



**Center for Faith & Learning
Scholar Program**

**Reading for
Dialogue Gathering #1
Fall 2021**

**"Hospitality - An Essential Virtue"
by John B. Bennett**

**Bennett, John B., 2003.
"Academic Life: Hospitality, Ethics
and Spirituality" pp. 46 - 58.
John B. Bennett. Bolton, MA:
Anker Publishing Co.**

Hospitality— An Essential Virtue

3

What does it mean to say that hospitality is a cardinal virtue in our work as academics? First, I illustrate what hospitality involves by contrasting it with insistent individualism. The openness of hospitality stands over against self-preoccupation and concern with controlling power. Second, I propose that the manner in which we *attend* to others is a basic element in practicing hospitality. Third, I look at a number of virtues associated with hospitality.

SOME FEATURES OF HOSPITALITY

Practicing the radical openness of hospitality means extending self in order to welcome the other by sharing and receiving intellectual resources and insights. Both an intellectual and moral virtue, hospitality is essential to the work and success of the academy. This is not a common view. Some may find it bizarre. Others understand hospitality as a superficial congeniality, a warm, shapeless softness—the very opposite of the rigor for which the academy should be known. Henri Nouwen (1975) notes that for many of us, hospitality suggests “tea parties, bland conversations, and a general atmosphere of coziness” (p. 66). Hospitable individuals within the academy are often regarded, and scolded, as “soft” on standards and inclined toward compromise rather than standing for intellectual rigor and excellence.

Organizationally, hospitality fares no better. Faculty and administrators associate it with recreation, tourism, or hotel/restaurant management programs rather than with goals for every program, school, and institution. As we saw in Chapter One, departments and schools often struggle over resources and prestige, and quite a few disciplines and departments house deep ideological and personal divisions. Entire institutions are locked in competition for students and standing. The insistent individualism traced earlier is like kudzu, growing by leaps and bounds. As a consequence, the concept of hospitality in academe has lost much of its original power. But as Nouwen (1975) observes of its broader importance, “if there is any concept worth restoring to its original depth and evocative potential, it is the concept of hospitality” (p. 66).

An Ancient Tradition

Hospitality has a long and honorable lineage going back to Homeric and biblical times. Once an ideal for nomadic people, being hospitable in the academy points toward companionship with colleagues in promoting and advancing learning. The etymology of “companion” directs us to one with whom we eat bread. Likewise, “colleague” means one with whom we are linked. Companions and colleagues are those with whom we seek mutual openness and intellectual reciprocity.

In academe, companion and colleague point to *collegia*, the learning communities we jointly create and to which we belong. As our Homeric and biblical heritages suggest, hospitality carries a sense of abundance and attentive presence to the other. They remind us that hospitality should extend to the stranger as well as the neighbor. Both traditions call for taking in the other and offering oneself and one’s goods. Who is not moved by the welcome given Odysseus in his travails, by the stories of Joseph hosting his faithless brothers, by the good Samaritan, or the prodigal son? Translated to the academy, being hospitable means being radically open to others, sharing resources, and receiving with care the new and the strange, as well as critically reviewing the familiar.

Hospitality is not simply generic openness. It recognizes the particularity of others as part of the broader interdependence of being and the interconnectedness of learning that characterizes the depths of our reality. As openness to particular others, hospitality requires careful attention to who and what is really there, as opposed to what we might wish. Carefully attending and listening to the other are acquired skills, often more difficult to master than the talking that comes naturally to the professoriate. But with desire, discipline, and careful attention to others, learning and knowledge become gifts to be exchanged, no longer possessions to be hoarded and controlled.

Practicing hospitality involves awareness that new and surprising value may reside in the other, once seen with fresh eyes. We learn to welcome the roles others play in our learning since it is easy to overlook adverse evidence and we are always potential victims of self-deception. We need others to protect us from skewing and slanting our teaching and research. Their ideas provide ballast and balance to our work—perspectives that may lead to changes or even breakthroughs. We can play the same role for others. As hosts we extend hospitality to our guests—be they students and colleagues or strangers. We share our learning and offer comparisons on common topics and concerns. As Nouwen (1975) reminds us, hospitable educators work toward “the creation of space

where students and teachers can enter into a fearless communication with each other and allow their respective life experiences to be their primary and most valuable source of growth and maturation” (p. 67).

Hospitable Sharing and Receiving Are Inseparable

In authentic hospitality, sharing and receiving are not seriatim, unconnected moments. To practice hospitality is to share with others in ways that involve receiving. Consequently, practicing hospitality can threaten our stability and control. Truly to share is to invite others into our world, eventually allowing their strangeness and unfamiliarity to affect and engage us. Sometimes the other is literally a stranger, but it may also be someone in our midst whom we have ignored. In either case, hospitable engagement can be threatening as well as enriching—challenging our comfortable truths, but also enlarging them and compensating for limitations in our understanding. When sharing is accompanied by receiving, the host becomes guest, one who receives the bounty of the other. Sharing the riches of my world becomes receiving as I enter into aspects of the other’s world. A new, jointly constructed world may then emerge. In its fullness, hospitality bears the fruit of reciprocity, an ongoing dialectic of host and guest.

As part of this process, practicing hospitality means relinquishing protective mechanisms and refusing to insist woodenly upon one’s own terms. It requires letting go the armor and weapons of insistent individualism. It means breaching the tight boundaries that encircle the correctly credentialed and the top-ranked institutions. It involves abandoning careful calculations respecting the quantity of good one decides to extend, based on what one anticipates receiving. To practice hospitality is to share experience, insights, and resources without imposing conditions that demand a return, or asking what is the least we have to offer in order to secure what we want.

Being academically hospitable means letting others know they matter as fellow inquirers, and inviting them to mutual interaction and reciprocity. It opposes the insistent individualism that throws up barriers to respect, even in familiar settings and classrooms. Too often

we do not grant respect to students, to stumbling and failing. We do not grant respect to tentative and heartfelt ways of being in the world where the person can’t quite think of the right word or can’t think of any word at all. We don’t grant

respect to silence and wonder. We don't grant it to voices outside our tight little circle. (Palmer, 1997, p. 11)

To practice hospitality is to acknowledge the intrinsic value of the other, to treat him or her as potentially authoritative, and through interaction to discover and promote fitting and harmonious outcomes. It is to provide an appropriate response to what is, to bequeath one's moment of individual insight to the future.

To practice hospitality is to hope for reciprocity, knowing it cannot be commanded, only invited. Genuine hospitality means sharing something that isn't required with someone who doesn't have to receive it. It is neither involuntary self-sacrifice nor coerced acceptance. Sharing and receiving arise out of freedom and engender freedom, not dependence. One can but offer one's own learning without stipulations as to its use. According to Nouwen (1975), "hospitality is not a subtle invitation to adopt the lifestyle of the host, but the gift of a chance for the guest to find his own" (p. 72). The reciprocity of hospitality means drawing out from each other capacities and gifts that otherwise lie dormant. Nouwen reminds us of the centrality of hospitality to the spiritual health of academe: "If there is any area that needs a new spirit, a redemptive and liberating spirituality, it is the area of education in which so many people spend crucial parts of their lives, as students or teachers or both" (p. 84). Openness to the other is essential in an academic ethic, a philosophy of integrity, and a healthy educational spirituality.

SOME CAUTIONS

Insistent individualism can be wily, sometimes masquerading as hospitality, and several more distinctions may be helpful. Intellectual hospitality is not simply a matter of manners, etiquette, or decorum. It is not primarily about being genteel, polite, civil, or even just nice or decent. These concepts are important, particularly in pluralistic and diverse communities, but they are not sufficient. Hospitality can be counterfeit, presenting the appearance but not the reality of openness. After all, one can be polite and mannerly without really being open. Discussions can be civil but superficial—sometimes veneers of politeness covering unrelenting contentiousness.

Civility

Appeals to civility can retard discussions on important, long-overdue initiatives. The real risk may not be incivility, but inaction. Familiar

examples include the “civil” refusal to review curricula or even traditional course assignments, for fear of upsetting accepted arrangements and reigniting turf wars. Educators enter into tacit agreements to isolate and ignore rather than confront colleagues who shirk service obligations, neglect students, or abandon the ongoing scholarship that informs teaching. Civil truces amongst warring parties are important, but they can deny the greater good that comes only with efforts to address the common welfare.

Student incivility is another area where hospitality can be overlooked. A number of faculty understandably protest incivility in the classroom. They are dismayed by disruptive and rude student behaviors (Schneider, 1998)—behaviors that seem to be increasing and intensifying. One study arrayed uncivil student behavior on the following continuum: disengaged, disinterested, disrespectful, disruptive, defiant, and disturbed (Gonzalez & Lopez, 2001). In increasing degree, each type undermines classroom teaching and learning. A sense of entitlement to high grades compounds matters. Of course, some of these behaviors may be responses to faculty incivility: “Teachers can be overbearing. They can adopt behavior that can mortify students. They can exhibit a purported intellectual superiority, belittle students, use sarcasm in a way that’s hurtful” (Schneider, 1998, p. A12). Faculty may come late to class, introduce irrelevant material, or skip office hours. Students may simply copy their insistent individualism.

However, the basic problem may be the inhospitable conditions in which education is offered. Huge classes are inherently dehumanizing. Unclear course expectations can worsen a situation for which students have been inadequately prepared. As one observer notes, “to a degree, classroom incivility is the way some students protest an alien academic culture that they deem onerous and unfair” (Trout, 1998, p. A40). Surely the hospitable response is not to dumb down material but to work toward classes with more humane numbers where knowing students by name is possible, to explicate clearly the course and classroom expectations, to clarify and show personally why they are appropriate and fair, and to devise evaluation forms that suggest courses *should* be demanding. This can mean openly challenging the equation of learning with high grades, valued because economically marketable.

Charity and Intimacy

Hospitality is not the same as charity—dispensing intellectual goods to the less fortunate. Charity in that sense is a substitute for hospitality, a

means of continuing self-preoccupation. At best, it is superficial hospitality, control masquerading as generosity. It maintains, rather than overcomes, barriers between selves. Because real intellectual hospitality leads to a critique of the self as well as the other, some academics may commit acts of charity because they find it less threatening to be hosts rather than guests. They want to be benefactors, not also beneficiaries—dispensers, not also recipients. These acts continue the structures of separation that hospitality is attempting to bridge. Hospitality honors interdependence; charity reinforces dependence.

Neither does hospitality require intimacy or close, personal relationships. Some speak of familial relationships as a relevant standard of excellence without recognizing its limitations—families themselves often fail to exhibit close-knit relationships, the academy is not something into which one is born, affiliation with the academy is voluntary in a way that family membership is not, and faculty have different obligations to colleagues than family members do to each other.¹ Academic affiliations can be severed in a way family connections cannot—a faculty member may not be renewed, a program and its instructors can be discontinued, and an instructor can disenroll a student; only in hyperbole can a parent disown a child. The goal is not intimacy, but accountability and reciprocity in sharing concerns and resources.

Far from hospitality requiring intimacy, members of a healthy collegium need not even be friends in the sense of sharing company outside the work of the collegium. What is important is that they maintain interest and a capacity for distance in evaluating what they receive in mutual openness. In the rare relationship of intimacy, hospitality in its fullness involves learning in depth about what motivates and sustains the other, as well as sharing cherished fundamental beliefs and commitments that give form and sustenance. However desirable, these exchanges are infrequent and often not sustained, but their absence is no excuse for inhospitality.

True academic hospitality is centered in the relationship between self and others on matters of learning—a relationship marked by genuine openness and respect, not necessarily by unbounded care for the other. Indeed, there may be no promise of intimacy at all. Sometimes being hospitable may support being a curmudgeon as the most fitting way of attending to the other. Certainly, hospitality is not mere chumminess, nor is practicing it simply being polite. David Damrosch (1995) makes a similar point respecting collaborative work when he observes that any requirement

that the collaborators be friends eliminates most of the potential combinations that can be found on a typical campus. Academics simply aren't nice enough, to enough of their colleagues, enough of the time, for this to be a general basis for academic life. (p. 194).

Issues of Language

How we use language can block as well as nurture hospitality. Inherited patterns of expression may transmit derogatory and oppressive concepts. Like organizations, language can create and perpetuate inequities and deformations of genuine community. Yet, we must be careful. For instance, the recent, widespread shift from the inclusive use of the masculine pronoun to more gender-neutral constructions is now a common practice. Failure to appreciate that the shift is recent can result in unfair judgments of earlier writing and speaking governed by a different grammar. Charitableness and generosity of spirit, if not acts of charity, are always in order.

The use of ample questions and the subjunctive rather than the descriptive promotes hospitality in conversation. These linguistic patterns convey interest rather than presumption; they speak of considered possibility rather than assumed fact. Indeed, these uses of language can prepare the way for practicing hospitality. One can still be a self-centered individualist, but take baby steps to anticipate becoming hospitable. Desiring to change can generate stage directions for learning to practice hospitality—for acquiring the dispositions, outlooks, inclinations, and patterns of interaction in which hospitality is embedded.

A broader point is that no single position is exhaustive. Formulations are forever provisional—awaiting revision, correction, and expansion as the ongoing fruits of intellectual hospitality suggest. This is not an argument for relativism or the abandonment of standards. It is an argument for rigor, but hospitably, rather than negatively, construed. The search for truth and knowledge is never concluded.

A Matter of Respect

Authentic hospitality is marked by respect. The respectful reception and use of intellectual gifts from others is not an invasion of their privacy. Heightened competitiveness and multicultural tensions can give rise to a conviction that hard-won perspectives on the oppressiveness of privileged positions or persons are private property, off-limits to those lacking first-hand experiences. Such absolutist stances create further division rather

than mutual receptivity, reflection and understanding. We do not need hard lines of separation but bridges that enable experiences to be shared, received, examined, and pondered—and then shared again.

The manner in which one receives the hospitality of another is also important. For instance, sensitive awareness of others' contributions allows one to express gratitude without embarrassing those who are shy or withdrawn. Likewise, a hospitable receiver extends courtesy and graciousness toward even the tactless and insensitive giver. These can be difficult challenges and success is usually partial. But overall, in the best of hospitable interactions, each returns to the other what he or she has received, now enriched and enhanced by the fruits of personal reflection—a potentially endless process of reciprocity, limited only by patience, time, and energy.

In sum, being hospitable involves treating others at least initially as worthy of intellectual attention, letting them know they matter as fellow inquirers, and working toward mutual interaction and reciprocity. It eschews quick dismissal without thoughtful efforts to learn—no judgments already, and irrevocably, formed. It means recognizing that each could supplement or correct the other's work and self-understanding. Hospitality points toward active sharing and a willingness to learn from others. Being hospitable is adverbial in character. It refers to *how* one relates to others.

ATTENDING TO THE OTHER

The adverbial character of practicing hospitality demands that we attend to the other with care and respect, while honoring differences and disagreements. Hospitality involves intellectual curiosity—interest in the other, the unknown, and the foreign. It stands over against indifference to new ideas, ideological rigidity, and refusal to reexamine the familiar. But practicing hospitality is never risk free. It makes one vulnerable to being misunderstood, ridiculed, and attacked. Practicing hospitality involves exposing one's faults and deficiencies. It is not simply that one's ideas may be proven deficient. It is also that one may jeopardize the appearance of self-confidence and competence that our individualistic society admires.

Respectful engagement requires suspending initial skepticism about the other as well as putting one's own cards on the table. The hospitable scholar does not shrink from allowing his or her inadequacies, frailties, and other personal weaknesses to surface. Yet he or she does not dwell in these frailties, self-consciously calling attention to them. Energies are directed toward attending to the other. This does not require surrender-

ing to the other, to manipulation, or to acquiescing in an identity that the other creates for oneself. It certainly does not mean gullibility. Hospitality requires critical examination of all positions as well as scrupulous honesty about who one is and the standards one honors.

We can use the image of “passing over” to characterize hospitable efforts to understand the other as a concrete individual, rather than an abstraction or projection. The point in passing over is imaginatively to see things from the other’s perspective. It is to suspend assimilating the other to our frame of reference or projecting our frame upon the other. It is to immerse ourselves in the other’s culture and concepts, to learn the other’s standpoint and intent. To pass over is to adopt for a time this different perspective and the insights it offers—and then to come back with an enriched understanding about ourselves.

Passing over to respectful engagement with the other—practicing neither indifference nor aggressive attack—requires suspending initial suspicions and attending in order to hear, not to devise a clever or argumentative response. Feigned openness does not work—others see through that pretty quickly. But respectful engagement can be difficult, requiring courageous honesty about our own position and its support. Letting go of uncritical loyalty to our own habits is essential. Bernard Loomer (1976) observes that the authentically relational self “makes his claims and expresses his concerns in such a style as to enable the other to make his largest contribution to the relationship” (p. 27).

Dwelling in the narratives and artistic images of the other can be helpful in securing imaginative access, in challenging evasions, and in generating recognition of commonalities without sacrificing respect for separateness and privacy. Throughout, the attitude we display toward the other helps create his or her response to us. As Nouwen (1975) reminds us, “a good host is the one who believes that his guest is carrying a promise he wants to reveal to anyone who shows a genuine interest” (p. 87).

Attending

The work of Simone Weil is notable for its explanation of what it means to attend. Paying attention, she says, involves putting to the side the presentation and defense of our own position in order truly to hear the other.

Attention consists of suspending our thought, leaving it detached, empty, and ready to be penetrated by the object; it means holding in our minds, within reach of this thought, but

on a lower level and not in contact with it, the diverse knowledge we have acquired. (Weil, 1951, p. 111)

This kind of attention requires what Parker Palmer (1983) calls “the discipline of displacement” (pp. 115–116). It involves holding one’s own position in abeyance, while listening intently and receptively to the other. It means letting go our inner preoccupations as well—developing an inner silence that allows the other to be heard.

Of course, we cannot literally leave our experiences behind. They are part of who we are. But we can work to keep them on a lower level—suspending, not suppressing, what we think. The point is to understand the other in his or her terms, not our own. Attending is not a debate, where one seeks to uncover weakness in order to attack. Agonism and oppositional thinking are antithetical to genuine attention. The objective is to grasp the inner rationale, to see in new ways what commends the other’s way of thinking and doing. In both teaching and scholarship, we need to see the other not as a pristine object, but rather as an “other” with whom we are in relationship. The person is not at our disposal. We recognize the polyvalence of this process—the multiplicity of meanings it bears—as well as the variety of possible perspectives upon it. And we ask about our own openness to this wealth of perspectives—our willingness to enter into genuine conversation rather than to project our position or to remain indifferent.

A Shallow Inclusivity

We must attend to the other’s particularity before thoughtlessly appropriating symbols or ideas. Without taking time to study and understand the other, borrowing really is a form of theft (Hunt, 1994). It fails to show respect for the integrity of the experiences in which the borrowed symbols and ideas are embedded. Hunt distinguishes between petty theft, “the use of materials and sources without contextualizing or nuancing,” and what she calls “grand larceny, the wholesale taking over of people’s ideas without any regard for the integrity of the work itself” (p. 106). Among the examples of the latter that Hunt provides is “the endless repetitions of the name and work of Alice Walker, as if somehow just quoting Alice Walker will chase away the problem of racism” (p. 106). This kind of borrowing is a “misuse of another’s intellectual property” (Hunt, 1994, p. 106). It is a violation of academic ethics. It turns an authentic pluralism into a shallow inclusivity and spirituality.

An important part of attending to the other is determining what is potentially worthy of respect. We must open ourselves to claims that the humanity of others lays upon us, but practicing openness to everyone means dwelling in superficialities. Refusing to recognize our own limits and finitude—trying to be open to everything and everybody at all times—is a form of arrogance and insistent individualism. Here too letting go our need for control is essential. In both teaching and learning, attending can mean listening and waiting for something—not treating it as an object to be analyzed and dominated, but as something that may stand as teacher in relation to us. When this happens, attending to the other may reveal value where we had not seen or known it before. Attending may also help us hold on to values when our grip is loosening.

Critical Evaluation

Being hospitable does not mean dwelling in heightened self-consciousness. It *does* require abandoning the protective personas and shrillness that often characterize debate. Intellectual hospitality also calls for clear and thoughtful articulation of standards, both as a courtesy to others and to determine our faithfulness to such norms—even as it prompts consideration of their adequacy. Indeed, practicing hospitality involves presenting the best defense we can of our own position—out of respect for ourselves as well as the other.

We are responsible for our own actions, endorsements, and criticisms. Hospitality demands that reasonableness, not social status or power, determine conclusions and decisions. But part of our evaluation of what we bring back could well include precisely what the other has taught us about how to judge. Unless it is mere carping, difference or dissent is always in the service of a view that is potentially more fruitful, cogent, coherent, or in other ways more satisfying. For that reason, an important part of practicing hospitality is listening to others who have had our otherness imposed upon their self-understanding. Many in majority or privileged classes have now (finally) come to see the importance of allowing women, non-Europeans, and others to speak for themselves. When this happens, we may be chastened by the other, becoming more aware of the complexity of the human condition.

Only after this initial process of sharing and receiving is under way is it appropriate to provide feedback and critical comment on the positions exchanged. This second stage presupposes the first and intends neither destruction of a position nor conversion of the other, but rather joint testing with the expectation that insights new to both parties may emerge. It

is in subsequent dialogue that the rights of the self and the other are clarified and adjudicated. Critical reasoning is required of all participants in the conversation. A major question is whether what is believed is *worthy* of belief. We must evaluate the standards of others, but also engage the difficult task of questioning our own preunderstandings, standards, and behaviors. Most of the time, more precise agreements will eventually emerge, perhaps only after considerable exchange and searching examination.

Disagreements

In passing over we may discover deep-seated disagreements. When this happens, we need to fashion ideas about common purpose in the midst of conflicts over meaning. The point is not that all cultural values are equal—or incomparable. In reflecting on multiculturalism and the imperative of a scholarship of dialectical reconciliation, Charles Taylor (1992) observes that “real judgments of worth suppose a fused horizon of standards. . . . they suppose that we have been transformed by the study of the other, so that we are not simply judging by our original familiar standards” (p. 66).

Our goal should be to identify “certain norms and procedures as imperative to a life in common, norms and procedures that do not stipulate a purpose, but that provide a just procedure for arriving at a common purpose” (Anderson, 1993, p. 143). This may not be possible in some cases. Deep cultural differences may mean that we do not yet have a life sufficiently in common, and may not for the foreseeable future. At other times, our disagreements are about the nature of things. Here too the path of hospitality is commitment to further deliberation and investigation, seeking agreement on procedures that might allow us to come to a common view on the relevant nature of things—though also knowing that the time or circumstances may not yet be ripe.

Of course, in passing over we must be prepared not only for a lengthy process of interaction but also for the possibility that self-giving will be met not by reciprocal self-giving, but by refusal. Sometimes the invitation to reciprocate will be met by anger and resentment at having been ignored, marginalized, or manipulated in the past. Sometimes, too, when we share hospitality we do receive it—but not as we expected, and perhaps not from those to whom we extended it. In any case, “coming back” means returning to one’s original standpoint, enriched now by the perspective of the other. In a literal sense, one’s original standpoint is no more, or at least no longer the same, for it has been altered by the new understanding.

Unless one is able to seek and receive from the other, all that remains is simply a display of unidirectional power. At its worst, this is rightly seen as ugly and arrogant—refusing to allow another to help, or even to acknowledge the capacity of another to help. These are forms of control. For the hospitable scholar, however, coming back means that a new perspective on the humanity one shares with the other is now available. Since the humanity is at least partially shared and common, one now knows more about oneself in knowing more about the other. Something has been added to the original standpoint, extending and potentially transforming it. The limits of the original understanding have been transcended.

Genuine hospitality stands in contrast to the domesticated version wherein the other to whom we extend openness is already well-known. Our canon is sometimes domesticated in this way—reflecting both appropriate celebration *and* unimaginative exclusions of human excellence. At other times we pay attention to what we do *not* know, and neglect a searching examination of the familiar. The foreign and esoteric challenge us, whereas that which we think we already know may not—unless we see it from a different perspective, such as trying to explain it to the stranger. However they occur, such acts are always forms of recognizing and affirming the worth and humanity of others and expressing commitment to an enlarged common good.

As the cardinal virtue for the academy, hospitality is required, independent of personal generosity. Rosemary Haughton (1997) reminds us that the concept of hospitality

codifies the human desire to cross boundaries, to meet, to experience compassion and act on it. The codification is important because it does not negate the generosity, but removes it from the sense that the human acceptance, the sacrifice, the *giving* are one-sided and greatly to the moral credit of the giver. There is no special moral credit in doing what a common humanity requires and the human soul naturally craves. (p. 144)

This takes the issue of practicing hospitality away from the narrow frames of moralistic preoccupations and locates it as a way of proving and keeping oneself worthy of his or her humanity.

CONCLUSION

The concepts I have been urging highlight the self as relational rather than autonomous. Who we are is a function of relationships that constitute us rather than of the controlling and distancing barriers we erect. The relational self reminds us of the richness that others can contribute and teaches us how important the academic community can be as a context in which we contribute to and receive from others. When the community to which we belong is healthy, when there is mutual interaction and support, when there is hospitality in sharing and receiving resources, insights, and criticism—then the good of the whole is pursued in ways that embrace the goods of the member selves in a quest for mutual fulfillment.

The virtues we have examined promote this openness, but they have to be learned, cultivated, and shared. They are not mere expressions of feeling. They have cognitive significance, are important guides to learning, and correlate importantly with the increase of knowledge. Equally, they have ethical punch and give shape and texture to our spiritualities.

Relationships that approach the level of mutuality and reciprocity of intellectual interest and exchange for which I am calling may be rare. But with desire, discipline, and effort more could occur. Despite its marginalization, academic hospitality remains fundamental to the work of the academy—to the pursuit, enlargement, and sharing of learning.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. W. (1993). *Prescribing the life of the mind: An essay on the purpose of the university, the aims of liberal education, the competence of citizens, and the cultivation of practical reason*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bass, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Practicing our faith: A way of life for a searching people*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennett, J. B. (1998). *Collegial professionalism: The academy, individualism, and the common good*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.
- Booth, W. C. (1988). *The vocation of a teacher: Rhetorical occasions 1967–1988*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Damrosch, D. (1995). *We scholars: Changing the culture of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Macroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gonzalez, V., & Lopez, E. (2001, April). The age of incivility: Countering disruptive behavior in the classroom. *AAHE Bulletin*, 53 (8), 3–6.
- Haughton, R. L. (1997). *Images for change: The transformation of society*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

- Hunt, M. E. (1994). Commentary. In L. K. Daly (Ed.), *Feminist theological ethics* (pp. 104–107). Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Loomer, B. (1976, Spring). Two kinds of power. *Process Studies*, 6 (1), 5–32.
- Nouwen, H. M. (1975). *Reaching out: Three movements of the spiritual life*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday and Company.
- Palmer, P. J. (1983). *To know as we are known: Education as a spiritual journey*. San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row.
- Palmer, P. J. (1997, September). The grace of great things: Reclaiming the sacred in knowing, teaching, and learning. *The Holistic Education Review*, 10 (3), 8–16.
- Plante, P. (1990, Winter). An administrator will yearn for the classroom: Myth or reality? *Educational Record*, 71 (1), 27–30.
- Rosovsky, H. (1990). *The university: An owner's manual*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Schneider, A. (1998, March 27). Insubordination and intimidation signal the end of decorum in many classrooms. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A12.
- Taylor, C. (1992). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Trout, P. A. (1998, July 24). Incivility in the classroom breeds 'education lite.' *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A40.
- Veysey, L. (1965). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Weil, S. (1951). *Waiting for God* (E. Craufurd, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper and Row.

ENDNOTES

1. For an example, see Henry Rosovsky's (1990) argument. A former Harvard Dean, Rosovsky speaks of the tenured faculty as an "extended family" (p. 184) and suggests that "a good academic department should resemble a family: supportive, guiding, and nurturing" (p. 176). For the reasons I suggest, "family" seems a misleading metaphor in this context. In addition, see my earlier book for comments on Rosovsky's appeal to entertainment and business metaphors and his comparison of university faculty to a sports team (Bennett, 1998, pp. 86–88).
2. Dorothy Bass (1997) has edited a collection of essays on selected Christian religious practices. Many of the virtues applauded in her volume are also embraced in other religious traditions.
3. One is reminded of William James' observation: "What an awful trade that of the professor is—paid to talk, talk, talk! . . . It would be an awful universe if *everything* could be converted into words, words, words" (Veysey, 1965, p. 420).