not need to be forced on the academic disciplines, but will naturally emerge from the human study of the world. Questions of scholarship do not need to be forced on faith, but will be called forth by faith itself when faith is properly understood and appropriately explored.

This hope-filled articulation of Catholic scholarship is rooted in the conviction that the world as created by God still remains at some level fundamentally good, despite the ravages of sin. Other Catholics have found this hypothesis overly optimistic and insufficient to deal with the horrible violence that has wracked the world during the last century. David Hollenbach, David O'Brien, and John C. Haughey, among others, have repeatedly made the case that a view of Christian scholarship articulated only in terms of a theology of creation is not sufficient to meet the needs of the present day. Their proposal is that "the struggle against injustice and the pursuit of truth cannot be separated, nor can one work for the one independent of the other."<sup>23</sup> They call for a scholarship of the cross, meaning that "the problem of human suffering must be directly confronted in the university."<sup>24</sup> This proposal has not been universally accepted, and some have criticized it as little more than the turning "of Christian spiritual life into ideological politics and activism."<sup>25</sup> But concerns for peace and justice are increasingly prominent in Catholic faith and scholarship and seem likely to remain so in the foreseeable future.<sup>26</sup>

### Other Christian Traditions

When we examine the intellectual traditions of churches outside the Catholic orb, it is impossible to formulate a single statement that fits all groups. It seems best, then, to simply survey the options. Our goal is not to be comprehensive but merely to illustrate something of the diversity of approaches that can be found. To that end, we will discuss Lutheranism, Anglicanism, Wesleyanism, Pentecostalism, Anabaptism, and Primitivism as at least partially representative of the wide range of available options.

#### *The Lutheran Tradition*

The Lutheran view of Christian faith and scholarship, while somewhat similar to the Reformed perspective, allows for more mystery and ambiguity. Like the Reformed theology described in chapter 1, Lutheranism places significant emphasis on the fallenness of the world, but it is rather less confident than the Reformed tradition that the redeemed can actually overcome their own sinfulness and serve as models or tutors for the rest of humanity. For Lutherans, the world is full of paradox—God is at work in surprising and sometimes hidden ways—and it is hard to predict in advance where truth or grace will suddenly burst forth. Lutherans historically have assumed that truth is as likely to be expressed in great works of art or courageous moral action as through rational discourse.<sup>27</sup> Lutheran approaches to Christian scholarship have tended to show great respect for the independent value of all the disciplines, honoring the arts and social sciences as sources of truth alongside philosophy and theology.

The Lutheran emphasis has been to discover the way the created order actually functions, as opposed to the way we in our limited knowledge think it ought to function. As for who can best understand the world, Lutherans believe that intelligent unredeemed individuals may often possess more insight than less insightful Christians. Mark Edwards, Jr., former president of St. Olaf College, observes that Lutherans claim no special epistemological privilege: "Lutherans and others in this tradition are left with (admittedly fallible) reason, experience and experiment—the sharpest tools of the modern academy." He argues that what makes the enterprise of scholarship Christian is the Christian calling of those involved in it—a calling that ultimately puts more faith in the unseen workings of the Holy Spirit than in the visible efforts of human actors. Because that is the case, Edwards says, "a sense of humility and, yes, an accompanying sense of humor are not out of place."<sup>28</sup> The sense of freedom that runs through this version of the Lutheran view of Christian scholarship stands in marked contrast to the sobriety and discipline that often characterizes Reformed articulations of the nature and character of Christian scholarship.<sup>29</sup>

#### *The Anglican Tradition*

One of the things that marks the Anglican tradition as distinctive is its strong commitment to not being distinctive. That is, Anglicans have little if any desire to erect their own battle standard of theology against other Christian traditions. Instead they have typically tried to chart a middle way between or around most church-dividing issues of faith. Anglicanism has valorized the notion of "mere Christianity," and it should never be forgotten that C. S. Lewis, author of the well-known book *Mere Christianity* (written in the 1940s), was himself an Anglican. Lewis's purpose in that book was thoroughly Anglican: "to explain and defend the belief that had been common to nearly all Christians at all times." The danger he sought to avoid was that he "should put forward as common Christianity anything that was peculiar to the Church of England or (worse still) to myself."<sup>30</sup>

More recently the theologian Rowan Williams, who is also the archbishop of Canterbury, has reformulated this Anglican point of view into the principle that theological language, if it is to have integrity, must avoid claiming too much. Theologians do not have complete knowledge of either God or the world; what they possess are a few very important clues about how to reflect on those subjects. Because of that, theologians should not speak as if they possessed "God's point of view." Their task is much more modest, being concerned with repentance and worship more than with explicating a "total perspective" on the world.<sup>31</sup> This humble style of theology is rooted in the Anglican understanding of the incarnation, which accentuates the significance of the ordinary. The fact that God took on ordinary human flesh in the person of Jesus is seen as a valorization of ordinary life with all its frailties and limitations. Because God understands human finitude, human beings themselves can accept their own finitude.

The quandary in this tradition, of course, is to avoid having mere Christianity devolve into simple bland, minimalist Christianity, and the antidote has been a trilogy of interwoven concerns: a vibrant sense of worship, liturgy, and tradition; continual dialogue between faith and reason; and the critical importance of imagination in theology and the religious life in general. Arthur Peacocke, professor of physical biochemistry at Oxford and an Anglican theologian, has tried to strike that balance. He says first that "theology that is not fed by and consummated in prayer and worship is indeed sterile and can deteriorate into a merely intellectual exercise." At the same time he avers that "to pray and worship we need supportable and believable models and images" of God that are consonant with the best and most up-to-date science. Taking those concerns together he argues that Christians must forever be in the business of imaginatively "refurbishing our images of God" so they remain fresh and powerful, fully capable of inspiring both meaningful worship and intelligent faith.<sup>32</sup>

It is this emphasis on the imagination, perhaps more than anything else, that defines Anglicanism's distinctive contribution to Christian scholarship. Dorothy Sayers argued in *The Mind of the Maker* (1941) "that creative mind is . . . the very grain of the spiritual universe."<sup>33</sup> Creativity is what makes us like God; she says it is the *imago Dei* within us. Creativity is also at the heart of the scholarly task. Scholars necessarily reimagine the world in ways others have not seen it. They dismantle the ideas of the past and seek to reconstruct them in better, more attractive, ways in light of advancing knowledge. In the Anglican tradition, creativity and imagination are at the heart of all truly insightful Christian scholarship.<sup>34</sup>

### *The Wesleyan Tradition*

The Wesleyan tradition represents another way of understanding Christian faith and scholarship.<sup>35</sup> John Wesley himself was a priest in the Church of England, so there is an Anglican flavor to most Wesleyan thought. He was generally optimistic in his assessment of the world and, like his Anglican colleagues, he tended to stress the positive power of faith in the world rather than the negative influence of sin. But Wesley was no mere Anglican. In particular, he added a heightened understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit to his vision of faith, and he placed great stress on the idea that all Christians could and should become wholly sanctified during their lives on earth. With these added emphases, Wesleyanism took on a life of its own.

In terms of the intellectual understanding of faith, the key concerns of the Wesleyan tradition can be described as a "quadrilateral" composed of the Bible, experience, reason, and tradition.<sup>36</sup> When the task is theology proper, the usual Wesleyan pattern is for the Bible to take precedence. In terms of Christian scholarship construed more broadly, however, experience has historically played a very significant role. Wesley was an empiricist who believed that if something could not be experientially validated it was not true. Wesley's stress on experience also guaranteed that his followers would internalize a deep respect for our physical embodiedness. Human beings are not merely rational minds; they are also bodies. As embodied selves, persons hurt and hunger, work and play, feel joy and sorrow. Christian scholarship understood in light of this experiential orientation will necessarily incorporate the subjectivity of human existence in a way that other traditions may not.

All dimensions of the quadrilateral, of course, play a part in Wesleyan scholarship. Reason is thus viewed as an invaluable aid in assessing experience and in interpreting both the Bible and tradition. Tradition, in turn, helps moderate the claims of unfettered reason and underscores the fact that all human knowing is situated in larger contexts of relationship and conversation. In fact, Wesleyans see Christian scholarship as a whole as embedded in a never-ending process of traditioning, which receives wisdom from the past and passes it on

to future generations in modified and hopefully improved form. Finally, Wesleyans believe that God can reveal new truths through the words of the Bible, but they consider these truths to be characterized by subjectivity as much as by objectivity, focusing on matters of both heart and head.

All of this lends to Wesleyan scholarship, at least in its best expressions, a certain humility and grace rooted in its willingness to admit that knowledge is always partial, never complete, and inescapably mixed with human needs and affections. Thus the Nazarene political scientist Ron Kirkemo has argued:

Wesleyans are . . . reluctant to draw conclusions too early or too tightly. Rather than drawing up a worldview, they are more willing to leave space for individual differences, which in turn reinforces the grace of human dignity. From this perspective, it is not scandalous that there is no tight intellectual integration of faith and learning. Structures of reality are too dynamic and the rate of our scientific and social discoveries and understandings too rapid to claim much finality. Wesleyans see ambiguity and tension in efforts to understand the two realms [of scholarship and faith] and so are comfortable with differing viewpoints and efforts at reconciliation rather than with the certainties of integration.<sup>37</sup>

The Wesleyan philosopher Samuel M. Powell has proposed much the same thing in his *Participating in God: Creation and Trinity* where he says explicitly that Christian scientists are not called "to create a distinctively Christian form of science," but are rather to demonstrate how scholarship done with sufficient care and rigor can become an act of prayer and adoration offered to the God of creation who both transcends this world and simultaneously participates in each and every aspect of this world.<sup>38</sup>

### *The Pentecostal Tradition*

Pentecostalism represents yet another distinct style of Christian faith with its own implications for scholarship. What distinguishes Pentecostalism from other Christian traditions is its focus on the Holy Spirit, especially as experienced in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals describe the baptism of the Spirit as that event through which the Spirit of God physically enters the believer's body, changing that person forever. The significance of this emphasis on experience is that Pentecostals believe truth necessarily contains an affective dimension. We can learn some things through our emotions that we can learn in no other way. Pentecostals believe that ordinary thinking is valuable and that moral convictions are critical but that raw experience has a pivotal role. Thus Steven Land, a leading Pentecostal theologian, argues that Pentecostal spirituality and Pentecostal scholarship need to pay special attention to the

affections alongside beliefs and actions. He says all three—beliefs, affections, and actions—must be blended together to keep them from “fragment[ing] into intellectualism, sentimentalism and activism respectively.”<sup>39</sup>

Samuel Solivan has made a similar point, arguing for the importance of pathos in Pentecostal theology in general and Hispanic Pentecostal theology in particular. In making his argument, however, Solivan is more prone than Land to stress the diversity that necessarily accompanies the Pentecostal appeal to the affections. Analyzing the biblical narrative of Pentecost recorded in the second chapter of Acts as an example of “cultural glossolalia,” Solivan argues that Pentecostal faith and scholarship should affirm “all people and cultures [as] each having their place and contributions.” In his view, “cultural or linguistic arrogance, or the imposition of one language over another” has no place in Christian faith and scholarship.<sup>40</sup> More than most Christian traditions, Pentecostalism affirms the goodness of particularity. Another Pentecostal theologian, Jean-Jacques Suurmond, underscores this point when he writes “the essential contribution of Pentecostal spirituality lies in its playful character . . . [where] everyone has a contribution to make—regardless of race, gender or status.”<sup>41</sup>

The person who has perhaps explored the scholarly potential of the Pentecostal vision of Christian faith more than anyone else is the late Princeton Theological Seminary psychologist James Loder. In his book *The Transforming Moment*, Loder argues that the Pentecostal paradigm of knowledge points to a dynamic of insight that exists deep within the self, well “beneath our educated and scholarly ways of knowing.” This intuitive sense of knowing, which draws on all the “many splintered ways we are taught to think,” has the power “to generate from hidden sources new, sometimes powerful, insights that [can] transform [a person’s] horizons of intelligibility.” In these moments of transformational knowing, the very personhood of the knower is remolded by the act of knowing; one’s very self is deconstructed and reconstructed in a new way. And Loder did not think this was a rare phenomenon, but the normal way that human understanding advances even if the language of the academy tends to obscure it from view. To dramatize his point and to unmask the false objectivity of so much academic discourse, he advocated the following “theory of error”:

Any assertion of truth that does not recognize and accept its primary dependency on some leap of imagination, some insight, intuition, or vision, is guilty of intellectual dissimulation. Reason thinks it secures an objective, airtight case when in fact its processes are open-textured, its sources rooted in “personal knowledge,” and its conclusions are laced with human interests.<sup>42</sup>

If nothing else, the Pentecostal vision of scholarship reminds us never to forget the personal factors that are inherent in all forms of faith and learning.

### *The Anabaptist Tradition*

The Anabaptist tradition, which is discussed in more detail in the essay by David Weaver-Zercher that follows, points in yet another direction. The Anabaptist tradition is built around the radical call to obey God in opposition to the coercive powers of the state and to be especially wary of the coercive powers of the Christian state. In the midst of disagreements among persons and conflicts between nations, Anabaptists call on Christians to seek peace and justice without recourse to deadly force. Anabaptists are committed to coexisting in peace with those with whom they disagree and, even more, to actually do good to those who are their enemies. In terms of faith, the main concern becomes, as in the Wesleyan tradition, one of striving for perfection rather than fleeing from sin. But perfection in the Anabaptist tradition is construed in terms that are more publicly visible and ethically defined than is the case with the Wesleyan tradition, which focuses more on the inner character of the believer. In terms of scholarship, the Anabaptist vision is attuned to the corrupting influences of violence, power, and political ideology—including the ways that Christians sometimes lust for hegemony. The positive task of Christian scholarship is framed in terms of reconciliation and service to those in need. Within Anabaptism there is also the implicit understanding that actions come before words and that obedience comes before testimony. This too has profound implications for Christian scholarship, perhaps most notably giving Anabaptist scholarship a decidedly applied edge.

### *The Primitivist Tradition*

An interesting antidote to the other traditions is the primitivist tradition, whose adherents often deny being influenced by any tradition at all. Very few church groups actually use the word “primitivist” to describe themselves, but the term accurately applies to a host of Christians who call themselves pietists, evangelicals, Baptists, or simply nondenominational Christians.<sup>43</sup> The primitivist tradition centers on the Bible alone and on the need always to start afresh in our attempts to understand what God is saying through that holy text. Ideas are not to be handed down from the past but rather to be discovered anew through Bible study. There is something very energizing and important about this kind of biblicism, but it would be a mistake to see it as an untraditioned view of faith. In point of fact, there is a long tradition of antitraditionalism within the history of Christianity.

The notion of Christian scholarship that emerges from the primitivist tradition is, like this tradition’s view of faith itself, one that always and ever starts from scratch. For the primitivist, insights from the past may or may not have any current relevance; the goal is to examine the data of the world with fresh eyes in dialogue with our best current reading of the biblical text in order to

construct new understandings of reality. An academic application is obvious: so many of the academic disciplines are currently beset by internal ideological squabbles that the notion of just ignoring it all and starting over is mightily attractive. The problem, of course, is that this kind of scholarship can be immature or amateurish. It takes a long time for many scholarly projects to mature—a process that often extends over several generations. The primitivist paradigm simply does not allow for that kind of multigenerational development. While some extraordinary geniuses may be able to flourish within this tradition, it seems likely that most scholars will find the going rough. If the academy does not already have an established niche for one's work, one's scholarship may simply be set aside as idiosyncratic. Such scholarship may be interesting and even insightful, but if it has no ready connections with other ongoing academic conversations, it will probably be ignored regardless of its brilliance.

#### Traditions of Spiritual Practice

While the churchly theological traditions just described have been central for many Christian scholars, Christian faith transcends churchly affiliation and theological affinity. A person's faith is in some sense a gut-level reaction to the sacred. The early twentieth-century religious philosopher Rudolph Otto described faith as involving the whole person, not just the intellect.<sup>44</sup> In fact, he said nonrational and relational factors often predominate. When we speak of traditions of spirituality, what we have in mind is that holistic experience of the sacred—an experience of faith that involves the entire person: the combined physical, emotional, and intellectual dimensions of who we are as human beings.

Piety or spirituality is almost always complex and multilayered. Our personal response to God pulls us in different directions at the same time: wordless wonder, thankfulness, worship, prayer, joy, sorrow for the pain of the world, desire to serve others. For most of us, however, certain dimensions of spiritual practice ultimately become more important than others. Out of the many and varied impulses of piety, only some seem a natural fit; only some aspects of Christian practice demand our sustained attention. As a result, some Christians pour themselves into the life of prayer. Some devote themselves to the compassionate service of others. Some express their deepest faith through evangelistic outreach. Some seek justice for the poor. Some direct their energy toward worship. Just because our divergent spiritualities push in these different directions—just because we tend to spend more time and effort on one kind of spiritual activity rather than another—does not mean that we thereby dismiss other expressions of piety as inherently less valuable. It simply means that given the time constraints that define our lives, given the need to choose

priorities, and given our own natural inclinations, we will find ourselves drawn to certain forms of piety or spirituality more than others. And those different spiritual dispositions can have an influence on the way we understand Christian scholarship.

Although spirituality is a deeply personal response of the individual to God, our expressions of piety are rarely novel. In their book *Spiritual Traditions for the Contemporary Church*, Robin Maas and Gabriel O'Donnell outline fourteen schools of spirituality ranging from monastic and mendicant forms of piety to Marian and modern feminist expressions of spiritual fervor and experience.<sup>45</sup> For our purposes, the simpler cataloging of options developed by Richard J. Foster in his popular book *Streams of Living Water: Celebrating the Great Traditions of Christian Faith* may be more useful. Foster identifies six traditions of spiritual practice that provide a short but helpful taxonomy of the spiritual life.<sup>46</sup>

According to Foster, the *contemplative tradition* of Christian piety emphasizes the mystical experience of God that comes through the life of prayer. It is a deeply personal form of spirituality and one that often draws individuals away from attachments to the world. Saint Antony, the first monk in Christian history, fled the city of Alexandria in the late third century for the deserts of Nitria in northern Egypt to pursue his contemplative calling. In the medieval era Julian of Norwich assumed the life of an anchorite to do the same. Foster lists the twentieth-century figure Henri Nouwen as another exemplar of this tradition of piety. Nouwen did not entirely flee the world, but his contemplative passions eventually led him to leave his teaching post at Harvard for a life of service among the physically and mentally challenged residents of the L'Arche community in Canada. The contemplative tradition of spirituality has the goal of always living in the conscious presence of God.

The *holiness tradition* focuses on the development of Christian character through self-discipline and the cultivation of the virtues. The goal is the restructuring of the inner affections so that right living becomes a natural habit. According to Foster, the rather different sixteenth-century religious leaders Ignatius of Loyola (founder of the Jesuits) and Menno Simons (founder of the Mennonites) both fit this paradigm. What they shared was a sense of Christian faith as a way of life—a way of life that required the cultivation of certain dispositions like humility, a willingness to serve others, nonviolence, and introspective self-criticism. Foster also includes in this category Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the Lutheran pastor put to death by the Nazis, and the nineteenth-century American Holiness leader Phoebe Palmer. In their lives we see a commitment to deny self and to conform fully to the requirements of the gospel, especially as expressed in Jesus' words in the Sermon on the Mount.

The *charismatic tradition* centers on spiritual power. It is supernaturalistic in orientation and seeks to use the gifts of the Spirit, including the more spectacular gifts of healing, prophecy, and speaking in tongues, to recall the



church to its miraculous roots. Francis of Assisi and Hildegard of Bingen carried on this tradition in the medieval era; the Pentecostal pioneers William Seymour and Aimee Semple McPherson have done so in the twentieth century. The charismatic tradition embodies a spirituality of divine interruption. God is fundamentally unpredictable and may intrude into our lives and activities at any moment. The Christian's task is constantly to remain open to those interruptions of the Spirit and to be ready to serve as a conduit of God's miraculous grace and power.

The *social justice tradition* stresses the need for Christians to transform the world, to make the earth a more just and peaceable place for all. It is prophetic and often confrontational, demanding that those in power use their positions to aid the poor and oppressed rather than to serve those who are already well off and comfortable. Foster cites Germanus, a sixth-century bishop of Paris who was known for feeding the poor at his own table, as an ancient exemplar of this path of piety. In the modern era he points to Dorothy Day and Martin Luther King, Jr. The social justice tradition of spirituality is more down-to-earth than many other forms of piety, rooted as it is in the belief that no one can claim to love God who does not also visibly love his or her neighbor in need. This style of spirituality demands that the religious life never be separated from moral responsibilities to the poor, the homeless, the sick, and the prisoner. It seeks not merely to comfort those in pain but to change the world so there will be less pain to experience.

The *evangelical tradition* places critical emphasis on conversion and right belief. In fact, it sees these two concerns as necessary corollaries of each other: holding right beliefs about God and ourselves is a necessary part of turning our lives over to God in conversion. Billy Graham obviously comes to mind here, but Foster also lists Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Martin Luther as exemplars of evangelical spirituality. The core of this form of spirituality can be defined as submitting to truth. When we understand God properly, our response to God will also be proper, starting with contrition and confession and ending with the submission of our entire lives to God's will. Conversion can take place quickly (the Protestant version) or more slowly and developmentally (the Catholic version). Regardless of the speed of the process, this spiritual tradition emphasizes the dramatic way in which conversion totally transforms the believer's life.

Finally, the *incarnational tradition* arises out of the need for Christians to merge faith into the many necessary and unavoidable tasks that are part of human life. A key concept is the idea of vocation: the art of seeing our ordinary work in the world as part of our Christian calling. The enacted rituals of worship—especially the bread and wine of the Eucharist—are important for they model the sacramental manner in which the ordinary can take on spiritual significance. Foster points to Susanna Wesley (the mother of John and Charles Wesley) as one model of this way of life; he cites the writing of Flannery

O'Connor as another expression of this earthy form of Christian piety. In contrast to other forms of spirituality that emphasize the difference between acts of devotion and normal life, this tradition underscores the continuity between those two domains.

The vocation of Christian scholarship is not necessarily central to any of these six traditions of spiritual practice, but each has implications that might apply to the academic life. The contemplative tradition reminds us of the need to make room for divine mystery in our academic interpretations of the world. The holiness tradition points to the fact that the habits we cultivate—either habits of virtue or habits of vice—have the potential to shape our scholarship in subtle ways for good or for ill. The charismatic tradition underscores the fact that reality can surprise us; miracles can happen. It also reminds us that one need not be a scholar in order to be used powerfully by God. The social justice tradition implies that virtually all of our scholarship has ethical implications and asks whether our work truly benefits the poor and needy of the world. The evangelical tradition suggests that scholarship connects with faith most powerfully in the practice of apologetics—explaining the world intelligently in a way that promotes belief and submission to God's will for our lives and for the world as a whole. Finally, the incarnational tradition encourages us to put academic resources to work in the service of ordinary human beings and to find the holy in the ordinary structures of the world.

But while each of these traditions has the potential to influence Christian scholarship in one way or another, it is hard to envision any of them—apart from the incarnational model, perhaps—actively persuading anyone to take up the life of scholarship. This may be because scholarship ultimately is of only secondary concern to most Christians—and perhaps that is the way things ought to be. Perhaps Christian faith should push scholarship into second place well behind love of God and neighbor. (J. R. R. Tolkien enjoyably illustrates this attitude in his short story "Leaf by Niggle," which portrays an artist who can never complete his master painting because he feels compelled to help his grumpy neighbor.)<sup>47</sup> Maybe Christian spirituality predisposes us to regard scholarship as a kind of hobby, albeit a serious one, that often has to be set aside in order to help one's friends, families, and neighbors in more concrete and immediate ways.

Or perhaps Foster has missed something, and a seventh tradition, one that focuses specifically on faith and learning, needs to be added to his list. We might call this the *seeking tradition*. The seeking tradition begins with wonder over creation and the inexhaustible depth of God's being as the ultimate source of all that is. For seekers, that sense of wonder is tantamount to a divine call to explore all the marvelous intricacies of the world in which God has placed us. This is not a Faustian quest, seeking all knowledge—Christians know we "see in a glass darkly," that knowledge will always be limited—but it is a quest nonetheless to know all that God has made us capable of knowing. The ex-

emplars of this tradition of spirituality are, for the most part, entirely missing from Foster's book, but they are not hard to locate in the history of Christianity. Origen, who headed up the famous Christian school in ancient Alexandria, would be an early exemplar. Abelard and Heloise, who loved knowledge as much as each other, would also be included. The great Christian humanists of the Renaissance, with Erasmus of Rotterdam at the fore, would perhaps be the most prominent standard-bearers. In more recent times, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and Dorothy Sayers might exemplify the seeking model of Christian spiritual practice.

It is likely that almost all Christian scholars would affirm this seventh tradition as their own, even if this form of piety is tempered by a parallel emphasis on one or more of Foster's other six styles of spirituality. Whether that is the case or not, however, is relatively unimportant. What is important is to understand that our personal piety deeply affects our work as Christian scholars. Most of the time Christian scholars might be unaware of how much this is the case, for the influences of spirituality tend to work in largely unself-conscious ways. Scholarship would surely be enriched, however, if Christian scholars were more self-conscious of their own spirituality and its relationship to the academic work they pursue.

#### Traditions of Political-Cultural Engagement

A third way of identifying divergent traditions of Christian faith is to look at the different ways Christians have tried to orchestrate their relationship to the larger culture. In one sense, this is the issue of faith and learning writ large because scholarship can be understood as merely one part of culture, but the broader focus on culture and society as a whole lets us see things in a slightly different light. In contrast to our discussions of theological and spiritual traditions, the focus here is not on the inner character of belief but rather on the public profile of Christian faith in society.<sup>48</sup>

In the long history of Christianity, and especially of European Christendom, there has not been much need to debate this topic. From the late fourth century until the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries, Christianity reigned supreme as the formally established, politically enforced religion of the state and society. During this time the relationship of Christianity to culture was clear: Christianity dictated the morals that society was supposed to follow. Compromises had to be made, of course, and Christian leaders occasionally, if not often, bent the rules for political rulers (who were actually sometimes more moral than the leaders of the church). Faith merged with political and cultural power. The church "served" the world by ruling it; the relationship of Christianity to culture was one of dominance.

This pattern of religious power has slowly dissolved in the last two or three

centuries. In most countries of the West, church and state are now formally separated, and even where that is not the case, full religious (and irreligious) freedom is for the most part protected by law. In fact, many Christians now feel threatened by their lack of power to shape the public cultures of the countries in which they live. They feel that most Western cultures are so secular—so devoid of Christian values and control—that they have no choice but to withdraw from those cultures and develop alternative lifestyles designed to protect them and their children from corrupting societal influences. This is part of what modern fundamentalism is all about.

But fundamentalism is also about fighting back, and many fundamentalist Christians would like to see Christianity regain the power over society it once possessed. The rise of the religious right in the late 1970s was one expression of that desire, but instead of turning the nation back to its Christian roots, the result was a "culture war" that pitted conservative Christians against liberal secularists. That "war" was never as all-encompassing as the belligerents on either side reported it to be, but the rhetoric of warfare effectively silenced real discussion. What needed to be discussed was not who would win the culture war but rather how Christians should understand their public role in society, given that the option of political power is no longer available. And it is not simply that religious political power is a thing of the past; most contemporary Christians approve of that development and believe in religious freedom as ardently as everyone else. So the question is not merely a matter of tactics, but of principle: How should Christians envision the positive role they can and should play in society?

Despite the criticism he has received, H. Richard Niebuhr undoubtedly remains a helpful guide in this area. His book *Christ and Culture*, published over fifty years ago, has become a classic. Rather than speak in the simplistic bipolar language inherent in any culture-war analysis of society, Niebuhr outlined five different paths Christians had followed in their historical quests to be both faithful followers of Christ and good members of society. He meant for these five models of Christian social ethics to be understood as sociological "ideal types" that have rarely, if ever, been embodied in pure form. But we can also view them as relatively distinct traditions of Christian citizenship that provide us with yet one more conceptual grid to help locate our own views and opinions. Historically, Christians have often drawn on more than one of these traditions to form their own mixed approach to the larger culture and to help them negotiate interactions with various cultural subgroups. Given the increasingly decentered character of contemporary society, this kind of eclectic appropriation of Niebuhr's categories is likely to become even more prominent in the future.<sup>49</sup>

Niebuhr's first ideal type is called the *Christ against culture* model. It stresses the need for Christians to take a firm stand against all that is wrong in their culture, even to the point of actually separating themselves from most

cultural activities. Niebuhr says that the Christ-against-culture Christian "uncompromisingly affirms the authority of Christ . . . and resolutely rejects culture's claim to loyalty."<sup>50</sup> Niebuhr's second model, the *Christ of culture* approach, argues almost the opposite: that Christian faith at its best and the values of human culture at its best are virtually identical. This model calls on Christians to participate fully in all the activities of society as a means of receiving divine grace and of sharing grace with others. Christian citizenship takes the form of being the best artist, teacher, lawyer, businessperson, or farmer that one can possibly be and helping others to do the same. The third model is identified as the *Christ above culture* stance. This approach affirms that while culture is basically good, it still stands in need of being augmented and completed by the grace that comes to the world in and through the church. Seen in this light, Christian citizenship requires believers to honor all that is right in their cultures and then to seek to add the graces of Christian faith, hope, and love to that substrata of human goodness. Niebuhr's fourth style of cultural engagement is called *Christ and culture in paradox*. According to this view, Christians are called to strive to be both loyal to Christ and responsible for their cultures even when those concerns seem to conflict. God is at work in both the church and the culture in surprising and often unexpected ways, and the public task of Christians is to help the world discern that hidden divine presence in all the joys and tragedies of life. The fifth and final model is that of *Christ the transformer of culture*, which argues that human cultures have the potential to embody the values of Christ, but most currently do not. The Christian's task is to enter into the still fallen zones of culture to reorder them so they more fully conform to God's own desire, which is also ultimately best for humankind.

The application of Niebuhr's categories to the practice of Christian scholarship is relatively straightforward. Like the Christ-against-culture model, some Christian scholars see their work as directed primarily against the errors and arrogance of the larger academy. Other Christian scholars are so comfortable within their disciplines, schools, and academic societies that virtually nothing distinguishes their work from that of their peers. A third group of Christian scholars sees their Christian values as subtly but significantly completing their academic undertakings. Still other Christian scholars experience a certain degree of tension between some aspects of their faith and some dimensions of their academic work, but they feel hard pressed to define that tension in clear terms, and they would be troubled by the suggestion that they may need to choose sides between faith and learning. Finally, many Christian scholars hope their academic work will, in some small way, slowly bend their disciplines and their cultures as a whole in directions more compatible with God's overall will for the world.

Beyond any correspondences between Niebuhr's categories and different models of Christian scholarship, however, the real significance of Niebuhr's analysis is to remind us that Christian scholarship is not rooted only in Chris-

tian faith but also lives in the world at large. In fact, Christian scholarship always incorporates within itself a disposition toward the larger culture, either of resistance or identity or cooperation or compassion or correction. In short, Christian scholarship has a political edge to it or, at the very least, it always embodies an impulse of desired public influence in one direction or another. If Christians themselves do not recognize this political dimension of their work, others will. Thus this chapter closes with the same point with which it began: Our scholarship as Christians will be better formulated and better received if we are more aware of the subtle ways in which our theological, spiritual, and political dispositions affect our work.

## NOTES

1. In the past two decades a large body of scholarship dealing with the issue of tradition has been produced. Alasdair MacIntyre led the way with his groundbreaking work *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981). MacIntyre further developed his views on the role of tradition in a series of other books, perhaps most articulately in *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988). Two other helpful books are Terrence W. Tilley, *Inventing Catholic Tradition* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2000) and Dale T. Irvin, *Christian Histories, Christian Traditioning: Rendering Accounts* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1998). Irvin describes the notion of tradition in terms that helpfully include more diversity and multidirectionality than is typical in much of the literature in this field. He says traditions are more like "rhizomes: plants with subterranean, horizontal root systems, growing below and above ground in multiple directions at once" than they are "like a tree, organized with a major trunk and smaller (minor) branches, and drawing primarily from a single, dominant taproot that likewise grows in one direction" (47).

2. See Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, edited by Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981). See also Michael Holquist, *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

3. See Imre Lakatos, "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes," in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, edited by Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 91-196.

4. Richard Hughes has championed the need to recognize the role of church traditions in Christian scholarship and higher education. See *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), and Richard T. Hughes, *How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001). *Models for Christian Higher Education* includes eight thematic chapters on what different Christian traditions (Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Mennonite, Evangelical, Wesleyan/Holiness, Baptist, and Church of Christ) can contribute to higher education. These chapters were written by persons who locate themselves within these traditions. In *How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind*,

Hughes provides his own interpretation of Catholic, Reformed, Mennonite, and Lutheran views of Christian scholarship in a chapter entitled "The Power of Christian Traditions."

5. For a helpful introduction to the way Catholic faith has informed Christian scholarship and the practices of higher education see Monika K. Hellwig, "What Can the Roman Catholic Tradition Contribute to Christian Higher Education?" in Hughes and Adrian, *Models for Christian Higher Education*, 13–23.

6. Tilley, *Inventing Catholic Tradition*, 125–126. Tilley derives the notion of analogical imagination from David Tracy, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (New York: Crossroads, 1981). Tracy develops the difference between analogical and dialectical thinking in chapter 10, "A Christian Systematic Analogical Imagination." See especially the chapter subsection "Classical Theological Languages: Analogy and Dialectic," 405–21.

7. Andrew Greeley, *The Catholic Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 9.

8. "Gaudium et Spes," in *The Documents of Vatican II*, edited by W. M. Abbott (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 199–200.

9. John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 45.

10. John Paul II, "Ex Corde Ecclesiae," in *American Catholic Higher Education: Essential Documents, 1967–1990*, edited by Alice Gallin (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 418.

11. John Paul II, "Ex Corde Ecclesiae," 418.

12. Lisa Lattuca, *Creating Interdisciplinarity: Interdisciplinary Research and Teaching among College and University Faculty* (Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 2001). It is perhaps not beside the point that Lattuca teaches at a Catholic institution: Loyola University in Chicago.

13. John Paul II, "Ex Corde Ecclesiae," 418.

14. Mark W. Roche, "The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University," in *The Future of Religious Colleges*, edited by Paul J. Drove (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 181.

15. Roche, "The Intellectual Appeal of Catholicism and the Idea of a Catholic University," 181.

16. John Paul II, "Fides et Ratio," *Origins* 28, 19 (October 22, 1998), 321.

17. Catholic scholars who disagree with the way Pope John Paul II has articulated some of these points would still typically agree with his underlying principle, even if they are convinced that Catholic universities need more freedom from the church than the pope wants to allow. See, for example, Catherine Mowery LaCugna, "Some Theological Reflections on *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*," in *The Challenge and Promise of a Catholic University*, edited by Theodore M. Hesburgh (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 117–25. LaCugna writes: "To say that the university is born *ex corde ecclesiae* should mean, from the heart of the people of God whose quest for knowledge is genuinely religious. What is the heart of the church? The heart of the church is the Holy Spirit who is leading the church into the fullness of truth. But the institutional church does not control the Spirit, nor does the church control the human need and desire for knowledge, which is why the Catholic university is not simply an extension of the church" (121).

18. Quoted in R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), 32.

19. Newman said: "There are no short cuts to knowledge; nor does the road to it always lie in the direction in which it terminates, nor are we able to see the end on starting. It may often seem to be diverging from a goal into which it will soon run without effort, if we are but patient and resolute in following it out" (*The Idea of a University*, 230). Thomas P. Rausch develops the same point in *Reconciling Faith and Reason: Apologists, Evangelists, and Theologians in a Divided Church* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000). Rausch says that the Catholic historical consciousness "presumes development and change based on new insights, the reinterpretation of traditional positions, and the incorporation of higher viewpoints. Its approach is inductive, not deducing conclusions from some concept of a universal nature, but synthesizing the results of empirical observation, critical, historical evidence, and personal experience. It recognizes that meaning emerges out of a historical process of investigation, that it develops, sometimes becomes frozen, and can change, but is always capable of reinterpretation and arriving at deeper insight" (121).

20. John Paul II, "Fides et Ratio," 325.

21. See David Tracy, *Blessed Rage for Order: The New Pluralism in Theology* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975). See especially chapter 5, "The Religious Dimension of Common Human Experience and Language," 91–118.

22. Michael J. Buckley, *The Catholic University as Promise and Project: Reflections in a Jesuit Idiom* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1998), 17–18.

23. John C. Haughey, "Catholic Higher Education: A Strategy for Its Identity," in *Enhancing Religious Identity: Best Practices from Catholic Campuses*, edited by John Wilcox and Irene King (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 164.

24. Hollenbach, "The Catholic University under the Sign of the Cross," in *Finding God in All Things*, edited by Michael J. Himes and Stephen J. Pope (New York: Crossroads, 1996), 294.

25. James V. Schall, *Another Sort of Learning* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 263.

26. On these themes in general see David J. O'Brien, *From the Heart of the American Church: Catholic Higher Education and American Culture* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1994), especially chapter 10, "Disciples and Citizens."

27. On this point see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Fools for Christ: Essays on the True, the Good, and the Beautiful* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955). Pelikan was a Lutheran scholar, but he has recently converted to Eastern Orthodoxy.

28. Mark U. Edwards, Jr., "Christian Colleges: A Dying Light or a New Reformation?" *Christian Century*, April 21–28, 1999, 463.

29. For further reading on the nature of Lutheran scholarship and higher education see Ernest L. Simmons, *Lutheran Higher Education: An Introduction for Faculty* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1998), and *The Lutheran Reader*, edited by Paul J. Contino and David Morgan (Valparaiso, Ind.: Valparaiso University Press, 1999).

30. C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001), viii, xi. Lewis was, on this point, largely in sympathy with Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who once quipped: "He who begins by loving Christianity better than the truth, will proceed by loving his own sect or church better than Christianity, and end in loving

himself better than all." Quoted in A. S. McGrade, "Reason," in *The Study of Anglicanism*, edited by Stephen Sykes, John Booty, and Jonathan Knight, rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 125-26.

31. Rowan Williams, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 6, 8-9. Paul Avis, subdean of Exeter Cathedral, makes essentially the same case using a more homely image. Concerning the scope of Christian truth he writes: "The knowledge it gives is not like the noonday sun, but (as Locke used to say) like the light of a candle in a dark room, sufficient to see our way—to make the moral commitment of faith that we are called to exercise as persons in a moral universe." *God and the Creative Imagination: Metaphor, Symbol and Myth in Religion and Theology* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 12.

32. Arthur Peacocke, *Theology for a Scientific Age: Being and Becoming—Natural, Divine, and Human* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 348-49.

33. Dorothy L. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker* (New York: Harper and Row, 1987), 185.

34. The Anglican theologian and canon of Durham Cathedral, David Brown, defines imagination as the ability "to think laterally" in ways that create new connections between ideas, images, or facets of nature that formerly seemed unrelated. He suggests that skillful imagination is at the heart of both intelligent faith and faithful scholarship. Imagination uses "story, poetry, and the visual arts" to reveal the deepest truths of natural and divine reality in contrast to philosophy which favors "prose as a vehicle for truth." See David Brown, *Discipleship and the Imagination: Christian Tradition and Truth* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 352-53.

35. For a general introduction to the Wesleyan intellectual tradition and its implications for scholarship, see John E. and Susie C. Stanley, "What Can the Wesleyan/Holiness Tradition Contribute to Christian Higher Education?" in Hughes and Adrian, *Models for Christian Higher Education*, 313-26.

36. For a helpful analysis of the Wesleyan quadrilateral, see W. Stephen Gunter, Scott J. Jones, Ted A. Campbell, Rebekah L. Miles, and Randy L. Maddox, *Wesley and the Quadrilateral: Renewing the Conversation* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1997).

37. Ron Kirkemo, "At the Lectern Between Jerusalem and Sarajevo: A Christian Approach to Teaching Political Science" in *Teaching as an Act of Faith: Theory and Practice in Church-Related Higher Education*, edited by Arlin C. Migliazzo (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 44.

38. Samuel M. Powell, *Participating in God: Creation and Trinity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 215-16.

39. Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 41.

40. Samuel Solivan, *The Spirit, Pathos and Liberation: Toward an Hispanic Pentecostal Theology* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 118.

41. Jean-Jacques Suurmond, *Word and Spirit at Play: Towards a Charismatic Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 220.

42. James L. Loder, *The Transforming Moment*, 2nd ed. (Colorado Springs: Halmers and Howard, 1989), 2-3, 26. While Loder was not a member of any Pentecostal church, he explicitly rooted his understanding of Christian faith and scholarship in a charismatic understanding of what he called mainline Christian faith. The charis-

matic tenor of *The Transforming Moment* is evident starting with the preface, and Loder confirmed that understanding of his work in a personal conversation several years before his death.

43. On the idea of primitivism and its influence in American religion see *The American Quest for the Primitive Church*, edited by Richard T. Hughes (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), and *The Primitive Church in the Modern World*, edited by Richard T. Hughes (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

44. Rudolph Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923).

45. Robin Maas and Gabriel O'Donnell, *Spirituality for the Contemporary Church* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1990).

46. Richard J. Foster, *Streams of Living Water: Celebrating the Great Traditions of Christian Faith* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998).

47. J. R. R. Tolkien, "Leaf by Niggle," in *Tree and Leaf* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965).

48. Two alternative perspectives, which we do not explicitly discuss in this book, deserve mention here. One is to view the connections of church and world in terms of evangelism and mission, perhaps best summarized in David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1991). In addition to outlining all the important debates and developments that have taken place in recent years, Bosch analyzes thirteen emerging paradigms of mission that map the entire range of contemporary opinions. Another helpful perspective is to view the engagement of church and culture as a function of the church's own self-understanding, an approach taken by Avery Dulles in *Models of the Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1974). He develops five different ways of understanding the mission and identity of the church: as institution, mystical communion, sacrament, herald, and servant.

49. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper, 1951). For a critique of Niebuhr see Glenn Stassen, D. M. Yeager, and John Howard Yoder, *Authentic Transformation: A New Vision of Christ and Culture* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1996) and Duane K. Friesen, *Artists, Citizens, Philosophers: Seeking the Peace of the City* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 2000). A somewhat different way of laying out the political options available to contemporary Christians can be found in J. Philip Wogaman, *Christian Perspectives on Politics*, rev. and expanded ed. (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000).

50. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, 45.