

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Criticism of Alan Gillespie's *Theological Roots of Modernity*

Habibe Gravari

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Social Sciences,
Research Institute of Hawzah & University, Iran

Abstract:

The present article is a critical analysis and evaluation of the book *Theological Roots of Modernity* written by Alan Gillespie. The said work is one of the successful socio-theological texts. The author develops his idea in the book with an optimistic and positive stance towards modernity. His main concern is to prove the role of religion and theology in the formation of modernity. A claim that has no place in the narrative of the Age of Enlightenment, Modernity is understood as an attempt to suppress superstition and religious authority. However, Glimpse believes that not only is opposition to religion not the basis of modernity, but modernity also has a religious origin. He understands modernity as emerging in a theological dialogue, not as a new problem that has nothing to do with modernity. The conflict over the issue of the will of God and man and the sum between the duality of predestination and free will shapes all subsequent philosophical disputes in any period. It has been established that Gillespie tries to analyze modern evil based on the transfer of divine attributes to humans or the secularization of these attributes. Thus, he speaks of the disappearance of secularization and blames the disasters of world wars and other modern evils on the basis of the secularization of divine attributes and their transfer to humans. He also discusses social forces and history.

Keywords: Theology, subjectivity, secularization, modernity

1. Introduction

Proving the main role of religion and theology in the formation of modernity is the idea proposed by the author in this book. He believes that not only is opposition to religion not the essence of modernity, but modernity has a religious origin. Modernity emerges in theological dialogue, and after finding this meeting ground, the topic of the formulation book issue is the distinction between antiquity and modernity. To show the origins of modernity, Gillespie traces the roots of the debate in ancient and medieval times (Ibid.:46) and considers the ancient and modern distinction more than historical. A philosopher knows that it is actually a distinction between two views about universals. In the Middle Ages, there were two different readings of Aristotle; the older reading is realist, which considers universals to be ultimately real and embodied matters of divine reason. A more recent reading is nominalist, which questioned universals and saw them as the names we give to things outside of which there are only particulars. In this way, the nominalists proposed a new understanding of God, man and nature, in which only nature can be known, and this was a ground for man's sovereignty over nature, which, in modernity, man becomes the owner of nature. In the first chapter of the book, titled the nominalist revolution and Glyphs modernity, modernity was actually an attempt to get out of the crisis that nominalism created. The nominalist revolution was a movement that challenged the Aristotelian idealists. There are also two currents of Descartes and Hobbes that are opposite to each other. Luther's and Erasmus' insoluble contradictions on the issue of will and freedom played a decisive role in the emergence of modernity and the processing of Descartes' subjectivity, and it remained as a big gap and insoluble contradictions in the heart of modernity. He considered it divine and, to a certain extent, natural, believed that it could not be objectified, and made a natural transaction with it. Descartes' subjectivity and duality of soul and body is the beginning of humanism (Ibid: 65). Hobbes is in contrast to Descartes. He considers man to be a natural being who is governed by natural laws. From the nominalist revolution to the invention of individuality by Petrarch and Luther's theological debates, followed by the insoluble contradictions between Erasmus and Luther over the recurring problem of the contradiction between the absolute will of God and the will of man, which respectively form the chapters of the book; It provided a context for Descartes to lay the foundations of modernity and the current West. In fact, all the previous topics are an introduction to understanding how Descartes invented the Cogito theorem, where Descartes' subjectivity began, and where it ended. The goal of people like Hobbes and Descartes was not to destroy religion but to limit the role of religion in the framework of a specific naturalistic metaphysics, so it cannot be said that they were consciously in favor of a completely secular life (Ibid.: 454). According to Gillespie, modernity is the gradual transfer of divine attributes to humans, the natural world, social forces and history; therefore, what happened in the path of modernity was not simply the removal or destruction of God but the transfer of the attributes and characteristics of the powers and capabilities of other beings or realms of existence. The powers that were previously attributed to God now have given divine character to man and nature. (ibid: 458)

2. An Overview of the Structure and Content of the Work

2.1. *The Nominalist Revolution and the Origin of Modernity*

Nominalist revolution appeared in what atmosphere? Philosophical thoughts in ancient Greece and the rise of Christianity create the duality of reason and revelation. The rational-philosophical teachings of Greece and the theology of Christ moved towards compatibility over time and were always reviewed and revised. Much of this tension between the duality of revelatory reason remained a perennial problem in Christian history. (Ibid: 68) Madrasa philosophy was the biggest attempt to harmonize philosophical elements and biblical elements. The classic form of Marasigan philosophy was realism, which believed in the transcendental existence of universals and considered universals to be divine wisdom that could be known through illumination (Augustine) or through exploration of nature (Thomas Aquinas) (Ibid.: 69).

The movement that formed against the Platonic and Aristotelian schools of realism was the school of nominalism. They denied universals and only believed in the existence of people outside and said that everything that exists is naming and the mind gives names to these details. (Celestin, 1388: 142-141) Generally, nominalism is known with the thoughts of William Accor. His ideas were a platform for the spread of nominalism among his followers during the Renaissance. (Jolson, 1389: 699)

Why did the nominalists go in this direction? The nominalists said that if God created the universe, if he cursed man, for example, he would include all humans. Therefore, God did not create generalities and only created people; we just brought people into categories. We name them; everything is individuality, the only essential being is God, and the rest are creatures. Another thing is that everything is different from other things; It can never be said that if we know A, we also know B. As Aristotelian logic said, it cannot be logically transferred from one proposition to another. Nominalists questioned logical analogy and believed that hypothesis is a substitute for logic. Everything has separate rulings; there are no common rulings. In order to know things, one must go to the hypothesis. We assume that objects are similar. They replaced the inductive method with the analogical method, which is developed through experience and testing cognition. The nominalists raised the issue of God's freedom; they believed that God does whatever He wants and intervenes in all matters, there is no limit for God, and there is no absolute necessity other than God. (Gillespie, 2018: 72-73)

The nominalists offered a new meaning of God and man. Man reaches happiness with his own will and self-understanding. From here, the duality of the will of God and the will of man was formed, a conflict that has remained to this day. In fact, the nominalists emphasized the absolute power of God. Gillespie says that the conflict is formed here. On the one hand, God is not bound by anything and does whatever he wants. He has absolute power, and on the other hand, God was created in the form of man, and man also has free will. But, how will the free will of man be combined with the absolute will of God? In fact, it is the duality of predestination and free will that shapes the subsequent philosophical disputes in any era. (ibid: 84)

In this situation, a deep gap between God and man was created, and great anxiety fell in Christianity. Because God acts freely and changes, there is no guarantee of happiness. The laws of human happiness may also change, and the world is full of chaos. This deep gap between God and man caused the emergence of ideas to reconnect God and man. People like Francis argued that walking with Christ and retracing the path of poverty and austerity is the only way to understand the meaning of God's love for man (ibid.: 77 and 76). There was a controversy over the teachings of Francis. The stream of moderates wanted the Pope to exempt them from the extreme restrictions of Francis's law. Against the flow of extremists, they followed Francis' law without any doubt, and as a result, the church gained power again.

2.2. *Petrarch and the Invention of Individuality*

Petrarch rejected Marasigan's philosophy and realism, but he did not accept nominalists either. He goes to ancient moral virtue and Christian moral behavior and believes that man is self-sufficient and complete in himself and evolves with individuality. Petrarch, as the first humanist, never separated from the teachings of Christianity and had a kind of fascination with the ancient Greek culture. (Johnson, 1388: 153) He saw everything constantly changing; this change started with inanimate things and spread to the whole spiritual world. The war is universal. The whole universe, from the smallest worms to the highest angels, is constantly in conflict. Human life is also subject to conflict. The struggle is in the human soul and for superiority over others. Man fights to gain and maintain freedom. Petrarch's political life was a means to achieve morality, and his goal was not politics in itself; he placed culture on a higher level than governments and politics (Gillespie: 127).

Petrarch, who emphasizes individuality, says that there must be a will for humans. A strong and firm will that is worthy of this name. Petrarch's goal is not salvation but perfection, and he achieves this goal with the blessing of human will. In the existing society, man is not free to pursue his own good, but he is a slave who loves the praise of others and is afraid of their criticism. Belief and genuine souls do not seek peace except in God, themselves, and their personal thoughts. According to Petrarch, solitude is a sacred, innocent, incorruptible and purest possession of all human beings (Ibid: 131)

2.3. *Humanism and Human Individuality*

Petrarch's influence on humanism was because he offered a new insight into how to live in the Christian world. A world that was undergoing a huge spiritual crisis that emerged as a result of the nominalist revolution and the crusades of the 14th century. Petrarch's project was based on the existential priority of man as an individual and emphasizing the principle that the meaningful life of man begins with the exploration of individuality (Ibid: 146). Petrarch considered humans to be beings with will, not rational beings. Volition was the basic condition of human individuality, but Petrarch was not fully aware of the consequences of this issue. Later, humanists gradually became aware of these consequences

(Ibid: 161). Petrarch's individuality and his introspection were formed based on the teachings of ancient Greece and not just Christianity. The concept of existential priority and human value as an individual became the guiding light of the humanism project and made the Renaissance and the modern world possible. Petra K sought the union between Christianity, Plato's teachings and Roman virtues, although he never succeeded in achieving this goal because combining these elements was a difficult task. After him, two groups of humanists began their efforts to combine these three teachings.

The term 'humanism' was first used for the Renaissance educational system, which was based on classical texts. This term refers to those who read classical literature and philosophy, not with the purpose of establishing theology but with the purpose of understanding what it means to be human and how a person should live. Humanism was a kind of comprehensive educational system based on the individuality of man, his dignity and his privileged position in the world. It was an all-encompassing cultural movement that included poetry, art, literature, history, and philosophy, and Petrarch grew up in such a tradition (Ibid: 149)

Secular humanism is commentators who doubt not only the roots of humanism but also its meaning and importance. At least since the time of Burckhardt and Nietzsche, humanism has been viewed from the perspective of a school and in the revival of paganism (rational-moral and virtue-based teachings) of ancient times against Christianity and Nietzsche's interpretation as turning from the ethics of slaves to the ethics of Greek masters when humanism is increasingly Catholicism was equated with secular humanism, and the Protestants brutally attacked it as well, because they considered humanism to be a layer of secular modernity and ultimately atheistic modernity (ibid.:150) Gillespie believes that the secular readings of humanism are related to the interpretations of Nietzsche and Burckhardt and that humanism, which is side by side nominalist and arose from its heart, is contrary to what we think; It is not atheism and it has no enmity with religion. Renaissance humanism has always been Christian humanism, which paid more attention to moral practice instead of faith or religious rituals that emerged from the heart of the nominalist and to solve the problem of divine absolute power (Ibid.: 88 and 89).

In this context, the humanist project that Petrarch imagined disappeared, and three different paths or possibilities emerged. First possibility: a total emphasis on Christian piety, the washing hands of Platonism, and chivalrous virtue (Savonarola and later Luther). Second possibility: emphasis on the virtues of Roman chivalry was underestimating or abandoning the piety of Christ and Platonism (Machiavelli's pragmatic humanism). The third possibility: based on that, a person used a generally Neoplatonist approach in Christianity and abandoned the piety and virtue of chivalry, which Erasmus is the pioneer of (ibid: 175-182).

However, the conflict between science and religion will still remain. "Wala" is one of the humanists who accepted that humans cannot understand how free will can be combined with God's prior knowledge. Although he believed that these two wills could be combined, he speculated about how they were compatible and said that the will of God flows through the will of man in a completely mysterious way. An understanding that Luther clarified later, but this conflict still remains.

2.4. Luther and the Storm of Faith

To solve the problem of divine absolute power and human will, he addressed the issue of happiness and salvation. If God is omnipotent, then what will happen to our salvation (Ibid: 90) Luther gives a different position to the Bible. He considers it a tool through which God speaks directly to man. We and God both have free will. Our will is a pious moral will in the form of practising the commands of the Bible. Luther's slogan was, only faith and only divine grace and only the Holy Bible. God looks at his servants through his kindness, breathes himself into us and takes possession of us. Faith alone is sufficient for salvation. The practice of selling forgiveness is a clear sign of the corruption of the church and the work of the devil. According to Luther, the existence of God and creatures are different from each other, and there is no continuity connecting the creature to the Creator. The source of unity is the existence of Christ, who mysteriously bridges the gap between the creator and the creature. The incarnation that Luther believes in cannot be justified philosophically and can only be achieved through faith. Luther's doctrine of salvation was based on God's absolute power and human will. He considered the hidden God to be the absolute power that is responsible for everything.

The Bible considered God as absolute goodness and absolute power and insisted on the sinfulness of humans and their punishment. However, it was not clear that if God is omnipotent, how can humans be held responsible? If they are not responsible, how did they become guilty? If they are not guilty, how can they be punished justly? And if the punishment is unjust, how can God be considered absolute good? (Ibid: 256) According to Luther, the visible God is Christ, and the hidden God is absolute power. The hidden God remains a dominant and incomprehensible force. He is the only absolute and dominant power incarnated in Christ, and all the responsibility of good and evil in the world is on his shoulders. In fact, Luther denied human freedom and did not have a clear answer for it. His only solution was that we should focus on the manifest God (Christ) and the preacher God and ignore the hidden and non-preacher God. Luther's thought owed a lot to nominalism but was surrounded by many unsolvable problems, the issue of human will and freedom, justice, and the mystery of the hidden God; he considered God to be the center of everything and man to be nothing. This is the point of Luther's conflict with humanism. (ibid: 216)

2.5. Contradictions of Pre Modernity

Christian humanists and theologians of the religious reform movement represented by Luther faced many questions but had completely different answers. There were ontological differences over the issue of the realm of beings and their dominance over each other. Luther's and Erasmus's insoluble contradictions on the issue of will and freedom

played a decisive role in the emergence of modernity and the processing of Cartesian subjectivity and remained as a big gap and insoluble contradictions in the heart of modernity. Erasmus wrote a book about "freedom of the will". In this book, he addressed the issue of spiritual freedom, which was important in Christian humanism. Luther also wrote a book titled "Captivity of the Will" against Erasmus in a rhetorical and fanatical way. Erasmus' book "Protective Warrior" was a two-volume rebuttal to the accusations made by Luther. These quarrels took many violent political and social dimensions. Although, at first, the victory was from the radical Protestant faction led by Luther, in the long run, the moderate Christian humanism of Erasmus won. (ibid: 245-252)

Both Luther and Erasmus considered themselves Augustinian; Augustine was the first person who considered man to have free will and argued that man with free will can do evil deeds. God has given freedom to man. This was his initial idea, and later, in response to the Manichaeism, he emphasized the independence of the will to make man the source of evil who has been captured by sin and believes that the will is not effective without God's grace. (Later, Augustine was approved by Luther) Erasmus obviously preferred the early anti-Manichean Augustine, and Luther was interested in the late Augustine of Pelagius. Augustine had humanistic approaches, interpreted free will in a Neoplatonist manner, and took a skeptical position on controversial issues. (Ibid: 264)

A report of the disputes between Luther and Erasmus in the books *Free Will and the Protective Warrior* by Erasmus and *Captivity of the Will* by Luther. The main discussion of the dispute between Luther and Erasmus was the relationship between God and man. Luther believed that God is responsible for everything both before and after the fall and that free will never existed and will never exist. He argued that humans were created to be free, and the tyrannical Satan captured free will, but God's grace restores it. However, this cannot be effective without God's grace. Erasmus believes that Luther relied on the criterion of absolute truth. However, the scriptures are full of contradictions and ambiguity. This is because God deliberately wants to keep things secret. Humans will have different interpretations of the Bible, and many of the contradictions are related to the interpretation of the text of the Bible. According to Erasmus, it does not matter that God is omnipotent. If humans are not free, how can we understand why God punishes sinners? In this case, what motivation will humans have for moral action? According to Luther, Erasmus was not a Christian because Christians do not argue; they express their faith decisively, defend their belief, and fight for it. However, Erasmus prefers peace over anything. There are many similarities between the position of Luther and the Stoics. According to the Stoics, there was a truth, the truth that had become one with the divine "Logos", and the Stoic sage knew about it. Freedom is only for the stoic sage, and everyone is his slave. Luther considered "Logos" to be the Bible and not the reason of "the child of a Christian person" whose freedom is only because God has embraced him. Like the Stoics, Luther considers all evil to be the same. He also uses the concept of Stoic metamorphosis and believes that the Bible takes over man and speaks directly to him and through him. Therefore, the Bible is not the word of man or a text for interpretation but the word of God. (ibid: 271-276)

Luther leaves the question of the source of evil unanswered; he attributes evil to Satan, but it does not explain Satan's relationship with God and how Satan became an evil being. Luther does not explain the issue of descent because if a person does not have freedom and responsibility, moral decline becomes meaningless. Luther takes refuge in the problem of divine incomprehensibility when answering Erasmus. It is more concerned with maintaining divine power, not divine justice. The practical result of Luther's view of Christianity is war and not peace, a war to maintain the belief and a war between the church of this world, which is the tool of Satan, and the true church, which is the tool of God. Luther believed that insisting on peace, as Erasmus did, was affirming Satan's victory (Ibid: 286)

Erasmus says that Luther's opinion about the absolute obedience of man to God is wrong. God or the devil does not drive man forward. Rather, man chooses himself, God or Satan. There is no doubt that human inclinations and habits lead people in different directions. Humans are influenced by their past desires and choices and the choices of their ancestors. All these factors do not completely determine a person. Humans are able to change their ways, and this ability to change varies from person to person. According to Erasmus, there are different levels of grace: the natural grace that draws us to good and is at the foundation of things. The second level of preliminary grace is the grace that gives us the opportunity to live a Christian life. Absolving grace helps us to resist the temptations of sin after we are absolved from sin. Our free will is related to the stage of preliminary grace. God is the creator who created the world; after creation, he does not interfere in this world; man determines his destiny in this world and the world the hereafter determines. This opinion brings Erasmus closer to the heroic humanist of the Italians and away from Augustine's position. Erasmus believed that church and state could be reformed through a humanistic educational system. Luther believed that reform is not possible because man cannot change what God has ordained. (ibid: 286-296)

All that has been said, from the nominalist revolution to the invention of individuality by Petrarch and Luther's theological debates, followed by the insoluble contradictions between Erasmus and Luther on the continuing problem of the contradiction between the absolute will of God and the will of man, provided the ground for Descartes to lay the foundation of meaning that The basis of modernity and the current West should be based on it. In fact, all the previous topics are an introduction to understanding how Descartes invented the Cogito theory and where Descartes' subjectivity started and where it ended.

2.6. Descartes' Way to Truth

Descartes' historical background is specifically related to the wide-ranging contradictions that developed between Luther and Erasmus, which resulted in widespread wars and violence that continued for a century and many weak classes, such as peasants, were killed in these wars. Descartes lived with these acts of violence and contradictions at the same time and was looking for a way out of it. Gillespie says that in this chapter, I argue that Descartes wanted to build a strong

fortress of reason against the terrible god of nominalism, a fortress that not only guaranteed individual certainty and security but also adversity. It would reduce or eliminate nature, but it would also end religious and political conflict. The struggle that had left Europe in black soil (Ibid: 316) Descartes presented a different view of the modern project; his thought was influenced by the nominalist God. Descartes' understanding of the position of man and his relationship with God and nature was different.

The fundamental principle of cogito, "I think therefore I am", bases the entire modern science on the subject of self-ritual and self-understanding in such a way that it can even challenge God and take his place. Man becomes the master of nature when he drives out the current owner of nature. In his project, Descartes uses the humanistic ideal of the self-creative and self-reliant individual and creates the concept of subjectivity. In this way, Descartes establishes a concept that faced modernity with enormous moral and political risks. (ibid: 102 and 101)

In his initial idea, Descartes defends analytical mathematics and believes that mathematics can detect and reveal the true relationship of all things (Charleston, 1388: 143). He tried to give a new formulation of science by proposing the certainty of mathematical science. However, his original plan was challenged by the trickster god. It is possible that the god of deception created us in such a way that we would have misunderstandings about our understanding of the world. The assumption of the existence of such a god of deception was enough to make us doubt the intuitive rules of mathematics. Descartes' grammatical doubt begins here. Based on this doubt, Descartes could treat the external world and all abstract entities and mathematical truths as dubious. He must ask the question: Does he exist at all? Or not. As he says at the beginning of the second reflection in the "Book of Reflections", "I am convinced that there is absolutely nothing in the world, neither heavenly nor earthly, nor mental or physical" (Gillespie, 2018: 236 and 235)

The skepticism proposed by Descartes has two traditional solutions. The first solution is faith, which Augustine formulated against academics. He considered piety to be the solution to skepticism. Descartes believed that faith could be a solution to skepticism to some extent, but faith is not an answer to skeptic doubts. The second traditional solution to Descartes' skepticism is disbelief in God. If there is no God and everything happens based on the infinite necessity of the pre-existing, this radical doubt is ruled out. According to Descartes, none of these two solutions to resolve doubt can help us to understand the foundation of science because, in both solutions, the possibility of being deceived by a deceiving God or even a random deception remains. Descartes' solution to such skepticism is through the fundamental principle of cogito; "I think therefore I am" is the foundation of Cartesian science. According to Descartes, this principle is universal, and almost anyone can experience it. Someone who thinks must exist. According to Descartes, the thinker is something that can doubt, understand, affirm and deny, agree or reject. He describes himself as a thinker (cf. Coletton, 2008, 123). The fundamental principle of Descartes is described as self-awareness or subjectivity. It is possible to represent the world through the subject or the thinking self. What Descartes means by the thinking self is completely different from the common understanding of self-awareness. (Gillespie, 2018: 339-340)

According to Descartes, man was a thinking thing, and a thinking thing is representative and constructive. In particular, it always represents itself. In this way, man is no longer a rational animal and instead is a being who wills. Both humanism and the religious reform movement considered humans to have will and not reason; Descartes was indebted to these ideas. The subject who has the will is not bound to the end of this world, so he can become the absolute master of the world. The subject of the will is not subject to God's will, and his will is not in conflict with God's will. According to Descartes, the certainty of natural science replaces faith and theology. Achieving this certainty does not arise from the act of wisdom or understanding but is the result of the act of will. The principle of this new science was the individual self-ritual that arises from the will of man, expresses his will and puts it into practice. Therefore, the self is not an object among other objects. The truth of Descartes' science was dependent on the truth of mathematics, and the only thing that challenged the truth of mathematics was the possibility of a deceptive existence that had absolute power. If, based on Descartes' fundamental principle, it can be shown that such a deceptive entity does not exist, intuitive and mathematical facts will prove its certainty and the self-evident nature of Cartesian science is guaranteed (ibid.: 345-347)

To deny the existence of a deceiving God, Descartes takes help from his fundamental principle: I am a finite being; I have an image of perfection in my mind; this perfection does not stop anywhere and is unlimited; where did the idea of infinite perfection come from? How can a finite being have an idea of infinity? An infinite being must have given us the infinite idea of perfection; the one who gives the idea of infinite perfection is himself perfect and cannot be a deceiver because deception is the result of loss. So, God cannot be a deceiver because it is perfect. (Carleton, 1388: 131) So I can understand objects and their relationships by using the right mental powers and that God is not a deceiver. As a result, mathematics and physics are necessarily possible, and their clear and distinct ideas are guaranteed. (Gillespie, 2018: 350) The result is that according to Descartes, both man and God have a will, and the will of man is the same as the will of God. Human will is infinite and completely free and is not subject to any rules or laws. The only difference between the will of man and God is that while both wills are infinite, the knowledge of man is finite (cf. Carleton, 1388: 178). What is important is the use of this rational will to dominate nature; therefore, humans are like God, although they are not God. According to Descartes, when we understand God in this way, religious strife will disappear. Although subjectivity was proposed by Descartes with a theological motivation, and ending the long dispute over the issue of the absolute will of God and the will of man, or the duality of predestination and free will, was the basis for the emergence of such an idea. But with human being the subject, everything is understood in relation to human beings, everything that comes to the consciousness and understanding of the thinker, and is relevant and suitable for him, exists, and whatever is not understood in relation to human understanding, one cannot comment on its existence or non-existence even God. In this way, the absolute God of nominalism and the religious reform movement are deprived of the absolute power of the

universe, a world that is dominated by the scientific world, a scientific world whose criterion of certainty is the fundamental principle of cogito. (Gillespie 2018: 253 and 252)

2.7. *The Fearful Wisdom of Hobbes*

Descartes considered the fear of God to be the beginning of wisdom. Hobbes also uses the concept of fear and believes that fear arouses reason in us, so it is the beginning of wisdom; the source of movement, in Hobbes' view, is God. In Hobbes's thought, thinking begins not with the joyous and indescribable gift of existence but with the recognition that death and misery are in our footsteps and we must save our lives. Fear forces us to search for the invisible cause of everything. We seek to subdue fear, and this is the source of piety, the basis of all religions, and under the right circumstances, it can provoke reflection. When we understand that the gods or God do not directly intervene in earthly affairs, fear leads us in a new direction, a path closer to confronting the reality of the natural world. Recognizing the point that if we understand the causes, we can form a science that will make us dominate nature and eliminate the risk of horrible death. Hobbes believed that none of our earthly deeds affect our salvation. It is the factor that provides modern political science and natural science. It is not a rejection of religion but proof that religion has nothing to do with our life in this world. Like Bacon, Hobbes was a nominalist and was directly influenced by Bacon and Descartes. He accepted Bacon's view (the owner of *novum organum* and the inductive method) that science should be practical and not theoretical. Like Bacon, he considered knowledge to be power. Hobbes' humanism was closer to Calvinism and modern natural science than Cartesian humanism. Hobbes, like Calvin, considered creatures to be natural beings that were subject to the will of God's power, and he was less willing to consider humans in a humanistic manner as God-like beings who choose their own nature. (ibid: 360-362)

The most important work of Hobbes is *Leviathan*, which is an introduction to political philosophy, an effort to lay the foundations of a kind of just and permanent political order based on new science. *Leviathan* shows that reason and revelation bear witness to both the church and the state so that the ruler can establish a permanent order. *Leviathan* provides a basis for solving political and theological problems. Because of writing *Leviathan*, Hobbes faced political tensions and controversies, including the debate between Hobbes and Bramhall about predestination and free will, which in many ways was similar to the debate between Luther and Erasmus about how eternal destiny is possible with human responsibility to gather? Hobbes tried to show that the doctrine of predestination does not mean the absence of free will, so his people are not responsible for their actions. In Hobbes' opinion, people are not responsible for what they do while pursuing wrong desires; rather, they are blamed for the wrong pursuit of these desires. Four issues form the Hobbes project: Political science, anthropology, physics and theology of Hobbes. It can be said that the grand project of Hobbes is to establish political order. He turns to physics to establish political order; in fact, he seeks a mechanism to minimize the violent collisions of human bodies. He wants to make man the master of nature, but he denies the special position of man, unlike Descartes. Humans are no different from other creatures, so the science that wants to turn humans into masters of nature by discovering the causes of movement, it must necessarily include the domination and possession of other humans. If nature can be conquered, then humans can be conquered too. Thus, he had to examine the motivations of human action and the means of monitoring and controlling these actions. Anthropology and political science were an integral part of Hobbes' system. (Ibid: 382)

The goal of Hobbes' science is not only to understand the world but also to change it and empower people to protect themselves and increase their share of earthly benefits. Therefore, the goal of philosophy or science is not a theoretical goal. Science does not seek to know what things are; rather, it wants to know how things work, which means knowing the techniques or mechanics of the things we are facing. The narrative that science presents about the world is a kind of construction. We construct a hypothetical picture of reality that does not necessarily correspond to actual causal pathways; the hypothesis of hypothetical knowledge is superior to certain knowledge in a way (Ibid: 396).

Every person's happiness depends on getting what they want. The extent to which we achieve our desires depends on power, and power is the product of our domination of the surrounding moving world and the destruction of objects that harm us. According to Hobbes, power is the basis of what can rightly be called liberty. Hobbes denies free will and considers lust to be an identity maker. It defines freedom as the ability to exercise power. The more power we have, the more freedom and security we have. No path is inherently better than other paths; good is what pleases us, and evil is what hurts us; good is something that enhances movement, and evil is what hinders movement; Good means increasing our power, and evil means reducing it (same: 404)

The foundations of Hobbes's political science are influenced by his anthropology and physics. Second introduction: The most important human lust is the fear of horrible death. Introduction 3: Humans try to increase their power to continue living and satisfy their desires. Humans who live in close proximity to each other are in a state of war, and this state of affairs can only be ended by establishing a political society ruled by an absolute rule (ibid: 407) on the nature whose state is war. There are rules. The first rule is self-protection. The second law specifies the means of achieving peace and self-preservation because a person must take care of himself through real means. Such protection is possible through agreement with others, making covenants with others and being satisfied with a certain amount of freedom. The second law says that our natural drive in the initial state is to fight or flee and not to negotiate to make a covenant; because we are never strong enough to dominate everyone, we find out that nature pushes us to make a covenant. As a result, this decision is not completely voluntary. All other laws of nature derive from these two laws. The first law describes the goal, and the second law justifies the means.

There is a question of whether there is a necessity to adhere to this covenant. If they leave the person, there is no necessity unless an external power forces them to fear divine punishment by threatening them with a horrible death.

However, real power instead of divine power should come in handy; Hobbes' Leviathan is a dying god with the same irresistible and terrifying power that we know from God; He urges people to obey him. (Same: 411)

Hobbes' god inspires more fear than love. God determines the standards of good and evil, but these standards are arbitrary. God rules, but it does not give it any specific form or purpose. God is far from human life; therefore, human happiness depends not only on God but also on the person himself. Man tries to imitate God's power and art by mastering the order of the world. Hobbes tried to make nominalism's absolute God compatible with human domination of the natural world and the political world; in this way, it gives a basis for accepting this God. He formulates a doctrine that, in opposition to Descartes and humanists, removes the divine character of man, and in opposition to Luther, he assigns a role to God and religion in human life. Although some consider this teaching as another step on the path of secularization, the path that starts with Elam and leads to Nietzsche. This doctrine was rooted in new theological insight and science. If we do not understand this theological insight, we will neither understand modern science nor modernity (Ibid: 413).

Modernity has two goals:

- Turning man into the master and owner of nature.
- Making human freedom possible.

Are these two goals compatible? In the discussions of Hobbes and Descartes, there is an indication of the incompatibility of these two goals. According to Descartes and Erasmus, man has free will, and in the view of Hobbes and Luther, the only thing behind the movement of matter is the absolute power of God as the final cause. It is again at the center of modernity. The modern ontological turn from man and God to nature confronts man with the same problem that Hobbes and Descartes faced in the modern tradition (Ibid: 104). Descartes' polemical theorems of the parties show this well; Descartes believes that issues such as will, selflessness and the existence of God are controversial, in the sense that these issues cannot be proved rationally, nor can they simply be rejected. (Kant, 1362: 471-499).

2.8. Enlightenment Contradictions and the Crisis of Modernity

Modernity is challenged by thinkers. Rousseau argues in the speech about arts and sciences that modernity not only improves the human condition but also increases its deterioration, and it not only shows the virtue of ability or honesty but also allows the vice of weakness and deception to appear. Hume made a skeptical attack on modernity that challenged the idea of the necessary connection of cause and effect; an idea that was the basic element of the modern idea of certain science. Although Kant was inspired by the criticisms of Rousseau and Hume, he was a defender of modernity; he believed it could defend modern science and open a place for religion and ethics. (Gillespie, 2018: 433)

The essence of the modern project that started with Descartes and Hobbes is that he believed that he had found the light and could discover the absolute truth and, with this truth, lay a foundation for the unprecedented prosperity of man, and reason can enlighten man. It was the idea of Hobbes and Descartes that was proposed in the middle of the 17th century. Hobbes and Descartes were influenced by Bacon. Descartes repeatedly uses the words "the great light of our understanding" and "natural light". Kant describes the goals and aspirations of this century, which he calls the Enlightenment Century; Enlightenment is man's way out of self-inflicted immaturity. Immaturity means the inability to use one's understanding without guidance. "Be brave to think" is the slogan of enlightenment. (Ibid: 436-434) However, Kant doubted the idea that he could achieve enlightenment and the rule of reason.

To realize modern thought, two goals must be achieved:

- Dominating nature through modern science.
- Actualizing human freedom.

However, in the meantime, a new contradiction showed itself. Kant calls this contradiction the polemical theorems of the parties; these cases left a person in the valley of Hume's skepticism. The contradiction and skepticism that the modern world was running away from had returned again. The conflict between freedom and necessary causality is something like the conflict between the absolute will of God and the will of man. All the causes in the natural world must go back to the cause of the first person or God and have a cause. So, we have to assume that the first cause is free. If God is free, then there are no laws, including the laws of nature. This means going back to the chaos and great disorder that the nominalists proposed: if God is not in nature, disorders will return. Freedom is both necessary to and incompatible with reason.

Kant concludes that if this conclusion is correct, the modern project will be self-contradictory. Modern reason does not make man the master of nature, nor is it desirable to find freedom. Kant tries to solve the problem of conflicting propositions; for this reason, he offers theoretical and practical reasons (Ibid: 437). Kant says we have two knowledges: Knowledge of understanding and pure reason that understands nature (like causality in physics) and the second knowledge of practical reason with which we understand right and wrong and moral virtues. He says that understanding necessity is related to theoretical reason, while the understanding of human will and freedom is related to practical reason. By separating the field of necessity and causality and the field of human will and freedom, Kant sought to resolve the contradiction. However, he was not very successful; he could not explain the connection between theoretical and practical reasons or how these powers unite, and he simply commented that without this unity, experience is impossible, but the amount was not enough. (ibid: 438)

If the controversial issues of the parties cannot be resolved, it is difficult to understand how the modern scientific and technological project that wants to make man the master of nature is the same as the moral and political project that aims to realize and guarantee human freedom. Will it be compatible? The fate of these contradictions had older roots, especially the third theorem of the controversial theorems of the parties, which was related to the contradiction between freedom and causality. Previously, such a contradiction had been raised in the thought of Erasmus, Descartes, and Hobbes,

and efforts had been made to answer the questions arising from the nominalist revolution with the humanism movement and the religious reform movement. Humanists and reformers were not willing to eliminate God or man; for example, Erasmus started with a man and gave formality to his will that divine absolute power would be endangered, or, for example, Luther would start with the doctrine of freedom and divine absolute power that human freedom became impossible, and humans became puppets (same: 440).

The attempt to resolve the contradiction in Descartes' and Hobbes' thought also continued. Descartes considered man to be a naturalistic and material creature comparable to other creatures. However, he believed that humans are immaterial and comparable to God, and he opened a place for human freedom. On the other hand, Hobbes argued that humans are no different from other creatures; they cannot act and create anything by themselves. Hobbes concluded that everything happens by necessity. The difference that divided the pre-modern world into two parts: It arose again in the position of disagreement over the nature of human freedom and natural necessity.

Secularization or disappearance has been described as the reduction of the importance of religion and theology in modern times in the form of the secularization process. The secular realm gradually expands, and as a result, it leads to the decline and destruction of the religious realm. In fact, modernization led to secularization and led to the increasing limitation of religious authority in the political and economic fields and then gradually in the social and cultural realms and turned religion and belief into personal practice and religious institutions into voluntary communities such as clubs and lodges. The goal of people like Hobbes and Descartes was not to destroy religion; rather, it was naturalistic to limit the role of religion in the framework of a specific metaphysics, so it cannot be said that they were consciously advocating a completely secular life (same: 454).

According to Gillespie, the nature of secularization and its fundamental thesis is that God does not exist and religion is man-made. In fact, it is something else, something other than what Nietzsche said that God is dead or something other than the withdrawal of other hidden Gods. According to Gillespie, modernity is the gradual transfer of divine attributes to humans, the natural world, social forces and history. Therefore, what happened in the path of modernity was not simply the removal or destruction of God but the transfer of the attributes and characteristics of the powers and capabilities of other beings or realms of existence. The powers that were previously attributed to God; now he has given divine character to man and nature (Ibid: 458-456).

After the Enlightenment, the hidden theology of late modernity, postmodernists and romantics believe that the Enlightenment, instead of understanding nature in a spiritual and organic process, has mistakenly given a mechanical interpretation of it. We must understand nature in a God-like manner as the life of the world, (Goethe) the soul of the world, (Emerson) the absolute self, (Fichte) and the eternal will (Schilling, Schopenhauer), then it will be compatible with human freedom. The real obstacle to human freedom is not nature but the institutions and practices that the Enlightenment created with its commitment to understanding the mechanism of nature, universal rights, bureaucratic politics, business development, and bourgeois ethics. The true freedom of man by expressing his will (including natural desires and desires) regardless of the consequences it has for the social or moral and political order can be obtained. They consider human life as a life in harmony with nature and in contradiction with customs. This way of life, which requires freeing oneself from the enlightenment belief and reconceptualising nature as the movement of the soul and the movement of matter, replaces passion or will with reason. He puts art instead of mathematics, and instead of universal rights, he turns to natural rituals, and instead of bureaucratic government, he turns to a charismatic leader. Post-Enlightenment thought tried to explain that there is no distinction between two realms and entities (nature and man) to solve the contradiction between freedom and nature. Like romanticism, which considers nature to have a living soul, and in this way, there is no longer a distinction between humans and other living beings. In this case, man is basically not free, and everything can be explained by referring to natural causes (Ibid: 466 and 465)

3. Evaluating the Work with a Critical Eye

The idea of "Enlightenment" became the focus of European reflection and thought from the very beginning of the 18th century. Reactions to the current of Enlightenment thought have been different. Alan Gillespie's work is also against the Enlightenment thought that criticizes modernity with a negative and pessimistic approach. In the first half of the 20th century in Germany, anti-Enlightenment speech was raised by thinkers such as Heidegger, Schmitt, Adorno, Horkheimer, and Karl Levitt in the form of radical criticisms against Enlightenment thought in various philosophical, political and historical fields. Karl Levitt's idea about the theological foundations of Enlightenment historical-political thought was formed in the context of the German anti-Enlightenment tradition in the first half of the 20th century. He considers the modern philosophy of history and the concept of progress to be a secularized form of theology, history and the concept of providence. With this claim, Levitt tries to introduce Enlightenment thought as illegitimate and wrong by proposing theological roots for it. It seems that the consequences of accepting Levitt's idea can face the assumptions of modern historical-political thought, especially about the concept of "progress", with a fundamental challenge as the secularization of theological concepts. (cf. Karl Levitt 1400: Chapter 4) in the sense that modern thought does not have the ability to project itself as an independent thought. On the other hand, Santo Mazzarino, Hannah Arendt and Hans Blumberg have subjected Levitt's theoretical foundations and method to fundamental criticism and have faced serious doubts. Alan Gillespie also shares many traits with Karl Levitt's thought. Although Gillespie never seeks to illegitimately read and misrepresent modernity and has an optimistic view of modernity due to its theological purpose. Levitt considers modern thought to lack independence because of the secularization of theological concepts. Lovato, by writing the book "Meaning in History" in 1949, the totality of historical consciousness-challenged the political from Judeo-Christian theology of history to modern philosophies of history and the concept of progress and concluded that modern ideas are nothing but

the "naturalistic version of Jewish/Christian theology" and as a result voted for the "illegitimacy" of the modern era and as such Wallace says; He "declared a crime" against modernity (Tousle et al., 2019: 109-138)

The most important representatives of the secularization thesis are Karl Levitt and Karl Schmidt. They consider modernity heretical, which has inherited its intellectual structures from the spiritual realm; Levitt says in his book *Meaning in History* that the philosophy of history is a secularized version of the theology of Christian history and the transcendental nature of God's kingdom in the kingdom makes it secular and universal. Michael Allen Gillespie bases his opposition to modernity on his opposition to the thesis of secularization. He does not pay attention to the secularization of the intellectual structure of Christianity. However, he rejects modernity because he sees the whole of modern science based on the subject of self-ritual and self-understanding to the extent that it has transferred the attributes of the infinite God to the finite human and made the divine attributes secretly secular. He calls the concealment of secularization the beginning of all contradictions and evils that can be revealed by following the theological roots of modernity. Gillespie believes that humanists did not deny God; they sought to elevate the status of man from a helpless and forced nominalist being to a creative being, in which the self was dependent on God's existence in the sense that the way to know God is through man. In Gillespie's narrations, the dispute between Descartes and Hobbes in the objections and answers of the reflections is reminiscent of the dispute between Erasmus and Luther, which was about free will and divine absolute power, but between Descartes and Hobbes. The dispute is over nature and man; nature takes the place of God. Descartes considers man to be a divine natural being, and Hobbes considers man to be a completely natural being. Descartes opens a place for human will, and Hobbes rejects it. Gillespie considers these contradictions as insoluble. He considers the basis of the contradiction between Descartes and Hobbes to be the contradiction in Kant's third-party polemical theorems. Gillespie does not distinguish between these controversies and contradictions and delivers them to their theological roots. He tries to define modern evil based on the transfer of divine attributes to humans or the secularization of these attributes. He analyzes and writes about responsibility for the disasters of world wars and other modern evils due to the secularization of divine attributes and their transfer to humans, social forces and history. From here, the difference between Karl Levitt's and Gillespie's perspectives on modernity is revealed. Gillespie considers modern contradictions to be theological in origin, and he believes that modern thought has killed God in order to rest on the throne instead of him. However, in an effort to understand himself and to remove the evil that he has achieved, he must seek his acknowledgement. Gillespie accepts that modern thought has removed God from the enigmatic equation of theology and even considers Nietzsche's narrative in the death of God as merely negative theology. The continuation of the desire for transcendence and the possibility of immanence always keeps the memory of this patricide and the impossibility of passing him alive for the owners of modern thought. And the intellect's attempt to transcend transcendence is unsuccessful. (cf. Gillespie, 2018: 10-31)

Gillespie's approach, which considers modernity arising from humanism, has theological roots and analyzes the historical course of modernity in the context of contradictions and challenges of the discussion of human will and free will. It is placed in front of an idea that traces the roots of humanism and modernity in the culture of ancient Greece and the works of Christ. The criticism that can be made of Gillespie's approach is his one-sidedness in the discussion of the roots of modernity because he emphasizes the role of the discussion of will and free will as the most fundamental basis of modernity so that the influence of the anthropocentric ideas of ancient Greece is neglected in his studies.

Ancient Greek myths introduced the presence of gods as being human in nature in such a way that their only advantage was their immortality. However, warriors and special people could also achieve immortality and become gods. The epic myths of Homer, such as "Iliad" and "Odyssey", are among the oldest myths of ancient Greece. These myths depict humans at the center of the world. "Igor" believes that the beginning of Greek history is the beginning of a new image of man and a new value to the human person, based on which the soul Every human being has a special purpose and boundless value in itself, and this is the ideal of European cultural revival, which considers every human being to be self-sufficient. (Sane pour, 1389: 89) has become life; "Goethe" created a perfect example for humanity that followed the behavior of gods and mythological heroes. In this way, it can be concluded that mythical warriors, both real and imaginary, played an important role in the maturation of modern Europe. The Renaissance humanist movement, also influenced by ancient Greek myths, attributes human virtue and authority to masculinity, which emerges in the art of war and politics. Subjectivism and relativism of the modern period can be considered the most important legacies of ancient Greek mythology. Most of the Renaissance schools are deeply influenced by humanistic thinking, for example, communism, which has presented the most ideas about humanism, or pragmatism, which relies on the authenticity of action; personalist, which places the greatest influence and power on the human spirit; existentialism, which emphasizes the existence of Aactually there is a person. Everyone has considered a human being as a self-sufficient existence that is its own subject and end. (Sane pour, 1378: 22-30)

4. Resources

- i. Carleton, F. C. (2018). *History of Greek and Roman philosophy* (Vols. 1 & 4, G. Awaji, Trans.). Tehran: Scientific-cultural.
- ii. Gilson, É. (1373). *Criticism of Western philosophical thought* (A. Ahmadi, Trans., Vol. 4). Tehran: Hekmati.
- iii. Gillespie, M. A. (1389). *Theological roots of modernity* (Z. Ebrahim, Trans.).
- iv. Johnson, R. (2017). *Types of humanism* (H. Alevi Tabard, Trans.). *Farhan Magazine*, 65, Spring.
- v. Kant, E. (1362). *The measurement of pure wisdom* (M. Shams Uddin Adeb Sultana, Trans.). Tehran: Amir Jabir.
- vi. Lovato, C. (1400). *Meaning in history* (Z. Ebrahim, Trans.). Tehran: Scientific-cultural.
- vii. Sane Pour, M. (1378). *A critique on the foundations of humanistic epistemology*. Tehran: Young Thought Center.

- viii. Sane Pour, M. (1389). *Modernity and its mythological foundations. Basic Western Studies*, 1, 87–116.
- ix. Travails Roknabadi, M., et al. (2019). Karl Levitt's idea about the theological foundations of historical-political thought: Enlightenment in the context of the German anti-Enlightenment tradition and its critics. *Quarterly Journal of Theoretical Politics Research*, 28, 109–138.