Jeffrey L. Morrow

Secularization, Objectivity, and Enlightenment Scholarship

The Theological and Political Origins of Modern Biblical Studies

In *Verbum Domini*, Emeritus Pope Benedict XVI addresses some of the dangers of the "secularized hermeneutic" often present in modern biblical criticism.[1] This is a topic that has long remained close to his heart as he has exhorted Catholic Bible scholars to study the roots of the methods they employ.[2] The academic study of religion and modern biblical studies in the university share a common origin, namely, the purported quest for objectivity.[3] Both scholarly disciplines came of age in the nineteenth century, and especially in German universities. Thus, it should come as no surprise that two of the most common designations for the academic study of religion in the university are German in origin: *Religionsgeschichte* and *Religionswissenschaft*. For the purposes of this article, I will assume the history of the discipline of comparative religion along the lines Tomoko Masuzawa argues persuasively in her groundbreaking work *The Invention of World Religions*, and thus I will not spend time reviewing that history.[4] What I hope to accomplish in this article is to provide a partial response to Benedict's call for a "criticism of criticism" by providing a genealogical account of the advent of modern biblical criticism underscoring the secularizing framework within

which the field operates. Historically, this secularizing trend had both theological and political aspects. The argument I make consists of three parts. In the first, I discuss the theologies and politics that shaped the modern project, commenting on the link to the emergence of modern centralized European states.[5] The second portion describes the early history of the drive toward modern biblical criticism from the medieval through the early modern period. In the final section, I emphasize how the attempt to achieve objectivity continued in Enlightenment universities and in nineteenth-century academic contexts that were often inseparable from European colonialism. Biblical criticism in the nineteenth century became, in William Farmer's words, "state supported biblical scholarship."[6]

The Theological Politics of Secularization

Before plunging into the genealogical history of modern biblical studies, it would be beneficial to review the development of modern notions of religious and secular, which undergird both religious studies and biblical studies in the academy today.[7] Talal Asad, Paul Griffiths, and William Cavanaugh provide important discussions of this development, and I am relying on their foundational studies.[8]

In 1990, John Milbank famously quipped, "Once, there was no 'secular.'"[9] As any thorough study of antiquity demonstrates, Milbank's assertion is obvious, when we take modern notions of what it means to be secular as our starting point. In English, secularization entered the language with the violent dissolution of the monasteries in the English Reformation. Agents on behalf of the English crown forcibly removed, or exterminated, Catholics from land the Catholic Church owned, and such land—ostensibly taken in order to support England's peasants—was handed over to the crown's supporters among wealthy noble families.[10] Secular eventually became associated with space absent of what we might call religious particularity. Once atheism, agnosticism, the New Age movement, and other more amorphous spiritualities became more prominent, God became one

more example of religious particularity, and thus secular—then and now—tends to exclude God in popular discourse.[11]

Prior to its emergence in the English language, the secular, *saeculum*, pertained to a sphere in time, in the world, which was saturated with God. In time, *saeculum* denoted linear history that was created by God and which would come to an end when God brought it to an end.[12] As pertaining to the world, *saeculum* places an emphasis on the natural order, and continues, for example, to play a significant role in official Catholic theology. In its dogmatic constitution on the church, *Lumen Gentium*, the Second Vatican Council taught that:

> The laity have their own special character which is secular [*saecularis*]. . . . It is the special vocation of the laity to seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and ordering these in accordance with the will of God. They live in the world [*saeculo*], that is to say, in each and all of the world's occupations and affairs, and in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life; these are the things that form the context of their life. And it is here that God calls them to work for the sanctification of the world as it were from the inside, like leaven, through carrying out their own task in the spirit of the gospel.[13]

Similarly, Pope St. John Paul II wrote, "There are two areas in which lay people live their vocations. The first, and the best one suited to their lay state, is the secular world, which they are called to shape according to God's will."[14]

"Religious" shares a developmental history with secular. Religion nowadays tends to be understood phenomenologically. In the past, Jews, Christians, and Muslims, for example, lived life in an attempt to follow God in all areas and aspects of their lives. Even if individuals did not live up to specific expectations in this regard, it would have been quite natural to make reference to God, norms pertaining to God, and so on. In the modern period, by contrast, God and religion newly redefined are expected to play a role only in certain

narrowly defined contexts, which tend to be private. When such religion enters the public realm it does so only by way of trespassing. Evelyn Waugh captures this attitude marvelously in his famous novel *Brideshead Revisited*, particularly in a conversation between one of the primary protagonists, Charles the erstwhile agnostic Anglican, and Brideshead the Catholic firstborn son of the Marchmain family:

> [Charles]: "'For God's sake,' I said, for I was near to tears that morning, 'why bring God into everything?'
>
> [Brideshead]: 'I'm sorry. I forgot. But you know that's an extremely funny question.'
>
> [Charles]: 'Is it?'
>
> [Brideshead]: 'To me. Not to you.'"[15]

To Charles the agnostic, emblematic of the modern individual, God does not belong in "everything," but members of the Catholic Marchmain family seem unnaturally to "bring God into everything." In the modern period Judaism, Christianity, and Islam join each other, and a host of other diverse traditions, as fellow members in the new category of world religions, each relegated to the private sphere.[16]

For Augustine, religion had to do with worship; religion was the praise and worship justly rendered to God. As Cavanaugh underscores, "For Augustine . . . *religio* is not contrasted with some sort of secular realm of activity. Any human pursuit can have its own (false) type of *religio*, its own type of idolatry: the worship of human works, land, etc. These, not something like 'paganism' or 'Judaism,' are contrasted to true worship."[17] In the Medieval period, Aquinas understood religion as in this earlier sense of worship or piety, and in this sense he treated it as a species of justice, since religion thus understood was authentic worship of God, which justice required. Aquinas also used religion in the standard medieval and modern sense as pertaining to specific Catholic religious orders. In this period, religion

referred to worship due to God, or monastic discipline, or specific orders within the Catholic Church. In the early modern period, religion was redefined to denote a discreet phenomenological category pertaining to sets of beliefs or practices by which such communities and community members may be studied and colonized.[18] This transformation served the political aims of emerging modern centralized states in their attempts to domesticate specific traditions, especially Catholicism and Calvinism.[19]

Until relatively recently, secularization was often seen as a trademark of modernity, and, if perhaps politically motivated, it was at least bereft of any theological influences. A growing number of scholars, however, have demonstrated the deep theological influences on the emergence of modernity.[20] Although some of these scholars see this as proof that modernity does not in fact have secular roots, a closer investigation reveals that the theological origins of modernity contain within them specific theologies that are secularizing by their very nature. This is specifically the case with their privatization of religion, newly redefined.[21] Thus, Luther's concept of two kingdoms, although firmly set within his theological vision, in theory and in fact relegated spiritual matters to the private recesses of the individual's soul, and left virtually all temporal matters in the hands of the state.[22]

Gallicanism, Erastianism, and related Conciliarist movements are also representative of this trend.[23] Certainly they are theological, but that does not mean they are bereft of a secularizing theology. It is important to move beyond the rigid dichotomization of secular and religious in the modern sense. Theology becomes secularizing, in the modern sense, when it banishes religion from the public sphere. When Church discipline loses its sting, Church membership becomes voluntaristic, and ecclesiastical authority becomes limited to rhetorical persuasion, a secularizing trend is at work, banishing God to some purely private sphere, in effect, if not also in theory. When we recognize in Gallicanism, and other movements, the call for a council of primarily state-appointed national bishops to trump the transnational authority of the pope, we begin to unmask a thinly

veiled secular political agenda, albeit one that is interwoven into the very fabric of these theological movements. In cases such as these, the roots of modernity are not merely theological, but in addition are secular and political.[24]

The Birth of Modern Biblical Criticism

Modern biblical criticism shares its theological and political origins with modernity because it grew up within modernity as one of modernity's swords serving in the combat that the modern project represents. In his groundbreaking article, "'A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House': The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State," Cavanaugh provides a genealogical account of the rise of modern centralized European states, which are the faces and engines of modernity.[25] Cavanaugh details how state centralization predated the early modern era by centuries, which in other of his works he maintains go back perhaps as far as the twelfth century, if not earlier.[26] As with Cavanaugh's arguments concerning the emergence of modern states, modern biblical criticism likewise did not appear ex nihilo from the minds of nineteenth-century savants, but rather has deep roots in the medieval period, and such precursors develop in such a way that, by the modern period, biblical criticism became, in Jon Levenson's words, "the realization of the Enlightenment project in the realm of biblical scholarship."[27]

Prior to the modern period and the development of what Michael Legaspi calls "the academic Bible," that is, the Bible as a book to be studied by scholars in the university—there was, to borrow Legaspi's words again, "the scriptural Bible," —that is, the living Scriptures which Jews and Christians encountered especially within their respective liturgies, interpreted by a panoply of exegetical traditions.[28] Traditional Jewish and Christian biblical interpretation was an immensely complex practice. For both Jews and Christians, the Scriptures themselves were difficult to understand and required serious effort, intellectual exertion that was deemed worthwhile, and

indeed necessary, because the Scriptures were meant for the faith-ful.[29] In some ways, encountering Scripture was about encounter-ing God: it was a means of "seeking the face of God" in this life.[30] Although most Jews and Christians were not primarily readers of Scripture but hearers of Scripture, they listened attentively and ac-tively in order to, as it were, seek the face of God here and now in the *saeculo*.[31] Christian interpretation relied upon multiple senses of Scripture. By the time of Augustine, who relied upon the *Book of the Rule* of the Donatist Tyconius, the *quadruplex sensus* became the stan-dard interpretive form, with the two senses (literal and spiritual) and three spiritual senses (typological, tropological, anagogical).[32] Aquinas relied upon this hermeneutical framework in his own work, when he taught about biblical interpretation.[33] Jewish interpretation likewise was as diverse as Christian.[34]

Already in the Medieval period these traditional multiple senses of Scripture began to erode with an emphasis on the literal sense, which triumphed in the Protestant Reformation.[35] The specialist began to take precedence over traditional ecclesial authorities.[36] Although precursors exist in people like Peter Abelard—who was likely influenced by Medieval Muslim commentators mediated to him via Peter the Venerable—we find the clearest precursors in Mar-silius of Padua and William of Ockham.[37] The Protestant Reformers continued this trend, especially in their continuation of the human-istic preoccupation with the Bible's textual tradition and with their mastery of philology.[38]

It was in the seventeenth century that an ostensibly objective, de-particularized biblical hermeneutic began to be sought, free of prior commitments. Although he had important precursors, Baruch Spi-noza is one of the most central figures within this history.[39] Spinoza sought an objective scientific method for reading the Bible patterned on geometry and the emerging natural sciences. The primary motive put forward for Spinoza's work, as well as the prior work of his own disciple, Lodewijk Meyer, was to put an end to violent wars caused by religion, most notably the Thirty Years' War.

The Modern and Colonial Pressures That Shaped the Field: Enlightenment History, the University, & the Birth of Biblical Studies

The biblical critical work of the seventeenth century was received by eighteenth-century scholars in very different ways. Many scholars were uneasy with the skepticism of seventeenth-century biblical exegetes such as Isaac La Peyrère and Spinoza, and yet they assumed the basic methodological framework of scientific objectivity. The study of the Bible survived and thrived at Enlightenment universities because of such study's transformation from a theological discipline into an historical one. Biblical philology and history, once viewed as pretheological enterprises, became independent and autonomous disciplines, and, in the Enlightenment university they represented the only respectable approach to studying the Bible.[40]

Enlightenment universities in Germany were initially created to form good civil servants. This objective coincided with a focus on culture; the best citizens were those who were most loyal to the state.[41] Hence German universities naturally sought to sever ties with Germany's Christian and especially Catholic past, which had the potential to undermine their goal, and they turned their attention to a search among non-Christian sources that contained excellent models of civic virtue. In time, the German quest came to be associated with the search among ancient Rome, Greece, and pre-Christian Germanic history, in the hopes of uncovering the cultural past necessary to supplant Christianity, and found a new Germany.[42]

Legaspi shows in his recent work, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies*, that the Bible became transformed from a theological wellspring into a cultural and historical artifact from a long dead civilization through the work of university professors, particularly Johann David Michaelis at the University of Göttingen.[43] The model for Michaelis' project was the German classicists Johann Matthias Gesner and Christian Gottlob Heyne's wholesale transformation of Classical studies. It would take Michaelis' disciple, Johann Gottfried Eichhorn,

to tread where Michaelis dared not go, and to dissolve Scripture into fragments by means of Eichhorn's acidic methodology.[44]

Biblical studies in the university thus became a tool of state-craft. Ever more secular, biblical studies taught in classrooms and as practiced in scholarship attempted to departicularize the various religious and theological commitments of scholars. As Levenson explains, "Like citizens in the classical liberal state, scholars practicing historical criticism of the Bible are expected to eliminate or minimize their communal loyalties, to see them as legitimately operative only within associations that are private, nonscholarly, and altogether voluntary."[45] Under the guise of objectivity, scholars began pushing agendas that supported their political concerns.[46] In the nineteenth century, the brunt of the attack was against contemporary Judaism and Catholicism, the latter of which scholars such as Julius Wellhausen saw as the bastard child of a long dead Judaism.[47] These biblical critical projects became embroiled in European colonialism already in the eighteenth century, but particularly, in the case of Germany, by the end of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century.[48]

To conclude, as with the academic study of religion, modern biblical studies emerged from the quest for objectivity, in the attempt to create distance between the Bible and the scholar, suppressing all prior commitments. A study of the history of such scholarship reveals the modern politics that undergirded the development of biblical criticism. In this history, the theological and the secular were not in dire combat, so much as certain theological politics were at odds with one another. The colonial projects of modern European states, especially Germany, gave shape and texture to the discipline, as it spread from German universities to the English-speaking world and beyond.[49] As we are only too aware, the quixotic quest for objective neutrality has often resulted not in illumination but in obfuscation. As Levenson explains, "the secularity of historical criticism represents not the suppression of commitment, but its relocation."[50]

Notes

I owe several individuals thanks for assistance at various stages with this article. I am indebted to Michael Legaspi, Eric Johnston, Scott Hahn, Benjamin Wiker, Michael Barber, Fr. Pablo Gadenz, and Biff Rocha for fruitful conversations/correspondence on several topics brought up here, as well as for Legaspi providing me with copies of his unpublished work. Finally, I owe Maria Morrow and Jay Morrow thanks for their comments on earlier drafts.

1. Pope Benedict XVI, *Verbum Domini* (Boston: Pauline Books & Media, 2010), no. 35.

2. See for example, Pope Benedict XVI, *Light of the World: The Pope, the Church, and the Signs of the Times: A Conversation with Peter Seewald*, trans. Michael J. Miller and Adrian J. Walker (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 171–72; Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, "Biblical Interpretation in Conflict" (1988), in Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI, *God's Word: Scripture—Tradition—Office*, ed. Peter Hünermann and Thomas Söding, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008 [2005]), 91–126; and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Behold the Pierced One: An Approach to a Spiritual Christology*, trans. by Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986 [1984]), 42–46.

3. I use several phrases to describe the same disciplines. Thus, "the academic study of religion," "*Religionsgeschichte*," "*Religionswissenschaft*," "religious studies," and "comparative religion" are used interchangeably, to describe the phenomenological approach to studying world religions in nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first century Western universities. More problematic is my use of "modern biblical studies," "biblical studies," "modern biblical criticism," "biblical criticism," and "historical criticism" for roughly the same enterprise. Modern historical biblical criticism, or the historical critical method of modern biblical studies, is only one among many methods of modern biblical studies. My use of these terms as interchangeable in this article stems from two related points: (1) nascent historical criticism emerged in the early modern period as the first method that is recognizable as modern biblical studies and yet is distinct from what came before the modern period. Thus, although biblical philology and textual analysis—both of which are included in modern biblical studies—existed, arguably, from at least the patristic period, what emerged in the seventeenth century as historical criticism, perhaps in inchoate form, represented something new (M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: Rise, Decline, Rebirth," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 [1983]: 376). Biblical philology, particularly a concern for developing a command of the original languages, existed in the patristic era, and there are a number of examples such as Jerome. See, for example, Megan Hale Williams, "Lessons from Jerome's Jewish Teachers: Exegesis and Cultural Interaction in Late Antique Palestine," in *Jewish Biblical Interpretation and Cultural Exchange: Comparative Exegesis in Context*, ed. Natalie B. Dohrmann and David Stern (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 78. Clearly a fully formed textual criticism would have to wait until the Renais-

sance, Reformation, or perhaps the modern period, but patristic authors such as Augustine were already aware of different textual traditions and provided an accounting for such traditions —in the case of Augustine, who was limited to reading the Bible in Latin, he had access to different textual traditions via the Latin Vulgate and the Vetus Latina (Michael C. Legaspi, "'Unless You Believe, You Will Not Understand': A Brief History of Isaiah 7:9" [paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Boston, 2008]; and Miguel Angel Tabet Balady, "La hermenéutica bíblica de san Agustín en la carta 82 a san Jerónimo," in *San Agustín: Meditación de un Centenario*, ed. José Oroz Reta [Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1987], 181–93). Jerome himself engaged in a more thorough textual criticism, as discussed in Williams, "Lessons," 79. (2) Historical criticism's continued hegemonic status in the academy also leads me to use it interchangeably with the other phrases denoting modern biblical studies in this present study. Although postmodern, feminist, liberation, canonical, narrative, overtly theological, and other methods are evidenced in scholarly journals and introductory textbooks, a survey of recent scholarly literature shows how indebted to historical critical methodologies the discipline remains. As the articles in any recent copy of the standard refereed journals in the field, for example, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, *Vetus Testamentum*, *Novum Testamentum*, *Biblica*, *New Testament Studies*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, and the *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* make clear. More often than not, even the articles using other methodologies, assume and utilize historical critical (e.g., source criticism, form criticism, and redaction criticism) methodologies.

4. Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

5. Talal Asad informs us that "Modernity is a *project*—or rather, a series of interlinked projects—that certain people in power seek to achieve. The project aims at institutionalizing a number of (sometimes, conflicting, often evolving) principles: constitutionalism, moral autonomy, democracy, human rights, civil equality, industry, consumerism, freedom of the market—and secularism. It employs proliferating technologies (of production, warfare, travel, entertainment, medicine) that generate new experiences of space and time, of cruelty and health, of consumption and knowledge. The notion that these experiences constitute 'disenchantment'—implying a direct access to reality, a stripping away of myth, magic, and the sacred—is a salient feature of the modern epoch" (Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003], 13). Writing further, Asad explains, "Modern projects do not hang together as an integrated totality, but they account for distinctive sensibilities, aesthetics, moralities . . . what is distinctive about modernity *as a historical epoch* includes modernity as a political-economic project" (14).

6. William R. Farmer, "State *Interesse* and Markan Primacy: 1870–1914," in *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850-1914*, ed. Henning Graf Reventlow and William Farmer (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 24.

7. A number of very useful histories of modern biblical scholarship exist. Some of the more important, in my mind, are Scott W. Hahn and Benjamin Wiker, *Politicizing the Bible: The Roots of Historical Criticism and the Secularization of Scripture 1300–1700* (New York: Herder & Herder, 2013); Magne Sæbø, ed., *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation Vol. III / 1: The Nineteenth Century* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Pierre Gibert, *L'invention critique de la Bible, XV*-*XVIII*ᵉ *Siècle* (Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 2010); Magne Sæbø, ed., *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation Vol. II: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008); Henning Graf Reventlow, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung Band IV: Von der Aufklärung bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2001); Henning Graf Reventlow, *Bibelautorität und Geist der Moderne, Die bedeutung des Bibelverständnisses für die geistesgeschichtliche und politische Entwicklung in England von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1980); and Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments* (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956).

8. William T. Cavanaugh, *The Myth of Religious Violence: Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Paul J. Griffiths, *Problem of Religious Diversity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001); William T. Cavanaugh, "'A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House': The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State," *Modern Theology* 11 (1995): 397–420; and Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

9. John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 9. The broader context for this pithy phrase is: "Once, there was no 'secular.' And the secular was not latent, waiting to fill more space with the steam of the 'purely human,' when the pressure of the sacred was relaxed. Instead there was the single community of Christendom, with its dual aspects of *sacerdotium* and *regnum*. The *saeculum*, in the medieval era, was not a space, a domain, but a time—the interval between fall and *eschaton* where coercive justice, private property and impaired natural reason must make shift to cope with the unredeemed effects of sinful humanity" (9).

10. Jeffrey L. Morrow, "The Politics of Biblical Interpretation: A 'Criticism of Criticism,'" *New Blackfriars* 91 (2010): 541–42; Anthony W. Marx, *Faith in Nation: Exclusionary Origins of Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), for example, 128–39, 153–61, and 175–84; and Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400–c. 1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 383–85, 397, 402–3, and 462.

11. Biff Rocha and Jeffrey L. Morrow, "Dancing on the Wall: An Analysis of Barack Obama's 'Call to Renewal' Keynote Address," in *What Democrats Talk About When They*

Talk About God: Religious Communication in Democratic Party Politics, ed. David Weiss (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010), 129–54.

12. Rocha and Morrow, "Dancing on the Wall," 145; and Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 9.

13. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 31. All quotations from the Second Vatican Council taken from Norman P. Tanner, SJ, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume Two: Trent to Vatican II* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990). Compare this with the comments in Vatican II's decree on the apostolate of the laity, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 2: "Laypeople, sharing in the priestly, prophetic and kingly offices of Christ, play their part in the mission of the whole people of God in the church and in the world. They truly exercise their apostolate by labours for evangelising and sanctifying people, and by permeating the temporal order with the spirit of the gospel and so perfecting it. . . . Since it is proper to the lay state to live in the midst of the world engaged in secular [*saecularium*] affairs, laypeople are called by God, with lives made fervent in the Christian spirit, to exercise their apostolate as leaven in the world."

14. Pope St. John Paul II, *Ecclesia in America* (1999), no. 44, available online: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html. These thoughts dovetail with the ideas of St. Josemaría Escrivá. In one of Josemaría's most famous homilies, "Amar al mundo apasionadamente" (1967), we read: "God is calling you to serve him *in and from* civil, material, secular doings of human life: in a laboratory, in the hospital operating room, in the barracks, in the university chair, in the factory, in the workshop, in the field, in the home and in all the immense panorama of work, God awaits us each day . . . there is *something* holy, divine, hidden in the most common situations, that is up to each one of you to discover" (Josemaría Escrivá, "Amar al mundo apasionadamente," in *Conversaciones con Mons. Escrivá de Balaguer* [Madrid: Rialp, 1968], no. 114).

15. Evelyn Waugh, *Brideshead Revisited* (New York: Back Bay Books, 1999 [1944]), 145. A similar conversation occurs earlier between Cordelia and Charles:

    "When we were alone she [Cordelia] said: 'Are you really an agnostic?'
    [Charles]: 'Does your family always talk about religion all the time?'
    [Cordelia]: 'Not all the time. It's a subject that just comes up naturally, doesn't it?'
    [Charles]: 'Does it? It never has with me before'" (93).

16. Masuzawa, *Invention*, xi–xiii, 1–21, 107–20, and 179–206; and Griffiths, *Problems*, 1–12.

17. Cavanaugh, *Myth*, 63.

18. St. Augustine, *De Vera Religione* in *Augustine: Earlier Writings* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953), 225–31; Jeffrey L. Morrow, "The Bible in Captivity: Hobbes, Spinoza and the Politics of Defining Religion," *Pro Ecclesia* 19 (2010): 285–87 and 293; St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* (Cambridge: Blackfriars, 1964), II.II.81; Cavanaugh, *Myth*, 57–122; Griffiths, *Problems*, 1–12; Cavanaugh, "Fire Strong Enough,"

403–8; Asad, *Genealogies*, 27–54. In his *City of God*, Augustine later brings up diffi-
culties and inadequacies with the phrase religion as pertaining to worship, mention-
ing that it typically pertains to human relationships. See St. Augustine, *City of God*
(New York: Penguin, 2003), X.I.; and Cavanaugh, *Myth*, 63–64.

19. Morrow, "Bible in Captivity," 285–88, 293, and 298–99; Cavanaugh, *Myth*, 123–
80; Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philoso-
phy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 146–54; and Cavanaugh, "Fire Strong Enough,"
398–403.

20. Eric Nelson, *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Polit-
ical Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); Michael Allen Gillespie,
The Theological Origins of Modernity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008);
and Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

21. Cavanaugh, *Myth*, 123–80; and Cavanaugh, "Fire Strong Enough," 397–420.

22. Martin Luther, "Von weltlicher Obrigkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei"
(1523), in *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe Band 11* (Weimer: Her-
mann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1900), 246–80. See the comments in Cavanaugh, "Fire
Strong Enough," 399.

23. I recognize that especially French Gallicanism is incredibly diverse. See Yves Con-
gar, "Gallicanisme," *Catholicisme* 4:1731–739. Congar's entry may be old, but it re-
mains, in my opinion, one of the finest treatments of Gallicanism.

24. Morrow, "Politics of Biblical Interpretation," 543–45; and William L. Portier,
"Church Unity and National Traditions: The Challenge to the Modern Papacy,
1682–1870," in *The Papacy and the Church in the United States* (ed. Bernard Cooke;
New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 27–37.

25. Cavanaugh, "Fire Strong Enough," 397–420.

26. William T. Cavanaugh, "Killing for the Telephone Company: Why the Nation-State
is Not the Keeper of the Common Good," *Modern Theology* 20 (2004): 246–48.
Regarding state centralization's early origins in the medieval period, Cavanaugh fol-
lows the arguments made in Joseph R. Strayer, *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern
State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970).

27. Jon D. Levenson, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and
Christians in Biblical Studies* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 118.

28. Michael C. Legaspi, *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies* (Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2010), viii. For the contrast between these two Bibles,
and the origins of the academic Bible, see pages vii–x and 3–26. See also Morrow,
"Bible in Captivity," 288–92. On Legaspi's important work, see Jeffrey L. Morrow,
"The Enlightenment University and the Creation of the Academic Bible: Michael
Legaspi's *The Death of Scripture and the Rise of Biblical Studies*," *Nova et Vetera* 11, no. 3
(2013): 897–922.

29. James L. Kugel, *How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now* (New York:
Free Press, 2007), 10–24.

30. Here I am borrowing from the subtitle of Robert Louis Wilken, *The Spirit of Early*

Christian Thought: Seeking the Face of God (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).
Wilken explains his subtitle as follows: "The subtitle *Seeking the Face of God* is based
on Psalm 105:4 in the Latin version, 'Seek his face always' (Quaerite faciem eius
semper) . . . . More than any other passage in the Bible it captures the spirit of early
Christian thinking" (xxii). In his third chapter, devoted to early Christian biblical
interpretation and entitled "The Face of God for Now," Wilken opens with a quota-
tion from Augustine: "For now treat the Scripture of God as the face of God. Melt
in its presence" (50).

31. Morrow, "Bible in Captivity," 289-91; Peter M. Candler, Jr., *Theology, Rhetoric, Man-
uduction, or Reading Scripture Together on the Path to God* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Ee-
rdmans, 2006), 7, 9, 15, 18, 27, 38–39, 50, 66, 74, 77–82, 151–60, and 162; Peter
van der Coelen, "Pictures for the People? Bible Illustrations and their Audience," in
Lay Bible in Europe 1450–1800 (ed. M. Lamberigts and A. A. den Hollander; Leuven:
Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2006), 185–205; Wilken, *Spirit of Early Chris-
tian Thought*, xiii–xxii and 25–79; and Asad, *Formations of the Secular*, 37–38.

32. Edward Synan, "The Four 'Senses' and Four Exegetes," in *With Reverence for the Word:
Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Jane Dammen McAu-
liffe, Barry D. Walfish, and Joseph W. Goering (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
2003), 225–36; A. J. Minnis, "*Quadruplex Sensus, Multiplex Modus*: Scriptural Sense
and Mode in Medieval Scholastic Exegesis," in *Interpretation and Allegory: Antiquity
to the Modern Period*, ed. Jon Whitman (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 231–56; Manlio Sim-
onetti, "L'ermeneutica biblica di Agostino," *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 12 (1995):
393–418; Maureen A. Tilley, "Understanding Augustine Misunderstanding Tyco-
nius," *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993): 405–8; Curtis W. Freeman, "Figure and History:
A Contemporary Reassessment of Augustine's Hermeneutic," in *Collectanea Augus-
tiniana III: Augustine, Presbyter Factus Sum*, ed. Joseph T. Lienhard, Earl C. Muller, and
Roland J. Teske (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 319–29; Martine Dulaey, "La six-
ième Règle de Tyconius et son résumé dans le 'De doctrina christiana," *Revue des
études augustiniennes* 35 (1989): 83–103; Maureen A. Tilley, "The Use of Scripture
in Christian North Africa: An Examination of Donatist Hermeneutics" (PhD diss.,
Duke University, 1989); Pamela Bright, *The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Its Purpose and
Inner Logic* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988); Giancarlo Gaeta,
"Le *Regole* per l'interpretazione della Scrittura da Ticonio ad Agostino," *Annali di
storia dell'esegesi* 4 (1987): 109–18; Cornelius P. Mayer, "Prinzipien der Hermeneu-
tik Augustins und daraus sich ergebende Probleme," *Forum Katholische Theologie* 1
(1985): 197–211; and Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Ecriture*,
4 vols (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1959, 1961, and 1964). I am aware that exegesis
within the ancient and medieval Christian world often went beyond the bounds of
the *quadruplex sensus*, as pointed out in Bogdan G. Bucur, "Sinai, Zion, and Tabor: An
Entry into the Christian Bible," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 4 (2010): 33–52;
and Bogdan G. Bucur, "Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies in Byzantine Hymnography:
Rewritten Bible?" *Theological Studies* 68 (2007): 92–112.

33. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I., q. 1, a. 10.

34. Rimon Kasher, "The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jay Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2004 [1988]), 547–94; Barry D. Walfish, "An Introduction to Medieval Jewish Biblical Interpretation," in *With Reverence for the Word*, 3–12; Michael Fishbane, "Midrash and the Meaning of Scripture," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia*, ed. Jože Krašovec (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 549–63; Frank Talmage, "Apples of Gold: The Inner Meaning of Sacred Texts in Medieval Judaism," in *Jewish Spirituality: From the Bible Through the Middle Ages*, ed. Arthur Green (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 313–55; and Moshe Idel, "Midrashic Versus Other Forms of Jewish Hermeneutics: Some Comparative Reflections," in *The Midrashic Imagination: Jewish Exegesis, Thought, and History*, ed. Michael Fishbane (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 45–58.

35. Of course, it is more accurate to say that the magisterial Reformers broadened the *sensus literalis* rather than abandoned the traditional senses of Scripture, as their works evidence exegesis traditionally identified as typological and tropological. See for example, David C. Steinmetz, "John Calvin as an Interpreter of the Bible," in *Calvin and the Bible*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 282–91; Richard A. Muller, "The Hermeneutic of Promise and Fulfillment in Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament Prophecies of the Kingdom," in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. David C. Steinmetz (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 68–82; and David C. Steinmetz, *Luther in Context* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986).

36. The politics of this shift in authority is often missed by scholars, but see the important insights in this regard, in Constantin Fasolt, "Religious Authority and Ecclesiastical Governance," in *The Renaissance World*, ed. John Jeffries Martin (London: Routledge, 2007), 364–80; and Travis L. Frampton, *Spinoza and the Rise of Historical Criticism of the Bible* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 13.

37. Morrow, "The Modernist Crisis and the Shifting of Catholic Views on Biblical Inspiration," *Letter & Spirit* 6 (2010): 267–70; Jeffrey L. Morrow, "Politics of Biblical Interpretation,'" 530–33; A. J. Minnis, "Material Swords and Literal Lights: The Status of Allegory in William of Ockham's *Breviloquium* on Papal Power," in *With Reverence for the Word*, 292–308; Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 71–72; Roger Arnaldez, *Grammaire et théologie chez Ibn Hazm de Cordoue: Essai sur la structure et les conditions de la pensée musulmane* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1956), 319; and Miguel Asín Palacios, *Abenházam de Córdoba y su historia crítica de las ideas religiosas II* (Madrid: Tipografía de la "Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos," 1928), 74 and 74 n. 105.

38. Gibert, *L'invention critique*, 47–73; Michael Maria Waldstein, "*Analogia Verbi*: The Truth of Scripture in Rudolf Bultmann and Raymond Brown," *Letter & Spirit* 6

(2010): 100–01; Morrow, "Modernist Crisis," 269–70; Morrow, "Politics of Biblical Interpretation," 533–34; Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*, 10–26; and Frampton, *Spinoza and the Rise of Historical Criticism*, 23–42.

39. Several important precursors to Spinoza's work were actually among his contemporaries: Isaac La Peyrère, Thomas Hobbes, and Lodewijk Meyer. See for example, Jeffrey L. Morrow, "Historical Criticism as Secular Allegorism: The Case of Spinoza," *Letter & Spirit* 8 (2013): 189–221; Jeffrey L. Morrow, "French Apocalyptic Messianism: Isaac La Peyrère and Political Biblical Criticism in the Seventeenth Century," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 27 (2011): 203–13; Jeffrey L. Morrow, "Pre-Adamites, Politics and Criticism: Isaac La Peyrère's Contribution to Modern Biblical Studies," *Journal of the Orthodox Center for the Advancement of Biblical Studies* 4 (2011): 1–23; Jeffrey L. Morrow, "*Leviathan* and the Swallowing of Scripture: The Politics behind Thomas Hobbes' Early Modern Biblical Criticism," *Christianity & Literature* 61(2011): 33–54; Jeffrey L. Morrow, "The Early Modern Political Context to Spinoza's Bible Criticism," *Revista de Filosofía* 66 (2010): 7–24; Morrow, "Modernist Crisis," 265–80; Morrow, "Politics of Biblical Interpretation," 528–55; Morrow, "Bible in Captivity," 285–99; and the bibliographical references therein.

40. Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*, x–xi, 4–7, 9, 31–36, 81, 83–104, and 155–59.

41. Thus, Legaspi writes, "It was not at all clear that the study of the Bible in any form would have a place at a new university, especially one created by the government to educate civil servants and noblemen in the rational, tolerant spirit of the age. Yet, at Göttingen, academics succeeded in folding the humanities, though tied strongly to ancient texts and traditions, into a modern, statist enterprise" (*Death of Scripture*, x). In regard to the emphasis on culture (in the sense of both *Bildung* and also *Kultur*) and biblical scholarship, Jonathan Sheehan astutely notes, "culture became a powerful tool in the rhetorical arsenal of German savants and would come to subsume man's entire spiritual, political, artistic, historical, and scholarly heritage" (*The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005], 223).

42. Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*, especially x–xi, 27–78, 156–60, and 164–66; Suzanne Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Stanley Hauerwas, *The State of the University: Academic Knowledges and the Knowledge of God* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 12–32; Sheehan, *Enlightenment Bible*, especially 211–17; Gavin D'Costa, *Theology in the Public Square: Church, Academy, and Nation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 8–20; George Williamson, *The Longing for Myth in Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Brian Vick, "Greek Origins and Organic Metaphors: Ideals of Cultural Autonomy in Neo-Humanist Germany from Winckelmann to Curtius," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63 (2002): 483–500; and Suzanne Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

43. Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*. Legaspi makes an important fundamental point when he writes, "The two [the scriptural and academic Bibles] are opposed to one another, but I believe it is necessary to reconceive the nature of this opposition. Too often it has been seen, unhelpfully, as an expression of stale antitheses between reason and faith, history and revelation, the secular and the sacred. The history of modern biblical criticism shows that the fundamental antitheses were not intellectual or theological, but rather social, moral, and political. Academic critics did not dispense with the authority of a Bible resonant with religion; they redeployed it" (xii).

44. Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*, 128, 136, 156, and 165; Gibert, *L'invention critique*, 305–6, 323–25, 327–30, and 346; and Sheehan, *Enlightenment Bible*, 90, 199, 214, and 219–20. Legaspi explains, "In the main, the guiding light of our eighteenth-century figures was not a beautiful vision of what criticism as a theological enterprise might look like. It was rather, for them, a matter of what biblical criticism, as a university subject, might *do*, what it might contribute to the education of men who would one day run the governments under which they themselves would have to live" (31).

45. Levenson, *Hebrew Bible*, 118. Writing further, he maintains, "The new arrangement . . . tends subtly to restrict the questions studied and the methods employed to those that permit the minimization of religious difference with relative facility. . . . Those unwilling to pay the price are unable to participate in this type of study" (118).

46. Something similar occurred in the discipline of history as well. See Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

47. Anders Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), for example, 39–41, 54–57, 64–69, 77, 79, 82, 93, 115–17, 119–20, and 588–89; James Pasto, "W. M. L. de Wette and the Invention of Post-Exilic Judaism: Political Historiography and Christian Allegory in Nineteenth-Century German Biblical Scholarship," in *Jews, Antiquity, and the Nineteenth-Century Imagination*, ed. Hayim Lapin and Dale Marin (Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 2003), 33–52; James Pasto, "Islam's 'Strange Secret Sharer': Orientalism, Judaism, and the Jewish Question," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40 (1998): 437–74; James Pasto, "When the End is the Beginning? Or When the Biblical Past Is the Political Present: Some Thoughts on Ancient Israel, 'Post-Exilic Judaism,' and the Politics of Biblical Scholarship," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 12 (1998): 157–202; and Frank Manuel, *The Broken Staff: Judaism through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 311. On the political context, and especially the role of the *Kulturkampf* as well as the history immediately preceding the *Kulturkampf*, within which it is necessary to place the works of scholars like Wellhausen, see Michael B. Gross, *The War Against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); Farmer, "State *Interesse*," 15–49; Christian Simon, "History as a Case-Study of the Relations

Between University Professors and the State in Germany," in *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms*, 168–96; and Arnaldo Momigliano, "Religious History Without Frontiers: J. Wellhausen, U. Wilamowitz, and E. Schwartz," *History and Theory* 21 (1982): 49–64.

48. Already in the eighteenth century, "German intellectuals of the late Enlightenment were engaging in dialogue with the colonial restructuring of the world" (John K. Noyes, "Goethe on Cosmopolitanism and Colonialism: *Bildung* and the Dialectic of Critical Mobility," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 39 [2006]: 443). On the link between colonial enterprises and biblical studies during this time, see Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*, 95–97; Sheehan, *Enlightenment Bible*, especially 186–217; Bill T. Arnold and David B. Weisberg, "Delitzsch in Context," in *God's Word for Our World, Volume 2*, ed. J. Harold Ellens, Deborah L. Ellens, Rolf P. Knierim, and Isaac Kalimi (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), 37–45; Bill T. Arnold and David B. Weisberg, "A Centennial Review of Friedrich Delitzsch's 'Babel und Bibel' Lectures," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 441–57; Steven W. Holloway, "Biblical Assyria and Other Anxieties in the British Empire," *Journal of Religion & Society* 3 (2001): pars. 1–21; and Neil Asher Silberman, *Digging for God and Country: Exploration, Archeology, and the Secret Struggle for the Holy Land, 1799–1917* (New York: Knopf, 1982).

49. This is an interesting reversal, since Germany was actually a latecomer to the game of modern biblical criticism, initially building upon the work of English Deists and rationalists in biblical criticism. Germany eventually became master of the field and then later influenced the very England on whose own foundational studies it had built. See for example, Gibert, *L'invention critique*, 309–16; Legaspi, *Death of Scripture*, 115–21; Sheehan, *Enlightenment Bible*, 27–30; John W. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany* (London: Fortress Press, 1985 [1984]); and Reventlow, *Bibelautorität und Geist der Moderne*. See Sheehan's comment that "The Enlightenment Bible was delivered, in Germany, by those committed to transforming, not preserving, the *textus receptus* . . . this initial difference of position allowed the Enlightenment Bible to thrive in Germany, thrive to such an extent that the enormous outflow of intellectual energy from England to Germany in the early eighteenth century was, by century's end, completely reversed, as Germany became the center of a vibrant biblical scholarship the envy of Protestant nations across Europe" (30).

50. Levenson, *Hebrew Bible*, 125.