Dear Alumni and Friends —

The Spring 2013 issue of Criterion opens with a paper by Paul Mendes-Flohr, the Dorothy Grant Maclear Professor of Modern Jewish History and Thought. Discussing “The Promises and Limitations of Interfaith Dialogue,” Professor Mendes-Flohr points out the tensions in different conceptions of tolerance, and claims that tolerance need not be seen as a threat to religious integrity.

Next is a lecture by Stephen Chan (AM 1990, PhD 1998), who spoke at Swift Hall last year as part of a conference on “Sino-Christian Theology in Today’s China.” At the conference, scholars reflected critically on the religious, cultural, political, economic, and sociological factors that are giving rise to the growth of Christianity in China, and asked how theology, as an academic discipline, could engage, interrogate, and complicate this novel phenomenon. Professor Chan’s talk, reproduced here, addresses how issues of translation inform the enterprise of Sino-Christian theology.

The opening Wednesday Community Luncheon talk of 2012, by Dean Margaret M. Mitchell, then challenges us to consider the academic study of religion, and the place of religion within that enterprise. Reminding us of how complicated religious identity is, she cautions against theories that see a great divide between religious and non-religious scholars.

A sermon by current Theology PhD student Andrew Packman (MDiv 2012) follows. He takes the occasion of the temporary relocation of Wednesday worship to Swift Hall during renovations to Bond Chapel to remark on the relation between the spiritual and the reasonable, between prayer and study, and to consider the sort of community that engages these “supposedly competing claims.”

The issue concludes with news from our alumni. Please continue to keep us up to date on your accomplishments.

As always, my thanks to Susan Zakin, editorial assistant, and Robin Winge, designer.

I hope you enjoy this issue.

Terren Ilana Wein, Editor
To tolerate is to insult. Tolerance must only be preparatory to open the way to mutual acceptance. ... True liberalism is acknowledgment and understanding.

— Wolfgang Goethe

In what might be regarded to be a commentary on Goethe’s sapient maxim, cited as the epigraph to this essay, the Jewish philosopher Franz Rosenzweig exclaimed, “the main thing is that we still must prove ourselves — the test is still before us: The overcoming of mere thoughts of tolerance, above all the overcoming of [mutual] indifference.” In the best of liberal circles, marching under the banner of tolerance, “the Christian ignored the Jew in order to tolerate him, and the Jew ignored he Christian in order to allow himself to be tolerated.” This strategy of studious indifference attained its most pristine expression in the German poet and philosopher Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s didactic play Nathan the Wise. A parable of tolerance, this play, first performed in 1779, projects the difference between the bearers of the three monotheistic faiths to be irrelevant, of no consequence because they are — despite their religious particularities — first and foremost human beings. As Nathan, Lessing’s wise Jew, rhetorically asks, “Are Christian and Jew sooner Christian and Jew than human beings?” Indeed, as Rosenzweig observed, Nathan is abstracted from his Judaism, as is Lessing’s Muslim from Islam, and his Christian from Christianity. They meet solely as fellow human beings.

Their religious patrimony, grounded in the witness they bear to their respective faith communities, is accordingly treated as an encumbrance, or an ultimately trivial accident of birth. Hence, as Rosenzweig laconically observes, Lessing’s Jew, Christian, and Muslim “have no children.” As pure human beings, they have no progeny, certainly no Jewish, Christian or Muslim descendents. But surely believing Jews — as Christians, Muslims, and for that matter believing Buddhists, Hindus, or Navajo Snake Dancers — would protest that their humanity is refracted through the particularity of their community of faith. Yet one must acknowledge that religious faith, especially of biblical or theistic inspiration, may engender intolerance. The claim to privileged knowledge often instills hubris, and contempt for other faiths. Indeed, historically the liberal ethic of tolerance was born of a resolve to contain the fury and wrath aroused by conflicting religious claims. If tolerance courts indifference, let it be. For surely it is preferable to the scourge of religious intolerance.

Hence, the liberal creed of tolerance poses an irrefragable challenge to men and women of faith: Can an abiding fidelity to the theological positions and values of one’s religious community allow one to acknowledge the cogni-
The liberal ethos, the challenge of interfaith reconciliation

Tolerance is a theological virtue as well as a civic and moral virtue. Whether it can be our point — shares some basic humanity with oneself. The issue of tolerance, of course, is considerably alleviated if it is faithful; and cultural relativism. This was Lessing’s recommendation. In his parable of tolerance, neither the Jew nor the Christian nor the Islamic are certain whether he is God’s elect, that he possesses the pristine covenant. Benefit of such knowledge, Lessing’s Jew, Christian, and Muslims are enjoined to humility, and thus to disregard the doctrinal and historical differences that divide them. In effect, to overcome what divide Lessing sought to remove the differences by urging a self-critical agnosticism and an ethic of cultural relativism. If all is relative, religious and attendant cultural differences are not worth a fight. This attitude leads to what has been applied called a skeptical pluralism, and an “easy acceptance of a heterogeneity of values and ways of life.” This may also be characterized as a laissez-faire conception of tolerance. With the elimination — often by dint of a sheer decision for the sake of tolerance — of a clear ground of morality and religious conviction, one ethical system and set of beliefs are to be regarded as good as the next. As in the case of the well-meaning Lessing, this form of relativism is prompted not merely by pragmatic objectives of civic and inter-communal tranquility, but also by a genuine humanism. At the core of every culture and faith, the humanist holds, is a common humanity and even shared spiritual sensibilities. Focusing on the essential humanity of the other allows one to dismiss that which is particular as unessential. Indeed, extending tolerance to the Jew in the person of Nathan the Wise, Lessing “abstracted” him from his Judaism. He became what later Isaac Deutscher would call a “non-Jewish Jew.” And to a lesser degree, Lessing did this with the Christian and Muslim proponents of his play. What is tolerated is the human being hidden beneath the façade of a particular faith community. A species of this type of tolerance is what might be called “ad hominem tolerance,” in which a pious individual — be he or she a devout Jew, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, or what have you — is portrayed as being fundamentally a decent person, for he or she is perceived to possess such engaging human qualities as sincerity, integrity, and horrabilis. Intrinsically valuable is attributed to these trans-cultural and implicitly granted priority to the distinctive beliefs and practices that define the particular Jew, Christian or Muslim. The danger of this approach is also illustrated by Lessing. In his earlier play, “The Jews,” he presents a Jew of manifest integrity, social grace, and a humanism, and then has one of the protagonists parenthetically but tellingly sigh, if only all the Jews were like him. Unwittingly, he casts his Jews — as he does the Muslim and Christian in Nathan the Wise to be exceptional, and, in fact, praiseworthy for transcending the constraining limits of their respective faith communities. Seeing the individual Christian, Jew, or Muslim as an autonomous and thus a trans-cultural subject, Lessing, the preeminent humanist, in effect ignores or at least downplays their faith commitments. In some contemporary interfaith circles, there is a beguiling twist to the humanistic leveling of differences...

If one takes one’s own faith seriously, one must perforce demand that others take one’s faith seriously, even if but to protest.

The challenge is perhaps more poignant when formulated from the perspective of religious educators: How is one to address to inter-communal and inter-faith encounters? The maximal freedom and thus diversity of opinion and conduct. But, again returning to Goethe’s instructive example, illustrates the point. In his earlier play, “The Jews,” he “abstracted” the Jew as unessential. Indeed, extending tolerance to the Jew presents a Jew of manifest integrity, social grace, and a humanism, and then has one of the protagonists parenthetically but tellingly sigh, if only all the Jews were like him. Unwittingly, he casts his Jews — as he does the Muslim and Christian in Nathan the Wise to be exceptional, and, in fact, praiseworthy for transcending the constraining limits of their respective faith communities. Seeing the individual Christian, Jew, or Muslim as an autonomous and thus a trans-cultural subject, Lessing, the preeminent humanist, in effect ignores or at least downplays their faith commitments. In some contemporary interfaith circles, there is a beguiling twist to the humanistic leveling of differences...
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It does not flinch from engaging the other theologically...

But the two religious events are, of course, not the same at all. Their calendrical proximity, and the fact that both occasion an exchange of gifts, and that both holidays are marked by illuminated candles does not render them spiritually and theologically homologous. Nor is Passover “essentially” identical with Easter. There are, to be sure, more nuanced and sophisticated variations of this approach to interfait understanding, represented especially among certain trends in the academic study of religion, stemming from the Religionsgeschichte-Schule of the early twentieth century which holds that all faiths, including so-called pagan faiths, enjoy a relationship to the Absolute. This is not a theological but a phenomenological argument, based on heuristic presuppositions of a universally apprehended Absolute or divine reality, and some core religious personality to which particular religious beliefs and actions are ultimately peripheral.14

To be sure, these strategies promoting inter-religious tolerance generally reflect more than a mere pragmatic accommodation or sufficiency of the other. They express humanistic affirmations and a moral commitment to the ideal of genuine tolerance. Without gainsaying the over-arching significance of this attitude, I wish to highlight conceptual problems inherent to such an attitude.

H umanistic and phenomenological approaches to interfait tolerance induce two distinctive forms of pluralism: A weak pluralism, which contends on heuristic presuppositions of a universally apprehended Absolute or divine reality, and some core religious personality to which particular religious beliefs and actions are ultimately peripheral.14

To be sure, these strategies promoting inter-religious tolerance generally reflect more than a mere pragmatic accommodation or sufficiency of the other. They express humanistic affirmations and a moral commitment to the ideal of genuine tolerance. Without gainsaying the over-arching significance of this attitude, I wish to highlight conceptual problems inherent to such an attitude.

Or, to adjust revealed faith to the demands of tolerance. in the eighteenth century Jewish circles, Moses Mendelssohn argued the Judaism in not constituted by a divine dispensation of “eternal truths” — which should in principle be available to all rational individuals — but rather a divine legislation of ritual or ceremonial laws. But twist and turn as he did, the German-Jewish philosopher could not deny that Judaism had a privileged status, for, as he argued, the ceremonial laws had the symbolic role of keeping the Jews ever alert to the eternal truths, of which ordinary mortals, that is, non-Jews often tend to lose sight. Despite his passionate endorsement of the then new, indeed, revolutionary ethic of religious tolerance, Mendelssohn could not explain away Judaism’s privileged status as a revealed religion. Liberal Christian theologians fared no better in their efforts to adjust revealed faith to the demands of tolerance. In the twentieth century, a radical new strategy crystallized with the rejection of propositional conceptions of revelation.

To be historically significant, interfait understanding cannot demand a theological shift to non-propositional conceptions of revelation.

Revelation, according to this view, is not a disclosure of divine truths, but is rather the experience of divine presence, especially as manifest in given historical events. Founded on such events, religion is thus said to be an encounter with the living God, and not principally a dispensation of privileged knowledge. Such encounters cannot be properly formulated in propositional statements to be affirmed or denied; the witnesses to these events are meant to inspire among believers a posture of faith allowing for similar encounters in their lives. In this sense, revelation is instructive, not constitutive. A non-propositional conception of revelation, propounded especially by Protestant liberal thinkers, is by definition less exclusive and thus in principle capable of accommodating other faith experiences. But, even if one should grant that the non-propositional conception of revelation paves the way for religious tolerance and pluralism, it is actually irrelevant to the larger question of whether religious tolerance can be regarded as a theological virtue. Moreover, it is probably a historically irrelevant position. For the fact remains that the votaries of a non-propositional view of revelation are a small minority of theologians, who address a rather circumscribed circle of readers. The vast majority of believers still — at least formally — regard their respective theistic faith communities to be based on a privileged access to divine truths.

There is yet another more basic flaw in the non-propositional view of revelation. Eager to free monothestic faith from what they regard as the baneful exclusivity, the proponents of a non-propositional view of revelation implicitly deny the faith reality of those whom revealed truths are an intrinsic, indeed, perhaps the constitutive aspect of that reality. Should interfait understanding not be limited to post-traditional, perhaps secularized theologians representing various monothestic faiths, it must also be forged between individuals for whom propositional revelation is deeply part of their faith experience. To be historically significant, interfait understanding cannot demand a theological shift to non-propositional conceptions of revelation. The reality is that there are those, perhaps the majority of believers, who are beholden to propositional conceptions of belief. One cannot demand of Christians to forfeit their conceptions of dogma as revealed truths mediating salvation, and urge to claim that “outside the Church there is no salvation” (Saint Cyprian). Nor can one demand of Muslims...
Constitutionally antagonistic to religious pluralism? Incapable of genuine tolerance? Are monotheistic faiths, grounded as they are in historical reformulations, still capable of regarding religious tolerance as a theological possibility of regarding religious tolerance as a theological virtue? The Jewish editor of Die Kreatur, Martin Buber, explained that in such a dialogue one encounters the other as a Thou (ein Du)—as an irreducibly unique presence. The Thou, he further pointed out, is not to be construed as some hidden essence of the Other, some quintessential core distilled from the Other. Rather the Thou is the whole—the Gestalt, if one wills—of the Other. The Thou is beholden in the Presence of the Other, through which the Presence of the Divine is also manifest. Dialogue thus differs from a humanism that seeks to isolate and celebrate the common “human” essence of each of us. In contrast, dialogical tolerance discerns one’s humanity—or creatureliness—in the particularity, as Emmanuel Levinas would put it, of the distinctive Face of each human being. Hence, within the sphere of theistic faith, dialogical tolerance finds in the concept of creatureliness a theological ground analogous to the humanistic notion of our universal humanity. But creatureliness is not to be construed as a mere synonym or metaphor for the humanistic notion of a common humanity. By virtue of a consciousness of one’s creatureliness, one assumes a bond with one’s fellow human beings—or divinely graced creatures. One is thus bonded to the others not only by dint of common anthropological features but also because of a sense of shared origins, destiny and responsibility before the transcendent source of life.

Because dialogical tolerance secures the integrity of each participant in the ensuing dialogue, it need not, as is often feared by orthodox custodians of the various monotheistic faith communities, threaten the certainty of one’s beliefs, or commitment to the values of one’s religious tradition. Open-mindedness and tolerance need not necessarily lead to a loosening of communal bonds, and a weakening of logical cognitive attachments. Indeed, dialogical tolerance may be hailed a theological virtue.

Indeed, dialogical tolerance may be hailed a theological virtue.

**Endnotes**

1 Goethe Werke, ed. Emil Sträger (Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag, 1966), vol. 6 (“Sprache”): 507.
3 Ibid., 947.
6 This argument has been most recently raised by Jan Assmann, The Price of Manifestations, trans., Robert Savage (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010).
7 For a philosophical analysis of the principle of religious tolerance as represented by Lessing’s Nathan the Wise, see Avitalah Margaliot, “The Ring: On Religious Pluralism,” in David Heyd, ed. Toleranz: An Elusive Virtue (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996): 147-157. Margaliot argues that Nathan the Wise is actually an “anti-pluralist story.” He points out that the parable of the three “identical” rings is given to the following logical, mutually exclusive possibilities: “One is that the ring is made [of genuine gold]. The analogy to this is that the belief is true. The second possibility is that the ring is real if it is effective, if faith in it leads to desirable actions.” The analogy here is to religious practice; a religion is genuine if it leads to the proper worship of god. The third possibility is that the ring is real if it truly determines who the father’s legitimate heir or representative is. Here the analogy is to the question of who truly constitutes the source of religious authority—more precisely, who the true prophet is, from the three claimants for legislative revolution. Of course, there is yet another important version of the parable: A ring made of impure gold...is replaced by a ring of pure, ‘moral’ real gold. This is a possible Christian or Muslim interpretation of the story, and the analogy is clear.” Ibid., pp.148-9. Margaliot’s logical analysis of the parable, as trenchant as it might be, is of course not in accord with Lessing’s intended message of the parable.
11 Ibid., p. 4.
15 In this respect, dialogical tolerance would go beyond what David Heyd characterizes as a “perceptual conception” of tolerance. “We do not tolerate,” he argues, “opinions and beliefs, or even actions and practices, only the subjects holding dislike beliefs and the agents of detected actions…. [Tolerance] exists only in the shift from the perspective of judging beliefs and actions impersonally to focusing on persons. Only human beings can be the object of restraint based on respect, which is required by the idea of tolerance.” Heyd offers this perspective to avoid the problem of relativism. “Tolerance of the practices and beliefs of other peoples and cultures involves recognizing the intrinsic value of the human beings who are committed to certain cognitive systems or who autonomously choose to follow certain systems of rules and values.” Note how Heyd speaks of “the intrinsic value of the human beings” who abide by particular beliefs and practices one might find objectionable or at least alien; in order to affirm the humanity of their agent, these beliefs and practices are to be ignored or bracketed. The conclusion that Heyd draws from this conception of tolerance is in accord with the presupposition of dialogical tolerance. A perceptual conception of tolerance, he insists, “does not require any weakening of certainty, confidence, or commitment to our own beliefs and values.” Heyd, “Introduction,” pp. 14, 15.
Theology as Translation

A Glimpse of Sino-Christian Theology in China

It is an extraordinary occasion for us to gather together in Swift Hall to present and discuss the formidable issues of the development of Christian theology in today’s China, and it’s especially exciting to have this conversation here at my alma mater.

First, allow me to indulge in a brief recollection of the Chicago-China connection. Dr. Philip Shen, alumnus of the year of 1992, was the earliest Divinity School trained scholar to pen an article on theological pluralism from a specifically Asian-Chinese perspectives. Professor Anthony Yu, the eminent scholar of John Milton, as well as the Chinese texts Dream of the Red Chamber and Journey to the West, has made our school the preeminent center of study of religion and literature with special emphasis on Chinese literature. Professor David Tracy, my mentor, has been to China twice (1981, 1992) and shared his reflections in Criterion (Volume 21, Spring 1982). Both Plurality and Ambiguity and Dialogue with the Other have been translated into Chinese, and have been warmly welcomed by Chinese intelligentsia from Beijing to Taipei. The latest addition to the repertoire of Divinity School works translated into Chinese is Professor William Schweiker’s Theological Ethics and Global Dynamics. Professor Dwight Hopkins has a long-standing interest in Chinese society and has travelled and taught there extensively. Finally, the Chicago-China encounter reached a crescendo with the opening of the Center in Beijing by President Robert Zimmer in September of 2010.

The following is a continuation of the Chicago-China story in the area of Christian theology. I seek to suggest that cultural-religious contact is an alliance of meaning, rather than a search for equivalent beliefs. In the immense region we call China today, the creative translation of Western scholarship is best seen in the ongoing story of Sino-Christian theology.

Theology as Translation

Haun Saussy, the University Professor of Comparative Literature at the University of Chicago, is a renowned scholar of Chinese and comparative literature. His rumination on culture and literature is highly comparative and cross-cultural as exemplified in his formulation of translation as a model of inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue. He describes translation (“fanyi” in Chinese) as follows:

[The job of the translator is not reproductive, representing a pre-existing meaning in a new milieu, but rather expository and applicational — the task of
making something mean something to somebody. Its political counterpart would be not jurisdictions but alliances. "Aliances deserve to be prominent among the models and metaphors of cultural contact, because it is through choosing sides that emirates become participants in the civilization they have come to visit. There is an affinity between such participation and the notion that translations are acts, not discoveries."

Saussy seeks to bypass the equivalence model of communication by pointing to creative acts of cross-cultural interaction and participation, as exemplified in the efforts of a handful of Jesuit missionaries in China during the seventeenth century. In Saussy's reformulation, translation is not understood as a "ferrying" (the original Platonic pun) of meaning from the authorial to the audient pole, "not as a matter of finding equivalences between vocabularies but as one of making the meanings of one speech community mean something to another speech community." This is a brief portrait of some of the approaches taken by contemporary Sino-Christian theologians to reading certain, major Christian thinkers: Augustine, medieval mystics, Karl Barth and feminist theologians. I seek not precision but grand concurrence.

Overview of Sino-Christian Theology

Historically, the modern period of Sino-Christian theology begins in 1978 when Deng Xiaoping inaugurated the Reform and Open Policy, though the history of Sino-Christian theology begins with the sixteenth century Jesuit missions that claims its history from Matteo Ricci, if not the Nestorians (Jingjiao, 8th century) of the Tang dynasty, to the modern-day People's Republic of China. The past three decades have witnessed the rise and development of theological and religious studies in major Chinese universities. The theological interaction of this new phase of "East meets West" (pace Kipling) is intense and vibrant. The following is a brief portrait of some of the approaches taken by contemporary Sino-Christian theologians to reading certain, major Christian thinkers: Augustine, medieval mystics, Karl Barth and feminist theologians. I seek not precision but grand concurrence. In short, translation is a reductive but a representational act.

Translation is not an act of cultural negotiation, for this popular jargon in cultural studies still retains a metaphor of bilateral contractual relationship towards some kind of "fusion of horizons" in the distant future. How can we "translate" this linguistic model of translation into the setting of Sino-Christian theology? How should one read Augustine's Contra Faustus in Beijing? How can we translate Meister Eckhart's apophatic theology in the context of Chinese cultural discourse? This is the story to follow.
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Historically, the modern period of Sino-Christian theology begins in 1978 when Deng Xiaoping inaugurated the Reform and Open Policy, though the history of Sino-Christian theology begins with the sixteenth century Jesuit missions that claims its history from Matteo Ricci, if not the Nestorians (Jingjiao, 8th century) of the Tang dynasty, to the modern-day People's Republic of China. The past three decades have witnessed the rise and development of theological and religious studies in major Chinese universities. The theological interaction of this new phase of "East meets West" (pace Kipling) is intense and vibrant. However, the language and insights of medieval Christian mystics provide correlation, or even an "analogical imagination," to today's ideological struggles in China: the dilemma of rationalism and empiricism, of individualism and nationalism, of Platonism and Marxism (and post-Marxist) pragmatism.

The modern episode of the historic encounter between Christian intellectual traditions and Chinese intellectuals has accelerated to fortissimo in the arena of modern Chinese Christian theology. How do we assess the development of Sino-Christian theology? The usual approach is to ask how we can "translate" this linguistic model of translation into the setting of Sino-Christian theology? How should one read Augustine's Contra Faustus in Beijing? How can we translate Meister Eckhart's apophatic theology in the context of Chinese cultural discourse? This is the story to follow.

How can we "translate" this linguistic model of translation into the setting of Sino-Christian theology? How should one read Augustine's Contra Faustus in Beijing? How can we translate Meister Eckhart's apophatic theology in the context of Chinese cultural discourse? This is the story to follow.
To ask for a method without paying equal attention to its subject matter is a misplaced method itself.

Bend! Brushing this local quip aside, one has to heed David Tracy’s repeated caution against methodologism in theological exploration. To ask for a method without paying equal attention to its subject matter is a misplaced method itself.

As a theological movement, Sino-Christian theology certainly has to give an account of its methodology, and such accounts can be read in many methodological papers published by the Institutes of Sino-Christian Studies in Hong Kong. However the discussion of a theological method itself.

Is Sino-Christian theology another form of cultural theology? The answer is both yes and no. However even if it is a cultural discourse, it’s not the over-differentiated and over-essentialized cultural typology of Richard Niebuhr. Is Sino-Christian theology another facet of contextual theology? The answer is both yes and no. However even if it is a contextual praxis, it’s not an over-appropriated theological program, which often, ironically, retains and reinforces an implicit essentialism. In summary, Sino-Christian theology is neither indigenization nor contextualization of Christianity in China. Instead, it is a translation of Christian intellectual traditions in today’s Chinese cultural milieu. It is a translation-as-alliance, and seeks to form an alliance between Christian thoughts and contemporary Chinese concerns. There is no haunting of “lost in translation” here.

Langdon Gilkey once suggested that China is the third encounter of Christianity, after the two grand historical periods: the encounter with Greek philosophy in the third century, and with modern science over the last two centuries. As a graduate of this institution, I am privileged and burdened to carry on this mission. As a fine product of Swift Hall, I run the full course from the medieval McGinn, through the nineteenth-century Gerrish, to the modern and postmodern Tracy. I have fought the good fight, but the race is not yet over. May I wish my alma mater well. May I wish that the Divinity School becomes an active participant in the flourishing of Sino-Christian theology in China.

Endnotes

2 Translations of both books were published in Chinese by the Institute of Sino-Christian Studies in Hong Kong, the first in 1995, and the second one (translated by me) in 2009. Tracy’s latest contribution to interreligious dialogue is “Western Hermeneutics and Interreligious Dialogues,” in Interreligious Hermeneutics, ed. Catherine Cornille (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2010).
4 Ibid.
7 Saussy, Great Walls, 32.

multi-faceted legacy of Matteo Ricci, and his creative suggestion that translation is an alignment or allegiance of meanings. If cross-cultural theology is like translation, it engenders a situation whereby “two speech communities can coincide in their language, although not in their frames of reference.” Hence the intellectual burden of Sino-Christian scholars is not a mere retrieval of Western tradition, nor a new meaning generated by a Gadamersian fusion-of-horizons. Their theological reflection, analogous to Saussy’s comparative literature, is post-hermeneutical and post-contextualization. In light of Tracy’s formulation, it is a retrieval, suspicion, and reconstruction of Western Christian theology. Sino-Christian theology is both a critique of Western methodology, as well as of the content of Christian theology, in the cultural setting of today’s PRC.

Since most Sino-Christian scholars are translators of Christian classics, one can often encounter genuine methodological insights even in their non-methodological writings, such as their translation works and their readings of Western theologians as illustrated above. Examples par excellence are the Chinese translations of heavy-laden words like “being” and “existence.” Sino-Christian scholars seek not to construct an independent theological movement apart from the Anglo-American tradition, instead most of its members see themselves as exegetes and interpreters of the Western tradition. The commitment to translation in Chinese academia is deep and massive: we often have two translations of complete works of major Western thinkers, such as Plato and Augustine. There are also two translations of Kant’s Gesammelte Schriften. The Institute of Sino-Christian Studies has completed more than one hundred volumes of translated works by modern German and Anglo-American theologians, including our very own David Tracy, William Schweiker, Bernard McGinn, and the late Don Browning (the latter two in process). It is refreshing to read Haun Saussy’s reflection on the
In a recent issue of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, we find the following statement: “…religiousness will continue to constrain the academic study of religion even as it will continue to dominate the concerns of Homo sapiens generally.” And a second: “it is delusory to think that ‘religious studies’ has ever achieved, or can achieve, a full emancipation from religious concerns.”

For these two authors, the culprit is two-fold: an institu-
tional context within higher education for the academic study of religion that is, in their view, still too much domi-
nated by “theology” and concern for meaning and value, on
the one hand, and on the other the human brain, which is
 evolutionarily predisposed, on their account, to try to find external causality for things, including the ultimate delu-
sion, the explanation for which should be the only goal of
a properly scientific study of religion — the persistence of
belief in what are by definition false imaginary beings.

The authors present themselves with deliberate self-
irony, couched as a statement of public repentance of the
optimism of their middle years about forging a properly
scientific study of religion uncontaminated by religion;
instead, now elder statesmen, they throw up their hands
and renounce their ‘faith’ (my word) or ‘hope’ (their word)
in the ability of properly scientific human beings to over-
come the delusions that constitute religion, which are so
thoroughly perpetuated by others in forms both individual
and structural. Although two of the four respondents to
the piece in this issue of *JAAR* try to cheer the authors up
with some evidence of the traction the cognitive science of
religion is having in some circles of the study of religion
(while the other two, including our own Alumna of the
Year in 2012, Professor Ann Taves, dispute Martin and
Wiebe’s model of science, on the one hand, and vision of
the university, on the other), in their afterword Martin and
Wiebe pronounce themselves still among the de-converted,
misplaced hope now set aside with the weary resignation
of defeated Jeremias (my image) or brilliant, but still
unheeded Freuds (their title, evocative of his 1927 book,
*The Future of an Illusion*, with more than a soupçon of
Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion*). In their own response
to the responses we see that they have actually had two
de-conversions,” as they refer to their former, former selves
as ‘recovering humanists’ (p. 619). Converted from human-
ists to optimistic scientists, they now convert yet again from
optimistic scientists to pessimistic ones.
From where do these smooth pebbles, untouched by the grit of religion, come?

All of us who study religion and have made it our work to talk about religion critically ... have complicated pasts and presents in religion.

Professors Martin and Wiebe yearn for a completely, utterly scientific study of religion that must, by their definition of science, be entirely uncontaminated by its object. The scientist of religion, on this model, conducts his or her work in a laboratory, in a HazMat suit, with sanitized theoretical tools, with the goal being explanation of religious thought and behaviors (and also, it appears, the legitimization of the scholar of religion as a bona fide scientist, alongside the biologists, physicists, and others in the university). This scholar is a genuine modernist (he inveighs against this model (after successive years where I have spoken to him of his mesiora and how he intends to embrace ‘theory’). Fratruantingly, the concession they offer that “[t]his is not to deny that many in the field [of religious studies] have done valuable empirical work, and are increasingly doing so” (p. 594) bears no footnotes, so we are not even given models for this model of the study of religion.

What we are left to divine is that the scientist must either have left ‘religiousness’ behind or have found some way to separate their ‘religiousness’ from their scholarship (apparently left in the locker room after donning the Haz-Mat suit) and must have renounced the quest for meaning and value, in life or in religion (which quest they regard as itself an expression of the same cognitive deficit — you can see why they are ‘recovering humanists’). The recipe for getting to the scientific mind-set resounds with rugged frontier values: by power of will and hard work. The model presumes (and an interview with Donald Wiebe that I heard online confirms), above all, that it is possible to separate those other ‘religious scholars’ from ‘non-religious’ ones and, as well, to know securely what camp oneself resides in.

I am not at all so sure.

For one thing, this model assumes that what a ‘religion’ or ‘religiousness’ is (and what is really the object of study) is ‘faith’ or ‘belief’ in invisible beings. Not complex social systems of practice and thought variously conditioned and fashioned by human beings over time, but individual brain (mis)fixing is what this ‘religion’ is that we seek to understand. This ‘belief’ in the supernatural may be a constant, occupies a very particular place within religious identification, past or present (changing or putatively constant), and yet (how can one claim to have had some upbringing or some experience in ‘religiousness’?). The recipe for getting to the scientific mind-set resounds with rugged frontier values: by power of will and hard work. The model presumes (and an interview with Donald Wiebe that I heard online confirms), above all, that it is possible to separate those other ‘religious scholars’ from ‘non-religious’ ones and, as well, to know securely what camp oneself resides in.

I am not at all so sure.

For one thing, this model assumes that what a ‘religion’ or ‘religiousness’ is (and what is really the object of study) is ‘faith’ or ‘belief’ in invisible beings. Not complex social systems of practice and thought variously conditioned and fashioned by human beings over time, but individual brain (mis)fixing is what this ‘religion’ is that we seek to understand. This ‘belief’ in the supernatural may be a constant, occupies a very particular place within religious identification, past or present (changing or putatively constant), and yet (how can one claim to have had some upbringing or some experience in ‘religiousness’?). The recipe for getting to the scientific mind-set resounds with rugged frontier values: by power of will and hard work. The model presumes (and an interview with Donald Wiebe that I heard online confirms), above all, that it is possible to separate those other ‘religious scholars’ from ‘non-religious’ ones and, as well, to know securely what camp oneself resides in.

I am not at all so sure.

For one thing, this model assumes that what a ‘religion’ or ‘religiousness’ is (and what is really the object of study) is ‘faith’ or ‘belief’ in invisible beings. Not complex social systems of practice and thought variously conditioned and fashioned by human beings over time, but individual brain (mis)fixing is what this ‘religion’ is that we seek to understand. This ‘belief’ in the supernatural may be a constant, occupies a very particular place within religious identification, past or present (changing or putatively constant), and yet (how can one claim to have had some upbringing or some experience in ‘religiousness’?). The recipe for getting to the scientific mind-set resounds with rugged frontier values: by power of will and hard work. The model presumes (and an interview with Donald Wiebe that I heard online confirms), above all, that it is possible to separate those other ‘religious scholars’ from ‘non-religious’ ones and, as well, to know securely what camp oneself resides in.

I am not at all so sure.
We scholars of religion should rightly bristle at such a blunt instrument, a rhetoric of reasonability that masks religious differences for political ends.

This is true for all citizens of the University (these complicated religious pasts and presents), but what is required in the academic study of religion practiced here—self-consciously at the intersection of historical studies, religion and the human sciences and that constructive study of religion that makes its special but not exclusive possession the interest in meaning and value—is that one is not only willing, but eager, to discuss religion in public with the widest possible set of conversation partners, who bring different perspectives, experiences, assumptions and values to the discussion. And one is willing to examine critically what is inside one’s own HaMat suit.

This is not just an act of the individual will or individual self-scrutiny, though it requires both (those frontier virtues have their place!). It is also for us in the Divinity School an institutional commitment to hosting a conversation that is deliberately pluralistic, that does not pretend that religious commitment or identity can either be screened in or out, or measured on an outcomes scale, but that demands of each participant that she or he grapple in publicly accountable ways with the evidence, with the source material and theoretical perspectives on religion that do not represent any single orthodoxy. That the critical distance cultivated and practiced in the Divinity School is not distant enough for some and too removed for others probably means that we are doing it right—working the messy middle where we should be. There is no golden explanation and understanding in intellectual inquiry. But that and that is both the reason we study, and the precondition for it.

On another day we shall talk perhaps about whether a purely scientific study of religion is possible, let alone desirable, whether a university we would want to participate in should make it a matter of principle to avoid all questions of meaning and value, and what the relationship is between explanation and understanding in intellectual inquiry. But this is more than enough for one Wednesday lunch talk. Welcome to the new academic year, Divinity School.

Andrew Packman

Between Angels and Reasons

During Fall quarter 2012, renovations to Bond Chapel created an opportunity to reflect on the Divinity School’s long-standing tradition of Wednesday Worship. During this time, Wednesday services were held in Swift Hall’s third-floor Lecture Hall and the following sermon, delivered on October 17, 2012, contemplated what it means to engage in religious worship as a scholar of religion.

What are we doing when we pray in a lecture hall? Historically, of course, we’ve held Wednesday Worship in Bond Chapel. The Beatitudes are written along the walls. The ceiling is high and vaulted. The stained-glass windows cast lavender hues across the gathered community. Worship and prayer fit in Bond Chapel like a glove.

But a worship service in the Third Floor Lecture Hall takes a little squeezing. The glove doesn’t fit quite so naturally. Consider where we are. Wednesday Worship is now tucked into this little strip of space, squeezed between two neo-gothic university quadrangles. Yet in the middle of this “secular” academic setting at the University of Chicago, we squeeze ourselves into a little sacred space.

In some way, this room itself bears the marks of this squeezing. We are, in fact, gathered under the gaze of some professors and students who take it as their mission to stand in dialectical opposition to these angels!

Perhaps it was blunt necessity that led us to move this service from the chapel to the Third Floor Lecture Hall. But since we’re here, we might as well take note of the theological implications.

Professor Rosengarten, back when he was Dean Rosengarten, liked to say that Swift Hall was a place that held no orthodoxy except the rule of argument. I like that phrase. I take it to mean that there are no sacred cows here; everything is subject to questioning, everything is on the table. We are free to take any belief and make any claim we like, so long as we give reasons.

But is that the kind of place you can worship? Can you pray in a place where the lines are so blurred? Could some bold soul dare to preach in a community that takes different texts as sacred, different liturgical elements as proper?

Can we be spiritual in a place that’s so reasonable?
stretched between supposedly competing claims on our identity—sacred and secular, spiritual and rational, person of faith and scholar of religion. It may feel like we have to squeeze ourselves into a space that doesn’t feel quite right. This is that awkward space between the angels and reasons. In our reading today, Paul sheds some helpful light on what we're doing when we worship. And as it turns out, these lines weren’t so clear for him either.

In Chapter 12 of his Letter to the Romans, Paul calls these lines weren’t so clear for him either. But there is an uncomfortable breach in this translation. The phrase the NRSV translates as “your spiritual worship” is, in the Greek, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν. But the word that gets rendered as “spiritual” is λογικὴν. λογικὴν is from λόγος, the word from which we derive the English word “logical.”

That’s why the NRSV places a footnote on this word “spiritual.” The alternative rendering for “spiritual worship” is “reasonable worship” or “thoughtful service.” Paul exhorts the Romans to present their bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is their spiritual/reasonable worship. This breach we find ourselves in is not new. This squeezy-ness of our bodies into the space between Angels and Reasons is the very same space that Paul inscribes in his carefully chosen words to the Romans.

In other words, that slash-mark between spiritual and reasonable runs all the way down in Paul’s text. And I believe it runs all the way down in us too. As soon as we give up the space in between, we’ve missed what Paul means, and we’ve missed something fundamental about what it means to be human.

As soon as we begin to live our lives, these living sacrifices to God, as either spiritual or reasonable, become the posture we assume the rest of the week? What would it look like if this posture of vulnerability before God and before each other, this communal expression of our need for transformation we cultivate here, guided our conversations about Riceouer, Schleiermacher, and Job? What would it look like if we treated our studies, not as assignments to get through, but as spiritual disciplines, shaping us and preparing us, indeed, transforming us by the renewing of our minds, to be ministers and scholars that this world desperately needs?

What would it look like if we heed the words of Paul, and as we seek to be transformed by the renewing of our minds, we present not just the reasonable and not just the spiritual, but our whole person as an offering, holy and acceptable to God? I like Bond Chapel, and I like religious space. And when the new organ comes to rest in the choir loft, and when our services return to their more fitting home, I’ll be there. But for now, I’m glad we’re here.

Last winter, I was riding the subway in New York and I noticed a poster that said, “Imaginate: the world, different.” It had an aerial shot of the entire island of Manhattan. If you know New York City, you know that the city is almost entirely concrete and stone. But squeezed into the middle of this island full of city is a little strip of green from 59th Street to 110th – Central Park.

This image showed Manhattan transformed. The map displayed an island almost entirely green, filled from top to bottom with trees, lakes, and public parks. But squeezed in the middle of the island of green was a little strip of city, from 59th Street to 110th Street. But for now, I’m glad we’re here.

What if our weeks were transformed like that? Instead of constraining our prayer and our worship to one thirty-minute block, what if the posture of prayer that we cultivate in this breach between angels and reasons were to become the posture we assume the rest of the week? What would it look like if we treated our studies, not as assignments to get through, but as spiritual disciplines, shaping us and preparing us, indeed, transforming us by the renewing of our minds, to be ministers and scholars that this world desperately needs?

What would it look like if this posture of vulnerability before God and before each other, this communal expression of our need for transformation we cultivate here, guided our conversations about Riceouer, Schleiermacher, and Job? What would it look like if we treated our studies, not as assignments to get through, but as spiritual disciplines, shaping us and preparing us, indeed, transforming us by the renewing of our minds, to be ministers and scholars that this world desperately needs?
Larry Bouchard, AM 1975, PhD 1984, Associate Professor at the University of Virginia, has published Theater and Integrity: Emptying Selves in Drama, Ethics, and Religion (Northwestern University Press). The book follows questions about the nature of integrity across theatrical, philosophical, and theological studies of moral, personal, bodily, and kenotic patterns of integrity.

T. L. Brink, PhD 1978, is YouTube’s “headlesspresenter” where he has uploaded nearly three hundred videos covering topics in psychology, economics, logic, statistics, and Mexican politics as well as religious studies. He has videos on theology, the ontological argument, teleological argument, cosmological argument, Calvin, and religious roles. The videos are particularly useful in his online lower-division courses.

Michael Brown, MDiv 1994, PhD 1998, left his position at Emory, where he was Associate Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins, for the position of Associate Dean of the College and Director of the Malcolm X Institute of Black Studies at Wabash College.

Marcia Bunge, AM 1979, PhD 1986, has been named the Bernhardsson Distinguished Endowed Chair in Lutheran Studies at Gustavus Adolphus College.

Lisa Sowle Cahill, AM 1973, PhD 1976, received an honorary degree from the College of the Holy Cross during the College’s Commencement ceremonies on May 25, 2012. Cahill is the J. Donald Monan Professor of Theology at Boston College where she has taught since 1976. She is a past president of the Catholic Theological Society of America (1992–93), and the Society of Christian Ethics (1997–98), and is also a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Her recent books include Bioethics and the Common Good (Marquette University Press, 2004) and Theological Bioethics: Participation, Justice, and Change (Georgetown University Press, 2005).

John Carlson, AM 1999, PhD 2005, and Jonathan Ebel, AM 1999, PhD 2004, have published From Jeremiad to Jihad: Religion, Violence, and America, which assembles an interdisciplinary team of scholars to explore the critical, historical, and normative connections between religion and violence within the American context. In its scope and perspectival diversity, the book offers a nuanced, multi-disciplinary treatment of the intersections of religion and violence in American history. Carlson is Assistant Professor of Religious Studies and Associate Director of the Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict at Arizona State University. Ebel is Associate Professor of American Religion at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Dennis Castillo, MA 1982, PhD 1996, is Academic Dean and Professor of Church History at Christ the King Seminary. He has published The Santa Maria Convent: Faith and Endurance in War-Time Malta, 1940–42 (Lexington Books). Using published histories as well as interviews and oral histories, the book explores the experiences of the Maltese during World War II and how their faith sustained them through this dark period of their history.

Anthony Cerulli, PhD 2007, has won a European Institutes for Advanced Studies (EURIAS) Fellowship, with affiliation at the Institut d’études avancées-Paris, for 2012–2013. He has also been awarded an NEH Fellowship for 2012–2013. He is an Assistant Professor at Hofstra and William Smith Colleges and the Managing Editor of India Review. Cerulli has recently published Somatic Lessons: Narrating Patiency and Illness in Indian Medical Literature (November 2012) with SUNY Press. The book looks at narrative in the history of ayurvedic medical literature and the perspectives on illness and patiency that emerge.

Rebecca Chopp, PhD 1983, became President of Swarthmore College in August 2012.

Jessica DeCou, PhD 2012, will be Visiting Lecturer in Systematic Theology at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary beginning August 2012.


Spencer Dew, AM 2001, PhD 2009, joined Centenary College of Louisiana as Assistant Professor of Religious Studies in the fall of 2012, where he will hold the Maurice Allen Broues Inaugural Year Research Chair. He is completing a manuscript on religious understandings of writing in the work of Jack Kerouac, Norman Mailer, and James Baldwin, and he is at work on a study of the Moorish Science Temple of America, funded in part by a research fellowship from the Black Metropolis Research Consortium. He is the author of a collection of short stories, Songs of Inurgency (Vagabond Press, 2008), Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres (Another New Calligraphy, 2010), and the critical study, Learning for Revolution: The Work of Kathy Acker (San Diego State University Press, 2011). His first novel, Here is how it Happens, is forthcoming from Ampersand Books. A regular reviewer for Rain Taxi Review of Books, and a Staff Book Reviewer for decept magazine, his fiction and essays have appeared in scores of publications, including art reviews in Newcity Chicago and Chicago Artists’ News, and essays in Religion Dispatches and Sightings.
H. Byron Earhart, PhD 1965, has just published the fifth edition of Religion in Japan: Unity and Diversity (Cengage Learning, 2013). This standard text explores religion in Japan as a complex tapestry of different religious strands, reflecting both the unity and diversity of Japanese culture, a theme Earhart pioneered in the first edition (1969) of this classic book. Tracing the development of religious traditions from the prehistoric era through modern times, Earhart explores the vital influence of Shinto, Buddhism, Daoism, Confucianism, and folk religion. This new edition updates the description and interpretation of the entire history of religion in Japan in light of the latest developments in the field.

Jo Preuninger Forrest, MDiv 2010, is now the Associate Minister for Congregational Care at Kenilworth Union Church in Kenilworth, Illinois. She was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry on December 2, 2012.

Joel Harter, PhD 2008, published his first book, Coleridge’s Philosophy of Faith, Symbol, Allegory, and Hermeneutics. The book reconstructs Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s intellectual project as a philosophy of faith that anticipates modern philosophical hermeneutics, challenges reductive notions of reason and personhood, and illustrates the progressive potential of the biblical tradition. Harter is currently the Lilly Pastoral Resident at Hyde Park Union Church and an adjunct instructor of philosophy at Catholic Theological Union.

Ellen Davina Haskell, PhD 2005, has recently published with SUNY press the book My Mother’s Breasts: The Image of a Nursing God in Jewish Mysticism (November 2012). The book provides a discussion of the kabbalistic image of a nursing god, its historical context, and its theological implications. Haskell is Assistant Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and is the recipient of an American Association of University Women American Postdoctoral Research Leave Fellowship for the academic year 2012–2013.

C. David Hein, AM 1977, Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Hood College, has published, with coauthor Andrew Chandler, Archbishop Fisher, 1945–1961: Church, State, and World (Ashgate, 2012). The book explores Fisher’s influence on major contemporary issues and events, including divorce-law reform, capital punishment, and the most dangerous years of the Cold War abroad. It establishes the continuing significance not only of the office of Archbishop in the Church but also of the Church at large in the tumultuous world of the later twentieth century. A final section of original source material brings vividly to life the range and character of Fisher’s public and private role.

Laura Hollinger, MDiv 2004, has become the Campus Engagement Manager with Interfaith Youth Core, a Chicago-based nonprofit with the mission of building inter-faith cooperation. She moved to this position after seven years as Associate Dean of Rockefeller Chapel and coordinator of Bond Chapel worship for the Divinity School.

Werner Jeanrond, PhD 1984, is the new Master of St Benet’s Hall in Oxford. This is a smaller College owned by a Benedictine Trust and run by Ampleforth Abbey. Jeanrond will be the first layman to run a Hall in any of the religiously owned colleges of Oxford. The College teaches humanities and social science subjects, and Jeanrond is charged with developing its postgraduate activities. Previously Professor of Divinity at the University of Glasgow, in 2008 he became the first lay person to hold the Chair of Divinity, the senior chair of University of Glasgow. Prior to that he was a professor of systematic theology at Sweden’s University of Lund, the first Catholic in Sweden to hold such a post.

Michael Karunas, MDiv 1998, has been named the new senior minister of Central Christian Church in Decatur, Illinois. He concluded service as the senior minister of First Christian Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on January 31, 2012.


Alex Kindred, MDiv 2009, has become Pastor of First Christian Church in Muscatine, Iowa.
Ellie Krasne, AM 2012, is an Associate at Grosvenor Capital Management, L.P. in Chicago, Illinois.

Fr. Paul V. Kollman, PhD 2001, Associate Professor of Theology at Notre Dame University, has been appointed the executive director of Notre Dame’s Center for Social Concerns (CSC). Kollman has worked with the Center since 2004, including his recent tenure as its acting director. In addition to his commitment to the CSC, Kollman serves as a fellow of three Notre Dame institutes: the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies and the Nanovic Institute for European Studies.

Jeff Lehman, MDiv 2010, is the new pastor of First Presbyterian Church in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Rachel Diane Graef Leslie, AM 2012, is working as a Foreign Service Officer for the U.S. State Department.

James W. Lewis, PhD 1987, who served as Dean of Students at the Divinity School from 1980–1991, retired as Executive Director of the Louisville Institute at LPTS (Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary) in the summer of 2012. Lewis was the Institute’s first Executive Director and served for twenty years, developing a national center for the support of research and leadership education on North American religion. During that time, the work of the Institute supported through grants at least 141 dissertations, 182 books, and 315 books.

April Lewton, MDiv 2007, became the Vice President of Development and Marketing for the National Benevolent Association (NBA), a general ministry of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in June, 2012. Founded in the 1880s, the NBA “creates communities of compassion and care” through the provision of health and social services. Prior to joining the NBA, Lewton worked with Chicago Theological Seminary (CTS), a United Church of Christ related institution of theological and ministerial learning, to build a comprehensive annual giving program.

Kinndlee Shea Lund, MDiv 2008, has been called to serve as Associate Pastor of St. Paul’s Lutheran Church in Brenham, Texas.

Elizabeth Marquardt, MDiv 1999, and Amy Zietlow, MDiv 1999, have received a three-year grant from the Lilly Endowment to investigate aging, death, and dying in an era of high family fragmentation. They plan to write a trade book. Each currently blogs at Huffington Post and FamilySchoars.org.

Adrienne Martin, MDiv 2012, is now Children’s Ministry Coordinator at St. John’s Lutheran Church in Salisbury, North Carolina.

Mark Mattes, PhD 1993, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Grand View University, is the co-translator of Klaus Schwarzwälder’s Cross and Resurrection: God’s Wonder and Mystery (Fortress, 2012) and Oswald Bayer’s A Contemporary in Dissent: Johann Georg Hamann as a Radical Enlightener (Eerdmans, 2012).

Dan McKanan, PhD 1998, has published Prophetic Encounters: Religion and the American Radical Tradition, with Beacon Press. In it, McKanan challenges simple distinctions between “religious” and “secular” activism, showing that religious beliefs and practices have been integral to every American movement promoting liberty, equality, and solidarity. He is Ralph Waldo Emerson Unitarian Universalist Senior Lecturer at Harvard Divinity School.

Richard B. Miller, PhD, 1985, is professor in the Department of Religious Studies at Indiana University and Director of the Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions. He was named Provost Professor and awarded the 2011 Tracy Sonneborn Prize. His book Terror, Religion, and Liberal Thought (Columbia, 2010) was selected as a 2011 Choice Outstanding Academic Title.

Bonnie J. Miller-McLemore, MA 1980, PhD 1986, the E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Professor of Pastoral Theology at Vanderbilt University, has completed two publications with support of a Sabbatical Grant for Researchers from the Louisville Institute. The titles are Christian Theology in Practice: Discovering a Discipline (Eerdmans, 2012) and The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology (Wiley/Blackwell, 2012). She also recently completed her tenure as president of The International Academy of Practical Theology, where she served from 2009–2011.

Anne Mocko, PhD 2012, has joined Concordia College in Moorhead, Minnesota as Assistant Professor of Asian Religions.

Tristan Orozco, MDiv 2010, has become Associate Minister of Wakonda Christian Church in Des Moines, Iowa.

Dan Overmyer, AM 1966, PhD 1971, has published two books and been honored by a Festschrift in the past several years. These are: Local Religion in North China in the Twentieth Century: The Structure and Organization of Community Rituals and Beliefs (Brill, 2009); (coedited with Larry DeVries and Dan Baker) Asian Religions in British Columbia (UBC Press, 2010); and (Festschrift), The People and the Dan: New Studies in Chinese Religions in Honour of Daniel L. Overmyer, Monumenta Serica Monograph Series LX, Sankt Augustin, Institut Monumenta Serica, 2009. He has retired from teaching and research, and is now a happy grandfather of five and President of Nature Vancouver (The Vancouver Natural History Society).

Andrew Packman, MDiv 2012, was ordained a minister in the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) on August 19, 2012 at First Christian Church, in Centralia, Illinois. Michael Karunas (MDiv 1998), Senior Minister of Central Christian Church, Decatur, Illinois, preached. Packman is currently a PhD student in the Divinity School.

Aristotle Papanikolaou, PhD 1998, was promoted to full professor in the Department of Theology at Fordham University. He is also the Co-founding Director of the Orthodox Christian Studies Center at Fordham. He recently published The Mystical as Political: Democracy and Non-Radical Orthodoxy (University of Notre Dame Press, 2012). In February 2012, he received the Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching in the Humanities. He was also recently awarded a Sabbatical Grant for Researchers from...
the Louisville Institute for his current project: *The Ascetics of War: The Undoing and Redoing of Virtue.*

Anne E. Patrick, AM 1976, PhD 1982, retired from Carleton College as William H. Laird Professor of Religion and the Liberal Arts, emerita, in 2009 and moved back to Silver Spring, Maryland. She has recently published *Women, Conscience, and the Creative Process* (Paulist, 2011), and is now at work on another volume on Catholic feminist ethics.

Anthony R. Picarello, Jr., AM 1992, general counsel for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), has been named associate general secretary for policy and advocacy of the USCCB. He has served as general counsel for the USCCB since 2007 and will retain that title. In his new role, Picarello will function as director of policy and advocacy for the full range of issues in which the USCCB engages.

Santiago Piñon, Jr., PhD 2012, is Assistant Professor of Religion at Texas Christian University.

Jeff B. Pool, PhD 1994, recently received an appointment to The Eli Lilly Chair of Religion and Culture at Berea College in Kentucky. He also recently began a term of service as the chair of the Religion Department. From 2003 to 2012, he served at Berea College in a combined teaching and administrative position as Professor of Religion and Director of the office of religious life. For a portion of his most recent sabbatical leave, during the spring of 2011, he taught a graduate seminar as Guest Professor and Research Scholar at Universita Karlova (Charles University), in Prague, The Czech Republic. His recent books include two volumes of a three-volume study on divine suffering in Christian thought: *God’s Wounds: Hermeneutic of the Christian Symbol of Divine Suffering, vol. 1, Divine Vulnerability and Creation,* and *God’s Wounds: Hermeneutic of the Christian Symbol of Divine Suffering, vol. 2, Evil and Divine Suffering* (both part of the Princeton Theological Monographs Series and published by Pickwick Publications).

Jackie Posek, MDiv 2007, has become Assistant Director of Campus Ministry at DePaul University in Chicago.

Helena Sofia Lennecke Post, AMBS 2012, is a researcher at VU Medical Center in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Katherine Raley, MDiv 2012, was ordained June 23 at First Christian Church, Columbia, South Carolina. She has been called to serve as Associate Minister of First Christian Church in Colorado Springs, Colorado, where Chuck Blaisdell (AM 1977) is the Senior Minister.

Rebecca Raphael, PhD 1997, has been appointed NEH Distinguished Teaching Professor in the Humanities at Texas State University–San Marcos where she is Associate Professor of Philosophy. During her three-year appointment, Raphael will implement a project that focuses on the intersection of religious studies and the humanities, with activities to include conferences, panels, honors classes and faculty seminars.

Laura Jennison Reed, MDiv 2012, was ordained in August 2012 at North Hill Christian Church, in Spokane, Washington and is now serving as Assistant to the Dean of Disciples Divinity House.

Brent Reynolds, MDiv 2000, has been called to be Director of the Florida Christian Center, Jacksonville, Florida, a ministry site of the National Benevolent Association.

John Cheadle Rich, MDiv 2004, graduated in April from the University of Southern Indiana with a Bachelor of Science in Nursing. In June, he passed the state boards to become a Registered Nurse and is working as a Nurse Resident at Deaconess Hospital in Evansville, Indiana. He and wife Amy Rich continue to serve as Co-Executive Directors of Patchwork Central, a nonprofit ministry operating near downtown Evansville.

Joanne Robinson, PhD 1996, is the 2012 recipient of the highest teaching honor bestowed by The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, the Bank of America Award for Teaching Excellence. Robinson is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at UNC Charlotte.

Susan A. Ross, MA 1976, PhD 1982, Professor and Chair of the Department of Theology at Loyola University Chicago, assumed the presidency of the Catholic Theological Society of America in June, 2012. Additionally, her book *Anthropology: Seeking Light and Beauty* was published by Liturgical Press in May 2012. Ross also serves on the Board of Trustees of Manhattanville College, where she did her undergraduate degree.

Jamie Schillingler, AM 2004, PhD 2004, has been granted tenure at St. Olaf College, where he is Assistant Professor of Religion. His academic interests include theology and ethics in both the Christian and Islamic traditions, the philosophy of religion, and the relationship between religion and politics. His current research concerns understanding and improving Christian-Muslim relations and dialogue.

Franklin Sherman, PhD 1961, has published *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue, Volume 1: The Road to Reconciliation, 1945–1985* (Paulist Press). The forthcoming Volume 2 will bring the documentation up to the present. After many years on the faculty of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, Frank became Founding Director of the Institute for Jewish-Christian Understanding at Muhlenberg College, his alma mater. In 2010, he received the third annual Shevet Achim Award from the Council of Centers on Christian-Jewish Relations for outstanding contributions in the field.

Mun’im Sirry, PhD 2002, is currently a Research Associate Fellow at the University of Notre Dame.

Garry Sparks, MDv. 2004, PhD 2011, has accepted a tenure-track appointment as Assistant Professor of Humanities in Global Christian Studies at the University of Louisville in Louisville, Kentucky. His research and teaching interests focus on an ethnographic and ethnohistorical understanding of theological production in the Americas, specifically among indigenous peoples.

Ryan Stecher, AM 2012, will be a Management Analyst in the Office of the Chairman for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Barkey Thompson, AM 1998, has accepted the call to be the ninth dean and twentieth rector of Christ Church Cathedral in Houston in the Diocese of Texas. Thompson has served as rector of St. John’s Episcopal Church in Roanoke, Virginia, since 2007. He will assume his new role in February of next year.

Daniel Patrick Thompson, AM 1987, PhD 1998, has been named Chair of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Dayton. Thompson was formerly chair and associate professor of Theology at St. Mary’s University in San Antonio.

Emilie Townes, AM 1979, DMsn 1982, has been named the new Dean of Vanderbilt Divinity School, starting in July 2013. An ordained American Baptist clergywoman, Townes is currently the Andrew W. Mellon professor of African-American religion and theology at Yale Divinity School. Her research focuses on Christian ethics, womanist ethics, critical social theory, and cultural theory and studies.

The Rev. Dr. John R. Van Ewkyk, PhD 1981, Clinical Director of The International Trauma Treatment Program, in Olympia, Washington, has recently published Clinical Chaos: The Strange Attractor of Childhood Trauma (Inter City Books, 2013). The book combines chaos theory and Jungian psychology to explore the psychodynamics of unconscious adaptation. Case studies illustrate how to identify and to integrate those childhood adaptations that spontaneously deploy in situations that resemble the original trauma.

Bill Wassner, AM 1982, DMsn 1985, is now Senior Pastor at Port Orange United Church of Christ, in Port Orange, Florida.

Blake Wentworth, AM 1998, PhD 2011, is Assistant Professor in the Department of South and Southeast Asian Studies at the University of California at Berkeley.

Eric Ziolkowski, MA 1981, PhD 1987, Charles A. Dana Professor of Religious Studies at Lafayette College, has just published The Literary Kierkegaard (Northwestern University Press). The book examines both the pseudonymous and the signed published writings of Kierkegaard, as well as his private journals, papers, and letters, in relation to works by five literary giants from different times and places, showing how Kierkegaard signals the essentially literary as opposed to strictly theological or philosophical nature of his writings. Ziolkowski is also one of the main editors of The Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception, a prospective thirty-volume work published by De Gruyter in Berlin, whose third volume appeared this past fall, and whose fourth volume is scheduled to appear in winter 2012.

The Rev. Donald L. Berry, BD 1950, retired Colgate University professor and Episcopal priest, died on January 15, 2013 in Hamilton, New York. He was 87 years old.

Dr. Berry was born in Goshen, Indiana in 1925 and educated in the Goshen City Schools. He enlisted in the US Army in 1943, and after a period of military service, attended and was graduated from Goshen College (BA), the University of Chicago Divinity School (BD), and Yale University (STM and PhD). He was ordained in 1950 in the Congregational Church, and he served churches in Marion, Indiana and Norwalk, Connecticut.

He joined the Colgate University faculty in 1957 as a Chaplain and member of the Department of Philosophy and Religion. In 1988 he was named the Harry Emerson Fosdick Professor of Philosophy and Religion, and was the 1992 recipient of the Sidney and Florence Felton French Award for Inspirational Teaching. He retired in 1994.

He was the author of many reviews and more than forty articles in scholarly and professional journals, and six books, including How to Listen to a Sermon.

He was received into the Episcopal Church and confirmed in 1965, ordained to the diaconate [1971], and to the priesthood [1972] in the Diocese of Central New York.

He is survived by his wife, five children, and four grandchildren.

Myron L. Eberole, AM 1961, DB 1963, passed away on December 8, 2011 at Lancaster General Hospital in Pennsylvania. He is survived by his wife, two children, and four grandchildren.

Ray Greenfield, MDv. 2003, passed away on April 1, 2012 at the age of 57. Ray was the pastor at the Illinois Street Christian Church in Lewistown, and at the Ipava Christian Church. He was a chaplain at Graham Hospital in Canton. He was also the former pastor at the First Christian Church in Rushville. He pursued his college education as a second career student, earning his bachelor’s degree in social work from MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Illinois in 2000. He entered the Divinity School as a Disciples House Scholar in 2000 and commuted every week from Jacksonville. He is survived by his wife Helen, his three children, and four grandchildren.

Reverend Dr. Barbara Jurgensen, AM 1975, DMsn 1982, died on July 1, 2012 at the age of eighty-three, surrounded by the love of her family and friends. She died in her sleep.
from complications from a stroke and heart failure. A writer, pastor, and seminary professor, she is survived by her three children, her sister, three grandchildren, and two nieces.

**Jack V. Reeve**, DB 1945, died on February 25, 2012 in Indianapolis. A native of Des Moines, Iowa, and a graduate of Drake University, he was a member of the 1942 entering class of Disciples Divinity House Scholars. In 1945, he graduated from the University of Chicago and that summer married June Varner. In 1958 he was called to the national staff of the Disciples of Christ as stewardship secretary. He continued to emphasize stewardship when he was called to regional ministry in the Christian Church in Illinois and Wisconsin in 1968 and, beginning in 1978, as Professor of the Practice of Ministry at Lexington Theological Seminary. In 1968 he was elected to the Board of Trustees of the Disciples Divinity House. As its president from 1990 to 1992 as a longtime member of its development committee, Jack Reeve both encouraged and exemplified generous giving, and in 2005, he was elected an Honorary Trustee for Life. Jack also participated actively in Habitat for Humanity, working on more than forty houses in the Lexington area.

**Walter J. Harrelson, 1919–2012**

Walter J. Harrelson, who served as Dean of the University of Chicago Divinity School from 1955–1960, died on September 5, 2012 in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. He was ninety-two years old and had been in hospice care.

Harrelson was born in Winnabow, North Carolina, on Nov. 28, 1919. He attended Mars Hill College before serving in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Harrelson received his undergraduate degree from the University of North Carolina before earning a doctorate in Theology from Union Theological Seminary in 1953.

An ordained American Baptist minister, he taught at Vanderbilt from 1960 until retiring in 1990, and was dean of Vanderbilt’s Divinity School from 1967 until 1975. In 1990 Harrelson became Distinguished Professor of Hebrew Bible, emeritus, and a scholarship was established at Vanderbilt in his name. In the mid-1990s, Harrelson was asked by Wake Forest University to guide the development of its proposed divinity school. He became a professor of religion at Wake Forest until his (second) retirement.

Harrelson’s broad range of areas of expertise included Jewish-Christian relations, Biblical interpretation, the study of Biblical law and prophets, and the churches’ response to social issues.

Harrelson was predeceased by his wife, Idella Aydlett Harrelson. He is survived by a daughter, Marianne Harrelson McIver, and two sons, David Aydlett Harrelson and Robert Joseph Harrelson. There are also six grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

---
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