“The Professor as Scholar: Exiled to Eden”

Scot McKnight, Ph.D.

Address for All-Faculty Colloquium

I have a friend at a major research university who teaches on Thursday afternoons, 3-5, and when he learned my hours of teaching he asked with a snarl, “How do you get anything done?” I have another friend, a high school driver’s education teacher who never reads a book but who teaches from 7:20am to 3:30pm with a one hour break and who also coaches after school, who asks me regularly, “Is it because you can’t stand the pressure that you don’t do anything?” I have another friend, a manual laborer, whose comments to me are of this order: “How can you go through life not doing anything?” For the first, we liberal arts professors are “exiles from Eden” (the research university), for the second, we are “exiles from society” (the real world), and for the third, we are “exiled from work” (the world of manual labor) because we couldn’t handle the labor. For each we are Exiles but I want to contend with you today that it is we, those who teach in a liberal arts college, who are actually in Eden because here we enjoy both a vocation of unsurpassable joy, a constant interaction with young minds who (usually) want to learn and change, and a freedom of schedule that permits us to pursue our passions and loves.

I have been asked to address the issue of the “Professor as Scholar” and I will look at scholarship through the lens of what a “scholar” is and what “scholarship” is in the context of being a “Professor”. But I want to say up front that I do not think we are all alike, I am not going to argue that scholarly publishing is the most important thing we do or that every professor needs to be a scholarly writer on a constant basis, and I am not relegating teaching to a subsidiary task on our campus. I have been asked to address you on the matter of Professors as Scholar and, taking that one angle on what we do, quite naturally leads to discussions about publications. I shall do this but I want the right perspective to be acquired before I go on. Not only do I define scholar and scholarship broadly enough to include what we do in the classroom, but I also value the importance of expounding our ideas in print. That’s what I want to contend with you today about.

1.0 The Professor as “Scholar”

I begin with the larger context, that we enact our gifts in the context of providing, or attempting to provide, *a "liberal education"* which, whether we draw from the excellencies of John Henry Newman, Robert Maynard Hutchins, A. Bartlett Giamatti, or Jaroslav Pelikan, comes to something like the following roundabout conclusion: "That alone is liberal knowledge, which stands on its own pretensions, which is independent of sequel, expects no complement, refuses to be informed by any end, or absorbed into any art, in order duly to present itself to our contemplation".[1] Discussion of the essence of a liberal education revolves around the fundamental insight that *it is about knowledge for its own sake* and cannot be sacrificed on the altar of utility or profession or career.[2] This is why Yale's president, Bart Giamatti, contends that "we believe in an education that is a process of exploration and fulfillment, a love of learning for its own sake, not a process of technical training for pursuing a career".[3] Allan Bloom, who is not given to bashful comments about education, said: "True liberal education requires that the student's whole life be radically changed by it, that what he learns may affect his action, his tastes, his choices, that no previous attachment be immune to examination and hence re-evaluation. Liberal education puts everything at risk and *requires students who are able to risk everything*."[4]

I confess here that I am overstating the case somewhat and I want to go on record saying that I do believe professions and careers do have their place within the scope of a liberal education. I am more concerned with the student's perception that one is college fundamentally to prepare for a job, or to find something that will enable great acquisitions of money, and, just as much, with programs that develop in such a manner that pursuit of classical disciplines can be avoided or exploited for a given professional career (e.g., History for Business Majors). However, it is not just professionalization that strikes at the heart of a liberal education for we also encounter pragmatism and pluralism calling into

---

[1] John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated* (I.v.4).
[2] See the proposal of Merold Westphal, who presents a case for "holistic education" by appealing to Aristotle's three virtues of contemplation, moral know-how, and technical know-how; see "Academic Excellence: Cliché or Humanizing Vision?," in *Should Got Get Tenure? Essays on Religion and Higher Education* (ed. D.W. Gill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 27-40.
[3] A. Bartlett Giamatti, *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1990), 180.
[4] A. Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987) , 370.

question what has, until now, formed the very core of a liberal arts college. There is not time here for me to address these issues.

In this context of setting out a liberal education we direct our energies toward a rag-tag group of *students* who, as a result of the mass education movement begun under Harry Truman,[5] matriculate full of hope for independence and a future career, not always realizing that the former is sometimes in conflict with the latter! We also direct our vocation toward the *academy* and its present realization in our particular institution, and, in light of our mission statement, toward the *Christian Church,* catholic and otherwise.

In this context, it is my hope that we lead students to think of large questions, questions like "Who am I?", "Who is God?" and "Can we know God?", "What gives life meaning?", and "Who are We?" and lead them out of the endless self-serving maze of thinking only of what jobs match up to the most money and toward something that approaches meaning in life. That meaninglessness lies at the bottom of many issues on campus has recently been explored by William Willimon and Thomas Naylor.[6] In his stimulating book about the role religion is to play in higher education, Mark Schwehn, who left the Edenic University of Chicago to guide the Honors College at the Exiled location of (his own terms!) Valparaiso University, says that the "'problem' is not to explain, much less to justify, the relationship between religion and higher learning: it is to account for how we could ever have lost sight of it."[7] Without spending time to criticize the sardonic aggression of scholars like David Wells we can note here the important critique and challenge of Mark Noll's *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*[8] who leads a charge up the hill in challenging Christian colleges to put forth in the academic forum their important Christian ideas and alternatives.[9]

---

[5] See E.L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass [Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching], 1990) 11.
[6] See W.H. Willimon, T.H. Naylor, *The Abandoned Generation: Rethinking Higher Education* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
[7] M. Schwehn, *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America* (New York: Oxford, 1993), 46.
[8] See D.F. Wells, *No Place for Truth, Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,1993); and his *God in the Wasteland: The Reality of Truth in a World of Fading Dreams* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994); M. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).
[9] See also the insightful essay of Bruce R. Reichenbach, "On Being a Professor: The Case of Socrates," in *Should God Get Tenure? Essays on Religion and Higher Education* (ed. D.W. Gill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 8-26.

Our *vocation* of executing a "liberal education" places each of us, whether willingly or not, into a three-fold role: we are scholars-researchers, we are teachers, and we are mentors. Just how you and I perceive ourselves can be probed by asking each of us to recall what we tell perfect strangers in public places, like bus stops, grocery stores, and parks, what it is that we do when they ask the all-too-common Western question: "What do you do for a living?" Our answers reveal our inmost perceptions of our vocations. Socrates, as you might remember, saw himself as a "midwife" who led others to see their ignorance by becoming their adversary (*Theaetetus* 150d). Our answers, regardless of the term we use, fits into one of these three categories I have used: scholars-researchers, teachers, and mentors.

A word about each is in order to set our stage. First, the dominating model for the *"researcher-scholar"* in American universities and colleges derives, as Mark Schwehn has so ably explicated, from the German model defended, with characteristic Tuetonic vituperations, by Max Weber in his essay "Science [read: *Wissenschaft* , which is larger than the discipline of the sciences] as Vocation."[10] Here the professor is a scientist, called to the platform to give facts and their interrelatedness, but not to express any personal views or to impose any values on the scientific pursuit of such facts.

While this is the *only legitimate exercise of the professor* for Weber, and while this model seemingly can be encountered in the occasional impassionate "geek" or "egghead" and has been bombastically vilified by Charles J. Sykes in his highly-acclaimed *ProfScam* even though its procedure of piling on top of one another nothing but egregious examples leads one to see here a "JournalismScam",[11] most of us would agree that the second dimension of our vocation, that of *teaching* , is foundational to who we are and what we do. While Parker Palmer might be the most well-known advocate of teaching as a discipline within a context of community and interpersonal development, it is Mark Schwehn who has perhaps most perceptively set out the distinctives of what teaching is all about: "First, teaching, not *Wissenschaft*, becomes the activity in terms of which all others – publication, collegiality, research, consultation, advising – are to be understood,

[10] "Science as Vocation," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (ed. H.H. Gerth, C. Wright Mills; New York: Oxford, 1958), 129-156.

interpreted, and appraised. Second, the cultivation of those spiritual virtues that make genuine teaching and learning possible becomes a vitally important aspect of pedagogy. Finally, both charity and *philia*, the loves that Weber banished from the academy, become once again central to its self-conception and to its overall mission in the world."[12]

Because teaching is so central to our self-identity and because American liberal arts colleges derive from the early American and British model of colleges where personal development of social graces took place, the role of *mentor* immediately shapes our vocation at NPU.[13] John Henry Newman saw this long ago: "An academical system without the personal influence of teachers upon pupil is an arctic winter; it will create an ice-bound, petrified, cast-iron University and nothing else."[14] Each of has the experience of having students in our office telling us personal stories about their lives and asking us for life-shaping; sometimes we have been able to give them the word they need and at other times our experience and theirs are so much at odds that all we can do is listen, 'nod' and wish them on their way. Treating them as persons made in God's good image, recognizing our common humanity, guiding them in their "career", and loving them is at the heart of mentoring them. This also we do.

Back to the research dimension. NPU is not a research university and we are not disciples of Max Weber; therefore, our task of scholarship is to be set within the context of our vocation as scholars, teachers, and mentors. In fact, as Ernest Boyer has observed: "… the most important obligation now confronting the nation's colleges and universities is to break out of the tired old teaching versus research debate and define, in more creative ways, what it means to be a scholar. It 's time to recognize the full range of faculty talent and the great diversity of functions higher education must perform."[15]

In speaking of "scholarship", we might be tempted to fall back in an easy chair and excuse ourselves because we are *teachers* and because we do not teach at a research

---

[11] C.J. Sykes, *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).
[12] M. Schwehn, *Exiles from Eden* , 58-59. For Parker Palmer, see his *To Know as We are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey* (SanFrancisco: Harper, 1993); *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).
[13] A book emphasizing the importance of mentoring in the development of Christian character in students can be seen in S. Garber, *The Fabric of Faithfulness* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1994). ???
[14] J.H. Newman, *University Sketches* (New York: Walter Scott, 1902), 73 (*apud* Schwehn, 65).
[15] *Scholarship Reconsidered* , xii.

university but such relaxation won't do – we are scholars whether we want to be or not in being teachers and mentors. And such a term, decorating what we are called to do, have a *fundamental set of values*. Besides the obvious value that research and scholarship has for the *individual scholar and that person's very identity* [16] and for the rather crass capacity it gives each of us for "moving elsewhere", what we study has value for our *discipline* as we either advance knowledge or foster a new generation of scholars, or both!, but most especially it brings into the *classroom* a new excitement and level of stimulation that cannot be achieved in any other way – unless one is simply a stand-up comedian. What I am saying then is that scholarship has fundamental value for our *students* as we teach them and model before them some new wave of scholarship.[17] Bart Giamatti says it better than I do, and he was the President of Yale: "Research, in whatever field, alone or in groups, done late at night or snatched at dawn, in laboratory, library, or at home, pursued for a few hours a day or throughout weekends, during vacations or on leave, *is the essential source from which teaching is drawn.*"[18] Or, in the words of another Yale professor, "the most exciting form of teaching, also of undergraduate teaching, is the communication not of some other scholar's 'existing knowledge' but one's own 'discovery' in the very process of its being carried on (and revised)."[19] Standing before our students to present our knowledge is what the term "professor" originally meant (*OED*, *s.v.* "Professor").

Besides the value scholarship has for our students, we should also mention its direct value for *society*, in preparing students for a life of civic duty, a preparation that dominated the early decades of education in the United States.[20] Any study of the history of education reveals the pushy and demanding role civic duty has been played in higher education. Serious academic debates, of course, have arisen over which direction the influence should move but a healthy dialectic is the only sane resolution and obtains in nearly every American school of learning.

---

[16] I suspect that most of us study because of the joy it brings us.
[17] See Theodore M. Benditt, "The Research Demands of Teaching in Modern Higher Education," in *Morality, Responsibility, and the University: Studies in Academic Ethics* (ed. S.M. Cahn; Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 93-108.
[18] *A Free and Ordered Space* , 149.
[19] J. Pelikan, *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination* (New Haven: Yale, 1992), 123.
[20] See esp. A. Bartlett Giamatti, *A Free and Ordered Space*, 58-72; E.L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered* .

A scholar, then, is a person who constantly gives expression to his or her own thoughts in an academic setting, whether that expression be a constant flow of publications, an occasional review, or an exercised and evolving life of teaching students. This definition, incidentally, finds support in the Carnegie Foundation's attempt to show that scholarship is more than scholarly journal articles written under the pressure of evaluation, tenure, and peer review, but is instead expressed in at least four dimensions (1) discovery, (2) integration, (3) application, or (4) teaching.[21] Each of these "dimensions" of our scholarship, and with no necessary ranking in importance, asks a different, and complementary, question: (1) Discovery: what is not yet known that I can investigate?, (2) Integration: what does some new knowledge *mean*?, (3) Application: what are the applications and implications of some new knowledge?, and (4) Teaching: how may I teach this new knowledge? Scholarship of discovery and integration finds its way in publications, and publications can be either highly technical or popular, while application frequently merges itself with society, say the business world, while teaching has its own outlet. A recent study, so recent that its publication date is 2000, on education by Ardra Cole and J. Gary Knowles argues, in fact, that teaching *is research* and is research fundamentally in an autobiographical sense.[22]

One foundation for this important way of seeing scholarship is the reality of how much is actually published by professors at liberal arts colleges. The Carnegie Foundation's study reveals the following facts: (1) 32% of professors in liberal arts colleges have never published an article; (2) 42% have published between one and five; (3) 67% of liberal arts professors have never published or edited, even in collaboration, a book or monograph; (4) only 30% have published or edited one to five books. The implication of these facts are clear: liberal arts colleges do not generate lots of publications on the part of their professors though publications are the surest form of prestige for many. While I do not want to suggest that liberal arts colleges should become research institutions, I do believe that changes are in the wind regarding publications as

[21] See E.L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered* .
[22] See *Researching Teaching: Exploring Teacher Development through Reflexive Inquiry* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000). I am grateful to Barb Phillips for kindly loaning this book to me.

administrations are increasingly on the prowl for younger scholars who can fill a traditional role of both teaching and writing.

Following hard on the heels of this important categorization of our task is a creative and more realistic approach to "faculty appointments" that are shaped by differing emphases: (1) traditional appointments which focus on both research and teaching, (2) teaching appointments, (3) research appointments, (4) service appointments, and (5) administrative appointments – and each of these "tracks" of faculty appointments have a differing set of criteria for evaluation and promotion. What I am saying here is that the research model of Max Weber both overwhelms the other models, leaving many guilty and defeated in its wake, and is totally out of sync with what is actually going on in a liberal arts colleges. We are first of all teachers and not researchers.

But, having said this, I do not want to give the impression that all is the same: scholarship is required for each to take place appropriately in a context of academic education. Maybe not all will be constantly publishing, but all are to be involved in the kind of scholarship that compels them to find a way of expressing new learning and developments with joy and excitement.

Before I proceed to outline what I think scholarship is, I need to turn the light on what I see to be a problem at NPU: that its nature as a teaching college has led to a certain coziness about independent scholarship that leads to publications of various sorts. We have developed a rather wondrous satisfaction in the security that comes from a Christian liberal arts college, in the elimination of a "publish or perish" mentality, and most especially in the banner cry of "academic freedom". But, if we want academic freedom we should also require a certain measure of academic integrity that comes from having our ideas, our thinking, and our conjectures, held under the scrutiny of peer review – and I don't mean just publishing articles but I do mean genuine scholarship in each of its dimensions. And that comes only from faculty dialogue, public papers and publications. Put differently, the ethos at NPU seems to want Weber's detachment and freedom with Parker Palmer's security and emotional bonding to one another – all in the context of a Christian college crying out for self-definition and a lack of objective accountability. One of the strongest expressions of this sentiment I have seen is that of Theodore Benditt, Dean of the School of Arts and Humanities at the University of Alabama-Birmingham:

"There is something most unseemly about professors who will parade before their students their wisdom and the (as it may seem to them and their students) overpowering persuasiveness of their ideas and arguments, but will not present these ideas for their peers' consideration, let alone defend the ideas before them. The classroom is a safe place and the professor has a lot of power there."[23]

Now I might be criticized on the basis of NPU's firm stand as a "teaching institution" rather than a "research" one. I stand corrected but I shall shift over to how this same problem emerges within that field of operation: if we are a "teaching" college then how do we really measure our "scholarship in teaching"? I hear lots of carping about "Student Evaluations" and perhaps rightly so because students cannot be judges of our scholarship. Quote a foreign item and they will be impressed with your scholarship – even if quote it incorrectly. But let me suggest then that our biggest failure in evaluation comes from the neglect of how much we have energized our teaching on the basis of our scholarship. Is there anyone seriously measuring our professional development and how it makes an impact on our teaching? You and I know full well that the students only rarely know if we have read the latest or incorporated the most recent scholarship into our classes. I want you to know that I respect, profoundly and with admiration, the richness of NPU's tradition of emphasizing teaching and the mentoring role professors around here have played but NPU is not yet Eden. It is all too easy to say that Professor X has added inches to her CV and, therefore, has been developing professionally, while Professor Y, by golly, hasn't added anything to his CV and must be horsing around. Inches in a CV are not the only objective form of measurement.

2.0 "Scholarship"

If this is what a "scholar" is, let me define "scholarship" as *the independent examination of primary evidence in order to advance knowledge in a specialized field or to integrate new knowledge with old knowledge and to communicate what we have*

[23] Theordore M. Benditt, "The Research Demands of Teaching in Modern Higher Education," 105-106.

learned through our examination. In the words of Robert Maynard Hutchins, scholarship is participation in the "Great Conversation".[24]

If we look more narrowly at this definition, we would observe that "research" is the *pursuit of truth* in the sense of John Henry Newman's "first principles",[25] or Max Weber's infinite progress in "making knowledge",[26] or Arthur Holmes' argument that "all truth is God's truth",[27] or what C.S. Lewis called the *Tao* ,[28] or what Robert Scholes calls the "embarrassing T-word" (truth),[29] or even Neil Postman's terms "god" and "narrative" as comprehensive enough to sustain life and meaning.[30] In other words, "truth" here embraces both development in "facts" (discovering "quarks" or that Mark Twain invested his money as a mad fool) as well as in asking questions about the meaning of life (why do we need one another?).

Further, "scholarship" and the "pursuit of truth", as I have them in mind, are each *set within the parameters of a discipline*, say "anthropology" or "history" or "physics" or "education", and is exercised within the rigor of the methodology of that discipline. But that methodology can turn on itself has been well-documented and recent studies show a return to asking fundamental questions, e.g., as is the case with Robert Scholes about the discipline of English where he warns of "hypocriticism".[31]

To fill in the lines of this last point about our discipline's methodology, I would also say that "pursuit of truth" and "scholarship" are done within the *context of a community.* As Mark Schwehn has stated, and the burden of his book is about community, "Instead of Weberian *mastery* of the world through calculation and control, *academics ought primarily to seek understanding of the world through communal inquiry.*"[32] What is obvious to each of us in the context of our disciplines, "community" includes the tradition that each of us brings to the table of inquiry, including our childhood, public education

---

[24] R.M. Hutchins, *The Great Conversation: The Substance of a Liberal Education* (GB 1; Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952). For a personal memoir of that time, see W.H. McNeill, *Hutchins' University: A Memoir of the University of Chicago, 1929-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991).
[25] For a sketch, see J. Pelikan, *Idea* , 22-31.
[26] M. Weber, "Science as a Vocation," 138.
[27] A.F. Holmes, *All Truth is God's Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).
[28] *The Abolition of Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1947).
[29] *The Rise and Fall of English: Reconstructing English as a Discipline* (New Haven: Yale, 1998), 53.
[30] N. Postman, *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School* (New York: Vintage, 1996).
[31] *Rise and Fall* , 81-84.
[32] *Exiles from Eden* , 58.

and higher education, as well as the "school of thought" in which we were trained. In fact, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann have amply demonstrated that what each of us considers "knowledge" or "truth" is shaped and determined by that "community" in which we have been socialized, at both the primary and secondary levels.[33] It is therefore pretentious to think we study "on our own" and "really alone". Mark Schwehn draws a brilliant conclusion here: "Once the epistemological center of gravity has shifted to a place outside the self, questions about communal ideals and questions about knowledge and truth are, though not identical, ineluctably convergent."[34]

The primary "community" in which we ply our trade is what Newman called the "mansion-house of the goodly family of the sciences". Not only does living in this house ward off the entrance of arrogance and disciplinary superiority, but interaction between family members *enriches each family and helps to define knowledge and development* in new and exciting ways. My own field has been immeasurably enriched, especially in the last two decades, by its inter-disciplinary approaches. More particularly, in biblical studies we find scholarship that combines literary studies, sociological studies, anthropological studies, and philosophical studies with old-fashioned textual analysis – and the results are dramatically enlightening. I don't know if Mary Douglas is being exploited in English but I do know she has become a major player for some biblical studies – and maybe against her will!

Once we recognize that our attempt to shape a "meaningful narrative" is set in the context of our disciplinary and academic communities, the reason for *civility* becomes obvious: we are in this discussion together. Further, it is incumbent on Christians to reveal their own religious convictions by conducting themselves appropriately but its own history of frequent incivilities provides, as Richard Mouw has argued, a challenge for a renewed commitment to a necessary virtue in our vocation.[35] Civility, however, does not necessarily require "pure relativism"; instead, true civility is a spirited conversation between differing disciplines where genuine conviction is expressed, even "professed",

---

[33] P. Berger, T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Doubleday, 1966).
[34] *Exiles from Eden* , 37-38.

and the implications of a given position is clearly spelled out, but is done in a spirit of dialogue and exchange.[36] As Bruce Reichenbach has said it: "Profession and tentativeness are not incompatible in the classroom, except for the dogmatist."[37] Put differently, if teaching is in part *pithanos*, "persuasion", it is also open to *elenchus*, "refutation". Tentativeness and toleration, which implies and requires clearly stated differences, is the mark of mature thinking, especially when toleration and civility do not force agreement and standardization.[38]

One secure mark of civility is the refusal to "label" others within our community. Labels, if you study their peculiar history, "reify" and before long we identify the person with the label and forget that life cannot be reduced to label-defining. There are very few contemporary politicians who have learned the art of civil discourse and therefore most have instead resorted to the evocative and provocative technique of labeling. I see labeling as fatigue, as growing weary in seeking to understand the complexity of human nature and our fellow scholars but it is clear to me that civility shuns labeling.

I shall have something to say about how I think this "great conversation" should go on at NPU but before I do that I want to say a word about *academic freedom and professional integrity* because each is a corollary to what "research" is all about. In spite of the fact that I attended a college that was more fundamentalist than anything else, I was taught by an unsuspecting Bible teacher to "think for myself" and "believe only what I found in the ancient world and texts". I have lived with those guideposts my entire academic life and this simply is a way of confessing that I believe completely in *academic freedom*. After all, that is what a "liberal education" is all about. Jaroslav Pelikan expresses this absolutely correctly: "the two fundamental intellectual virtues in the 'law of studies' are free inquiry and intellectual honesty".[39] However, at NPU I am not convinced

---

[35] See R.J. Mouw, "Evangelical Civility and the Academic Calling," in *Should Got Get Tenure? Essays on Religion and Higher Education* (ed. D.W. Gill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 116-128. He suggests (1) respect for the academic, (2) an 'invitational' spirit, (3) a love of reality, and (4) a healthy pluralism.
[36] See B.R. Reichenbach, "On Being a Professor," 19-20, and pp. 22-25 for suggestions how this works out in classrooms.
[37] "On Being a Professor," 20.
[38] See Paul A. Marshall, "Religious Toleration and Human Rights," in *Should Got Get Tenure? Essays on Religion and Higher Education* (ed. D.W. Gill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74-85.
[39] J. Pelikan, *Idea*, 48.

that we are doing all we can when it comes to articulating in the public forum a genuine Christian perception of our disciplines. I quote here George Marsden: "Liberal arts colleges with both strong religious identities and some openness to the larger academic community are in the best position to encourage serious Christian academic discourse."[40] And I should add, on the basis of experience at a different school and conversations with numerous friends who teach at "Christian liberal arts" colleges, NPU is a *city on a hill* when it comes to the role it can play in contributing a unique Christian voice to the "Great Conversation". There is, so far as I know, no Christian liberal arts college in the USA that has suffered so little from Fundamentalist debates and which therefore has a measure of freedom in its pursuit and explication of truth.

Having addressed the two issues of what a scholar is and what scholarship is in our context, let me now turn to the brass tack issues of what it takes and what it is like to do scholarly work. I seem to have been fortunate enough to get an early start in the whole business of scholarship leading to publication and will be speaking now more from experience and about the pragmatics of it all. Further, I have been asked to address the issues pertaining to scholarship that leads to publication rather than scholarship that leads to teaching and mentoring.

3.0 The Disposition of Scholarship

I want to deal here with four "required virtues" and then pause to consider some institutional suggestions.

The first, and perhaps most important, virtue in research is *courage*. One might wonder how anyone could suggest "courage" in what is really a fairly genteel and hospitable lot that is the community of scholars. But let me suggest that courage plays a bigger role than we might think. First, we need courage *to know and to come to decisions about difficult issues*. I taught for eleven years at a graduate institution where I heard, on a regular basis, the following observation by students: "If the professors here can't agree on the issue, who am I to adjudicate?" And then this statement followed: "With so many options, and so much evidence to analyze, how can I possibly make a decision? After all,

[40] G.M. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford, 1997), 104.

I might be wrong." That is the crunch: this field is not for the timid and fearful. Let me say this differently: we are either paralyzed into the "nothing-but-survey-opinions approach" or we "confess that here we stand but we might be wrong". Those who are unwilling to be wrong have landed in an inhospitable profession because what the "great conversation" is all about is tossing our ideas into the vast sea of scholarship and seeing what happens; the fun is in the thinking, the tossing, and (sometimes) the watching. But sometimes our ideas find their way to the bottom, sunk in the ocean, and at other times just bobbing on the sea with rest of the flotsam and jetsam.

We also need courage *to believe in knowledge, to press on in our searching* – even when that means another summer of studying something we had missed in our previous study. Socrates said: "we will be better men [and women!], braver and less idle, if we believe that one must search for the things one does not know, rather than if we believe that it is not possible to find out what we do not know and that we must not look for it" (*Meno* 86b-c).

And we need the courage *to be open to peer review* -- perhaps the biggest fear that shapes our entire discipline. Courage to be vulnerable to peer review dovetails rather nicely with my previous suggestions about professional honesty and integrity: Jaroslav Pelikan contends that public expression of our knowledge, the results of our own study, is a "moral obligation". In fact, he speaks of the "continuous and unsparing evaluation and criticism of scholarship, one's own and that of others."[41] For whatever reasons, some hesitate here and need to be encouraged -- both for professional integrity and communal development. A species of this kind of courage also is *courage to submit a piece to a refereed journal or publication*, that is, the courage to submit something that might be rejected. While usually the editors who reject a piece don't give you any advice on how to improve your piece, and while more often than not the rejection is not because the piece wasn't good but didn't fit the "agenda" of that journal, this process of submission and rejection is actually very good for our fields: it monitors, according to standardizing methodologies, what is being published. In such journals, to be sure, "trendiness" and

[41] J. Pelikan, *Idea* , 51, 53.

"faddishness" often rule the day, but good pieces can almost always be published to the courageous, or persistent, author.

And we need courage *to change and to be renewed*. Some might need the courage to change schools while others might need the courage to change fields. Some will need courage to change teaching styles and others professional organizations. But when change doesn't take place we grow dull and weary, feeling as we do after Thanksgiving dinner in a warm room inviting us to nod "for just a bit".

A second virtue: the 3Ds. That is, *determination which leads to discipline and denial*. We must shed the notion that we are each the "Omni-Competent Professor" who can think creatively, which takes time, and do everything else: carry on our academic responsibilities well, look over the administration's shoulder, solve community problems, nurture our spouse and our families, participate in recreational activities, serve on committees at church, coach our son's or daughter's sports teams, etc.. The more competent you are the more often you should be saying "No" to opportunities. I am not old but I am older than I was: my wisdom says this – two of the hardest lessons in life are learning our limitations and then living within them. Some learn their limitations but fail to live within them; others live without ever learning that they are only "one human being".

If you want to be true to your calling as a professor, you have to shape your life to that calling and that means at least four things: (1) staying conversant with your field by reading the major journals, abstracts, and contributions; (2) being a member and participating in your central academic society; (3) reading the major studies in your discipline, which is probably wider than your "field"; and (4) constantly revising your class notes, whether they are more formally lectures or more informally discussion points. Unless your field is easy and knowledge is not growing, this is hard work in and of itself. And, unless you are determined to be good at what you do, and probably no one will check up on you (and this is the problem), it won't happen. Thus, *stamina* is an absolute requirement for professors, not only to face a new class with the same subject for the thirtieth time (I can't tell you how many times I taught students how to read the Greek

apparatus at the bottom of the New Testament), but also to keep going on in our field, to stay fresh, and to face our day with joy and passion.

Another "D" could be added here: *distractions*. There are lots of distractions, different for each of us, but the disciplined scholar distinguishes distractions from duties. The Internet might be for you; writing letters longer than you need to; reading too many newspapers; standing in hallways chatting endlessly; involvements in Fantasy Sports teams; television; video games; golf; yardwork. I find the need to get going early in the day and to let household chores wait until I need my first break, maybe noon or so. Your scholarship deserves your best attention; you know when that it is. Don't let distractions derail your discipline.

And what happens if we slip here? Besides the fact that you might tumble into some level of professional depression, your classes will suffer first. Ten year old lectures are like ten year old meals: stiff, moldy, and tasteless. You don't enjoy giving them and students do not learn from them. Second, your academic "good standing" will suffer next: you simply won't be able to converse with others at your annual meetings, unless of course you gather round yourself like-minded souls. Third, you will suffer at the level of identity: there is nothing like the rush that comes from "knowing what's going on" in your field. "The quality of scholarship [in its various dimensions] is dependent, above all else, on the vitality of each professor."[42] But there is also the "reverse thrust" of realizing that you no longer have any idea what is going on. Staying up in our fields keeps us ever young.

Let me urge you now, especially those of you who are young: I have seen colleagues slip in this area and they are embarrassed to talk to others, even their own colleagues, because they have lacked the discipline to keep up in their field. Professors who are "Commodore 64 Scholars" might enjoy one another's company but they are unprofessional and can be so only because of the general lack of quality control that takes place in higher education.

[42] E.L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered* , 43.

A third virtue, which I shall not develop at length: *solitude*.[43] I prefer what Mortimer J. Adler called this, "leisure",[44] and how he heroically described it, not because I think of lounge chairs or swimming pools, but because the most enjoyable feature of our vocation is "personal growth" that comes from learning and teaching. And that takes "time", time alone, time to think, time to read, time to write – uninterrupted time, quality time, lots of it, and sometimes day after day. Most of us know that "the muse only attends our minds" when it wants to and we better be in a state of receptiveness if we want to enjoy those conversations. Max Weber said it this way: "Ideas occur to us when they please, not when it pleases us…. Yet ideas would certainly not come to mind had we not brooded at our desks and searched for answers with passionate devotion."[45] I am in the habit of carrying pen and paper everywhere I go, especially in the car, just in case the muse attends my way.

Of course, we all know we have two problems, and each infects us in different ways: first, we may not have enough time. To you, I say, look at your schedule and see if you can pare it back and carve out for yourself time to think and to get your mind in condition. Second, we may have time but not use it wisely. To you, I say, start now using it in a determined, disciplined manner. I speak the language we all know: I like Cub games as much as you do; I like to play golf more than most of you; I like to attend our high school sports; I like to do some housework; I like to go on vacation; I like to play with my kids; I like to go out with friends; I like to go to movies; I like to be involved in church activities; I like to speak at churches, retreats, and conferences – but I know that I am limited in time and ability and I have decided to be a professor and I hope a good one. I know, however, whether I am or not, that it takes time and I want as much as I can get.

The fourth virtue is simple: *community engagement*. Good research and good scholarship takes place within the parameters of discussion and conversation with others about one's ideas and research. Overcoming the fear of censure and entering fray with our peers is fundamentally important. Bart Giamatti set out the parameters of our engagement

[43] This is the term of J. Pelikan, *Idea*, 64-65.
[44] Mortimer J. Adler, *Reforming Education: The Opening of the American Mind* (ed. G. Van Doren; New York: Collier, 1990), 93-108.

with one another: "At its worst, collegiality is a kind of clubbiness, an impulse to exclusivity; at its best, it is a genuinely vital sense of community."[46] Besides the "friendships" that develop within our discipline (don't you love your annual meetings?), peer readings and discussions, the Faculty Research Group, our "author friends" (i.e., our books), and other sorts of interpersonal-professional interactions are what sharpen our minds, clarify our thoughts, deepen our resolve to know, and stimulate our lives – to be better learners, teachers, and mentors.

I suggest *two implications* of my observation: first, I think departmental meetings should be less "business" and more "discussion of an academic nature". How else do we really evaluate and mentor our younger colleagues or monitor our colleague's "scholarship" that does not emerge in some published form? Apart from the really naïve assumption that we are all "doing everything just fine", we need to sit around a table with one another, or a cup of coffee, and discuss a new book, or an interesting idea by a department member, or read over the shoulder of a colleague who is writing an article or book, or sit in on a colleague's class to hear what is going on. Second, I think our Faculty meetings ought to begin with a brief presentation by a faculty member of the "state of the art" in that person's field. This can go on for years, as you might guess, and it will enlighten us all about other fields and it will also embolden our attempts at integration in our classes. The most enjoyable year of my own academic career was a year at Tyndale House in Cambridge England – not because it had a great library in a romantic city or because we rode bikes and sold our car. I liked it because we were a community: when we needed to know something we asked someone in the library at "tea breaks" and learned from one another. We gave papers for one another and experienced the idea academic community. Departments and Divisions and Faculties, I believe, can be like that.

Because I have the platform, I'd like to turn it now into a soapbox and say a few words about *institutional support*. These words of mine do not come from any disappointments at this school or at the last; they come, as they ought, from the simple

---

[45] "Science as a Vocation," 136.
[46] A. Bartlett Giamatti, *A Free and Ordered Space*, 39.

expectation that we are not yet in Eden when it comes to institutional support for scholarship – with its implications for teaching, mentoring, and publishing.

First, I believe our administration needs *to articulate its vision for scholarship and research*. No one has spoken of this better than Bart Giamatti: "Leadership, on the other hand, is an essentially moral act, not – as in most management – an essentially protective act. It is the assertion of a vision, not simply the exercise of a style: the moral courage to assert a vision of the institution in the future and the intellectual energy to persuade the community or the culture of the wisdom and validity of the vision. It is to make the vision practicable, and compelling.

A college or university is an institution where financial incentives to excellence are absent, where the product line is not a unit or an object but *rather a value-laden and life-long process* ; where the goal of the enterprise is not growth or market share but *intellectual excellence* ; not profit or proprietary rights but *the free good of knowledge* ; not efficiency of operation but *equity of treatment* ; not increased productivity in economic terms but *increased intensity of thinking about who we are and how we live and about the world around us* ."[47]

My goal here is not to criticize the specifics of our administration but lay bare the essential and it is this: the increasing bureaucratization and economization of academic institutions does not bode well for any of us when it comes to the matter of scholarship that leads to improved learning, teaching, and mentoring. We are now in need of a faculty-driven articulation of the vision of the institution to engage our administration so that we can all gain a fair hearing.

Let me now spell out a *strategy for scholarship at North Park* and these will be random suggestions that I think need to be integrated into an institutional vision.

First, I think we need a gentle reminder, rather than a demand, that each professor *needs to publish something every three years* (excluding a normal book review). Though Jaroslav Pelikan enjoyed the niceties of a research university, his thoughts apply – if taken at a lower level: "'Publish or perish!' is a fundamental psychological, indeed almost physiological, imperative that is rooted in the metabolism of scholarship as a sacred

[47] A. Bartlett Giamatti, *A Free and Ordered Space*, 36; see also pp. 40-42.

vocation. For that is how research remains honest, by exposing itself to the criticism and correction of other scholars and by inviting them – or daring them – to replicate its results if they can and, if possible, to carry those results further or to refute them by more careful or imaginative research."[48]

Second, I think we need to develop a system that *favors younger scholars and colleagues and which is largely mentored by senior faculty members.* And here's what I have in mind: during the first two years of an assistant professor's career they should have no committee work at all, excepting of course departmental, divisional, and faculty meetings. Additional funding should be made available to them and, if they have not finished their PhDs (which I find to be unwise usually), give them as much help to get the thing done. Funding should be available so that each of them gets a new computer when they arrive. I think they should teach only a 4/6 load for two years. I think in the third year they should publish something and they should also provide to the Faculty a "state of the discipline" paper as part of their promotion – my counterpart to what the Germans call the *Habilitationschrift* .

Why such favoritism? This is not hard to figure out: teaching that first and second year is exceedingly difficult; developing a habit of researching and doing scholarship needs to begin early and a full-load almost renders it impossible. Research by the Carnegie Institute supports the high presence of stress in the early years of an academic career, which gradually diminishes over time.[49] Furthermore, as Roger Baldwin has clearly shown, individual faculty members go through "career stages" as professors including the almost universal realization, at about mid-career that "this is our life and it ain't quite all that I thought it would be" or "this is our life and ain't life grand".[50] The crucial role that early career plays in the career of a professor means that the institution needs to utilize those years to mold professors into that institution's ideal. Here are the various stages according to Baldwin: (1) Novice professor: getting into the academic

[48] J. Pelikan, *Idea* , 123-124.
[49] E.L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered* , 45.
[50] See R.G. Baldwin, "Faculty Career Stages and Implications for Professional Development," in *Enhancing Faculty Careers: Strategies for Development and Renewal* (ed. J.H. Schuster, et al.; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990) 20-40 (with bibliography).

world; (2) early academic career: settling down and making a name; (3) midcareer: accepting a career plateau or setting new goals?; (4) late career: leaving a legacy.

Third, we need a *college bookstore with a coffee lounge* for the benefit of the whole school and the community. I am perhaps landing on a bed of roses here but I am not yet convinced, after five years of trying, that our current arrangement is working and is benefiting the community the way a college bookstore and coffee shop can. (And I am not saying that the staff does not work hard. This is not an issue of integrity or effort.) Available in this coffee lounge should be the *Journal of Higher Education* and other such publications pertaining to our vocation.

Fourth, I think every Faculty member should be "off campus" one day a week for personal development in scholarship. This is not a day "off" to go shopping or to work in the yard or to sleep but instead a moral imperative from on high to develop ourselves as scholars.

Fifth, I think we need to develop a "University" imprint with some publisher and have publications emerge from our campus conferences and our scholarship -- each published as part of the school's mission.

Sixth, the school needs to be evaluating the scholarship that is being produced, whether it shows up in publications or teaching, from the ground up – beginning with departments and division. The current "Annual Report of Activities" we submit has an unclear motion to me and I don't know who sees what and what difference it makes. We need to take our scholarship seriously and it ought to rank up there with our teaching as part of our evaluations and promotions. And I am speaking of scholarship here in its broadest senses.

Seventh, I believe the administration needs to set out a system of rewards and punishments, like Moses and his successors, for scholarship – and again, not just as publications. Appreciation needs to take on tangible form, either through monetary reward or the lessening of committee work. Faculty should be used according to talent and not assigned to committees because it is some "moral imperative".

Eighth, I think we should read one book a year on education, books about teaching, about the politics of higher education, about the impact of technology on what we do, and about our students.

4.0 Scholarly Publishing

So much for my suggestions about institutional support; let me now make some concrete suggestions about scholarly publishing.

First, writing is not about "technique" or "method" but about "*identity*". We write because of who we are: scholars need to get it down and need to express themselves. F.F. Bruce liked to call this need "scribbler's itch" (Latin: *cacoethes scribendi*).

Second, to paraphrase our late Mayor Daley, *write early and write often* . I'm not talking about the time of the day; I'm talking about the need to begin your career, or start now, with writing. As soon as you have your thesis in mind, start getting down; you can weave your secondary writing into your own garment – and when it is your own garment it is both clearer in your mind and easier to manage.

Third, when you want to submit a ms to a publisher, *get endorsements* , both from the prominents in that field of study and from those who have already published with that publisher. You might be surprised how effective this can be. My ms was given a fairer hearing with a publisher once because one of their authors told the Senior Editor that he should take my manuscript.

Fourth, learn to write, to use a phrase from Anne Lamott, *"bird by bird"* – that is: don't try to write a book all at once. Divide the whole project into small projects and seek to achieve those one day at a time. If you're writing about the Civil War, you can't write about the whole history all at once, but you can describe this battlefield in one day, or survey the general's plans for that day, etc..

Fifth, *end each day's research by beginning the next day's research.* This frequently cuts down on shiftlessness, lethargy, and late starts; it also enables quick starts and an "I can't wait to get back to it" attitude. Thus, if today I am writing a review of a book today but tomorrow I have to study the baptism of Jesus as a prophetic action, then when I am done with the review I need to look briefly at the baptism of Jesus, see what I will need to examine and see what I might need to read. That way when I get up I don't have any wondering about what I will be doing when I sit at my desk. We all know how hard it is to begin some days – ending the day by beginning the next day is the best thing we can do to make beginnings easier.

Sixth, *maintain a "list of projects"* and folders for each item on your desk and keep in mind what's coming next. I am currently writing papers for a conference in California, North Carolina, and Chicago, as well as some small writing projects for a couple of journals and I have them listed and I know what is next. I am also working on a bigger project on Jesus as Prophet. That way if something crosses my mind I stick it into a folder and when I begin serious work I have some ideas already ticking.

Seventh, *strike a balance between requests and self-initiated projects.* It is easy to fall into the trap of writing only what you are asked to write: a chapter in a book here, a journal article there, editing a series of essays, etc.. But it is also unfair to yourself to be only writing that sort of stuff: you have ideas of your own and you need to write those up as well. The most satisfying projects are ones you dream up yourself and these creative impulses are squelched if you don't air them.

Eighth, *meet deadlines!* I have edited a few books, one of which had hundreds of essays and contributors, and I can tell you the problems that occur when authors agree to deadlines (which are almost always extendable but which are set so extenders may get their wishes) and don't meet them. Not only is the book delayed but other authors are annoyed by what you are doing – and when they find out that you were on vacation they might never want to participate with you again. If you aren't going to meet a deadline, and know it, tell the editor. And along with this comes reality: you need to have realistic expectations of the time you need. I say this especially for young authors: publishers know which authors meet deadlines and which don't. And they want authors who meet the deadlines.

Ninth, *read the best books on writing*, like E.B. White's *Elements of Style* , 82 pages of clear conviction, and W. Zinsser's *On Writing Well* , even though I object to the dirty tricks their publishers have played in bringing out too many new editions of what was original genius. Also, read good writers in your field – learn from them but don't imitate them slavishly. Zinsser always reads some of White before he writes; others find it best to operate as did Hemingway, with no one else's style cluttering up yours. It is amazing to me that, just as many professors don't read about teaching so many also do not read about writing.

Tenth, here's my *suggestions to get younger scholars going*: write one book review a year (and before sending the review to the publisher, send it to the author for her or his comments – you make friends that way and you might save yourself from errors; besides it reflects the community that we all are in the spirit of the Golden Rule: "review as you would be reviewed"[51]); write one journal article a year; and plan on one book every decade. And, if your mind can withstand the pressure of long-term goals, work toward one significant book in your career.

5.0 Life for Writers

What is it like to be writing on a constant basis? I begin with the observation that we writers can be squeamish about our craft, fearing that letting out secrets might offend the muses and encourage them to find less talkative pens.

First, writing in our fields is not about *money or fame* . Learn that most people in your society don't care about writing and are not impressed that you write. Some of your colleagues might not even be impressed. Some take it for granted and others are just happy about it. Another angle on this has been provided by the earthy Anne Lamott: when she saw her first book she said "I understood immediately the thrill of seeing oneself in print. It provides some sort of primal verification: you are in print; therefore you exist." Then she adds: "Seeing yourself in print is such an amazing concept: you can get so much attention without actually having to actually show up somewhere. While others who have something to say or who want to be effectual, like musicians or baseball players or politicians, have to get out there in front of people, writers, who tend to be shy, get to stay home and still be public. There are many obvious advantages to this. You don't have to dress up, for instance, and you can't hear them boo you right away."[52]

Second, writing is *often very lonely* . You are at your desk when all your friends are out working in the yard, or going off to the movies, or planning exotic trips, or drinking beer at the local pub while watching Monday Night Football. Some people don't do much scholarship because they can't stand to be alone. I have spent summers and summers and vacations on vacations and weekends on top of weekends alone, in my study, hours on

[51] F.F. Bruce, *In Retrospect: Remembrance of Things Past* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 281.
[52] A. Lamott, *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), xiv.

end. That's what it is all about at times. Hemingway once said of himself as an author: "For he does his work alone and if he is a good enough writer he must face eternity, or the lack of it, each day."[53] For some the "fear" of eternity prevents them from being at the desk; for others, the joy of facing eternity compels them to study.

Third, you have to have *thick skin when it comes to reviewers* . First, not all reviewers have read your book that thoroughly. I once spoke with a scholar who had just written a review of a book I had just reviewed myself – the book was in German to complicate matters. When I asked him what he thought of the critique of Zionistic theology in favor of Creation theology he looked at me like I was speaking French. I knew then and there that he had not read the book thoroughly – but his review was published in a major journal. The standard joke reveals some truth: when asked if a scholar had read a book, the scholar retorted, "Read it? I haven't even reviewed it yet!" Second, you need to remember that being "unreviewed" is worse than being reviewed harshly. That the book was chosen to be reviewed means the editor thought this book was good enough to have scholars reflect on it. There is, according to *Dorian Gray* , only one thing worse than being talked about – that is *not* being talked about! Third, remember that "reviews" are not "official pronouncements" by your academic society. Most scholars recognize a review for what it really is: one scholar's review of another scholar's work. There is, in most fields to my knowledge, "no official pronouncements on books". One time I had a book reviewed very harshly by a scholar. It was unfair and it was, in my judgment, out of line. The irony of the nasty review was that I made a dozen friends who came to me to tell me they disagreed with the reviewer and hoped I would respond. Speaking of reviews: you should rarely respond to your critical reviews – unless the reviews become a bit of a sensation.

All this to say: The joy of writing should not be blunted by reviewers. Hemingway expresses my sentiments: "But if the book is good, is about something that you know, and is truly written and reading it over you see that this is so, you can let the boys yip and the noise will have that pleasant sound coyotes make on a very cold night when they are out

[53] L.W. Phillips, *Ernest Hemingway On Writing* (New York: Scribner's, 1984), 64.

in the snow and you are in your own cabin that you have built or paid for with your work."[54]

Anne Lamott evidently recovered from some tough reviews. She says "The first two notices I got on this tender book I'd written about my dying, now dead father said that my book was a total waste of time, a boring, sentimental, self-indulgent sack of spider puke." She adds laconically, "This is not verbatim."[55]

Let me return to Hemingway. Writing is to the scholar what fishing was to the old man: whether anyone ever sees your "fish" and whether anyone believes your "story", is not the issue. You were fishing and your joy came from the fishing, from the hunt, from the battle, and from the joy of landing the fish. That "sharks" (read: critics) ate the fish is not as important to you as that you enjoyed the battle and knew that you landed what your heart dreamed about.

Fourth, researching and writing is *hard work and takes lots of devotion and it deals to all those around the table both disappointment and joy.* The joy of research, scholarship and publishing is in the work itself. But it is nonetheless hard; it takes lots of time; you get stiff; your hands get tired; your mind gets foggy; and you are not so sure when you are done if it is good or bad or indifferent. Your friends usually tell you "great" only because you are their friend. Most people don't take notice of your work and you frequently are neglected in footnotes. Writing to his friend, Maxwell Perkins, Ernest Hemingway once said: "Writing is a hard business Max but nothing makes you feel better." Two years later he wrote to Charles Scribner: "That is why I like it at a war. Every day and every night there is a strong possibility that you will get killed and not have to write."[56] E.B. White compared his writing manner to a certain Kenneth Roberts who, evidently, was a bit of a workaholic with convictions that his way of writing was the only way. White said of his own manner: "Our professional life has been a long, shameless exercise in avoidance."[57] Writing, for most writers, is much like Tolstoy's relationship to his wife: "love and hate".

---

[54] L.W. Phillips, *Ernest Hemingway on Writing* , 140.
[55] A. Lamott, *Bird by Bird*, xxv.
[56] L.W. Phillips, *Ernest Hemingway on Writing* , 14 , 15-16.
[57] E.B. White, *The Second Tree from the Corner* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 162.

Fifth, scholarship *comes and goes like seasons in the calendar* and the coming and going is more unpredictable than CTA's bus #92. There have been times when I could think of nothing worth saying and so I didn't write; I just read; I've done that for months at a time. I had nothing to say. There are other times when ideas come so fast and furiously that they were like molecules banging into one another in my head and I couldn't get them down quickly enough. I've pulled off roads, interrupted conversations, gone spacey on others in conversation, hung up the phone, left meetings, missed busses and appointments, forgotten birthdays and anniversaries -- you get the picture – when creativities attended my way.

Sixth, *writing almost never brings finality* . There is always the prospect of revising the work so it is better, always something else to read, always the fear that we have missed some important piece of scholarship, always another project lurking in our hidden caverns, and always the prospect of being rejected. E.B. White said this so well: "A book should be the occasion of rejoicing, but it is seldom that, imparting a feeling of completion but not satisfaction. I suppose a writer, almost by definition, is a person incapable of satisfaction – which is what keeps him at his post."[58]

Seventh, a Sabbath point, if you are *intense* in your scholarship, you need *a rest that give you time to refresh yourself.* I have, not very often, sat at my computer or desk and started only to realize five or six hours later that I had hardly moved and was now stiff and in pain when I moved. I have also worked on projects day in and day out for weeks and months at a time – enough to rile my normally quite tranquil wife. For breaks, I usually take weeks off at a time to read something else that strikes my fancy. This year it was Mark Twain; sometimes I read one of the Great Books and more often I indulge my unquenchable appetite for baseball books; other times it is Tolstoy, or C.S. Lewis, or Abraham Heschel, or Elie Wiesel, or Garrison Keillor, or Charles Dickens, or Martin Luther King, Jr.. I have topics I like to read when the need arises: American Evangelicalism, current society as it intersects with Christianity, and books about places we have visited. Further, I think it important to respond, at times, to my colleagues' suggestions, as when Jim Nelson told me I should look at a new book on golf and

[58] *Second Tree* , xviii.

spirituality. These breaks give me time to recover from intense periods of scholarship; they also make life interesting and fuller.

Finally, I will say that scholarship is *essentially exhilarating both mentally and communally* . When you find something, there is no joy quite like it. Unlike financial success, your spirit is lifted when you advance knowledge or teach a new idea – and that is joy, the "deep gladness" spoken of by Parker Palmer. Further, this exhilaration is also *communal* -- that is, when you share your insights and the lights go off in someone else's head, they nod "yes" to you, and you go on saying to yourself – I am getting into that person's head and making sense.

Exiled to Eden

Scholarship is not about "winning", about "fame", or about climbing to the top; most won't know and many don't care; it is about expression, about a dialogue, about pursuit of truth, about our own development as humans, and about contributing to the Great Conversation of the Mind – from diverse, but nonetheless fully conscious, Christian points of view. Such a conversation will lead us out of what Robert Bellah and his team of scholars described as "individualism" and back into our academic positions as vocations, as callings, set within an orderly community.[59] That is, we will be back in Eden. If society thinks we have been banned as exiles, when the lights go out will somebody open the gate and tell them that we are enjoying ourselves and that they don't need to send the troops to rescue us just yet?

---

[59] R. Bellah, *et al., Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985).