

Dr. Roger Green, Reformation to the Present,

Lecture 10, The Enlightenment

© 2024 Roger Green and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Roger Green in his course on Church History, Reformation to the Present. This is session 10, The Enlightenment.

We're going to journey on to where we should be. That's right at the very end of the hall, the very end, and it's got tables, and we'll sit around the tables. Okay, so we're where we should be in our lecture, so we're rejoicing in that. Lecture 5, The Theology of the Age of the Enlightenment, is just a reminder that we started the course, of course, looking at medieval Roman Catholicism and what that was all about.

Then, the Reformation through Luther, especially for our course, through Calvin, is a response to medieval Roman Catholicism, an initial response to it. Then, we looked at the Catholic response to the Reformation response, the Counter-Reformation, and the Catholic Reformation. Then, in the last lecture, we saw Protestantism, which began as a fairly unified movement.

I mean, Luther was the first generation, and Calvin was the second generation. Protestantism then begins to split a bit and remember the two issues over which it split. It's church liturgy and church polity.

So, the Reformation in England formed the Anglican Church, and out of the Anglican Church eventually came Congregationalism, and the Baptists and some of the Baptists became Unitarians. In fact, some of the Congregationalists also became Unitarians. So, you're starting to have kind of a denominationalism being established here.

We also tried to stress that ecclesiology became the central argument during that time. If justification and assurance were the central arguments of the Reformation time, then when you move on to this period once the Reformation gets going, certainly ecclesiology is what becomes kind of central to that time. Now we're starting Lecture 5, The Theology of the Age of the Enlightenment, and now we're going to see the central argument, in a sense, or the central story of this time, is kind of a criticism of the Church and a criticism of Christianity.

So, in this lecture, what I want to do is show the kind of criticism that goes on in various places, and especially, of course, in Western Europe, but also here in America. The criticism that does go on, which makes Christianity and the Church, it sidelines, certainly sidelines Christianity and the Church. Then, the next lecture is about what the Church does about that. Well, the next lecture is about the evangelical resurgence in the Church.

So, we're doing okay in terms of our time, and we'll get this lecture started, and then we've got Friday, then we've got next week, and then the week after, we're at midterm already. So, the week after next, we're halfway through the course. So we are kind of marching on here.

So, okay. By way of introduction, what I'm going to do here is I'm going to, we're going to do two things. I'm going to introduce some terms, and then I just want to remind us of the rise of modern philosophy.

And remember, one of the things in the course we want to ask ourselves is what the relationship between theology and philosophy is. So, just some terms. Okay, let's just remind ourselves, I'm going to use three. Reformation, Renaissance, Enlightenment.

Reformation, the term Reformation. And remember that one of the things about the Reformation, in a sense, was that it freed up the individual conscience. And some of you answered the question about the freeing of the self, you know, or the freeing of the conscience.

You answered that question in the exam. But certainly, the Reformation was a reaction against medieval Roman Catholicism, no doubt. But it was a reaction that reformulated the body of Christ, the church, and re-understood what the church was all about.

But within that church, people could have freedom of conscience. They had the freedom to kind of think for themselves. Educated people, of course, could read the scriptures in their own language.

They could hear the preaching in their own language. But it was all done within the church. All that freedom of conscience was all done within the church, within the body of Christ.

So that's number one, the Reformation. Okay, now parallel to the Reformation, number two, the second definition is, of course, the Renaissance. And the Renaissance is a kind of going back to the original sources, Greek and Hebrew sources, and so forth.

As one person said, it's the recovery of humankind and human abilities. So, the Renaissance is running parallel to the Reformation. The Renaissance also gave people a kind of freedom of conscience.

The Renaissance also gave them the privilege, in a sense, of thinking for themselves, this freedom of conscience. The difference is that with a lot of Renaissance thinkers,

not all, but with some Renaissance thinkers, freedom of conscience took them outside of the church. It took them outside of the body of Christ.

So unlike the kind of Reformation thinking that was all done within the church, sometimes Renaissance thinking was kind of a liberation from the church and a creation of kind of terms we'd be familiar with, like secularization or humanism, terms like that. So, it kind of produced that. So now there's kind of, in the Renaissance, there's kind of a feeling of autonomy, and that feeling of a kind of human autonomy, but that human autonomy is done apart from the body of Christ, apart from the church.

Not for all Renaissance thinkers but for many. So, Reformation within the church and Renaissance started to move outside of the church. Okay, and then number three, of course, now we get to Enlightenment.

So, a definition of Enlightenment. Enlightenment is the period of the Enlightenment, starting in the 17th century, the period of reason, and the period of rationalization. It's really a conscious effort to apply reason to every aspect of life.

So that's how I would define the Enlightenment, the period we're going to be moving into now. Apply reason and rationality to every aspect of life. So, we do call the 17th century the age of reason, but there is kind of a caution here.

Even though we call it the age of reason, there is one little cautionary note, and that is in the next century, in the 18th century, the sufficiency of reason for everything was called into question. The sufficiency of reason for faith, for example, for religious life, was especially called into question. So, reason, you can judge everything by reason in the age of the Enlightenment.

You can apply the rule of reason to everything. There's kind of a pre-established harmony in life, but does that reason have limitations? And some people said, yes, we've got to be careful here because sometimes applying only reason to every aspect of life is going to have limitations, and nowhere is that going to be seen more so than when you come to religion. You can't just apply reason only to religion.

There's something. Faith has to come in here somewhere. So that's the period we're kind of entering into. So, what I'd like to do also by way of introduction here is remind you of two philosophers that, well, I'll remind you of three or four philosophers, two for the introduction, and then we'll get into a couple of others as we look at other stuff.

But we want to remind you of two philosophers from your days in philosophy when you took philosophy in your core course. So, the two that will just stand out in your

mind are ones that you probably have never forgotten, and you may still be kind of reading here. But one is John Locke, and here are the dates for John Locke.

Okay. So, do you remember anything about John Locke? What comes to mind when you think of John Locke? Anything at all comes to mind when you think of John Locke, especially when you think of John Locke in terms of the way we understand things? Right? That's true. That's true.

I wasn't, and I'm not thinking right here so much of the political theory as, okay, that's one thing you remember him, and we'll see that also when you get to people like Rousseau. Anything else about John Locke? Well, John Locke, when it comes to the way you think about things, this kind of empiricism, for John Locke, the mind is kind of a blank piece of paper. I don't know if you remember that or not, but the mind is kind of a blank piece of paper, and the sensations in your life, what you learn in life, are put on that mind and make impressions on your mind, and so forth.

However, as far as John Locke is concerned about this course, experience is really where knowledge begins. Experience is the best source of knowledge. For John Locke, what he and other people would be interested in would be a natural revelation.

How do we understand God? We understand God through a natural theology. We understand God by looking at his created world, and that experience of looking at the world is what is the impression that's put in our minds, and we might know something about God from that. But the thing that we want to take note of is that the starting point is a natural theology.

The starting point is experience. The starting point is not a revealed theology. So the starting point for your discussion is not a revealed theology, God revealing himself in Christ through the scriptures.

That's how we know about God, and we know somewhat about this world. So it's a different starting point. And if it's a different starting point, it's going to be a different ending point too, because as far as he's concerned, as far as Locke is concerned, the starting point for what you want to know is really lodged in us and not in God or in what you can learn about God from the church.

So that becomes really important, and that's a philosophy that's going to come into the 17th century, the 18th century, and that's going to develop and be important, no doubt about that. So, for John Locke, if you use words like reasonableness or rationality, that becomes really critical. Now, the second person is Immanuel Kant.

Immanuel Kant, okay, anybody, what do you remember about Immanuel Kant? What do you remember about Immanuel Kant? Anything at all? Does anything come to

mind about Immanuel Kant? Anything strike? John Locke is the guy on the right, and Immanuel Kant is the guy on the left here. But anything comes to mind, Ruth, about Immanuel? Ethics, right? We'll get to that. Yes, that becomes important, that's right, ethics.

Anything else about Immanuel Kant? Okay, okay, well, in a sense, Immanuel Kant is a representative of human beings coming of age in the age of the Enlightenment; he's a perfect representative of that. Humanity has come of age, humanity has kind of grown up, and reason has become the norm of life. You use your reason to judge things in life, and it becomes a norm of what you know.

You know through reason. Now, that's all good: reason, rationality, coming of age, and all that kind of thing are all good, but Immanuel Kant recognized that he's the person who helps us recognize that there are limitations to reason. And I think one of the reasons he might have recognized that as so important to him was because he was reared in a movement in Germany called Pietism.

Now, Pietism, we're going to talk about Pietism in the next lecture, so we don't need to worry about Pietism now, but Pietism basically was a very good, wonderful movement that combined the mind and the heart. It was a reaction against the kind of Lutheran scholasticism, which was all mind, no heart, all mind, no feeling, but God bless you, but Pietism kind of combined those. And that's how Immanuel Kant was reared, in Pietism.

So he certainly, then he reminds us that there are limits to reason. So, when it came to, for example, when it came to God for Immanuel Kant, you don't know God by rationality. You don't know God.

You don't have this knowledge of God by reason of some kind. You know God only by faith. It's a religious thing by which you know God.

And then you mentioned ethics or morality and so forth. So, he did have a moral principle. So, do you remember, anybody remember what that moral principle was? It's called the categorical imperative.

Do you remember that? Categorical, God bless you, the categorical imperative. So, I love the categorical imperative. Think of the consequences of your actions if they were universalized.

God bless you. That's the categorical imperative. Think of the consequences of your actions.

Think of the actions that you do, the ethical things you do, the moral things you do. Think of the consequences of your actions if everybody did that. Would that be a

good world, or would that be a bad world? Would that be a world in which you were pleased, and God was pleased, or would it be a bad world? So God bless you.

So, we're universalizing now our actions. So, just universalize your action and think if that would be a good or a bad world. So, for Immanuel Kant, that's the categorical imperative.

That's the ethical mandate. That's the way you should judge life. I've given the illustration in just a minute, but God bless you.

God bless you. This is spreading, isn't it? I think I'm going to back up a little, but I think of the categorical imperative in Immanuel Kant and, as you mentioned, ethics. Now, what you could say, however, is that Immanuel Kant believed in God, he believed in immortality, he believed in the afterlife, and so forth, but he also believed in the virtuous life, of course, universalizing your actions.

But what you could say, however, is that we're starting to reduce religion to ethics. We're starting to reduce religion to the moral life, the ethical life, the virtuous life. And so religion is starting. There's a reductionism going on here.

And with that reductionism, is it possible for some people following Kant to forget about other truths like God and the incarnation and the Holy Spirit and the church, the body of Christ, and so forth? Is it possible to forget about those other things? The answer to that is yes because a lot of people in the 18th century forgot about other kinds of religious things, and they just stressed the virtuous life or the good life. Kant's really difficult to read. I think you probably found that out in your course, but when I think of Immanuel Kant, it's when I'm driving down the street, and someone's in front of me, and they're rolling down the windows of their car, and they're throwing out their beer cans and cigarettes or their McDonald's stuff into the side of the road.

And you know what I think to myself when they're doing that? I think, you know, if these people had read Immanuel Kant, they never would have done that. Because if they just thought of themselves, what if everybody did that? What if everybody was driving down the road, rode down their window, and threw all the trash out? Even those people wouldn't want to live in that world. But they probably haven't read Immanuel Kant.

So, I'm guessing that probably they haven't read Immanuel Kant. So, they probably aren't thinking about what would happen if my action were universalized. What would be the consequences of that? And what kind of a world would that be? They're probably not thinking in those ways. But every time I see that happening, I always think of Immanuel Kant and what he would say to them.

But there it is. But is there this problem, maybe, of marginalizing, of emphasizing ethics, emphasizing morals, emphasizing the virtues of life? Is there a problem with people following Kant marginalizing other great truths or religious truths? I think probably there was that problem. Okay, so just by way of introduction, here are three terms that we just want to remember.

And then two people that kind of can help us get the story started. This is the birth of modern philosophy. Modern philosophy has an impact not only on this cultural world and the scientific world but also on the religious world.

So, what is the relationship between philosophy and theology? Locke and Kant help us to understand that relationship a little bit. Anything here at all? Are we okay? Now, if you're looking at your notes on page 13, what I'd like to do now is I'd like to look at how this age of the Enlightenment kind of worked itself out in four places. England, France, Germany, and America.

So, just to give a brief view of these four places, I want to see what happened here. So, we'll start with England then. How did this kind of understanding of the Enlightenment work itself out in England? Okay.

Whoops, sorry. I've got to think of some terms here. The way it worked itself out in England was in a movement called deism.

Okay, now, deism is not a denomination. So, we shouldn't think of it as a denomination. It's not a, it's not a Protestant denomination.

The thinking of deism would eventually work into Protestant denominations. However, deism itself is more of a philosophical, religious point of view. So, deism really began in the 17th century in England and really flowered in England during the Enlightenment.

And then it came over to America. But when you think of deism in terms of their view of God, what's the kind of standard view of God that the deists had? Is God up there? He created the world, he got it going, and then he stands back, and he's the watcher of this creation that he made. Often, it's the watchmaker God that he created, the clockmaker God.

He created the clock, got it set up, got it ticking, and then stood back. So, and deism was like that, no doubt about that. It began in England and came over here into America.

So, just so that we're clear, what I'd like to mention are six aspects of deism. So as deism takes shape in the age of the Enlightenment in England, there are a lot of

aspects of deism, but I want to just mention six so that we're clear about them. Okay, number one, the deists did believe in a creator God.

So, like I said, they were monotheists and they did believe in one God. They weren't, you know, agnostics or atheists or they weren't polytheists. They believed in the creator God.

They believed in the one God. Okay, secondly, the deists had a very high opinion of human free will. The deists in England were reacting against the Calvinists in England and the doctrine of predestination.

So these people believed in freedom of the will, and that's going to be important both in British religious life, but it's also going to be important in, I should say, it's going to be important in British and American religious life, but it's also going to be important in British and American political life as well. So, with freedom of the will, human beings are free to make choices, number two. Okay, number three, the deists believed in a virtuous life, like Immanuel Kant.

They believed in a moral life and an ethical life. They believe that that's a good way to live life. You don't necessarily need the Bible to tell you that.

Your own kind of reasonable thinking can tell you that. So that's number three. Number four, the deists did believe in an afterlife.

They thought that everything wasn't going to be settled in this life. So, the deists believed in the afterlife, although it was fairly vague, and they believed in rewards and punishments. So they did believe in a sense in heaven and hell, but it's pretty vague, but there is an afterlife, and there are rewards for the virtuous people, and there are punishments for the people, for the immoral people.

So, they did believe in that. So, number five, they did believe in the importance of reason. In fact, they underscored the importance of reason both religiously and, of course, culturally.

And especially culturally, especially when it comes to political life. So, okay. Number six, they believed in the importance of natural theology.

They underscored how critical natural theology is. And what is natural theology? Natural theology is looking at God's created order and drawing some conclusions from that created order. So you look at God's creation for the deists, and God is a God of order, God of beauty, God of design, and so forth.

Now, unfortunately, the deists didn't contend enough with the problems of natural theology. So, natural theology is one thing. Just when you're on a day like today and

you look at the beauty, order, and design of the universe on our campus, you know, that's fine. And natural theology can take you a little bit of the way, as the deists believed.

They were pretty reliant on it. What they didn't wrestle with enough is, what do you do with tsunamis, earthquakes, floods, and the Black Death? What do you do when the natural world doesn't demonstrate a God of order, beauty, and design? Then what do you do? Then where is your natural theology, you know? So unfortunately, while they relied heavily on natural theology, I don't think that they dealt enough with the limits of natural theology. Natural theology can only take us so far, but I don't think they dealt enough with that.

But anyway, they were reliant on that. So when I think of deism in England, and that's eventually going to evolve into a denomination called Unitarianism, when I think of deism in England, I think of those six characteristics of the deists. Now just to kind of underscore this deism, I do want to point out two deist writers, I'm sorry, two deist writers who were important.

One writer was a man by the name of John Toland, and those are his dates, and he wrote a book called *Christianity Not Mysterious*. *Christianity Not Mysterious*. Okay.

Oh, he's the third down here. *Christianity Not Mysterious*, John Toland. He was an English deist, and his book was kind of a manifesto of deism.

His book was kind of the Bible of deism and kind of a bestseller of deism in England. And what he tried, I mean, the title, I think, is pretty clear. His basic thesis is that there is nothing mysterious in Christianity.

Everything we need to know about God, Christianity, and the church can be known by reason. So, there's nothing mysterious here. There's no mystery here.

So that's his thesis. That's what he claims in the book, which is a good deist kind of claim. So, he's taking all the teachings of the Age of Enlightenment, applying them to Christianity, writing his book, and explaining what deism is all about.

So, he's one that I think we should take note of, because he and his book had a really profound influence. The second is Matthew Tyndall's book, *Christianity As Old As Creation*. *Christianity As Old As Creation*.

Okay? So, the same thing in Christianity. *As Old As Creation*, as far as he is concerned, reason is the touchstone of religion. There's nothing in the religious life, nothing in the Christian life, nothing in the church, nothing about God that you cannot know by reason. Just apply reason, apply rationality, and you will find that there's nothing you will. You'll understand what religion is all about.

Okay. Now, when that happens in his book, he takes two things to task, in a sense, in the book, obviously. Number one, he takes the miracles in the Bible to task, because the miracles are not reasonable.

They're not rational. They can't be reasoned out. So, they have to be dropped because they're not keeping up with strict natural theology.

So, the first thing to go are the miracles in the Bible. Okay? And the second thing to go is any sense of divine revelation, any sense of divine God revealing himself other than through the natural world. So, revealing himself in a book or revealing himself in a person, in Christ, that goes.

You can't have that. So, what he wants to do is see Christianity as old as creation. The title of the book is as old as creation, and the creation account is here.

And he wants to drop anything that speaks against natural theology. The deists were very good about picking and choosing from the scriptures. So if the creation account is a good example, creation account, one God created in an orderly way.

But incarnation, God coming in the flesh, or a Jesus who's performing miracles, or Jesus who rises from the dead, those kinds of things are out. So, he has to pick and choose. Right.

They believe that the creation account is a good example; they believe that they are, I mean, Tindal was a monotheist. So, he did believe that one God was created. He doesn't believe the creation account as you read it in the Bible.

He believes that's illustrative of how God created, but it's not scientifically accurate. That's what he would say. But he's not concerned about that.

One God created. That's the biblical story as far as he's concerned. But you wouldn't be able to confirm it by reason or rationality. So, the kind of things we mentioned above are what Tindal would believe.

But yeah, these people are going to have to pick and choose a lot from the Bible. They didn't throw out the whole Bible because they were monotheists, but they had to pick and choose. Okay, so deism.

So, the kind of expression of the Enlightenment in England was deism. That evolved into Unitarianism, and that is what the deists believed. And if you've got people like writing, preaching, teaching, and their writings are being our bestsellers, kind of what we would call bestsellers today, then you've got a pretty good flourishing here in England of the Enlightenment.

Does that make sense? Does anybody have any questions about this? I'm not asking you to believe the deists. I'm just asking you to understand the deists. Are we okay with them? They don't believe it.

They don't believe that Jesus was God. They believe, and we'll see this also probably a little more when we get to France and Germany, but they do believe he was a good moral person. They believe he was a historic person.

However, there were people who came along, especially in Germany, who denied the historicity of Jesus. But these deists do believe that he was a good moral and ethical person. Actually, they thought that you should follow Jesus and be like Jesus.

He was a good moral person. You should be a good moral person. Do you remember in C.S. Lewis, do you remember in mere Christianity what C.S. Lewis's rebuttal of that was? Jesus is a nice person.

You should be like Jesus. Just follow Jesus. You'd be a nice person.

Do you remember C.S. Lewis? What did he say? That's the liar, lunatic, liar. You can't have it that. You can't have Jesus as a nice man that you're going to follow.

There are only two choices to make with Jesus. He's either a liar and a lunatic because he calls himself God, which is really problematic here, or, and the gospel writers say things like God became flesh, or he's either a liar and a lunatic or he's Lord. But you can't have this middle ground that these deists are trying to have with Jesus.

As a nice man, a moral man, you should be like Jesus. I can't have that. So C.S. Lewis kind of put an end to this, in a sense, in mere Christianity.

I mean, people did it before C.S. Lewis, but in terms of maybe our reading. Have you all read Mere Christianity? Right. Okay.

If you haven't, you want to put it on your summer reading list. Okay. So, the deists, there they are.

Any questions about the deists? Are you all set with them? Okay. They were a pretty important group because they brought the enlightenment and applied it to religion. So, okay.

Number C is France. Now, the word that I use for France is, did I? I didn't put it up in the thing. Okay.

Oh, here, I get some words up here. Don't I? I do. Scholasticism, well, we know what that is.

Deism evolved into Unitarianism. We haven't gotten Pantheism yet. The categorical imperative was what I, the word I should have put up there when we were talking about Kant.

So, the moral imperative, the categorical imperative. So anyway, I, I thought, how can I deal with this 18th, 17th century, 18th century with what is going on? So I put a stop sign up there. It's like, I want to just when I read some of these people, especially a couple of ones we're going to mention now, I want to just yell stop.

Let's rethink this. Let's rediscuss this because these people were leading us pretty far astray from historic Christianity, from orthodoxy, from theology. So, okay.

So anyway, there they are. All right. All right.

Let's go to France and let's see what happened in France. The word I use in France is naturalism. So, in England, the word I use is deism.

In France, the word I use is naturalism. And there's no question that what happened in the 18th century in France was much more, much, much more radical than what happened in England. Much less restrained.

The deists were pretty restrained, rational, enlightened people. What happened in France was much less restrained than what was happening in England. And there was an outright kind of warfare against the institutional church in France.

And so the French Revolution came along. One statistic that I read was that by the time of the French Revolution, by 1789, a quarter of the land in France was owned by the church. A quarter of the land was owned by the church by the time of the French Revolution.

It's no wonder that the people were so upset with the institutional church because, as far as they were concerned, all the institutional church was doing was baptizing the royalty of France. And so, the French Revolution came, and of course, it was a horrible, horrible, horrible revolution. And a very bloody revolution.

Horrible revolution. So, what happened in France was much more radical, both religiously and politically, than what happened in other places. No doubt about that.

So in order to kind of underscore that, we're just going to look at a couple of people. First, we're just going to mention Spinoza. Okay, and there you've got the dates of Spinoza, Benedict Spinoza, a French thinker, a French writer.

So, the basic thing that you want to know about Spinoza is that Spinoza had a very, very extreme, if you read anything by Spinoza, very extremely critical attitude toward religion and the Bible. A much more radically critical attitude toward the Bible than the deists had, for example. And that's in spite of the fact that he had a Jewish background.

What Spinoza really developed was a kind of religious pantheism. Here it is, the fourth bullet down. What Spinoza really developed was a kind of religious pantheism.

He didn't believe in the God of the Bible. He didn't believe in the God of the church. But maybe there's something sacred in the world in which we live.

Maybe there's something, maybe there's a sacredness in the world in which we live. And so pantheism kind of gets at that. So, Spinoza is really much more radical than the deists, and he exemplifies what's going to go on philosophically in France during this period we call naturalism.

It's all interesting to me because Spinoza had a Jewish background. He was born into a Jewish family, and so you would have thought that he wouldn't quite go as radical as he did, but nevertheless he did. So that's one person we're just going to mention.

The second person we're going to mention is Voltaire. Voltaire takes the argument even a bit further into the, born later obviously than Spinoza, and then takes the argument right into the 18th century. Okay, so for Voltaire.

Pantheism. Pantheism is a kind of denial of monotheism. It's a denial of one God, and one God created in the world.

It's a belief that the sacred is not necessarily God, but that the sacred is in this world. So, you can find sacredness in the world by looking at the trees and the brooks. So God is kind of in the brooks.

He's kind of in the trees. He's kind of in the mountains and so forth. But it's a very, it is not the God of the Bible.

It's not the God who created and has power and authority over his creation and so forth. It's kind of a religious; this is a religious pantheism, a kind of belief that the divine, whatever that is, is the God of the Bible. No. Is it Christ? No.

Is it the Holy Spirit? No. But that the divine is in the universe somehow. Does that make sense? I don't think it makes much sense, but that's what we label as a kind of religious pantheism.

That's where he ends up. So, there's not much there too, not much there. If you're, I guess, I suppose if you're an extreme pantheist, I suppose then you get to worship that natural world then.

I suppose if you go, if you take pantheism to the extreme, if the sacred is in those trees, you begin to worship those trees because the sacred is there, the gods are there. Or if the sacred is in that brook, you begin to worship that brook because the sacred is, is it. Does that make sense, Jesse? So he certainly, he certainly moved into kind of pantheism and certainly away from anything that the church taught or that the Bible taught about God and incarnation and things like that.

Something else. He was mild, I think, compared to Voltaire. I think everyone was mild compared to Voltaire because he really, for Voltaire, religion is simply and really only, should I say, simply or only in morality and ethics.

His religious vision was about morality and living an ethical life. And he really did despise, I don't think that's too strong a word, he despised anything that came out of Christianity or the church. He despised the teachings of the church.

In fact, one of the famous lines that he gives in one of his writings is, crush the infamy. Well, by that, he meant to crush the church and crush everything that the church believes and teaches. Crush it, crush this business of God and the incarnation and Jesus and the local church and so forth.

So, as far as he was concerned, it was all an abomination. Now, with Voltaire, unfortunately, you get a very strong anti-Semitism in his writing because who produced all of this business about God and the Bible and Jesus? Who produced all of that, of course, were the Jews. So, you get this very kind of very strong anti-Semitism here.

And it's just kind of a vile attack. Voltaire's attack is kind of a vile attack on Christianity and upon things that we've studied. I mean, even the deists would have been humiliated by this kind of attack because the deists believed in one God and believed in the moral life.

So anyways, that's Voltaire. Okay, that's number two. And before we leave France, let's just come to Rousseau.

Okay. Rousseau is very, very important. Now, the thing about Rousseau is he wasn't born in France.

He was actually born in Switzerland, but he moved to Paris. So, his life and his writings are associated with France. So now you are going to be familiar with a couple of things with Rousseau.

What I'm going to mention are four things about him. The reason I took a little longer with Rousseau was because people in America read a lot of Rousseau. Rousseau would be very influential in public life over here in the New World.

So that's why we take a little bit more time with Rousseau in terms of sorting out this age of the Enlightenment. I've got time for maybe one or two things here for Rousseau. Okay, number one for Rousseau is, for him the hallmark of religion. As far as he's concerned, the hallmark of religion is feeling.

The hallmark of religion is the inner life. The inner life, the feeling that you have, that's what religion is all about. So what he's doing is getting away from. He's proving the limits of rationality, then, isn't he? He's proving the limits of reason.

He's going in the other direction. If religion is feeling, emotion, and religion is a matter of the inner life, then he's moving away from these people in the Enlightenment who were very much keyed on to rationality. Which means that under this first point, Rousseau is one of the figures who's going to be kind of a transition figure, helping to move the broader culture from a world of Enlightenment to a world of rationality and what is the next great kind of cultural movement that comes into the 19th century? Not the age of reason, but what comes into the 19th century? That would be Romanticism. Romanticism is a kind of cultural movement based on feelings and so forth.

So, the music of the 18th century, what's the music of the 17th century? If you happen to like that music, it's Handel-Haydn, isn't it? Maybe there are some music lovers here, but to me, in my own limited mind, it is very rational, isn't it? The music is very rational, very reasonable. When you come into the 19th century, though, and you get into Tchaikovsky and other people, the music is much more, isn't it? Much more emotional and so forth. And you could say that's the same thing, I think, about art and so forth.

So certainly, Rousseau is maybe a transition figure here because, for him, the religious life is not a life of rationality like the deists. It's more of a feeling, more of emotional. So that's kind of one thing.

Okay, a second thing about Rousseau, and that's in his writing, is a return to the natural world, a return to nature, kind of the noble, savage kind of imagery that he gives to us. He wants to see us living more in the natural world, and he wants to see humankind with that kind of natural morality that brings to you get away from the selfishness of the burgeoning industrial world. Get away from the evil of the burgeoning industrial world.

Get away from the greed of the burgeoning world. Get back to the natural world, what was intended in that natural world, and so forth. Well, that's one and two.

Three and four. We'll do three and four on Friday, and actually, the third and the fourth are more important for what we're talking about anyway. So, okay, I need to stop here.

This is Dr. Roger Green in his course on Church History, Reformation to the Present. This is session 10, The Enlightenment.