THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION has for the past two years sought programmatic data about the study of religion through two surveys, one of undergraduate departments and a second of doctoral programs in religion. The results are now beginning to see the light of day. With responses from approximately one thousand undergraduate and sixty graduate programs, the two surveys taken together present us with the most substantial data ever assembled on how religion is studied in the United States.

This is no small achievement, but it is, of course, only the beginning of the really interesting project: making sense of it. The AAR hopes that the surveys provide departments with a database to deploy in advocating the study of religion intra-institutionally. That may prove to be the case. Yet I confess to prefer an ulterior, if perhaps obvious, use. This data clarifies terrain that my colleagues and I traverse daily, consider constantly, and have always hypothesized about liberally. The undergraduate and graduate programs surveyed represent a (arguably the) central public for our work as—to adapt a phrase rightly used to characterize the university of which we are a part—a teacher of teachers of religion. What, then, does that world of teaching look like as defined through these surveys? How does its profile reflect what we do? And what challenges does it offer to the Divinity School?

These questions are most interestingly addressed in the data provided by the undergraduate survey. According to the Carnegie classification system for postsecondary schools, this survey’s primary respondents fall largely into three institutional types: public (25 percent), private/non-sectarian (20 percent), and religiously affiliated. This last cohort comprised just over half the respondents, including primarily departments and programs in Protestant (33 percent) and Roman Catholic (17 percent) schools. The respondents thus include the full range of institutions from which students matriculate at the Divinity School. And with the exception of seminaries and theological schools, they similarly encompass the full range of institutions in which the Divinity School’s doctoral graduates accept faculty appointments.

The responding institutions were asked to provide extensive data about their curricula in religion. Some general trends tell a great deal. The data on introductory courses—the offerings that enroll the most students and thus most accurately reflect general judgments about essential components in the study of religion—are particularly suggestive.
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Appleby Named Alumnus of the Year

The Board of Trustees of the Baptist Theological Union has named Robert Scott Appleby the Divinity School’s Alumnus of the Year for 2003. Appleby is John M. Regan, Jr., Director of the Kroc Institute and professor of history at the University of Notre Dame. He researches and writes on the roots of religious violence and the potential of religious peacebuilding, and he teaches courses in American religious history and comparative religious movements.

Having received his B.A., magna cum laude, from the University of Notre Dame in 1978, Appleby went on to earn his M.A. (1979) and Ph.D. (1985), with distinction, from the University of Chicago Divinity School. He taught from 1982 to 1987 in the Department of Religious Studies at Saint Xavier College in Chicago, chairing that department from 1985 to 1987. From 1988 to 1993, he served as codirector, with Martin E. Marty, of the Fundamentalism Project, an international public policy study conducted by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. From 1994 to the present, he has served on the faculty of Notre Dame University, directing that institution’s Cushwa Center for the Study of American Catholicism from 1994 to 2002, and its Kroc Institute from 2000 to the present. In addition to hundreds of articles, chapters, essays, and reviews, Appleby is author of The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence and Reconciliation (Bowman & Littlefield, 2000) and Church and Age: Unite! The Modernist Impulse in American Catholicism (Notre Dame, 1992). He is coauthor of Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalism in the World (University of Chicago Press, 2003), with Gabriel A. Almond and Emmanuel Sivan; The Glory and the Power: The Fundamentalist Challenge to the Modern World (Beacon Press, 1992), with Martin E. Marty; and Transforming Parish Ministry: The Changing Roles of Clergy, Laity, and Women Religious (Crossroad, 1989), with Jay Dolan, Patricia Byrne, and Debra Campbell. He has edited Spokesman for the Despised: Fundamentalist Leaders of the Middle East (University of Chicago Press, 1997), and coedited eight volumes, among them, the five-volume Fundamentalism Project (University of Chicago Press, 1991–2004), with Martin E. Marty, and Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America (Indiana University Press, 1995), with Mary Jo Weaver. He is the general editor for the Cushwa Center Studies of Catholicism in Twentieth-Century America series, published by Cornell University Press.

Appleby has received numerous awards for his contributions to scholarship and teaching, including the American Academy of Religion’s Award for Excellence in the Study of Religion (1996), an honorary doctorate from the University of Scranton (1998), fellowship in the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences (2001), and Washington Theological Union’s Sophia Award for Theological Excellence and Service to Ministry (2002), among others. In addition, he has received prestigious fellowships from such institutions as the Rockefeller, Henry R. Luce, and MacArthur Foundations, as well as from Lilly Endowment Inc.

Appleby will deliver his Alumnus of the Year Address, “The Study, the Practice, and the Construction of Religion: The Case of Religious Peacebuilding,” at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 29, 2004, in Swift Lecture Hall.

Letter from the Dean

that, following these general trends, much coursework addresses one of two approaches: either study in method or thematic courses (it is interesting, for example, that Religion and the Arts is one of the most commonly offered elective courses at many institutions). This data, however, is much less readily open to generalization. It is clear that in those more advanced course offerings departments reflect the idiosyncrasies of particular institutional settings much more fully.

One final consideration ought to influence the way we think about this data. It is a question of what the data does not show: the lack of information about how courses in, for instance, New Testament are taught. I can best illustrate this point by an example. In a seminar on developing skills for the profession of teaching that I taught several years ago, each student was required to write a syllabus for an introductory course in his or her area of specialization. Two students in the group specialized in New Testament, yet they wrote entirely different syllabi for a course each called Introduction to New Testament. One course took its bearing from the canonical writings and the issues these raise; the course moved from the earliest writings of Paul through the Gospels and the other epistles to the Book of Revelation, and inserted thematic excurses on the historical Jesus, the earliest church communities, and the formation of theological consensus. The other was a course in comparative religion, commencing with study of the religious communities that existed at the beginning of the Common Era, and moving from that social setting to investigate a series of questions about the relationship of state to religion and the circumstances under which a messianic movement that assembled around a charismatic prophet forged, over time and amidst controversy, a scriptural canon and a communal identity. Each course earned its title, but each had a distinctive set of governing assumptions about how best to approach the material. We need to be careful, then, in generalizing about the data to avoid assumptions of commonality based on course titles. We also can see, through such an example, how it is possible for a sacred religious text to be so central to the study of religion—it legitimately can be taught in myriad ways.

In many respects, the Divinity School’s program of study reflects these emphases: while non-denominational, historically we both privilege the study of Christianity and cultivate the study of the world’s religious traditions. Our largest cohorts of doctoral students concentrate in theology, on the one hand, and history of religions, on the other. It is possible to do serious programs of study in Judaism, Hinduism, and Buddhism as well, and to do serious comparative work not only in the history of religions, but also in the philosophy of religion, in the history of Judaism and Christianity in the medieval period, and in modern Jewish and Christian thought. (In addition, Chicago has historically pursued work in Islam; while we are not currently able to do that in the Divinity School, this is a circumstance of the moment that will change soon.)

Continued on back page
Faculty News

Doniger Appointed Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholar

Wendy Doniger, Mircea Eliade Distinguis­ished Service Professor of the History of Religions, was appointed a Phi Beta Kappa visiting scholar for 2004–2005. Visiting scholar­ship travels to universities and colleges that have Phi Beta Kappa chapters, spend­ing two days on each campus. The scholar meets with undergraduates informally, participates in classroom lectures and seminars, and gives the same lecture open to the entire academic community. Founded in 1776, Phi Beta Kappa is the nation’s oldest academic honor society. It has chapters at 270 colleges and universities, and over 600,000 members.

Elshtain Wins Publisher’s Weekly Best Book Award

Publisher’s Weekly awarded Jean Bethke Elshtain, Laura Spellman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics, one of its 2003 best book awards for Just War Against Terror: The Burden of American Power in a Violent World (Basic Books, 2003). In the book, Elshtain argues that there are times when we must use force to stop evil and punish wrongdoers, as in the struggle against the Nazis and imperialist Japan. The case against Al-Qaida and Bin Laden, she says, is clear, and a legitimate war deployed in the name of decency and righteousness should actually lead to a more peaceful world by restoring order and security. In fact, Elshtain argues, the U.S. has an obligation to pre­vent violence and help establish civic peace and promote nation building. According to Publisher’s Weekly, one of the main international news sources for book publishing and book­selling, “the book presents well the moral case for U.S. military engagement in the world and gives credence to those who advocate the use of force as a response to terrorism.”

Fishbane Consulting Editor for New Jewish Study Bible

Michael Fishbane, Nathan Cummings Professor of Jewish Studies, served as senior consulting editor of Oxford University Press’s Jewish Study Bible, published in January 2004. The volume, edited by Marc Zvi Brettler and Adele Berlin, reflects both contemporary biblical scholarship and the richness of Jewish tradition. In addition to featuring the Jewish Publication Society’s Tanakh translation, as­sembled by a committee of esteemed scholars and rabbis from the Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform movements within Judaism in 1985, the volume offers an array of supple­mentary materials that address biblical interpretation within the Bible itself and during the rabbinic period, through medieval, mystical, early modern, and current approaches. The volume has already garnered tremendous attention. According to Rabbi Burton L. Visotzky, Appleman Professor of Midrash and Interreligious Studies at the Jewish Theological Seminary, “What Rashi did for rabbinic tradition almost a millennium ago, The Jewish Study Bible does for Jewish Bible scholarship from its beginnings through the end of the twentieth century. . . . This book is a must, not only for Jewish congregations and classrooms, but for every person, Church, study-group, and university course interested in the Bible and its meaning throughout the ages.”

Frymer-Kensky Receives National Jewish Book Award

The Jewish Book Council of North America awarded Tikva Frymer-Kensky, professor of Hebrew Bible and history of Judaism, the Barbara Dobkin Award in Women’s Studies—one of its 53rd Annual National Jewish Book Awards—for Reading the Women of the Bible: A New Interpretation of Their Stories (Schocken Books, 2002). In the book, Frymer-Kensky argues that, although ancient Israel­ite society was a patriarchy, the Hebrew Bible does not portray women as inferior or justify their subordination. Instead, she contends, women in the Bible provide a paradigm for understanding powerlessness and subordination untainted by prejudicial ideas. Through creative readings of the stories of Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, Dinah, Tamar, Deborah, Ruth, Jezebel, and other biblical heroines, the women of the Bible emerge as victors, victims, virgins, or voices of God, each image capturing a critical feature of ancient Israel’s sense of itself. “Like these women, the people of Israel can persevere to preserve their destiny. The gifts of faith, persuasion, persistence, and cunning can allow the nation of Israel to be victorious when surrounded by, besieged by, and even conquered by more powerful nations,” writes Frymer-Kensky, whose book received a Koret Jewish Book Award last year.

Hopkins Promoted to Full Professor

Dwight N. Hopkins was promoted from associate to full professor of theology in the Divinity School, effective at the beginning of the winter quarter.

Klauck Named President of SNTS


Tanner Delivers Lectures across U.S. and Europe

Kathryn Tanner, professor of theology, has delivered several prestigious lectures across the U.S. and Europe in the past year, including the Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University, entitled “Grace and Money” and “Grace and Global Capitalism”; the Pitt Lecture at the Berkeley/Yale Divinity School Convocation, en­titled “Incarnation and Atonement: A Feminist Reappraisal”; and the Inaugural Walgrave Lecture at the Catholic University at Leuven, entitled “Postmodern Challenges to the Idea of Tradition.” In January, Tanner conducted a lecture tour of universities/semi­naries in the Nether­lands, including stops in Utrecht, Tilburg, Kampen, and Nijmegen.
Jean-Luc Marion began his appointment as John Nuveen Professor in the Divinity School, the Department of Philosophy, and the Committee on Social Thought this winter quarter.

He studies both the history of modern philosophy and contemporary phenomenology. In the former field, he has published several books on Descartes’ ontology, rational theology, and metaphysics, focusing especially on the medieval sources and using modern patterns of interpretation (On Descartes’ Metaphysical Prism and Cartesian Questions, both published by the University of Chicago Press in 1999).

In the latter field, he is pursuing a long-term inquiry into the question of God, as in his book God without Being (University of Chicago Press, 1991). He has published The Idol and Distance (Fordham University Press, 2000) and Reduction and Givenness (Northwestern University Press, 1998), the original, French version of which was awarded the 1992 Grand Prix du Philosophie de l’Académie Française. He has written on the relation between phenomenology and ontology in Being Given: Toward a Phenomenology of Givenness (Stanford University Press, 2002) and In Excess: Studies of Saturated Phenomena (Fordham University Press, 2002). Professor Marion has also worked in the area of patristics; the history of medieval, classical, and modern philosophy; and aesthetics. He has spent ten springs at the University of Chicago as a visiting professor. He will continue to spend part of the year in Paris, where he teaches at Université Paris—Sorbonne, Paris IV.

CIRCA: You have done substantial work on Descartes’ philosophy. Would you please say something about Descartes’ importance in your work?

J-L M: I am interested in studying Descartes not only from the inside, but also devoting attention to his context. So, at long range, I am interested in the relation of Descartes to Aristotle. My Ph.D. dissertation was on this topic. In it, I tried to understand Descartes’ modification of the definition of ‘science’ by referring to Aristotle’s definition of science and to late scholasticism. Aristotle thus allowed me to gauge to what extent Descartes’ positions were original. My ultimate goal was to rebuild the general frame of Cartesian metaphysics using up-to-date patterns of metaphysics, such as Heidegger and ontological theology. My books on Descartes are related to the epistemological, ontological, and theological results of this inquiry. In them, I maintain that historical philosophy is not just about philosophy’s past; it is about understanding the issues of the present. By extension . . . you cannot discuss postmodernism without a clear understanding of what modernity means.

CIRCA: Last spring, you taught a course on the “saturated phenomenon.” Would you please help readers of Circa understand something about your work in phenomenology?

J-L M: The question of the saturated phenomenon is the result of a long inquiry into phenomenology. The standard definition of a phenomenon in both classical metaphysics (Kant) and in phenomenology (Husserl) can be summarized as follows: A phenomenon is when an intuition we receive about something not yet known is framed and organized by a concept. By itself, a concept is an empty idea, rational but with no connection to the real world. An intuition without a concept is not yet knowledge, since it could simply be subjective. So, building up the two together allows us to decide whether or not something is a real object. I was surprised that most, if not all, philosophers, using this standard definition of a phenomenon, address either what Husserl calls ‘evidence,’ in which we have as much intuition as we do concept, or those cases in which we are not in front of evidence but in which there is an excess of concept, i.e., a deficiency of intuition. I argue that there is a third possibility: phenomena in which we have an excess of intuition. I call these phenomena “saturated,” and divide them into four distinct categories: Excess of quantity, that is, a phenomenon...
Wednesday Community Luncheons

Spring Quarter 2004

Community luncheons are held each Wednesday during the school year at 12:00 noon in Swift Common Room. They provide an opportunity for Divinity School students, faculty, and staff to gather to eat a student-prepared meal and listen to a guest speaker. Lunches cost $4 at the door and must be reserved in advance by calling 773-702-8230 or e-mailing jquijano@uchicago.edu.

April 7

“How to Teach Youth about Religion When They Don’t Want to Learn.” Bill Geraci, technology coordinator for the Divinity School and former student of Sanskrit, will show a video of his presentation to seventh-graders on artwork of the Hindu god Ganesh, and discuss why learning about other cultures/religions is important.

April 14

Steven Levitt, Alvin H. Baum Professor in the Department of Economics and the College and editor of the Journal of Political Economy, will discuss “Legalizing Abortion, Unwantedness, and the Decline in Crime.”

April 21

Student research presentations:

Geoff Chaplin, Ph.D. student in History of Christianity, will discuss the relationship between traditional modes of theological inquiry and emergent critical disciplines in the seventeenth century.

Sarah Hammerschlag, Ph.D. student in Philosophy of Religion, will discuss the intersections of nineteenth- and twentieth-century continental philosophy and the development of modern Judaism.

Patrick Hatcher, Ph.D. student in History of Religions, will discuss the conversion of the Turkish tribes of Central Asia to Islam in the ninth and tenth centuries, with special attention to the Muslim notions of what religious conversion consisted of at the time.

Garry Sparks, M.Div. student, will discuss the variety of Native American spiritual expressions, specifically among the highland Maya of Guatemala and Chiapas, Mexico. These presentations will be repeated at the Divinity School Alumni Reunion on April 30 (see page 6).


April 28

Joseph L. Price, professor of religion at Whittier College and director of the Divinity School’s Alumni Council, will discuss “Conjuring Curses and Supplicating Spirits: Baseball Culture of Superstition.”

May 5

Mary Keys, assistant professor of government and international studies in the Department of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame and 2003–2004 senior research fellow in the Martin Marty Center, will discuss her research on humility and modernity.

May 12

Angeliki Tzanetou, assistant professor of classics at Case Western Reserve University and 2003–2004 scholar at the Joseph Regenstein Library and the University of Illinois, will discuss “Exile, Democracy, and Empire in Athenian Tragedy.”

May 19

Wayne Booth, George M. Pullman Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus in the Department of English Language and Literature, will discuss the relationship between religion and science.

May 26

Kaleem Malik, M.D., emergency physician and Secretary Tabligh of the Chicago chapter of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam, will discuss “Jesus in Islam.”

June 2

Cookout in Swift courtyard, featuring live music by the Whisky Hollow Bluegrass Band.
A Conversation in Divinity with Martha Nussbaum

Thursday, April 1, at 5:30 p.m.
Chicago Cultural Center, 78 East Washington Street, Southwest Meeting Room

“Global Justice and the Social Contract” by Martha C. Nussbaum, Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics. The most influential model of social justice in the Western tradition is the idea of the social contract: “free, equal, and independent” people get together and decide to leave the State of Nature, framing principles by which to live together, because it is mutually advantageous to do so. Professor Nussbaum will argue that this model is an inadequate basis for principles of global justice for the interdependent world in which we live, and propose a new alternative.

Conversations in Divinity, a quarterly series, is free and open to the public. To register or for more information, please contact Molly Bartlett at 773-702-8248 or mbartlet@uchicago.edu.

Religion and the Democratic Prospect Conference

Thursday, May 6–Friday, May 7
Swift Hall

Frank Benzoni, Larry Greenfield, Erik Owens, and Joe Perri will deliver papers in this second conference on Religion and the Democratic Prospect. The conference will take place on Thursday, May 6, from 2:00 to 5:00 p.m., followed by dinner, and on Friday, May 7, from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon. All are welcome to attend. See page 11 for more information.

Spring Events

Divinity School Alumni Reunion

Thursday, April 29

Registration. Selected Divinity School classes will be open to alumni.

Alumnus of the Year Lecture by R. Scott Appleby (see page 2 for more details), followed by a reception in Swift Common Room.

Pub Night sponsored by the Divinity Students Association.

Friday, April 30

Registration followed by morning and afternoon panels representing a number of the areas of study that structure the curriculum and degree programs of the Divinity School.

Faculty Panels

- History of Christianity: Catherine A. Brekus and Susan Schreiner
- New Testament: Hans-Josef Klänck, David Martínez, and Margaret M. Mitchell
- History of Judaism: Michael Fishbane and James T. Robinson

Lunch with Franz Bibfeldt

Students and faculty will join alumni for a lecture and lunch.

Faculty Panels, Continued

- History of Religions: Bruce Lincoln, Martin Riezbrodt, and Christian K. Widmeyer
- Ethics: Franklin I. Gamwell and William Schwaberk

Administrative Conversations

The M.A./Ph.D. Programs: Winfried Fuller Sullivan

The Ministry Program: Cynthia Gano Lindner

The Undergraduate Program in Religious Studies: Lucy K. Pick

Evening Meeting with Alumni and Visiting Committee

Religion and Literature: Michael J. Marrin, Richard A. Rosengarten, and Anthony C. Yu

Cocktails and Dinner, followed by the State of the School Address by Dean Richard A. Rosengarten.

Saturday, May 1

Breakfast with the Dean. Join Richard A. Rosengarten for continental breakfast and conversation.

To register or for more information, please go to http://divinity.uchicago.edu/alumni/reunion, or contact Molly Bartlett at 773-702-8248 or mbartlet@uchicago.edu.

Jean-Luc Marion

Continued from page 4

These four basic cases of the saturated phenomenon, where the excess of intuition makes the phenomenon impossible to transform into an object, have consequences for the definition of the self, as well as for revelation. My guess is that the very combination of these four kinds of saturated phenomena gives us the concept of the non-objective phenomenon par excellence—that is, revelation.

CIRCA: Where does God fit into your work?

J-L M: I’ve devoted time in my books to the theme of the unknowability of God (The Idol and Distance, Prolegomena to Charity, God without Being). It is crucial to recognize that we cannot fully and really understand God.

This is a principle of theology. So what do we understand? It is not easy to answer this question. We have to be careful about our ambition to understand God, because it is that very ambition that makes God disappear. God is immediately downgraded to the level of a false name imposed upon a human representation. I am concerned with how to bridge the gap between what faith is supposed to assume and what mind is supposed to understand.

CIRCA: What influence do you think your work will have on the way people read such texts?

J-L M: My hope is that the question of phenomenality will be disconnected once and for all from the question of objectivity. It is perfectly fair and right for philosophy to build an epistemology dealing with objects, but a large part of the human experience does not deal with objects, and we cannot, and should not, assume that this part is
Endowing the Marty Dissertation Seminar

For several decades, the Divinity School has sponsored a seminar to support dissertation research. Students selected to participate in this program receive funding for a year and meet regularly, under the guidance of a faculty member, to share their work in progress. These meetings are designed to generate careful and insightful scholarship that deploys conceptual tools and interpretive methods to advance thought within a discipline in the study of religion, and to provoke new work at the intersection of disciplines.

Since its inception in 1998, the Marty Center has continued this tradition, but in so doing has amplified the program to require students to teach a course at a local college or university, under the guidance of a faculty member at that institution. The purpose of this requirement is to help students "step back" from the immediacies of specialized research to ask themselves how that research will contribute to the institutions and the society in which they will pursue their scholarly vocations. Seminar alumni describe the experience as having a seminal impact on their careers.

For the past three years, the Marty Center's dissertation seminar has been funded by the Henry Luce Foundation, which recently took the unusual step of extending the grant for two years. In so doing, the Foundation has urged the Divinity School to seek funding that would endow the seminar to ensure that it is a permanent part of the Center. Marty Center board member John Colman and his wife, Jane, recently pledged a challenge gift of $750,000 toward a goal of $2.25 million. The timeline to reach this goal is calendar year 2004. The Colman's generous pledge will be the centerpiece of Divinity School fundraising for the year because it so directly links the institution's core values with its critical need for student financial support.

The 2004 Brauer Seminar

This winter quarter, Paul Mendes-Flohr, professor of modern Jewish thought, and William Schweiker, professor of theological ethics, led the Brauer Seminar, an annual interdisciplinary dialogue in the academic study of religion established in 1991 through the generosity of friends of the late Jerald C. Brauer, the Naomi Shenstone Donnelley Professor Emeritus of the History of Christianity and former dean of the Divinity School. Entitled "The Religious Quest for the Human: Jewish and Christian Reflections," this year's seminar explored a range of post-Enlightenment thinkers, representing principally, but not exclusively, various expressions of the Jewish and Christian traditions as well as contemporary philosophical positions, who reinterpret classic claims about human freedom, dignity, and responsibility. The seminar considered what contributions these thinkers might make in fostering humane concern within the religious traditions in order to secure the image of God in the world, and strove to bring positions into dialogue determined not by consideration of interfaith understanding, but rather through a set of shared moral and political concerns. By means of critical inquiry, the seminar also sought to outline a constructive religious humanism attentive to the demands of the current world situation.

Each year up to ten students from the Divinity School and Humanities Division are awarded a stipend of $1,000 to support their participation in the Brauer Seminar. These students are encouraged to pursue a research project related to the seminar topic and to present this at one of the seminar sessions. Participating in this year's seminar were Ryan Coyne (Theology), Courtney Fitzsimmons (Theology), Chad Herring (Ethics), Jeffrey Israel (Ethics), Michael Johnson (Ethics), Michael Kraftson-Hogue (Ethics), Santiago Piñón (Theology), Maria Rethelyi (Committee on Jewish Studies), and Sandra Sullivan (Ethics).
Recent columns in “Sightings,” the Marty Center’s twice-weekly electronic editorial that addresses issues concerning religion in the public realm, have covered such topics as Kwanzaa, religion and the 2004 presidential race, Hispanics in the U.S. Catholic church, violence in Mel Gibson’s film The Passion, and religion and the question of “gay marriage,” to name only a few.

Our September 24, 2003, column, “Cracking the Da Vinci Code” elicited our most significant response to date, and was reprinted and distributed in a variety of newsletters, book clubs, and church groups. We reprint this column by Margaret M. Mitchell, associate professor of New Testament and early Christian literature, below, to give those of you unfamiliar with “Sightings” a sense of its character. Those interested in subscribing or contributing to the editorial should e-mail its managing editor, Elizabeth Alvarez, at sightings-admin@listhost.uchicago.edu. To access the “Sightings” archive, please go to http://marty-center.uchicago.edu/sightings/index.shtml.

Cracking the Da Vinci Code

By Margaret M. Mitchell

Besieged by requests for my reaction to Dan Brown’s Da Vinci Code (Doubleday, 2003), I finally decided to sit down and read it over the weekend. It was a quick romp, largely fun to read, if rather predictable and preachy. This is a good airplane book, a novelistic thriller that presents a rummage sale of accurate historical nuggets alongside falsehoods and misleading statements. The bottom line: the book should come coded for “black light,” like the pen used by the character Sauniere to record his dying words, so that readers could scan pages to see which “facts” are trustworthy and which patently not, and (if a black light could do this!) highlight the gray areas where complex issues are misrepresented and distorted.

Patently Inaccurate:

In his own lifetime Jesus “inspired millions to better lives” (p. 233); there were “more than eighty gospels” (p. 231; the number is factual-sounding, but has no basis); “the earliest Christian records” were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls (including gospels) and Nag Hammadi texts (pp. 234, 245); the Nag Hammadi texts “speak of Christ’s ministry in very human terms” (p. 234); the marriage of Mary Magdalene and Jesus is “a matter of historical record” (p. 244); the marriage of Mary Magdalene and Jesus is “a matter of historical record” (p. 244); Constantine invented the divinity of Jesus and excluded all gospels but the four canonical ones; Constantine made Christianity “the official religion” of the Roman Empire (p. 232); Constantine coined the term “heretic” (p. 234); “Rome’s official religion was sun worship” (p. 232). There are more.

Gray Areas:

“The vestiges of pagan religion in Christian symbology are undeniable” (p. 232), but that does not mean “Nothing in Christianity is original.” The relationship between early Christianity and the world around it, the ways in which it was culturally embedded in that world, sometimes unreflectively, sometimes reflexively, sometimes in deliberate accommodation, sometimes in deliberate cooptation, is far more complicated than the simplistic myth of Constantine’s Stalin-esque program of cultural totalitarianism. Further, Constantine’s religious life—whether, when, how, and by what definition he was Christian and/or “pagan”—is a much-debated issue because the literary and non-literary sources (such as coins) are not consistent. That Constantine the emperor had “political” motives (p. 234) is hardly news to anyone! The question is how religion and politics (which cannot be separated in the ancient world) were interrelated in him.

Brown presumes “the Church” is “the Holy Roman Catholic Church,” which he thinks had tremendous power always and everywhere, but ecclesiastical history is a lot messier.
He is as hard to figure out on this score as Henry VIII, Osama bin Laden, Tammy Fay Baker and George W. Bush. Brown has turned one of history's most fascinating figures into a cartoonish villain. "Paganism" is treated throughout The Da Vinci Code as though it were a unified phenomenon, which it was not ("pagan" just being the Christian term for "non-Christian"). The religions of the Mediterranean world were multiple and diverse, and cannot all be boiled down to "sun-worshippers" (p. 232). Nor did all "pagans" frequently, eagerly, and with mystical intent participate in the biens gamos (ritual sex acts). "The Church" is also used throughout the book as though it had a clear, uniform, and unitary referent. For early Christian history this is precisely what we do not have; what we do have is a much more complex, varied, and localized phenomenon. Brown presumes "the Church" is "the Holy Roman Catholic Church," which he thinks had tremendous power always and everywhere, but ecclesiastical history is a lot messier.

Brown propagates the full-dress conspiracy theory for Vatican suppression of women. Feminist scholars and others have been debating different models of the "patriarchalization" of Christianity for decades. Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza's landmark work, In Memory of Her (1983), argued that while Jesus and Paul (on his better days) were actually pretty much pro-women, it was the next generations (the authors of letters in Paul's name, like 1 and 2 Timothy and others) who betrayed their feminist agenda and sold out to the Aristotelian, patriarchal vision of Greco-Roman society. Others (unfortunately) sought to blame the misogynist on the Jewish roots of Christianity. More recently it has been argued that the picture is more mixed, even for Jesus and Paul. That is, they may have been more liberal than many of their contemporaries about women, but they were not all-out radicals, though they had ideas (such as Gal. 3:28) that were even more revolutionary than they realized (in both senses of the term). Alas, no simple story here. While obsessing over Mary Magdalene, The Da Vinci Code ignores completely the rise and incredible durability and power of the other Mary, the mother of Jesus, and devotion to her, which follows many patterns of "goddess" veneration (she even gets Athena's Parthenon dedicated to her in the sixth century).

This list is just a sample. A "black light" edition of The Da Vinci Code would, however, be unnecessary if readers would simply take the book as fiction. But there is an obstacle: the first page of the book reads, under the bold print headline, "Fact": "all descriptions of . . . documents, and secret rituals in this novel are accurate."
One of the pioneers of twentieth-century scholarship in Israel, Gershom Scholem put Judaism and mysticism on the academic map worldwide. Before he began his studies, many considered Jewish mysticism to be nothing more than an obscure superstition. In his major works, Scholem illuminated Kabbalah from its origins, showing that it emerged as an intellectually complex and spiritually creative response to the mystery, or even the absence, of God. But in his private poetry, he questioned and reflected on his scholarship and his quest for God.

Last year, his poetry was collected for the first time and published as *The Fullness of Time* (Ibis Editions, 2003), and on February 1 and 2, 2004, Paul Mendes-Flohr, professor of modern Jewish thought, convened a conference to reflect on its significance. The conference opened Sunday evening with a musical performance by members of the New Budapest Orpheum Society. On Monday morning, a session was held on Scholem’s poetry, featuring papers by Peter Cole (Ibis Editions, Jerusalem) and Steven Wasserstrom (Reed College), chaired by Paul Mendes-Flohr. This was followed by a session of readings from *The Fullness of Time*, with selections from the English translation presented by Peter Cole and selections from the original German presented by Berthold Hoeckner (University of Chicago), chaired by Philip Bohlman (University of Chicago). The conference concluded with an afternoon session on Scholem’s scholarship, featuring papers by Menachem Brinker (University of Chicago), Antony David (private scholar, Tucson, Arizona), and Ben Lazier (University of Chicago), chaired by Bernard Wasserstein (University of Chicago).

While Scholem did not address mysticism directly in his poems, the conference revealed a deep and difficult theme uniting his poetry and his scholarship. “Scholem was engaged in a mysticism that claims that when God created the world He created a void,” explains Mendes-Flohr, “a void in Himself and in the cosmos, in order to partake in creation. And that void remains with us, and is the great riddle of the creation and the divine presence, which is manifested through its absence.” According to Mendes-Flohr, “in this way Scholem’s mysticism connects to his poetry and to the paradoxical way that language expresses and yet doesn’t, at the same time.”

Sponsored by the University of Chicago’s Committee on Jewish Studies, Divinity School, Department of Music, Franke Institute for the Humanities, Division of Humanities, and Center for Interdisciplinary Research on German Literature and Culture, the conference attracted a large audience from across the University and city of Chicago.

The Scholarship and Teaching of Joel Kraemer

The Divinity School is finalizing arrangements for an autumn-quarter conference to be held in October 2004 to honor the scholarship and teaching of Joel Kraemer on the occasion of his retirement. Kraemer, John Henry Barrows Professor Emeritus of Jewish Studies, retired from teaching last spring. The theme of the conference will be “The Two Gentlemen of Cordova: Averroës, Maimonides, and the Transmission of the Classical Heritage.” Speakers will include Bernard McGinn and Paul Mendes-Flohr from the Divinity School, and such visitors as Barry Kogan (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati) and Alfred Ivry (New York University). Details are forthcoming in the fall issue of *Circa*.
Conclusion of the Religion, Culture and Family Project

The Religion, Culture and Family Project (RCF) officially concluded on December 31, 2003, after twelve years of hard work. Funded by a series of three generous grants from Lilly Endowment, Inc., and directed by Don Browning, Alexander Campbell Professor Emeritus of Ethics and the Social Sciences, the project sought to address the contemporary situation of American families from a range of theological, historical, legal, biblical, and cultural perspectives.

In 1991, the first Lilly grant provided funding for the production of a series of twelve books, published by Westminster John Knox and Cambridge University presses. To foster interaction between the various book projects, major project authors and editors met annually from 1991 to 1995 to present and mutually critique their ongoing work. During that time, a project office was established at the Divinity School, under the supervision of Don Browning and a project coordinator.


Awarded in 1991, the first Lilly grant provided funding for the production of a series of twelve books, published by Westminster John Knox and Cambridge University presses. To foster interaction between the various book projects, major project authors and editors met annually from 1991 to 1995 to present and mutually critique their ongoing work. During that time, a project office was established at the Divinity School, under the supervision of Don Browning and a project coordinator.

In 1999, RCF was awarded its third and final grant from Lilly Endowment, Inc., for the purpose of bringing the research findings of the project to a wider audience. Three central dissemination initiatives are currently under way. First, the project sponsored the production of a PBS video documentary and accompanying book, “Marriage: Just a Piece of Paper?” which aired nationally on February 14, 2002. Second, the project is sponsoring an adaptation of a highly successful curriculum for high school students by Kamper Curricula. Third, the project is currently sponsoring presentations of the innovative Great Start marriage preparation program, adapted for the project by Dr. Robert Cueni of Kansas City, Missouri.

Throughout its history, the project has harnessed the talents and energies of a number of Divinity School students, including Kelly Bostrom, David Clairmont, Ian Evison, Cheisy Green, Josh Heikila, Elizabeth Marquardt, Melanie O’Hara, and John Wall. The RCF staff was aided in its work by an advisory council, which consisted of University of Chicago Professors Anne Carr, Bertram Cohler, and Linda Waite, as well as by Cynthia Jurisson (Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago) and Dennis McCann (Agnes Scott College).

In the past twelve years, RCF staff and contributing authors have provided a scholarly source for the American conversation about families and the role of religion, especially Christianity, in shaping and helping families. The project has influenced many external research documents; countless churches and denominations have made use of its materials; and government and public policy discussions have used its resources. The RCF Web site, http://divinity.uchicago.edu/family/, which will be posted and updated for one more year, contains information about the project, its two series (Westminster John Knox and Eerdmans), its partnerships, its PBS documentary (“Marriage: Just a Piece of Paper?”), and its twenty books published or in press.

Religion and the Democratic Prospect

The challenge of the new century is to live up to our forebears, and to do so in ways that will inform a commonweal that is, in a first and primary instance, the undergraduate classroom.

offered a series of distinctive answers about what integrates our work, always rooted in the common denominator of scholarship on religion that is ever parsed through recourse to the highest standards of argument and evidence. This was William Rainey Harper’s vision: the ideal of a true research university that would be the repository of fundamental values that inform democracy for America and, eventually, the world. Harper’s declared connection of scholarship with the commonweal is the connecting thread of our most innovative research: to name only a few examples, in American religious history (William Warren Sweet, Sidney Mead, Martin E. Marty), in the history of religions (Joachim Wach, Mireia Eliaate, Joseph Kitagawa), in theology in its interaction with culture (George Burman Foster, Shailer Mathews, Paul Tillich, Paul Ricoeur, David Tracy), and in innovative interdisciplinary programs (religion and literature, religion and psychological studies). The challenge of the new century is to live up to our forebears, and to do so in ways that will inform a commonweal that is, in a first and primary instance, the undergraduate classroom. Our graduates must bring to bear a real breadth of understanding about religion, and a depth of knowledge of a particular tradition, to their teaching. Responsible citizenship, to say nothing of membership in the human community, will require nothing less than our absolute best in this regard. 

Jean-Luc Marion
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irrational. So we need to seek out the rationality of the non-objective part of our experience. To do that, we have to admit that there are phenomena that are quite sound, consistent, with a variety of rules, which nevertheless cannot be defined as objects. It is not up to me to say whether my work will have a positive or a negative influence, but I hope it will have momentum.

CIRCA: You have spent the last several springs in Chicago as a visiting professor. What impressions do you have of the students here, and how do you compare faculty life in Paris and Chicago?

J-L M: Faculty life in Chicago is the opposite of faculty life in Paris. Here we are on a campus, in Hyde Park, where there is not much to do but work. Paris, on the other hand, is a big city, filled with distractions. There I find that I am always under pressure. There are many people to see, so it is not at all conducive to writing. I enjoy the balance of dividing my time between Chicago and Paris, and feel lucky to be able to do so.

As for my impression of students in Chicago as compared with Paris, I would say the difference lies in the education systems. When you teach a class in France and ask if there are questions, students keep silent: they think that if they have a question it is because they have not understood the lecture and therefore need to do more work. In America, students are much more reactive. They are not afraid to challenge the teacher, to ask questions. There are benefits and disadvantages to both systems. I think. If I were to point out a general shortcoming of American students, it would be their lack of proficiency in foreign languages (German, Latin, or Greek), and this can be an impediment to teaching.

CIRCA: I understand that you’ve had a chance to read Jerald Brauer’s biography of John Nuveen. Is there anything about his life that particularly interests or impresses you?

J-L M: The book was fun to read. It gave me some insight into John Nuveen, Sr., one of the founding trustees of the University of Chicago, and his son, John Nuveen, Jr., the person after whom my chair is named. I particularly enjoyed one of the stories in the book about the latter. A good Baptist who drank no alcohol, John Nuveen, Jr., returned from a trip to Europe, where he was sent after World War II to enforce the Marshall Plan, drinking wine! He explained that while in Greece, he discovered that very decent people—people of faith—drank wine, yet never became drunk. He concluded that it must be possible to be a good Baptist and drink wine. This logic seems very wise to me!

I also learned that it was upon his return from Europe that Nuveen, Jr., endowed a chair for Paul Tillich at the Divinity School. It is this chair that I inherit. I am very proud to succeed Tillich in this honor and to be a part of the Divinity School and its fine traditions.