

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction: The Decline and Renewal of Scripture

EVERY YEAR, NEW BOOKS APPEAR OFFERING GUIDANCE ON how to read the Bible. Often written by eminent scholars for laypeople, they aim to address the yawning chasm in the public's cultural and spiritual education.¹ These volumes not only battle an educational system long in decline; they face an intellectual situation, centuries in the making, in which the Bible's singular status has eroded. Transformed beyond recognition where not simply discredited, the Bible today is largely the object either of literalist fanaticism or even-tempered apathy. In college classes, one might find the Bible taught as a literary and cultural possession to be studied, but certainly not as revelation.²

This state of affairs is only partly attributable to the necessary concessions to life in a pluralistic liberal democracy. More fundamentally, it reflects the undeniable power of modern science, philosophy, and history as our primary tools for making sense of the world. Simply put, the

¹ Some of these volumes even have the same title: see, for instance, James L. Kugel, *How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now* (New York: Free Press, 2007); Marc Zvi Brettler, *How to Read the Bible* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2005). Other recent additions to this genre include Jaroslav Pelikan, *Whose Bible Is It? A History of the Scriptures Throughout the Ages* (New York: Viking, 2005) and F. E. Peters, *The Voice, the Word, the Books: The Sacred Scripture of the Jews, Christians, and Muslims* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

² On the tensions within recent some Jewish translations and commentaries as they navigate these categories, see Elsie Stern, "Teaching Torah in the Twenty-First Century: Three Jewish Bible Commentaries," *Prooftexts* 25, no. 3 (2005); Martin Lockshin, "The Limits of Translation," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 96, no. 4 (2006). On the development of the idea of the Bible as a cultural possession, see Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Bible of earlier centuries is no longer accessible. Our understanding of the natural world, historical time, and the human psyche precludes the possibility of finding meaning in scripture's "simple sense."³ The rise of modern anthropology and its investigation of the literary and oral canons of non-Western cultures and traditions have further demolished the potential for the "The Bible" to be, as its etymology would have it, The Book. The Bible is, in short, no longer "scripture," an object of veneration regarded as foundational to religious tradition and human life.

The loss of the Bible's scriptural status is not merely a byproduct of modernization. The project of modernity itself depends on discrediting, or at least dislodging, scriptural authority. Clerical political authority in pre-modern Europe was based on the claim to the exclusive power of interpreting scripture in such a way as to legitimize the authority of its interpreters. Hence Spinoza's *Theological-Political Treatise* (1670), a foundational text of modern political life, introduces the argument for a secular religious sphere with a long and devastating critique of prophecy and of the integrity of the biblical text.⁴ Spinoza's desire to puncture the authority of scripture drew its force from the dream of a free civil state not ruled by clerical authority, in which "every man may think what he likes and say what he thinks."⁵ The significance of scripture was inextricable from the status ascribed to it as the revealed word of God, and the critique of scriptural revelation was closely linked, even central, to the main political project of the Enlightenment. In the world bequeathed to Europe by Spinoza, and later by Kant, revelation, whatever it was to mean, precluded access to God outside the channels of reason. The impossibility of sure knowledge of God or revelation forced both Christianity and Judaism to articulate novel grounds for their traditions, now disconnected from any self-evident mandate of revelation. Neither the Bible nor any other text could be said to be "revealed," at least in any simple sense.

³ See Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

⁴ Benedictus de Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise*, trans. Samuel Shirley, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2001). For a convincing reading of the Treatise and the relationship between the critique of scripture and Spinoza's political liberalism, see Steven B. Smith, *Spinoza, Liberalism, and the Question of Jewish Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

⁵ Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise*, 222.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

3

The trajectory I have outlined depends on an assumption of the absolute triumph of secularization and the inexorable decline in the cogency of revelation. But this “secularization thesis,” which claimed that religious belief and the social structures that once supported it would wither away with the advent of modern political, social, and economic development, has been increasingly challenged in recent decades.⁶ Since the sociological study of religion of the 1970s and, more proximately, since the American reckoning with the force of religious fundamentalism in the wake of 9/11, even intellectuals deeply skeptical of religious convictions have confronted the lasting pull of religion alongside and within modernity.⁷ Religious discourse has not simply atrophied with the advent of secularism; it has undergone a transformation. It now speaks in the cadences of the very discourses – history, the sciences, literature – that once uprooted its foundations.

The persistence of theological and religious ideas – albeit often in disguised or muted forms – within secularism is attested to by the lingering aura of sacredness that hovers over the Bible. From the late eighteenth century on, religious thinkers educated in Western thought have simultaneously invited and resisted the metamorphosis of the Bible from divine revelation to product of human experience, and thus have sought to redefine revelation within the confines of what reason can know and the human subject can perceive. Modern religious thinkers inevitably, then, must work with and build upon the very ideas that disrupted the foundations of earlier religious thought. In this way they have tried to salvage the Bible with appeals to its literary or generic uniqueness, its ethical insight, or, at the very least, its indispensability in Western culture.⁸ These claims testify to the persistence of the

⁶ See William Swatos Jr. and Kevin Christiano, “Secularization Theory: The Course of a Concept,” *Sociology of Religion* 60, no. 3 (1999).

⁷ Peter Berger, one of the sociologists best known for detailing the end of the “sacred canopy” of religion in modern society, himself embodied this very shift. Compare that eponymous work, published in 1967, with his subsequent reflections on religion: Peter L. Berger, *A Rumor of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969); Peter L. Berger, *The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation*, 1st ed. (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1979); Peter L. Berger, Brigitte Berger, and Hansfried Kellner, *The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness* (New York: Random House, 1973).

⁸ Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible*, ix–xi.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

privileged status of the Bible even in an age and culture that no longer recognizes the validity of this privilege.

This book examines the problems and the possibilities that surface from the attempt to articulate the religious force of the Bible *within* the broadly defined critical apparatus of modernity. As a work of scholarship, my contribution does not, and indeed cannot, affirm the sacredness or divinity of the Bible. Rather, its focus on a single historical figure provides a vehicle for investigating some of the strategies a modern religious thinker might employ when confronting the challenges modern thought poses to the traditional claims of a religious tradition.

I take it as a starting point that for such a thinker, the Bible can be neither affirmed without qualification as a “revealed” text nor simply dismissed as “just another text.” Given these intellectual constraints, what strategies might there be for claiming a privileged place for the Bible within a community of faith? Is it not the case that the justification for a religious community’s very existence stands or falls on the validity of its claim that its scripture embodies or transmits a revealed truth only accessible through it? Can any intellectually coherent foundation be built over the yawning chasm that divides traditional religious claims and modern consciousness?

The philosophical and belletristic writings of Franz Rosenzweig (1886–1929) offer a particularly compelling standpoint for posing these central questions. Rosenzweig’s preoccupation with the Hebrew Bible and its revelatory potential enacts a dialectical relationship to modernity that is the focus of this study. His attempt to navigate the competing intellectual forces faced by any modern intellectual illustrates some of the strategies and paths open to religious thinkers generally who seek to reinvigorate religion within the context of the liberal tradition of the West. I argue that Rosenzweig’s intellectual and theological project, which was guided by this quest to give new life to religion in modern thought and life, ultimately reinforced the tradition of post-Enlightenment German-Jewish liberal religious thought even as it rebelled against it. This simultaneous embrace and rejection of modernity captures the very epitome of religious thought in our own age.

Examination of the role of scripture in Rosenzweig’s work affords a greater appreciation of this complex, towering figure and his work as a

INTRODUCTION

5

whole. But even more, it offers a view into the tensions and contradictions of modern religious thought itself. The sacred status of the Bible is intimately tied to the concept of revelation, and both of these religious notions have been deeply problematized in the modern world; even the most “orthodox” thinkers have internalized the challenges to scripture and revelation that separate them from earlier traditions of thought. Thus my interest is less in the question of *how* scripture is to be interpreted and more in the fundamental question: *why* interpret scripture at all? For what range of meanings and significance might “scripture” have in a context in which revelation has been thoroughly transformed?

It was Rosenzweig’s self-appointed task to revitalize the concept of scripture for skeptical modern readers, a task that implied, if not necessitated, a reformulated concept of revelation. He executed this task with tremendous ambivalence toward the intellectual strictures of the modern period. He was quite aware that to engage the Bible was to engage the problem of revelation in modern times, and for this reason his writings are remarkably insightful as to the condition and possibilities facing modern and contemporary religious thought as a whole. The result of his labors – partly successful, often diminished by polemic and evasion – took a number of forms over the years of his productive life. Part of the task of this book is to document these successes and failures and investigate why Rosenzweig chose the strategies that he did. To accomplish this, I trace Rosenzweig’s evolving engagement with the Hebrew Bible throughout his works, from *The Star of Redemption* through his final literary and creative efforts, which culminated in a momentous translation of the Hebrew Bible itself. The peripatetic journey marked by these experiments with scripture reveals a thinker who simultaneously accommodated and resisted the strictures imposed by modern critical thought. Put another way, it is this very rebellion against the rationalism and historicism of the German-Jewish liberal tradition that indicates how deeply Rosenzweig was indebted to it.



THE PLACE OF SCRIPTURE IN ROSENZWEIG’S WRITING IS AN OVERLOOKED and significant dimension of his work, analysis of which shifts our understanding of this titan of modern Jewish thought. Franz Rosenzweig has

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

not been known for his study of or interest in the Bible.⁹ Among non-scholars, he is known for his colorful and dramatic biography; to a lesser extent, for his widely cited but rarely read philosophical book, *The Star of Redemption*. I will remark only briefly on Rosenzweig's biography, which, for most readers, is familiar, and has often overshadowed his published works.¹⁰

⁹ Numerous monographs on Rosenzweig have appeared in the last fifteen years. These include: Zachary Braiterman, *The Shape of Revelation: Aesthetics and Modern Jewish Thought* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007); Peter Gordon, *Rosenzweig and Heidegger: Between Judaism and German Philosophy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Eric Santner, *On the Psychotheology of Everyday Life: Reflections on Freud and Rosenzweig* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Leora Batnitzky, *Idolatry and Representation: The Thought of Franz Rosenzweig Reconsidered* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Paul R. Mendes-Flohr, *German Jews: A Dual Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Ernest Rubinstein, *An Episode of Jewish Romanticism: Franz Rosenzweig's "The Star of Redemption"* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999); Yudit Kornberg Greenberg, *Better than Wine: Love, Poetry, and Prayer in the Thought of Franz Rosenzweig* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996); Richard Cohen, *Elevations: The Height of the Good in Rosenzweig and Levinas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Robert Gibbs, *Correlations in Rosenzweig and Levinas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); and Stéphane Mosès, *System and Revelation: The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig*, trans. Catherine Thiyani (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992). For a review of trends in Rosenzweig interpretation and interest, see Peter Gordon, "Rosenzweig Redux: The Reception of German-Jewish Thought," *Jewish Social Studies* 8, no. 1 (2001).

Numerous new publications and translations of Rosenzweig's writings have also appeared in recent years; see Franz Rosenzweig, *The Star of Redemption*, trans. Barbara E. Galli (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005); Barbara E. Galli, *Franz Rosenzweig and Jehuda Halevi: Translating, Translations, and Translators* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995); Franz Rosenzweig, *Ninety-Two Poems and Hymns of Yehuda Halevi*, trans. Thomas A. Kovach, Eva Josepe, and Gilya Gerda Schmidt (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000); Paul W. Franks and Michael L. Morgan, eds., *Franz Rosenzweig: Philosophical and Theological Writings* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000); and Franz Rosenzweig, *Die "Gritli"-Briefe: Briefe an Margrit Rosenstock-Huessy* (Tübingen: Bilam, 2002).

¹⁰ The hagiographic impulse in Rosenzweig scholarship is pervasive and unfortunate, although recent scholars have become more wary of the temptation. The publication of the "Gritli" letters, which Rosenzweig wrote to Margrit ("Gritli") Rosenstock-Huessy, has also exacerbated this danger. Rosenzweig's affair with Rosenstock-Huessy during the years of the composition of *Star* is amply documented in Rosenzweig, *Die "Gritli"-Briefe*. The significance of the letters for understanding Rosenzweig's thought has been addressed, with different emphases, in Ephraim Meir, *Letters of Love: Franz Rosenzweig's Spiritual Biography and Oeuvre in Light of the Gritli Letters* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006); William Hallo, "Gibt Es So Etwas Wie Autoexegese? Franz Rosenzweigs Gritli-Briefe und der Stern," in *Franz Rosenzweigs "neues Denken." Band II: Erfahrene Offenbarung – in theologos*, ed. Wolfdietrich Schmied-Kowarzik (München: Verlag Karl Alber Freiburg, 2004); and Michael Zank, "The Rosenzweig-Rosenstock Triangle, or, What Can We Learn from *Letters to Gritli?*: A Review Essay," *Modern Judaism* 23, no. 1 February (2003). While the letters are a treasure trove for biographers of Rosenzweig, it is crucial not to allow the letters or the affair itself over-determine our understanding of the philosophical and theological meaning of *Star*.

Born in 1886 in Kassel and raised in an acculturated, bourgeois German-Jewish family, Rosenzweig developed an early interest in political philosophy, completing his doctorate under the great German historian and political theorist Friedrich Meinecke with a dissertation entitled *Hegel and the State* (1913).¹¹ The presumptions of his secular background and university training were shaken when he was twenty-six, as the result of a passionate encounter with his close confidant Eugen Rosenstock. Rosenzweig was moved by the faith of Rosenstock and experienced a spiritual crisis that led him to take religion seriously. He made plans to convert to Christianity, but the nature of these plans was unlike the *pro forma* baptisms of his many converted cousins. At the brink of his heartfelt conversion from his “philosophical,” rationalistic state to a fervent and believing Christianity, Rosenzweig abruptly and dramatically made an entirely different conversion: to his native Judaism, the nominal religion of his youth, which he newly appropriated and made vibrant for himself.¹²

Rosenzweig's first major work following his dissertation and his multiple “conversions” was his monumental, even grandiose philosophical book, *The Star of Redemption*. It was composed hastily, written in large measure on postcards sent home during the end of Rosenzweig's military service in the Balkans (1918–1919) in World War I. *Star* has – unpredictably – become his best known, if most trepidatiously read, work. Following the war, Rosenzweig decided against the academic career that was expected of him and took up, instead, the directorship of the Lehrhaus Judaica, a center for adult Jewish study in Frankfurt. He tried his hand at translating Jewish liturgical texts from Hebrew into German, an interest that was likely nurtured in part by the philosophy of religious education that he had cultivated during the war. He began

¹¹ Rosenzweig's dissertation was originally published as Franz Rosenzweig, *Hegel und der Staat* (München and Berlin: Verlag R. Oldenbourg, 1920).

¹² The account that made the story famous is found in Nahum Glatzer, *Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought* (New York: Schocken, 1953), 23ff. Eugene Sheppard confirms the reliability of Glatzer's version in Eugene Sheppard, “‘I Am a Memory Come Alive’: Nahum Glatzer and the Legacy of German-Jewish Thought in America,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 94, no. 1 (2004): 128–31. Rosenzweig's declaration “Also bleibe ich Jude” and his renunciation of his plan to “convert” to Protestant Christianity are often misunderstood as a rejection of all things Christian and an embrace of all things Jewish. As I will argue in the following chapters, Rosenzweig's belated construction of his own Jewish identity remained strongly influenced by his early encounters with the Christian faith that Rosenstock and his cohort embodied.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

to develop a distinctive philosophy of translation, in which sacred and “canonical” texts were of central interest. This reflected his growing belief that Jewish communal identity necessitated engagement with the classical texts of Judaism.¹³ From his 1920 translation of the traditional Hebrew grace after meals to his translation and commentary on the poetry of the medieval Hebrew liturgical poet Yehuda Halevi and, finally, the momentous Bible translation undertaken in collaboration with Martin Buber, Rosenzweig in his later years focused increasingly on the possibilities for liturgy and biblical texts to become the meeting ground for Hebrew and German, Jews and Christians, individual and God. These last efforts were cut short by amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, from which he had progressively suffered during his last eight years and from which he died just short of age forty-three, in 1929.

Rosenzweig's engagement with scripture grew out his formative intellectual experiences – in particular, with the problem, or “crisis,” of historicism that gripped Wilhelmine German intellectuals.¹⁴ This crisis was animated by “the concern, expressed by many German intellectuals around 1900, with the allegedly damaging effects of an excessive preoccupation with the methods and objects of historical research.”¹⁵

¹³ Franz Rosenzweig, “Zeit ists . . .” in *Zweistromland. Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken. Franz Rosenzweig: Der Mensch und sein Werk. Gesammelte Schriften III*, ed. Reinhold Mayer and Annemarie Mayer (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff, 1984). This essay and others on Jewish education have been translated in Franz Rosenzweig, *On Jewish Learning*, trans. N. N. Glatzer (New York: Schocken Books, 1965).

¹⁴ On the roots of historicism in theology and philosophy, see Thomas A. Howard, *Religion and the Rise of Historicism: W. M. L. De Wette, Jacob Burckhardt, and the Theological Origins of Nineteenth-Century Historical Consciousness* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Alan Megill, “Why Was There a Crisis of Historicism?” (Review of Charles Bambach, *Heidegger, Dilthey, and the Crisis of Historicism*), *History and Theory* 36, no. 3 (1997); Georg Iggers, “Historicism: The History and Meaning of the Term,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (1995). On Rosenzweig's early engagement with the “crisis of historicism,” see Paul Mendes-Flohr, “Franz Rosenzweig and the Crisis of Historicism,” in *The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr (Hanover, NH: University of New England Press, 1988), especially 312–13. For additional details of Rosenzweig's decision to become a historian, see David Myers, *Resisting History: Historicism and Its Discontents in German-Jewish Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 77–79. On Rosenzweig's studies and his intellectual development in the period 1906–1913, see Franks and Morgan, eds., *Franz Rosenzweig: Philosophical and Theological Writings*, 25–39; and Peter Gordon, “Angelus Novus: A Review of David Myers, *Resisting History*,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 95, no. 4 (2005).

¹⁵ Megill, “Why Was There a Crisis of Historicism? (Review of Charles Bambach, *Heidegger, Dilthey, and the Crisis of Historicism*),” 416.

INTRODUCTION

9

When Rosenzweig was a doctoral student, his studies with Meinecke and the neo-Kantian Heinrich Rickert brought him into direct contact with thinkers who had grappled with the simultaneously alluring and troubling ethos that historical thinking engendered.¹⁶ Among the most disturbing effects of this “excessive preoccupation” with historical consciousness and historical study was “a relativism destructive of absolute (or at least prevailing) values.”¹⁷ But in fact, as many intellectuals realized, the problem was not so much an overly zealous application of historical study but rather the natural result of its thorough application to the fundamental phenomena of contemporary society, including its values.¹⁸ Under these conditions, “historicism” took on a distinctly pejorative association, and intellectuals became divided on whether a solution to the crisis could be found within philosophy, and specifically neo-Hegelianism, or whether some radical alternative to historicism was necessary.

¹⁶ As pioneered by Leopold von Ranke, modern history sought to narrate historical events as they really were (*wie es eigentlich gewesen*). This involved the development of standards for historical evidence and principles of reevaluation in light of new evidence; the basic assumption that the origins of all social and cultural phenomena are rooted in history; and the belief that history itself obeys certain laws, yielding the concept of analogy in understanding historical events. For Ranke, as for the other proponents of history, the historian’s task was framed by the belief that “every epoch is equally close to God” (*ibid.*). The Wilhelmine intellectuals who were preoccupied with historicism as a problem were keenly aware of the paradox these methods contained. Ranke simultaneously secularized Christian theological understandings of divine Providence and put forth a new quasi-theological understanding of history itself.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*: 416.

¹⁸ For instance, theologian and theorist of religion Ernst Troeltsch, who of all theologians was the most interested in grappling with the implications of historicism for theology, argued that “scientific” historical thinking itself (rather than its overapplication) “dissolved verities, institutions, and ideas long held to be self-evident into the stream of historical becoming” [Ernst Troeltsch, “Die Krisis des Historismus,” *Die Neue Rundschau* 33, no. 1 (1922): 573]. His proposed solution to the problem of history and theology, one of the most thoughtful attempts to solve the problem theologians faced, is nicely illustrated in his essay “On the Historical and Dogmatic Method in History,” in *Religion in History* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991). For many younger religious thinkers of the 1920s, Troeltsch became, as Myers argues, “the personification of the historicist debasement of religious faith,” since he had attempted to reckon with the gravity of the historicist crisis by integrating its lessons into his own theology (Myers, *Resisting History*, 98).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-89526-2 - Rosenzweig's Bible: Reinventing Scripture for Jewish Modernity

Mara H. Benjamin

Excerpt

[More information](#)

The crisis of historicism predated the outbreak of World War I.¹⁹ But the literal economic and political crisis of the war galvanized some theologians to seek a new theocratic model for the social order.²⁰ For the radical Protestant “dialectical theologians,” the war and its millions of dead justly damned the legacy of nineteenth-century historicism and the Prussian nationalist aspirations that animated it. The primordial power of the originary moments and texts of Christianity – unmediated by overly cautious historicism – seemed to promise a resource for countering the seemingly pallid liberal theology of Adolf von Harnack and Ernst Troeltsch. A “Luther renaissance” suggested that the scriptures themselves could provide a powerful rebuke to the compromises of the earlier generation.²¹ But mobilizing the sources to do so required a hermeneutic that acknowledged historicism without becoming subjugated to it. In particular, the young “dialectical theologians” sought new interpretive strategies to overcome the historical and cultural

¹⁹ Renegade theologians such as Franz Overbeck had long decried the vacuity and arrogance of the alliance between religion and bourgeois values known as *Kulturprotestantismus*. See Franz Overbeck, *Christentum und Kultur. Gedanken und Anmerkungen zur Modernen Theologie* (Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1919) and *Über die Christlichkeit Unserer Heutigen Theologie* (Leipzig: E.W. Fritzsche, 1873). On Overbeck, see the provocative essay Jacob Taubes, “Entzauberung der Theologie: Zu einem Porträt Overbecks,” in *Vom Kult zu Kultur* (Munich: W. Fink Verlag, 1996).

²⁰ The spirit among the young theologians is captured in the radical Swiss pastor Friedrich Gogarten’s 1920 essay “Between the Times,” which became a rallying cry for young theologians disillusioned with the incapacity of liberal Christian theology to address the “crisis of culture” experienced by those who came of age during World War I. Gogarten’s essay inspired the title and the tenor of the short-lived journal *Zwischen den Zeiten*, which was edited by him along with the “theologians of crisis” Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen. See Friedrich Gogarten, “The Crisis of Our Culture,” in *The Beginnings of Dialectic Theology*, ed. James McConkey Robinson (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1968), 279–80. See also Kurt Nowak, *Geschichte des Christentums in Deutschland: Religion, Politik und Gesellschaft Vom Ende der Aufklärung bis zur Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1995), 212–14 and Samuel Moyn, *Origins of the Other: Emmanuel Levinas between Revelation and Ethics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 175. For a collection of some of the most important essays from this circle of theologians, see Robinson, *The Beginnings*.

²¹ See Karl Holl, *Was verstand Luther unter Religion?* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1917]; Karl Kupisch, “The ‘Luther Renaissance,’” *Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 4 (1967) and James Stayer, *Martin Luther, German Savior: German Evangelical Theological Factions and the Interpretation of Luther, 1917–1933* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2000).