Dear Alumni and Friends —

This issue begins at a beginning, with the text of the inaugural address of Laurie Zoloth as Dean of the Divinity School. Dean Zoloth raises questions of scholarship and leadership, asking what the “thoughtful, serious, and engaged study of religion” can do.

We continue with the text of the 2017 Alumnus of the Year address, delivered by John Corrigan. Entitled “Religion, Emotion, and History,” Prof. Corrigan’s essay ranges through far-flung sources and theories on how to understand “the range of feeling, the variety of emotions involved in religion.”

The issue’s last set of pieces involves the portrait of Benjamin E. Mays (a gift of the Divinity Students Association) now hanging in our Common Room. The unveiling of the portrait was the occasion for speeches from current students and from alumni both. We hope all alumni will have the opportunity to visit the portrait in person as well.

Finally, we close as always with Alumni News. Your news is always welcome; you can submit news both in print using the form attached at the back of the volume or online at https://divinity.uchicago.edu/alumni-and-friends.

Thanks as always to designer Ken Janssen for his work on this issue.

I hope you enjoy this issue.

Terren Ilana Wein, Editor
CRITERION

1  Contents & List of Contributors

2  Inaugural Address as Dean

6  Religion, Emotion, and History

16  Portrait of Benjamin E. Mays

26  Alumni News

Laurie Zoloth, Dean and Margaret E. Burton Professor of Religion

Robert M. Franklin (PhD’85), President Emeritus, Morehouse College

Photo Credits:
Cover & Inside Back Cover, Jean Lachat
Page 1, Laurie Zoloth, Seth Joel
Page 3, Nancy Wong
Page 4, Quinn Dombrowski

John Corrigan (PhD’82), Lucius Moody Bristol Distinguished Professor of Religion and Professor of History at Florida State University
Thank you, President Zimmer, and thank you Provost Diermeier, for a lovely introduction. Your passion for this university, your excitement about leading it, and your clear support of the centrality of the Divinity School to it are some of the defining reasons that convinced me to come to the University of Chicago.

It is the honor of my academic life to come here as professor and dean, and I am extraordinarily grateful for your trust in me. It is a privilege to teach in this great city, at this great university, in a field of global inquiry so deeply important in our time. I am also thankful to the devoted search committee. Our discussion that first winter day was a wonderful introduction to the rigor, the integrity and the excellent scholarship of this school and to the care with which you each attend to it, and to the serious intentionality of your thoughtful participation. Thank you for writing my favorite description of the Divinity School: A place that pays “attention to the existential, moral and practical claims of religion not to the bracketing of them.” You all do so much for the Divinity School. Thank you to the faculty and the staff who took the time to be a part of the search process, for your generosity and your engagement. I cannot wait to meet everyone and learn more about your work. Your work has made this Divinity School the most interesting and important center for research and teaching in my field—the first serious Cubs fan to serve as Dean.

Let me begin, as dean, by considering a section of the Talmud Balvi. Tractate Shabbat 114a. Let me begin in the middle of the conversation, as most Talmudic debates do. What are banna’im, builders, they ask?

Said R. Johanan: These are scholars, who are engaged all their days in the building up of the world.

R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar to whom a lost article is returned on his recognition alone? That [scholar] who is particular to turn his shirt.

R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar that is appointed a leader of the community? He who when asked a matter of halachah, in any place can answer it, even in the Tractate Kallah.

R. Johanan also said: Who is the scholar whose work it is the duty of his townspeople to perform? He who abandons his own interest and engages in religious affairs; yet that is only to provide his bread.

R. Johanan also said: Who is a scholar? He who is asked a halachah in any place and can state it.
The passions of politics are often inexplicable without understanding the arguments of faith.

What is going on in this discussion? We are in the Amoraic period, around 270 CE. We overhear a discussion that begins with a definition, like all good philosophical discussions: what are builders? The word is fairly clear, builders are, well, builders of things. But the discussion turns: scholars are the builders of the world. The rabbis of the Talmud are having a sartorial discussion, and at first, the bar is set fairly low: Don’t go into the marketplace wearing torn shoes or with stains on your clothes or the saddle of your horse. But then: Because, you are building the world, you scholar, a hubric claim, the bar set high. Who is the scholar that we can trust, they ask, whose word alone is trustworthy? Well, somebody answers, perhaps mockingly, perhaps seriously: he is the guy who wears his shirt right side out. So much for world creation. But who is the scholar who is a leader, asks Rabbi Johanan, again? It is someone who can answer a question of law, from anyplace in the canon of law, even the most obscure one. And the question is asked a third time: who is a scholar? This time, it requires much more: abandon your work, study, we will support you. And again: who is the scholar? And the fourth time, the answer is repeated: the one who can answer from anywhere. Of course, the repeated phrase creates a doubled possibility: answering a question from anyplace in the canon, and answering the question from anyplace one inhabits? From the marketplace, from the city? A scholar who would build the world must live in the world, must do work that the people in the city think is worth supporting. The rabbinc imagination does love that obscure tractate, to be sure, but they have deeper goals. In the social imaginary that is rabbinc discourse, scholars have serious duties.

Who is a scholar and who is a leader? It is an enduring question for us. Our beloved academy, how are we in the world, how do we build a world? Is our scholarship worthy? I believe that the Divinity School is the place for that sort of transcendent scholarship. For generations of American scholars of religion, Chicago has been the place that can answer “from everywhere.” Both from every obscure canon, and from every public location.

I am dazzled by your scholarship. Coming to Chicago means working with, thinking with and teaching with the scholars to whom I have turned my entire academic life, whose books are on my shelves, and whose ideas matter in the long, excellent project that is the study of religion.

We—and now I can say that, we—have the very best divinity school in the country, one of the very best in the world. This is all because of you, and especially thanks to the two deans who proceeded me, Margaret M. Mitchell and Richard A. Rosengarten. It is this excellence that calls us to the work before us. I think we live at an hour in which the work before us is urgent. In our country, in our city, we are called to attention in what many have argued is a newly critical time for democracy, civility and urbanity. It is not, I think, a unique time in our country. But what makes it a distinctive time for scholars of religion is that our field: the texts we study, the practices we encounter, the scriptures, the literatures and the images on which we are focused, these are the languages of public discourse. The passions of politics are often inexplicable without understanding the arguments of faith. The ethical and moral dilemmas that surround us as we create the ideas that will shape the future, these too, are inexplicable, are opaque without the languages of faith traditions. We live in modernity, a modernity that we have been told since Weber is secular. But we know that the questions of the future: genetics, robotics, all of the promises of genetic technology, and all of serious threats to our future, the violence, injustice, ecological instability, cannot be fully answered without the arguments in the languages of religion.

We teach fluency in these languages. As scholars of religion and theology, we know ideas matter, we know that the words, sentences, and arguments, that emerged in and were preserved in these languages has been and should be some of the many heard in the public square, in the face to face encounters insisted upon by Levinas and Arendt, that
We will shape the contours of rigorous, scholarly research for a generation.

make being and then civic life possible. I know you value what Dean Rosengarten has said is this “reciprocal conversation” – a conversation, he writes, “that is at its best truly when it is a practice of continual respect in which argument and evidence, informed by imagination, forge and sustain a collegiality with a vocabulary and syntax refined by an ongoing commitment to sympathetic listening.”

What a joy to be the newest member of that community. I promise to listen to each of you carefully, with sympathy and imagination. I have much to learn, for all of you, faculty, staff, and students, you know so much about our University and its elegant traditions. And yet, I know we can be even more, even greater, although that is a freighted word. We will be greater at our school, we will continue to teach the next generation of complexly trained, dedicated scholarly leaders. For the University, in which we are first professional school and in which we are a central carrier of the ideas and values, pellucid and powerful—that are the drivers of excellence at Chicago, we will be an even greater partner, a site of truthful inquiry. We will do our part to answer the greatest questions of the academy: what does it mean to be human? What does it mean to be free? What must I do about the suffering of the other? In our field, where we can be greatly called, we will shape the contours of rigorous, scholarly research for a generation. For the good city in which we are privileged to live, amidst a plurality of communities and social locations where religion is the site of meaning, we can listen, even more carefully, to what faith might bring, and what service justifies our work. For our country, for all the publics that surround this University, we will insist that the world that is illuminated by intellectual inquiry can have a voice, can speak to our shared future.

What can the thoughtful, serious and engaged study of religion do? It can answer from every text, it can answer from every place. It can build the world.

“I want to end by returning to the Talmud, this conversation about the City of Rome.

“There are three hundred and sixty-five thoroughfares in the great city of Rome, and in each there were three hundred and sixty-five palaces; and in each palace, there were three hundred and sixty-five stories, and each story contained sufficient to provide the whole world with food. Simeon b. Rabbi asked Rabbi— For whom are all these other stories then? — They are for you, your companions and your friends…as it is said …. for her gain shall be for them that dwell before the Lord. What means ‘for them that dwell before the Lord’?

— Said R. Eleazar:

‘They who recognize their colleagues’ place in the academy. Others state, R. Eleazar said: They who welcome their colleagues to the academy.”

Thank you so much for being such welcoming colleagues, and I hope, companions and friends. Let us build this world together.
I thank the Divinity School’s Alumni Council and the Board of Trustees for this honor. And I thank Rick Rosengarten and Aaron Hollander and Andrew Seber, for arranging my visit and making feel at home. I also am grateful to those colleagues who nominated me for Alumnus of the Year. It is a pleasure to be recognized by one’s peers and especially so for this honor. I also want to acknowledge this place, the Divinity School. Whatever traces of the late 1970s and early 1980s are coded in these walls, I hazard that they are good spirits, as it were; and especially so the muse of interdisciplinarity who sang to me while I was here then, and who has remained in my ear in the decades since. Traversing disciplinary boundaries seemed to be an everyday enterprise here, and for many of us it became such a habit that after a while we did not even notice it; if there really is such a thing as a habitus, the air we breathe, that’s what it was. In any event I have ended up as a scholar who happily poaches from the territories of colleagues working in many areas and my academic conversational partners are from many places. Which is to say that my comments this afternoon draw upon several areas of scholarship—hopefully in a productive way.

So, enough about me, let’s talk about you. All of you here in this room, who have bodies and brains, and nerves, and whose limbic and endocrine systems are dripping special juices into your bloodstream and routing electrical impulses that influence how you breathe and sweat and how you move your facial muscles and bodies into postures that express anger, or surprise, or embarrassment, or other affects. You are feeling creatures. Let’s talk about that a little, and about what that has to do with history and culture.

For decades, the starting points for many scholars in talking about emotion have been Darwin’s *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals* [1872] and William James’s *Principles of Psychology* [1890] (among some of his other writings bearing on emotion). I want to set off today on the other foot, by referencing the work of the historian Richard Hofstadter. In 1964, Hofstadter, who was by that time a multi-Pulitzer winner and arguably the young dean of American historians, published a highly influential and enduring interpretation of American political culture, “The Paranoid Style in American Politics.” I say enduring not just because only a few years ago, over a half century after its publication, the columnist George Will pulled it off his bookshelf to lash out at it as a model of liberal error, but because American historians over the years consistently have found it suggestive for its characterization of American anxieties about conspiracy, and the related fear of the deep state in its various forms. But more to the point, for us today, Hofstadter’s study, later expanded, was, he said, essentially about “the feeling of persecution.” In his introduction to the subject, he was clear about his approach: “My intention here, however, is not to make comparative judgments but simply to establish the reality of the style and to illustrate its frequent historical recurrence.”1 Expanding on that, he asserted that “The recurrence of the paranoid style over a long span of time and in different places suggests that a mentality disposed to see the world in the paranoid’s way may always be present.”2 Hofstadter accordingly began with a view of the
late eighteenth century and reported recurring instances in which the paranoid style played a key role in the politics of the nation. He reached into the distant past—drawing upon Norman Cohn’s rich study of early modern religious movements, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, to illustrate the deep roots of what he called a “mentality,”—and he noted, accordingly, that the paranoid style was not limited to America. It could be found in other places, in Europe and beyond. But his task, he said, was to demonstrate its presence in American politics.

What is important about this essay, beyond the fact that it forays the history of emotions, is the approach it takes to history. The key word here is “recurrence.” Hofstadter claimed that a certain feeling—of persecution, but more broadly, “paranoia”—recurred in American political history from the late eighteenth-century to the mid-twentieth century when he was writing. Paranoia, for Hofstadter, was visible in all kinds of political and social settings, over many decades of American history. Over time, it appeared in different ways, but it did not appreciably change. Paranoia, for Hofstadter, was the feeling of paranoia. The historian’s work, as much as it can be identified in that essay, was to make an historical inventory of its occurrences. For Hofstadter, such an approach, which to some extent put on hold analysis of cause and effect in emotional life, did not violate the bylaws of the historian’s craft. An historical inventorying of emotions was a plausible history.

Things have changed since 1964. The history of emotions pioneered more recently by Peter Stearns and others places greater emphasis on change over time in emotional life, and that approach is a productive one as well—and one that I personally find useful in some of my own writing. But I want to pay more attention to the study of emotions as a making of historical inventories right now, and I think that approach, especially, can be worthwhile when we study religion.

When I think of inventory, I think, first of all of things on a supermarket shelf. That picture might have something to do with my work experience as a teenager, or, equally, my hopelessly advanced assimilation into the Borg of commerce. But for whatever reasons, that image occupies me for a split second before I get to where I think I want to go, which, if the stars are aligned, is to a more complex understanding of inventory. If all of us were to imagine an inventory of things on a shelf, we probably would agree that it is an image of stacked objects that remain exactly as they are until someone takes them off the shelf and uses them: *Things*, ready and waiting to be used by us. I think there is some of that in Hofstadter’s history of the paranoid style. The *feeling of paranoia* in his study is a constant, a feeling that can be identified in a wide range of historical and social settings. It is not quite as simple as “Here’s an occasion for paranoia—and, look, there it is, people take it off the shelf and have it.” But there is a way of thinking about paranoia, or any emotion, that relies on a conceptualization of a feeling as a *thing*. I do not mean *thing* exactly in the sense that it is used by feminist “new materialism” theorists such as Karen Barad, or Jane Bennett, whose posthumanist materiality advocates for the ontological oneness of such things as rocks, piles of trash, bars of metal, old railroad cars, electrons, and the human body, “a walking, talking mineral,” all joined as actants in a seemingly non-anthropocentric networking. Rather, I am talking about emotion as a thing in the sense of a fact of human behavior that cannot be historicized away, or otherwise explained entirely as a byproduct of social and cultural circumstances.

The current academic interest in affect has something in common with this way of thinking about emotional inventory. Some researchers see affect as cross-cultural and transhistorical, a biologically-grounded and neurologically-driven physical response to environmental stimuli. “Affect theory,” simply put, is about what the psychologist Silvan
There are many ways to study religion and emotion …

Tompkins and his disciples, not surprisingly, call “affects.” Notable followers include Paul Ekman, who developed “facial expression” training—nowadays an edge sought by police and corporate human resource officers looking for frauds and fakers. The theory asserts that there are nine affects: joy, excitement, surprise, anger, disgust, anguish, fear, shame, dissmell (an impulse to avoid). They are said to be hard-wired in all of us. Affect theory attends first of all to impulsive physical expression. Affect theorists see in the smile a sign of an affective “fact,” the affect of joy. That joy, displayed on the face, is not something that persons have to talk themselves into. It is a physically embodied emotion. It does not require the discourses of culture—however those are defined—in order to take place (although affect theorists do assert that culture matters). As religion and emotions researcher Donovan Schafer writes, affect theory seeks to discover in affect something of the “pre-discursive materiality of bodies.” Or, in the words of affect theorist Brian Massumi, it is an approach that acknowledges that “the skin is faster than the word.” The idea of discrete, facially-coded emotions has been severely criticized recently by neuroscientist Lisa Feldman Barrett for its adoption of “folk categories” of emotional states or emotional faculties, but the point remains, that feeling has a pre-discursive bodily component.

Part of the reason that affect theory has been claiming the attention of persons working in the humanities, including religion, is, I think, its compatibility with an “inventorying” of emotion such as that modeled by Hofstader and adapted in decades since by a number of other historically-inclined scholars. But affect theory additionally is a potential collaborator with phenomenological approaches that religion researchers, especially, often have found effective in building interpretations. In suggesting some connections between affect theory, historical inventory, phenomenology, and religion, then, I will start with a word, in the other direction, about emotion as a construction.

There are many ways to study religion and emotion, too many to survey in a lecture, and there are too many good themes in studies of religion and emotion—what you might expect: gender, ethnicity, age, class, sexual identity, and so forth—to directly address. But if one wanted quickly to survey the field, one place to stand from which to do so would be the ground occupied by the constructivist approach. Typically, for religion researchers, that means threading together scholarship from anthropology, sociology, history, and psychology. A constructivist approach foregrounds the social and cultural settings of emotion. A shorthand way of understanding some of the roots of that is to invoke the anthropology of Clifford Geertz. Once Geertz began to press the case for a culturally constructed self in the 1970s, scholars recognized its possibilities for the study of emotions. Michelle Rosaldo and Catherine Lutz, among others, argued that emotion, as an integral aspect of self, was constructed within local social and cultural frameworks. Lutz, for example, wrote about how emotions among Micronesian islanders differed from what Westerners had considered “natural” emotions. Her unexpected finding of multiple feelings clustered in a single emotion (identified by a single word, such as fago), the absence of certain feelings or the striking centrality of others, the complex ways in which emotions were gendered and the ways in which they served social purposes, all pointed for Lutz to the cultural construction of emotion. Lutz’s evocative book title Unnatural Emotions pointedly expressed the refusal to treat emotions as “given” in nature and it challenged the idea that an emotion was an irreducible datum—a conclusion that would test religion scholars who sometimes freely associated emotion with religion itself in a way that essentialized both. Similarly, for social psychologist James Averill and sociologist Arlie Hochschild, the social function of emotions were paramount. Hochschild, in a study of the emotional lives of flight attendants and bill collectors, coined the term “feeling rules” to identify how feelings were elicited and regulated by prompts and standards coded in culture. Such rules, as Averill argued, were “part of our ‘second nature.’”
… in ancient Greece some expressions of anger could be prized as blessed rage …

There is a kind of historical constructivism as well. Several decades ago, Carole and Peter Stearns coined the term “emotionology” to refer to the historically-constructed expectations for feeling, expressing, and concealing emotions. While anthropologists made specific cultural contexts the frame for “feeling rules,” the Stearnses proposed that a particular historical setting constructed feeling life in much the same way. So, for example, in his history of jealousy in America, Peter Stearns discussed the way in which romantic jealousies and sibling jealousies, among others, were historically defined and constructed, which means, among other things, that they changed over time. Just as we might note that in ancient Greece some expressions of anger could be prized as blessed rage bordering on divinity, and that in 21st century America road rage will get you arrested, jealousy, in American history, was conceptualized and experienced differently depending on the historical circumstances. So, for example, over the course of time as the gravity of communities faded, as their capability to hold persons in line with structural controls declined, and the notion of romantic love ascended as the context for courtship, jealousy became more profound and more frequent. In Stearns’s view, adults who were becoming less practiced in sublimating self-interest to an ideal of community and at the same time were more pointedly prompted to claim a right to courtship based on a concept of romantic love, were more liable to feel jealous—and to express their jealousy—when a prospective pairing did not work out in the way that they had hoped. In short, the historically constructed expectations and guidelines for jealousy—the emotionology for jealousy—changed, and the emotional lives of men and women changed with it.  

Constructivist approaches, with their dislike of essentialist theories of emotion—that is, the kind of theories that many in the study of religion had long favored—strongly influenced historical scholarship in the decades following this groundbreaking research. Historians of religion, who for other reasons already had begun to turn away from reliance on understandings of emotions as generalizable, transhistorical, and cross-cultural things—turning away, for example, from Friedrich Schleiermacher’s free-standing “feeling of absolute dependence”—began to write emotion into narratives about religion that stressed historical and cultural reasons why people felt the way they did and why they “practiced” emotion in ways that were context-dependent. Experimenting with the claim that feelings were learned, not given, historians studying religion tried new ways of exploring how emotions were related to institutions, doctrines, rituals, and material culture. Such projects on the whole were not undertaken to smoke out evidence for grand claims about emotions as constructed experiences, but, rather, they were efforts to integrate emotional life more substantially into religious history. Much of this work in the end has been on the regulation of emotions—their elicitation as well as their suppression—in religious settings. And much of it has been on what medievalist Barbara Rosenwein has called “emotional communities”: the emotional experiences of groups, as that might be expressed in terms such as “emotional tenor,” or “mood,” or, simply “collective emotion.” Historians of course wish to tell stories about the religious past that demonstrate how things changed—including emotion. That endeavor typically has involved a certain amount of historical reduction of emotional experiences to components that signal responses to shifting social and cultural forces; but at the same time, historians have struggled, sometimes with some success, at other times less so, to avoid trampling on subjectivities, to avoid radically constructivist, radically historicized interpretations. We can glimpse that struggle in Susan Karant-Nunn’s The Reformation of Feeling: Shaping the Religious Emotions in Early Modern Germany. Her study details the manner in which Protestant, Reformed, and Lutheran emotional “tenors” were created or reinforced in the sixteenth century. Karant-Nunn demonstrates, for example, how sermonic literature and material culture signaled to Lutheran churchgoers that late medieval “emotion-oriented piety was at an end.” That piety was recast as a concentrated emphasis on masculinized and more intellectualized demonstrations of faith that modeled composure and control, over against the presumed recklessness of female emotionality. Pulpit messages were one way in which that shift was fostered, but so was the
In that sense, emotion in religion was as emotion in any other context.

redecoration of Lutheran churches. The depictions of the agonized body in the image of the crucifixion or in the torture of martyrs, which, according to Karant-Nunn, aroused the emotions of fear and terror among late medieval Christians, became less common in Lutheran churches in favor of art depicting outward tranquility as a marker of deep and careful reflection about sin, atonement, and salvation. Karant-Nunn suggests that the calm gaze of Jesus in the Wittenberg altarpiece represented that shift. Women, as emblems of loss of emotional control, all but disappeared from holy art in Lutheran churches as those churches were readorned. Emotion, for Lutherans, did not disappear. But it was remade in ways that fitted developing Lutheran theological interests and that represented the distancing of Lutheranism from some characteristic features of Catholic piety, as well as from popular religion as that was manifest in art, stories and legends, ritual behaviors, and elsewhere. Karant-Nunn accordingly attempts to walk a line between indicating the degree to which early modern emotionality was deconstructed and reconstructed by historical events, while at the same time holding out for emotion itself as something enduring and—in my terms—thinglike.

Gender as a social context is especially inviting for histories of religion and emotion. Phyllis Mack’s study of men and women in early Methodism - *Heart Religion in the British Enlightenment: Gender and Emotion in Early Methodism*—like Karant-Nunn’s research also addresses the gendering of emotion, but her religious community is more recognizable as a community of writers who lived their daily lives sometimes together and sometimes apart. Mack’s approach consequently is oriented toward understanding writers such as Mary Fletcher and James Rogers against the background of Puritan, pietist, and Enlightenment discourses about emotion. She moves between that larger canvas of intellectual influences, and the shared agenda of the small-scale early Methodist community, in describing how Methodists together conceptualized emotion as both a potential threat requiring disciplining, and an energy that powered missionary undertakings and enhanced persons’ agency as spiritual seekers. Everyday life—which includes writing—is central to her analysis, and her examination of social relations among Methodists shows them to be crucial to Methodists’ imagining their spiritual lives. As Mack proposes: “while women and men have the same capacity for the experience and expression of feelings, their different patterns of friendship and marriage generated a different emotional and imaginative relationship to the divine.” Again, here is an effort to talk about a shared non-gendered human capacity to feel, alongside interpretation that argues for disjuncture in the feeling lives of men and women as a consequence of historical forces that shaped marriage, friendship, and some other behaviors.

My own study of religion and emotion in mid-nineteenth century America, *Business of the Heart*, published in 2001, likewise attended to gender, and to race and ethnicity as well, in arguing for the emergence of a broad cultural rethinking—in churches as well as outside of them—of the nature of emotion itself. I argued that Protestant Christians reconceptualized emotion as a commodity that could be traded to God for favors. In my view, they endeavored to imagine emotion itself as a thing, as something akin to a material gift that they could give to God. And in fact they habitually utilized the materially-inflected phrase “give my heart to God” to represent their sense of emotion and, indeed, themselves. My sense was that these historical actors’ conceptualization of emotion in religion was part of a broader way of thinking about emotion that involved a great many wheels turning together: commerce, boyculture, marriage and courtship, physical education, teacher-student relationships, the rise of the theatre, changing gender norms, and much else. Emotion in religion, moreover, was performed—and I will return to that—in ways similar to how courtship was practiced, or children trained, or gangs of boys went rat-hunting, or how any other happy, sad, fearful, or wondrous event was emotionally performed. There were the formulaic voicings of emotional expectations, the standardized physical expression of feelings, the habitual act of writing emotion in a diary, the scripted reactions of awe and wonder at the spectacle of large buildings on fire, the ritual of mourning: all performances, of the emotions felt on such occasions. There was nothing special about emotion
One study associated anger with the left prefrontal cortex, another located disgust in the right prefrontal.

in relation to religion, and it was subject to the same historical forces as any other aspect of nineteenth-century urban American culture. In that sense, emotion in religion was as emotion in any other context. But, after all was said and done, emotion remained a thing; that is, people physically felt what they all agreed was joy, or fear, or anger. In other words, after acknowledging the power of culture and history to change emotionality, we glimpse that there was still the phenomenon of emotion.

“The phenomenon of emotion.” It is a simple phrase, but brimming with theoretical aspirations. It is a topic now ascending in philosophy and shows signs of making inroads in religious studies. I might add that we who are discussing this topic in this UC Divinity School lecture today are a full four days ahead of our colleagues at the University of Liège who will convene on Monday a major conference on the topic “The Phenomenology of Emotions.” Here is how that conference frames the issue:

... to date, the nature of emotions still remains a thorny issue. Part of the problem is that the term “emotion” covers a wide range of phenomena. It is, indeed, commonly used to refer to phenomena as different as joy, sadness, fear, anger, astonishment, boredom, love, aversion, jealousy, disgust, etc. This raises the following classical questions: Does the term “emotion” refer to a natural kind? Do all emotions exhibit a common feature?

Of late my way of approaching these questions as a cultural historian has been to draw upon phenomenological theory that is indebted to Merleau-Ponty, among others, for its focus on embodiedness. I got pointed in this direction partly because I reevaluated Merleau-Ponty, but equally so because I set out to learn something about the neuroscience of emotion. It turns out that while people, like some of us in this room, were poring over Phenomenology of Perception and Husserl’s Logical Investigations, other people, like Lisa Feldman Barrett and James Russell actually were at work in labs connecting the dots about how the body was involved in feeling fear, anger, surprise, and other emotions. The study of brain circuitry and hormones, the conductivity of nerves, the glands that make little drops of neurochemicals, the cingulate cortex, the hypothalamus, and much else, advanced rapidly in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, as did genomic research. Some scientists, in course, proposed very specific understandings of emotional experience. For example, Swedish medical researcher Hugo Lövheim, who was influenced by Silvan Tompkins’s affect theory, presented a case several years ago that each of eight of the affects that Tompkins and his disciples identify could be defined by the relative levels of serotonin, dopamine, and noradrenaline in the blood. Surprise, for example, correlated with high serotonin, low dopamine, and high noradrenaline, while shame registered low on all three substances. Other researchers located emotions in specific parts of the brain. One study associated anger with the left prefrontal cortex, another located disgust in the right prefrontal. Whether it is relatively well-known research such as that on Seasonal Affective Disorder (and light therapy treatment), or highly specialized work on emotions and the homeostatic body, or Barrett’s more holistic theory of emotions, theory points in the same direction: in as much as bodies are alike, they will feel similar emotions. Emotions are a thing, a bodily thing, a physically identifiable characteristic of the sensing body as it moves through its various, multilayered environments, where physical, geographic, cultural, historical, institutional, and discursive frames influence the ways in which bodies, feelings, ideas, power, language, and much else all constitute “assemblages,” or dynamic networks of relationships. We are talking, obviously, about materiality that cannot be historicized away, and at the same time we are talking about getting past binaries such as “thinking mind—feeling body,” “nature-culture,” and, hopefully, “historicizing subject-historical object.”

Which brings us to Shakespeare and sex.

I admire more than ever Bruce Smith’s influential article, “Premodern Sexualities,” published 17 years ago. In that article, Smith argued that it is hard to name eros (even though I seemed to have just done it) and for that reason it “resists objectification.” It can be corralled in a certain way by calling it sexualitas, and in that way made
Nevertheless, smelling coal and feeling embarrassment, as subjective, embodied processes, resist objectification.

an object of scientific investigation, “but,” said Smith, “for the historical subjects who felt it, no less than for the critic who reads its textual record, *eros* remains a subjective experience.” Then, drawing on Jean-Francois Lyotard, he proposed that such objects of historical inquiry are never really objects at all, if we identify the historian as sharing a continuum of time with what they research. In short: “the past is both now and no longer as the future is both now and not yet.” If the central insight of phenomenology is that you cannot know anything apart from the way in which you come to know it, then what Smith called a “historical phenomenology” proceeds, in the case of *eros*, or, for us, any feeling, by recognizing the embodiedness of historical subjects as it examines the material traces of their lives, at the same time that it admits the embodiedness of the historian who undertakes that.

Taking Smith seriously, we nevertheless must recognize that different cultural and historical frameworks of feeling—in some sort of way, the “emotionologies” that the Stearnses wrote about—mean that feeling fear, or sadness, or distress in one context is not exactly the same as another. When we think of emotions first of all as embodied, the historical study of emotions is included within a broader history of sensing. Portia’s embarrassment in *The Merchant of Venice* is recognizable to us, but it is likely that Shakespeare felt embarrassment differently than we do, just as we smell burning coal differently than he did. The discursive contexts for smelling, and feeling, matter. Nevertheless, smelling coal and feeling embarrassment, as subjective, embodied processes, resist objectification. Historical phenomenology treats sensing and feeling as parts of a broad ecology—as components in an “assemblage,” or deep network, to reiterate two terms current in humanities vocabulary. When Shakespeare scholars Kevin Curran and James Kearney talk about how such an approach “abandons neat distinctions between persons and things,” emphasizing how “meaning accrues from the way sensing bodies experienced and perceived objects,” they are endeavoring to identify an historical approach that resists binaries and, particularly, an approach that advocates the critical, but phenomenologically sympathetic, engagement of the emotional dimensions of early modern culture.

A detailed discussion of history and phenomenology that directly addresses some of these issues is in philosopher David Carr’s recent *Experience and History*. For forty years Carr has been making a case for a view of historical method that differs from those that privilege representation and memory. In other words, he found the “linguistic turn,” with its emphasis on linguistic representation and narrative—a view expounded in this very building by Hayden White in the 1970s—to be lacking, just as he did the notion of “collective memory” that is associated with the work of Maurice Halbwachs. Both, he said, “begin with a gap between us and the past.” He instead has proposed a phenomenological approach to history that, in his words, “puts experience in their place”—that is, in place of representation and memory (2).

Part of that new approach is to take narrative as “an essential feature of human existence” rather than as an alien structure that is imposed on the past and as such distorts it. In this he agrees in some ways with Paul Ricoeur, a former Divinity School faculty member who, at that same meeting herein in the 1970s at which Hayden White spoke of representation, spoke of narrative. The upshot is this: for Carr, the human experience of narrative connects us to the experiences of the past but we are connected *as well* because experience itself is “temporally extended and cumulative.” We might understand this as another way of saying that “the past is both now and no longer as the future is both now and not yet.”

If Carr is right that there is a bridge of experience that can inform historical investigation, if historical phenomenology enables a way to grasp, especially, something of the feeling-life of the past, we must recognize that
For them, emotional life is a habit of performance, set within that understanding of body and culture.

performances of feeling nevertheless are shaped by history and culture. We smell burning coal differently than Shakespeare because the historical circumstances that frame that experience are different. The same is true for our feeling sad or embarrassed. We might be able to agree that there are certain “affects,” such as anguish, shame, or excitement—all possibly correlated with similar specific biochemical and neuroemotional events taking place in bodies—that are similar across time and cultures. Nonetheless, shifting cultural, institutional, and discursive frameworks will influence performance. If Merleau-Ponty’s notion of a “reduction” as an attempt to describe the experience from within the experiencing is a guide here, so also is his dictum that “the most important lesson which the reduction teaches us is the impossibility of a complete reduction.”

Some leads on working within this complex framework of analysis are available in scholarship in the rapidly transforming field of performance studies. In recent years, scholars such as Stuart Grant have been rebelling against what they characterize as the oppressive reign of discursive and political approaches to the understanding of performance. Instead, they advocate a phenomenological approach that “offers a relief from the over-determining theoretical violence” of such “modes of inquiry” by “getting back to the things themselves,” as Husserl would put it - and that means, in short, the body, its movement, its sounds, and so forth: not so much as in “intention toward” but as “participation with.” Such an approach attempts to define performance as physical performance of the body that occurs in concert with other things. A sensing body is something like a node in a network, an item in an assemblage, a partner in multifarious relationships.¹⁵

That scheme of linkages or assemblage is not easy to see and difficult to theorize. But as a conceptualization of the feeling body in a social world of languages and politics it might be a productive prompt to research on religion and emotion. The historians of emotions William Reddy and Monique Scheer have adapted some of this thinking specifically to understandings of emotion as practice. For them the role of the body is crucial to emotionality, but it is not, in Scheer’s words, a “static, timeless, universal foundation that produces ahistorical emotional arousal, but is itself socially situated, adaptive, trained, plastic, and thus historical.”¹⁶ For them, emotional life is a habit of performance, set within that understanding of body and culture. More daringly, Sara Ahmed, together with some other affect theorists, have placed the sensing body prominently within what they call an “affect economy,” locating power in the “circulation” of affect and suggesting that power is best understood less as a platform of systematically articulated ideas than as a tornado of feelings. As such, emotion becomes a “materialist rhetoric.”¹⁷ I like the term offered by the philosophers Luca Barlassina and Albert Newen, for talking about this kind of approach. They call it “impure somatic theory.”¹⁸

To conclude, then, with a return to historical inventories. Why would we want to make an historical inventory of a feeling or clusters of feelings and how does that help us research religion?

I do not think we should be any less rigorous or ambitious in our historicizing emotion. The more we are able to join emotions to historical frameworks, the more we are able to chart the ways in which various emotions are shaped by culture, and the better position we are in to understand the history of religion as a dynamic history of feeling as much as ideas and institutions. Emotional life changes, religion changes, institutions change. But thinking about emotion as human experience involving the body and the chemical and neural structures of the body, especially, makes possible a kind of historical phenomenology that stands a chance at getting us closer to understanding not just the ideas and institutions but the experiences of religious persons as they practiced their way through their everyday lives. Just as importantly, that kind of qualified phenomenological approach makes possible the study of religion and emotion in connection with the long record of the intertwined histories of emotion and religion. Religion has provided much of the vocabulary for thinking about emotion in Western history; when we talk about
emotion today we still draw upon deeply imbedded ideas about self and body, mind and transcendence, intention and inaction that were redolent in emotional writings by a long string of figures from Augustine to Aquinas, Margery Kempe to Spinoza. There is an exceptionally rich and deep religious literature about emotion that we would be wise to continue to mine, in spite of its differences with much of what we know today about the body and feeling. I am not proposing that we look for the keys to understanding feeling in medieval treatises; but we should look to medieval treatises to inform us about what people felt as part of the historical study of religion and emotion. And we bear in mind that over the last couple of hundred years, some of the most interesting—and sometime influential—theorizing about religion and emotion has been by writers who stressed individual, complex emotions such as the “feeling of absolute dependence” or the feeling of “mysterium tremendum.” Those feelings are very much worth exploring today, in spite of the fact that they have been fully clothed in a Christian apologetics since they were first proposed. They should be inventoried, which means: taken seriously as phenomena grounded in bodily sensation and at the same time shaped by culture. A truly attentive, serious inventorying of emotions in religion will study them alongside of the shortlist of experiences currently of interest to affect researchers. The point will be to understand the range of feeling, the variety of emotions involved in religion; to learn more about how religion as ideas, rituals, and social groupings is related to feelings; and to experiment with bridging the gap, as David Carr might say, between us and the religious lives of the historical figures and groups that we study. This does not mean that we cannot consider how emotions are historically constructed—that would be a mistake. But it does mean that we can think of emotions as something shared, even across time. The aim of a robust history of emotions in religion would not be to prove a theory of what emotion is; rather, it would draw upon a wide range of scholarship, in multiple disciplines, to provide a fuller understanding of an area of human experience crucial to appreciating the complexity of religion, its historical changes, and its relation to other aspects of culture.\(^\text{19}\)

(Endnotes)

2. Ibid., 39.
20. It will be useful to think more in Barrett’s terms about whole brain emotion rather than emotional faculties and specific parts of the brain as responsible for specific emotions. For Barrett, emotion is a "whole-brain construction," which I read as an invitation to explore the cultural dimensions of emotion.
The Divinity Student Association gift of a commissioned portrait of Benjamin E. Mays, MA’25, PhD’35, and the Divinity School’s 1949 Alumnus of the Year, has taken its place on the east wall of the Common Room. The portrait was the 150th Anniversary Student Gift.

Dr. Mays (1894-1984) was the most prominent and influential black intellectual of his time, who sought to produce Christian ministers and community leaders committed to public service, social justice, racial equality and intellectual excellence. He is best known outside Swift Hall as the mentor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Mays and King met in 1944 early in Mays’s 27-year service as President of Morehouse College and while King was still a teenager.

The portrait was painted by Chicago artist Michael Van Zeyl. Mr. Van Zeyl trained at the American Academy of Art in Chicago, Chicago’s Historic Palette & Chisel Academy and the Art Students League in New York. His work is in many public and private collections, such as the United States District Court, DePaul University School of Law, Chicago Theological Seminary and American Hotel Register. He has received awards from the Portrait Society of America, The Artists Guild, the Oil Painters of America and is the 2014 recipient of the Dorothy Driehaus Mellin Fellowship for Midwestern Artists.

The unveiling took place on April 21, 2016, at a reception held after the 2016 Alumnus of the Year Lecture, delivered by Peter Iver Kaufman (MA’73, PhD’75). Student leaders from the Divinity Students Association and Alchemy in Color (a network created to serve and support underrepresented minority students) spoke, as did Robert Michael Franklin, Jr. (PhD’85, Alumnus of the Year 2010 and also a past president of Morehouse).

Offered here are the remarks by Dr. Franklin and by students RL Watson and DSA President Caroline Anglim. A statement from the artist is also included.
Mays was a restless child of the South.

Remarks at the Unveiling of the Portrait honoring Dr. Benjamin E. Mays

Dr. Robert M. Franklin, PhD’85

It is an honor to return to my school. I’d like to thank Dean Rosengarten, the faculty, staff, alumni, donors and other leaders who are here today to witness this historic milestone.

I am delighted that my predecessor at Morehouse College is here, Dr. Walter Massey and his wife Shirley. Dr. Massey is a Chicago product as he served on the faculty in the department of physics and led the Argonne National Laboratory. I also note that we are joined by the grandson of the first African-American president of Morehouse College, Dr. John Hope, appointed in 1906.

Please acknowledge Dr. Richard Hope and his wife.

It is extraordinary to note that three Morehouse presidents were profoundly connected to Chicago. Dr. Mays, Dr. Massey and me. I would submit that there is a poetic synchronicity about this day. On this day as we celebrate Harriet Tubman who is emerging on US currency, and as we mourn the loss of Prince, it is a reminder that icons are retrieved and celebrated, and icons may swiftly pass into eternity. And, we are all lifted today by this icon.

Mays was a restless child of the South. That restlessness prompted him to leave South Carolina and Virginia to pursue his undergraduate education at Bates College in, of all places, the state of Maine. And then, that same restlessness drove Benjamin Mays here to the University of Chicago. Mays, as you know, earned two degrees at Chicago. He earned an MA in 1925, he could have stopped there. He could have escaped. But he returned, and ten years later earned his PhD.
Mays was a scholar. He interrogated and documented its genius.

Why would he have wanted to escape? For here in Chicago’s quadrangles and classrooms, as Mays often spoke of this at Morehouse, he spoke with Aristotle and Shakespeare, with Anna Julia Cooper and Susan B. Anthony, with Du Bois and Robeson. Why would anyone want to be anywhere else? And, here he engaged the young president of Chicago, Robert Maynard Hutchins, who abolished football at Chicago, something Mays considered at Morehouse but did not achieve. He studied with Dean Shailer Matthews and admired his theological liberalism. He brought all of this exposure to that little college that had such a big impact on American history.

As you’ve heard from Professor Peter Paris’s letter and from our Morehouse alumnus here at Chicago, Devon Crawford, Mays was more than an admirer or a consumer of black religion, or even a producer of black religious products, Mays was a scholar. He interrogated and documented its genius. He explored its authenticity and the elasticity of the African soul. His classic books on the church and African-American conceptions of God in literature remind us of Paul Tillich’s observation that culture is the form of religion; religion is the substance of culture. Mays brought his insights to that formulation of religion and culture. And finally Mays was a rebel. Scholar and rebel. Many of you are aware that his autobiography is titled Born to Rebel.

Mays contradicted the presumed worlds of the privileged arbiters of meaning in 1950s America. He challenged the powers of segregation and depression. And, he saw in Morehouse the potential power of a strong institution with a strong culture to produce strong leaders like Dr. Massey and James Compton here, who served as president of the Chicago Urban League and so many others who are in the room today.

Morehouse became a leadership academy for social justice. And Morehouse promoted what I characterized during my presidency as the “Five Wells of the Morehouse Mystique.” That is, every student aspired to become well-read, well-spoken, well-traveled, well-dressed and well-balanced. No wonder Martin Luther King Jr. sat at Mays’s feet and learned much. Few people realized that Morehouse students were receiving a Chicago education as Mays channeled his experience into that institutional culture.

My favorite memory of Dr. Mays had occurred during a cool spring evening on the Morehouse campus when Dr. Mays returned to assist in the Phi Beta Kappa pinning ceremony. He was already retired but returned to assist then-President Hugh Gloster. There were eight of us standing there and to each of us he whispered a word of encouragement. Afterwards I lingered just to be in his presence and walked with him into the parking lot. Nervous and with nothing more compelling to say, I

“We call attention to Benjamin Elijah Mays during the Divinity School’s 150th Anniversary Celebration in the spirit of this place that trains students to think and speak about religion in an informed, critical, and engaged manner. Benjamin Mays is not merely an exemplar of such, but like his mentors before him—many of whom are pictured in the Common Room—Mays has had a hand in building Swift Hall and molding it into the multifaceted, flourishing place that it is today. The Divinity School exists as an exceptional classroom, a research center, a roundtable, a living museum, and a symbol of democratic social change. The students, faculty, and administrators are all aware that we are just temporary residents here; we are renters, charged with the upkeep of a house of education that extends beyond our own lifetimes, and yet we offer a piece of ourselves to this place through our words, ideas, and publications. Benjamin Mays was no exception, and by commissioning his portrait, we—the students and alumni of Swift Hall—hope to honor his work inspiring non-violent democratic change in our country, rigorous discussions about race in our classrooms, and an indefatigable commitment to justice in our hearts.”

—from the Divinity Students Association appeal
Mays practiced what he preached.

observed “Dr. Mays it is certainly cool for a spring evening isn’t it?” Hey paused, looked at me and replied, “Brother Franklin, do you intend to become a meteorologist?” I was befuddled by the question. I said “no sir.” And with a half-smile he looked at me with those piercing brown eyes and said “whenever you are in the presence of someone who can give you the gift of knowledge in reply to a sharply honed question, you should never ask a mindless question about the weather.” I paused, looked at him and simply replied, “Thank you, Dr. Mays.” What an amazing teacher and a wonderful gentleman and mentor he was.

It is good and perfect this evening that he is remembered here. He is celebrated at Bates College, he is celebrated at Morehouse College and he is celebrated at Howard University. Now, he is celebrated at the school where he came alive, the University of Chicago Divinity School. We all express appreciation to the students of Alchemy in Color, the Divinity School Student Association, the Development Office led by Donald Dale Walker, and all who have collaborated to make this happen.

Many people have thought about such an honor and discussed such an honor over many years. But, you, students, have made it happen. Thank God for the millennials.

CAROLINE ANGLIM

This is from a telegram sent on May 20, 1967: “Your 27 years as President of Morehouse College will go down in history as one of the epoch-making periods in the world of education...For all of these years you have moved in a uniquely meaningful orbit imparting light and heat to distant satellites. You have carved for yourself an imperishable niche in the annals of time. Atlanta, the educational world, the Christian community and the nation will remain indebted to you as long as the cords of memory shall lengthen” – Sincerely, Coretta and Martin

The Kings sent Benjamin Elijah Mays this telegram on the occasion of his retirement from Morehouse after a 27-year highly influential presidency. He re-imagined Morehouse in the image of the University of Chicago, with its emphasis on a broad liberal arts education. He understood Morehouse to be at the center of debates about democratic social change. So it’s not surprising that he focused on leadership development, public service, and social justice.

Importantly, and I think this speaks to Prof Kaufman’s work, among others here, for Mays, it is not enough for an individual to seek an education to serve her own needs. Education is a privilege, and it requires that an individual serve others. Mays understood the roadblocks that kept young African American men from attending college in the mid-20th century, so he fostered an inspiring vision of professional potential in his students, helping them to invest time and energy into their communities, as well as their minds.

To this end, Mays practiced what he preached. He graduated from the University of Chicago Divinity School with a MA in 1925 and then a PhD in 1935, served as
The portrait moves us to look both backward and forward.

Dean of Howard University School of Religion until 1940, and then guided Morehouse College into the tumultuous 1960s. He was co-founder of the United Negro College Fund, the VP of the Federal Council of Churches, and a member of the Atlanta Board of Education.

His biographer, Randall Jelks, calls him the Schoolmaster of the Civil Rights Movement—unmatched in his eloquent demands for democracy and social justice and unrelenting in his belief that racism reduced the Christian faith to pious platitudes and delegitimized democracy in America.

I think what is most important about this portrait, is not that it is smoothing things over or balancing things out—not even as a spark of diversity among those honored by portraits in this space. The people pictured in this room—Shailer Matthews, Goodspeed, Swift are important people. They are crucial to the making of the Divinity School and the University of Chicago and we live out the fruits of their efforts every day that we walk through these halls. But the figure of Mays holds us accountable, makes us responsible, exposes us to a different kind of legacy that’s not quite so established, not so finished, not so quiet.

The portrait moves us to look both backward and forward: looking to the past, it is an artifact honoring the history of successful alums of the Divinity School. In our rush to pursue important academic interests, it becomes all too easy to forget the rich history of minds that have shaped this place and also been shaped by this place. I congratulate you, fellow students, for working together to imagine and fund this project in recognition of 150 years of incredibly talented alumni. That intellectual lineage is what brings us together today to celebrate Peter Kaufman, the presence of many successful alumni joining us in this room, and Benjamin Mays. As graduate students here we are inserting ourselves into that lineage, and it’s our
... the portrait is complete, but the project is ever in process.

ARTIST’S STATEMENT BY MICHAEL VAN ZEYL

Portraiture is about far more than capturing a likeness. In an ideal painting, the subject engages the viewer, inviting curiosity, introspection and admiration.

For my portrait of Dr. Mays, the journey began in my research about his life and profound influence on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. While I was searching for visual inspiration—a challenge to find photos suitable for a large-scale painting—I was also inspired by his character. I worked with a model and used the standing pose to convey both his physical stature and presence.

I wanted to spotlight his face and use light as a symbol of hope in the composition, so I employed a chiaroscuro effect to distribute light and shadow. The position of his right hand adds dimensionality and creates a subtle outreach, connecting his work to the progress of the present day.

points of personal development for Morehouse Men—including education, integrity, curiosity, humility, confidence, steadfastness, and pride. The clip that you will hear is number nine about developing a passion for social justice. As you hear his words, I encourage you to reflect on the role of education in the cycle of violence and poverty that plagues our still very divided nation and to think about what skills you bring to our community that might radiate outward in support of Mays’s call to justice: [Recording of Mays]*

* The recording referenced was made in 1967. Dr. Mays delivered monthly chapel addresses during his 27-year tenure as president of Morehouse College; this recording was of the last one.
When we began wondering about whether or not we had the power to even ask about, let alone begin to change,

**RL Watson**

These past few days I have had inheritance on my mind—as a burden, and as a blessing.

Dr. Mays attended the University of Chicago at a time when even sitting next to another student, another potential future colleague, to share a meal together was a struggle. In preparing to speak tonight, I found that I wanted to preach, truly. But for everything there is a time and a place. Ecclesiastes 3 is also never far from my mind.

What I’ve learned about this man over the course of these few years leading up to this symbolic step—a step toward our ideals as a community and as an institution—has made me love him. I came to know him, not through his scholarship, or through his legacy at Morehouse, or even through his activity with the Movement. I learned about him not from anything on paper, but through the stories my friends and colleagues here shared with me about what they knew or learned of his life, and about what he meant to them.

That is my favorite way to learn, through a shared inheritance; through the stories that breathe life into it and provide us with opportunities to see ourselves.

The idea for this portrait began not with Mays himself, but with the kind of clear eyes, spirit of questioning and agitation, and striving toward the Better that he embodied so well.

Elijah Zeyhoue (MDiv’14)—who sends his warm
To hang his picture up in Swift Hall is a reminder that we are all born to rebel against the systems that oppress us and dominate us.

greetings from DC—was my first partner in what is now Alchemy in Color: A Divinity Students organization devoted to the voices and community-building of traditionally marginalized peoples of color during their time here. I am so pleased to see the organization thriving under its current leadership and membership, and I am grateful to you all for making Alchemy, and this place, your home.

I would like to acknowledge those standing behind me, the current board members of Alchemy in Color: Nauff Zakaria, Hyein Park, Stephen Green, Devon Crawford. Your work in bringing the vision forward and keeping the organization healthy, responsive, and dynamic is a true joy to watch.

This portrait project grew out of a casual conversation that Elijah and I had about what was on the walls of this place and others throughout the university, and the repeated shock and reminder of seeing so many elder white male faces enshrined in the places where we worked, studied, ate, and fellowshipped with other students. Like the recent Oscars hashtag, if I’d known anything about how to use Twitter (or what exactly Twitter was), I might have suggested my own hashtag: #wallssowhite.

When we began wondering about whether or not we had the power to even ask about, let alone begin to change, the makeup of those walls, Elijah mentioned Dr. Mays, and how cool it would be to champion first a portrait of
him, should we get lucky. He told me about Mays’ work as an architect of the modern Civil Rights Movement, his work as an academic educator and agitator, encouraging generations of young people at Howard and Morehouse to rebel against segregation and repression. In a recent email rejoicing over the completion of this initiative and the DSA’s tireless efforts this year, he wrote: “To hang his picture up in Swift Hall is a reminder that we are all born to rebel against the systems that oppress us and dominate us. Mays’ life stands as a towering testament to that.”

This is not about interior decorating choices, nor is it about keeping score, as if diversity were a numbers game. This is about institutional opportunity and identification. Where we sit when we work, study, discuss, learn, eat, and socialize together matters. When we ask the questions, Can I make a home here? Am I welcome? What space has the institution for someone like me? Is this my home? Can I claim it? Am I an exception? Am I an aberration? It is then that what is on our walls matter.

When the wall is monolithic, whatever the numbers past or present, the message is.

There is a reason these walls look the way they do. This institution, which I love, like so many others in this broken nation, has its own history of exclusion, prejudice, and misidentification. We have come some ways together, as evidenced by the fact that a great man who once had to fight to be, really be here, is now being honored in this place by this community’s descendants.

But this portrait is for me a reminder of how far we have yet to come. It is in this sense that numbers do matter. Growing a truly inclusive and exceptional community of scholars does not happen overnight, and it doesn’t happen without effort and an application of our collective powers and energies toward the achievement of that vision.

The terms have changed—we now have “microaggression” and “bias” and a universalized (and universalizing) canon with which to contend. Yet I am greatly encouraged by my fellow students’ efforts and at the very diverse coalition of our extended community of scholars, students, alumni, faculty, staff, and administrators, who were all represented in those who have given their time, money, and encouragement to this project and to other initiatives at the Div School that promote unity, respect, and mutual understanding here within these walls that we all share.

Yesterday afternoon I had the chance to view the portrait you are about to see tonight, and was deeply moved by the artist’s rendition.

The edges and bottom are shrouded in deep darkness. As someone working on a dissertation which has darkness, blackness, and the light/dark dichotomy at its heart, I was immediately struck by this choice.


As your eye travels down, Dr. Mays’ gray suit fades into the pool of darkness below. His feet, which are beyond our reach, must be, standing firmly in this darkness, as he stands straight easily on this dark lake.

It makes me think of my own experience as a woman of color, for whom the support of my community beyond—family, church family, play-aunties and uncles, and the host of black souls whose witness is in my very blood—blood red as Dr. Mays’ neat, lovely bowtie in this painting—have sustained me with their prayers, their love, and their belief in me as their representative in communities far from their experience.

I hear them in my head often:

Wherever you may go,
Whatever you may face,
Whatever you may achieve,
However you may struggle,
Never forget who you are,
Never forget where you come from,
Never forget that we love you and are praying for you continually.

A testimony of love—of community, of striving, of learning, of making things better—is a word for everyone. And I am so pleased this portrait is now here for us all, diverse as we are, within and without our census-sanctioned groups, to enjoy.
Phyllis D. Airhart (MA’81, PhD’85) won the 2016 Book Prize from the CSSR/SCÉR (Canadian Society for the Study of Religion) for *A Church with the Soul of a Nation: Making and Remaking the United Church of Canada*. The annual award recognizes an outstanding monograph in the field of Religious Studies. Airhart is Professor of the History of Christianity at Emmanuel College in the University of Toronto and cross-appointed to the Department for the Study of Religion.

Robert E. Alvis (MA’92, PhD’00) serves as Academic Dean and Associate Professor of church history at Saint Meinrad Seminary and School of Theology. He recently published *White Eagle, Black Madonna: One Thousand Years of the Polish Catholic Tradition* (Fordham University Press, 2016).

Matthew Becker (MA’90, PhD’01) is Professor of Theology at Valparaiso University. He recently edited *Nineteenth-Century Lutheran Theologians* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), and has edited and co-translated the first of six volumes of writings by Edmund Schlink. This first volume, *Ecumenical and Confessional Writings* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), contains Schlink’s most important essays from his work on the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, as well as his reflections on the Second Vatican Council, where he had served as the official observer from the German Protestant Church. His book *Fundamental Theology: A Protestant Perspective*, was published by Bloomsbury/T&T Clark. The book’s “Afterword” is by Martin Marty (PhD’56).

Christopher Beem (MA’92, PhD’94), has been named managing director of the McCourtney Institute for Democracy at Penn State. Beem is author or co-editor of five books, including *The Necessity of Politics* (University of Chicago Press) and, most recently, *Democratic Humility* (Lexington Books).


Alan L. Berger (MA’70) is Raddock Family Eminent Scholar Chair of Holocaust Studies and Director, Center for the Study of Values and Violence after Auschwitz at Florida Atlantic University. He recently co-authored *Third-Generation Holocaust Representation: Trauma, History, and Memory* (Northwestern University Press, 2017).

Thomas R. Blanton IV (PhD’06) has published *A Spiritual Economy: Gift Exchange in the Letters of Paul of Tarsus* (Yale University Press, 2017). The interdisciplinary study incorporates perspectives drawn from religious studies, the anthropology and sociology of gift exchange, Classics, and Biblical studies. He is the first recipient of ASOR’s recently established William G. Dever Fellowship for Biblical Scholars, established to award a qualified American untenured faculty member in the field of biblical studies with a grant to be used to gain elementary, first-hand experience in field archaeology and research in Israel.
Rev. Bernard R. Bonnot (AMRS’76) was elected for the second year as Chair of the leadership team of the Association of US Catholic Priests. He is Pastor at Christ our Savior Church in Struthers, Ohio. His essay “It’s time to reset our pastoral strategy: Ordain married men” was published in *Crux*.

Preston M. Browning, Jr. (PhD’69) writes that his book of ten essays, *Struggling for the Soul of Our Country*, was released by Wipf & Stock. Topics range from Christian socialism to America’s forgotten wars to global warming and Christian faith. Dr. Browning is Associate Professor Emeritus of English at University of Illinois at Chicago.

Joseph F. Byrnes (PhD’76) is Professor Emeritus of Modern European History at Oklahoma State University. He has published *Priests of the French Revolution: Saints and Renegades in a New Political Era* (Pennsylvania State University Press). The book presents the ways priests and bishops who opted to work for, or cooperate with, the revolutionary government based their political behaviors on their own interpretations of priestly ministry. Joe is now setting up online procedures to facilitate contributions to a digitized repertoire of the priests of the Constitutional (revolutionary) Church, and collaborating with French colleagues on a dictionary of the bishops of the Constitutional Church; details are available at www.josephfbyrnes.com.

Jerome Copulsky (MA’97, PhD’04, Theology) has been awarded an AAR-Luce Fellowship in Religion and International Affairs. His work focuses on modern Judaism, political theology, and religion/state issues. The fellowship will fund Dr. Copulsky to work in the Office of Religion and Global Affairs as a Franklin Fellow at the US Department of State. Most recently, he has served as Director of Judaic Studies and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Goucher College.

Julian De Shazier (MDiv’10), Pastor of University Church in Chicago, has won an Emmy Award. The award is for his work on the short film *Strange Fruit*. Read more about the film and SALT, an Emmy Award winning production company dedicated to the craft of visual storytelling at http://www.saltproject.org/.

Ronald W. Duty (AMRS’85) has co-edited, with Marie A. Failinger, a book entitled *On Secular Governance: Lutheran Interpretations of Contemporary Legal Issues* (Eerdmans) to which he also contributed a chapter, “Law, Grace, Climate Change, and Water Rights in the American Southwest.” Other Divinity School graduates contributing to the book were Patrick R. Keifert (PhD’82) and Robert Benne (PhD’70).


Robert M. Fowler (PhD’78) spent the Fall Semester 2016 in Rome as a guest professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute. There he taught a course on “Mark as Story” in which
he introduced 28 students, from 13 countries, to the basics of “narrative” and “reader-
response criticism” of the Gospel of Mark.

David W. Frantz (DMin’80, MA’75) was promoted from Associate to Full Professor of
Management, by the Indiana University Board of Trustees. He has served for the past ten
years as Dean of the School of Business and Economics at Indiana University East.

Thomas F. Freeman (PhD’48) was honored for his sixty-five years of service at Mt.
Horem Baptist Church. Dr. Freeman is professor of philosophy emeritus at Texas
Southern University, where the Honors College is named after him. A legendary educator
and distinguished Professor of Forensics, Dr. Freeman spent over sixty years as head coach
of the internationally acclaimed Texas Southern University Debate team.

Douglas M. Gillette (AMRS’75) has published a new book, At the Thresholds of Elysium:
Lyrical Illuminations for Lifting Spirit into Bliss. He has published seven other titles with major
publishing houses in the general area of religion and psychology, and history of religions.

Perry T. Hamalis (PhD’04) is the Cecil Schneller Mueller Professor of Religion at
North Central College in Naperville, Illinois. He recently returned from a Fulbright
12-month teaching and research fellowship at Yonsei University in Seoul, Republic of
Korea. In addition to teaching in both Yonsei’s United Graduate School of Theology and
their recently established Global Institute of Theology, Hamalis lectured and conducted
research on the Eastern Orthodox Community in Korea and the impact of Korea hosting
the 2013 General Assembly of the World Council of Churches upon ecumenical
relationships between Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant Christians in Korea.

C. David Hein (MA’77) has recently published two new articles related to Gen. George
C. Marshall. These are “The Marshall Plan: Conservative Reform as a Weapon of War,”
published in Modern Age: A Quarterly Review 59, no. 1 (Winter 2017) and “Ronald
Reagan and George C. Marshall: A Cold War Affinity” in The St. Croix Review 49, no. 4
(August 2016). David Hein is chairman of the development committee of the board of
trustees, George C. Marshall Foundation in Lexington, Virginia.

Phil Hefner (PhD’62) published a book, co-authored with Ann Pederson and Susan
Baretto: Our Bodies Are Selves (Cascade).

John Holt (PhD’77) is William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor of Humanities in Religion and
Asian Studies at Bowdoin College. He will be Visiting Professor of South and Southeast
Asian Studies at the University of California at Berkeley in 2018. He has recently
published Theravada Traditions: Buddhist Ritual Cultures in Contemporary Southeast Asia
and Sri Lanka with University of Hawai‘i Press and Buddhist Extremists and Muslim
Minorities: Religious Conflict in Contemporary Sri Lanka with Oxford University Press.
Most recently, he has served as Director of Judaic Studies and Assistant Professor of
Philosophy and Religion at Goucher College.

Annette Bourland Huizenga (PhD’10) is Assistant Dean and Associate Professor of New
Testament at the University of Dubuque Theological Seminary. Her book in the Wisdom
Commentary Series 1-2 Timothy, Titus was published last November. She was inducted
into the Faculty Hall of Fame at the University of Dubuque and recognized with the
William L. Lomax Award; one of three “Excellence in Teaching and Advising Awards” at
the University of Dubuque.
Joel Kaminsky (MA’84, PhD’93) has been appointed Morningstar Family Professor of Jewish Studies and Professor of Religion at Smith College.

Ralph Keen (PhD’90) was named President-Elect of the American Society of Church History at the 2017 meeting in Denver. Dr. Keen is Professor of history, Schmitt Chair in Catholic Studies, and Dean of the Honors College at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Ralph Keen (PhD’90) has been appointed dean of the Honors College at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

David M. Knipe (PhD’71) has recently published *Vedic Voices: Intimate Narratives of a Living Andhra Tradition.* (Oxford University Press).

Jonathan Bradley Krogh (AB’82 College; MA’84; MDiv’87) was installed as a Teaching Elder of the First Presbyterian Church of La Grange, Illinois.

Laura Lieber (PhD’03) has been promoted to full Professor of Religious Studies at Duke University, where she is also the Smart Family Director of the Duke Center for Jewish Studies.

William Meyer (MA’88, PhD’92) is Professor of Philosophy and the Ralph W. Beeson Professor of Religion at Maryville College in Maryville, TN. He has recently published *Darwin in a New Key: Evolution and the Question of Value* (Cascade Books).

Patrick J. Nugent (MDiv’90, PhD’99) has been appointed Executive Director of the Annapolis Symphony Orchestra, a professional regional symphony of 70 musicians performing eighteen concerts per year and offering an extensive education program for elementary and middle-school students, with annual attendance of 10,000.

T. Vail Palmer, Jr. (PhD’65) has published *Face to Face: Early Quaker Encounters with the Bible* (Barclay Press). This is projected as the first book in a three-volume set. Dr. Palmer is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy and Religion and Chairman of Social and Behavioral Sciences Department at Rio Grande College (now University), Ohio and the former editor of a theological journal, *Quaker Religious Thought.*

Joann Maguire Robinson (PhD’96) was awarded the American Academy of Religion Award for Excellence in Teaching for 2016. The award for Excellence in Teaching recognizes the importance of teaching, and honors outstanding teaching in the field. Robinson is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Kenneth S. Sawyer (MA’88 Library School, PhD’92) was inaugurated as Professor of Church History at the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago.

Donna Schaper (MA’71) is Senior Minister at Judson Memorial Church in New York City. Fortress Press has released her most recent work, *I Heart Frances: Love Letters from a Reluctant Admirer.* She presented on this work at a Wednesday Lunch.

Franklin Sherman (MA’52, PhD’61) was recognized by the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago with an award for lifetime achievement in theological education and interfaith relations. Frank was formerly Professor of Christian Ethics and Dean at LSTC, subsequently becoming Founding Director of the Institute for Jewish-Christian
George W. Shields (PhD’81) has retired after thirty-one years of teaching and was appointed Emeritus Professor of Philosophy and Environmental Studies at Kentucky State. Dr. Shields was elected University Distinguished Professor in 2000 and served for fifteen years as Chairperson of Literature, Languages, and Philosophy and Interim Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. In addition to teaching a wide range of courses in Philosophy, he developed and taught courses in Environmental Ethics and Environmental Justice for Kentucky State’s interdisciplinary graduate program in Environmental Studies. He continues to teach in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Louisville. He recently received recognition as a “Faculty Favorite” from Louisville’s Delphi Center for Teaching Learning.


John G. Stackhouse, Jr. (PhD’87) published his ninth book: Partners in Christ: A Conservative Case for Egalitarianism (InterVarsity). Stackhouse is the Samuel J. Mikolaski Professor of Religious Studies at Crandall University in Moncton, New Brunswick, and serves also as Dean of Faculty Development.

Elijah Zehyoue (MDiv’14) is now Director of Communications and Programming with the New Baptist Covenant, founded in 2008 by President Jimmy Carter to work to heal the racial divide.
Jamil Khoury (AMRS’92) was selected by the Diversity Leadership Council to receive the 2017 Diversity Leadership Award for University of Chicago Alumni.

Khoury is Founding Artistic Director of Silk Road Rising, which creates live theatre and online videos that tell stories through primarily Asian American and Middle Eastern American lenses. A theatre producer, playwright, essayist, and filmmaker, Khoury’s work focus on Middle Eastern themes and questions of Diaspora. He is particularly interested in the intersections of culture, national identity, citizenship, and class. Khoury is the 2015 recipient of the Community Leader Award from the Association for Asian American Studies, the 2013 recipient of the Kathryn V. Lamkey Award from Actor’s Equity Association for promoting diversity and inclusion in theatre, the 2013 ChangeMaker Award from South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT) for his pairing of artistic and civic processes in the development of his groundbreaking Mosque Alert initiative, and the 2010 recipient of the 3Arts Artist Award for Playwriting. In 2014, Silk Road Rising, under the leadership of Khoury and his husband, Malik Gillani, was inducted into Chicago’s Gay and Lesbian Hall of Fame for “showcasing works that address themes relevant to Silk Road peoples and their Diaspora communities, including polycultural LGBT stories.”

Silk Road Rising works to advance the creation of, and expand access to, the works of Asian American and Middle Eastern American artists and to deepen understanding of Asian and Middle Eastern cultures within the broader community. Providing resources and learning opportunities that allow individuals to explore, express and embrace a more global perspective, Silk Road Rising provides mentorship and professional opportunities to diverse artists, and partners with grass roots, community-based organizations.

“I have often been asked how a Master’s degree in religious studies from The University of Chicago Divinity School applies to my work as an artistic director,” says Khoury. “I am hard pressed to think of ways it doesn’t. In my work, I navigate text, representation, subjectivity, conflict, imagination, meaning, history, spirituality, identity, debate, and those endless quests for knowledge, truth, and justice. So I’d say the Divinity School provided me with tools and armour that enable me to perform this work with greater efficacy and integrity. In fact I have often said that Swift Hall is embedded in the DNA of Silk Road Rising!”

The University of Chicago’s Diversity Leadership Council was appointed by President Robert J. Zimmer in 2007 to help ensure that the University’s relationships with its staff, surrounding neighborhoods, and business partners appropriately reflect the University’s commitment to diversity as part of its core mission. As part of its role, the Diversity Leadership Council recognizes annually a University of Chicago alumna/us who has provided leadership in advancing social justice and equity, furthering the University’s goal of achieving greater diversity across our community and society.

University President Robert J. Zimmer conferred the award, saying, “Jamil has worked tirelessly to challenge stereotypical narratives against Asian, Middle Eastern, and Muslim Americans. He has created opportunities for writers, artists, and performers of color to bring their stories and craft to the stage. As an alumnus of this university, his use of the arts to counter dominant narratives, to educate the community, and to promote inclusion and social justice for underrepresented groups exemplifies the values of the university and its commitment to diversity and inclusion.”

Also recognized were Rudy Nimocks (Diversity Leadership Staff Award) and Margaret Beale Spencer (Diversity Leadership Faculty Award).
Laurie Patton (MA’86, PhD’9) has been elected Vice President of the American Academy of Religion (AAR). The AAR, a learned society and professional association of teachers and research scholars, has about 9,000 members who teach in some 900 colleges, universities, seminaries, and schools in North America and abroad. President of Middlebury College, Dr. Patton is an accomplished scholar and the author or editor of nine books on South Asian history, culture, and religion. In addition, she has translated the classical Sanskrit text, the Bhagavad Gita, and has published two books of poetry. She has lectured widely on interfaith issues and religion and public life, and consulted with White House offices on faith-based initiatives and civic engagement. Dr. Patton is completing two further monographs—one on scholars in the public sphere and another on women, Sanskrit, and religious identity in postcolonial India. Prof. Patton was the Divinity School’s Alumna of the Year for 2015.

Losses

Huston Smith, (PhD’45), a renowned scholar of religion, died on Friday, January 20th, 2016, at his home in Berkeley, California. He was 97. Born in China to Methodist missionaries, his book The World’s Religions (originally titled The Religions of Man, 1958) sold over two million copies and remains a popular introduction to comparative religions. A prolific author with wide interests, his books included Cleansing the Doors of Perception (2000), books on Islam, Buddhism, and Christianity, and a memoir, Tales of Wonder (2009). A five-part special devoted to his life and work was broadcast on PBS in 1996. He is survived by his wife Kendra, two daughters, Gael Rosewood and Kimberly Smith, three grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

Dr. Robert Wells Carton (Bob) (AMRS’90), 95, died on August 15, 2016, in Evanston, Illinois. Bob graduated from Northwestern University Medical College in 1946 through the Army Student Training Program and served in San Antonio Texas and Little Rock Arkansas. While in San Antonio, Bob met and married Jean Aubrey Keating. Discharged in 1948, he completed a residency in internal medicine at the Cook County Hospital; after finishing, he established an internal medicine practice, organized a laboratory for the study of pulmonary function at the Chicago State Tuberculosis Sanatorium, and served as Professor of Medicine at the University of Illinois Medical School. In 1971, he joined the team to restart Rush Medical College as Professor of Medicine and Associate Dean for Medical Sciences and Services. Bob served sequentially as Associate Dean, Chief of the Section of Pulmonary Medicine, Director of Respiratory Therapy and from 1982-1984 as Acting Chairman of the Department of Internal Medicine at Rush Presbyterian St. Lukes Hospital. On his 65th birthday in 1985, he resigned from Rush and enrolled in the Divinity School at The University of Chicago. After graduating with a Master of Arts in Religious Studies with a focus on Medical Ethics, Bob taught, consulted and wrote on medical ethics as a member of the Department of Religion, Health and Human Values at Rush Medical College from 1990-1994. During his career, Bob served on a variety of boards, including the Chicago Lung Association, and was active in the management of several local foundations. Married to Jean Keating Carton until her death in 2014, Bob is survived by four children, Barbara W. Carton; Margaret C. Stanley (Harlan); James A. Carton (Allison Mankin); and Aubrey C. Lande (Arthur), eight grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.
William Creighton Peden, III (MA’60, DB’62) has died (August 25, 2016). Peden, who received the PhD from St. Andrews University, Scotland, was the Fuller E. Callaway Professor of Philosophy at Augusta University, where he remained in residence until 1990. At Augusta, he designed and directed the Cullum Third World Culture Program, which was selected in 1979 as one of the ten most innovative programs by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. He was the founding executive director of the Georgia Consortium for International Education (1970-1973), served on state and national panels for the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Arts, and received numerous research and travel grants. He also served as president of the Highlands Institute for American Religious and Philosophical Thought (now IARPT) for twenty-one years, retiring from that position in 2008. Professor Peden was the author of numerous books, including The Chicago School: Voices of Liberal Religious Thought (1987); Civil War Pulpit to World’s Parliament of Religion: The Thought of William James Potter (1996), and Evolutionary Theist: An Intellectual Biography of Minot Judson Savage (2009), and many articles and chapters for other books. With Charles Hartshorne he wrote Whitehead’s View of Reality (1981). He co-edited several other books, including The Chicago School of Theology: Pioneers in Religious Inquiry (1996).

David H. Hesla (AM’56, Humanities; PhD’65) died at his home in Georgia on July 13. He was 86 years old. Dr. Hesla taught in the Institute of Liberal Arts at Emory University for 35 years, from 1965 until his full retirement in 2000. A scholar of the work of Samuel Beckett, Hesla’s most notable book The Shape of Chaos, sought to understand the Nobel laureate’s writings in terms of the history of ideas, discussing philosophic sources and analogues from the Pre-Socratics through the twentieth century. His lasting legacy will be the many students and colleagues whom he challenged and changed with intellectual rigor; unflaggingly high expectations and occasional unexpected tenderness.

Anne E. Patrick (MA’76, PhD’82) died peacefully on Thursday, July 21, 2016. A cherished member of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary since 1958, Anne is survived by the members of her religious congregation and her devoted sisters and brothers-in-law, Helen Patrick Varner (Jerry), Maureen F. Patrick (Robert Selig), Eugene L. Miles, III (Mary Petr), Susan Patrick Inzeo (Nick), and Mary Patrick Garate (John); as well as by her cherished nieces and nephews and her twenty-nine devoted great-nieces and nephews. Anne donated her body to Georgetown University Hospital.

Sarah Sadowski (MA’94) has died at the age of forty-four. A passionate educator and mentor to countless students, Sarah taught religion, ethics and philosophy at many high schools including Notre Dame Academy in Worcester. She also taught at Quinsigamond Community College and Fitchburg State. She was an academic advisor at Fitchburg State in the Expanding Horizons Program. There she was able to coach and mentor many students. Sarah is survived by her partner Tim Gannon and daughters Evangeline Welch and Verena Welch.

G. Wayne Glick (MA’49, PhD’57) died October 27, 2015 in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, at the age of 94. After receiving his doctorate at Chicago, he became a professor of religion and philosophy at Juniata College and then at Franklin and Marshall College where in the early 1960s he became dean of faculty and acting president. While in Lancaster, he was active in the Civil Rights Movement, participating in the Selma to Montgomery march with the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. From 1966-1974, Glick was president of Keuka College in New York State, leaving there to become director of the Moton Center for Independent Studies. In 1978, Glick became president of Bangor Theological Seminary in Maine. He was the author of The Reality of Christianity: A Study of Adolph Harnack as Historian and Theologian, a book of religious poetry, Songs for My God, and Barbara, a book of poetry for his wife, Barbara Roller Zigler, who passed away in 2005. Their marriage lasted for 63 years, and they had three children, Martha Sue, John Theodore, and Mary Margaret.

George Paul Guthrie (BA’50 [College], DB’54, PhD’62) died at his home in Estes Park, Colorado on August 31, 2015. Dr. Guthrie was a scholar of religion and philosophy; he taught at Pacific University before completing his PhD and in the Religion and Philosophy Department at the University of Toledo afterwards. His favorite courses were those on Modern (20th Century) Continental Thought—but he also taught the earlier philosophers going back to Plato and Aristotle. An ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church, his ministry was in teaching rather than the pastoral. He is survived by his wife Margaret, son Steven and Steven’s wife Jan Pycha Guthrie and son Mark Guthrie.
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