

## Facing the Divide since Babel: The Role of Faith in Urban Settings

Jordi Pujol

---

**Abstract:** There are two divisions of tongues: the division of Babel, where people were scattered in their speech because of pride, and the division of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost sent out men of one dialect to speak all the languages of the earth and bring all men to unity. Both speak about the power of speech: its potentiality of *communion* and of *division*. “Speaking in tongues” means difference, variety of languages, plurality of views. This article examines the paradox of simultaneously promoting pluralism and difference in the public sphere and building common ground. Communication helps to build the former and, when inspired by faith, can also be a catalyst for the latter, fostering networks of solidarity.

**Keywords:** free speech, pluralism, religion, communion, faith, communication

---

### Introduction

The dialogical nature of humankind points to speech as a foundation for personal growth and societal relationships. This article is about the power of speech to either build understanding or generate divisiveness in urban settings, and the role of faith in this. I use the two divisions of tongues narrated in the Bible: the one of confusion and divisiveness of Babel, and the other of understanding and communion of Pentecost.

### The Power of Speech and the Two Divisions of Tongues

Language is key because it determines two main bonds: First, it helps us to know reality (including ourselves), and second, it helps us to communicate with others. The first human bond is the relationship with reality. The knowledge of truth as *adaequatio rei et intellectus* (the adequation of things and intellect) means the matching between what reality is and our minds and hearts that unveil that truth (Aquinas 1964, q. 16, art. 1, 3). In this sense, the search for truth is one of the key tasks of mankind.

The second important bond is to other human beings, with whom we share life and the experience of the reality of what things are. In this interrelationship we try to understand, we communicate, and we discuss what is real. We codify information and describe, but we also grow through language (cf. Taylor 2016). In this sense, meaningful conversations constitute an important part of the search for truth.

One of the main features that defines and constitutes human beings is that we are *conversational*; language distinguishes us from other animals. Many authors, including Alasdair MacIntyre (1999), Charles Taylor (2016), and Hannah Arendt (1958), have stressed this dialogical dimension of mankind. However, this capacity is not inoffensive: words are not neutral and innocuous, but convey intentions and become deeds. The words of spouses in a given setting can perform a marriage (whereas the same words said by actors representing in a theater do not!), and words can also kill or destroy the reputation of a person not only on the internet, but also in real life.

Ideologies know well about the *power of language* and the old art of twisting words that is sophistry. The capacity of corrupting language works by obscuring these two aspects mentioned above: knowledge of reality and human relationships. Oftentimes, this power is exercised to pursue motives different than mere communication of the truth. When the power of language is exercised to produce a behavior in the other (without full awareness), that communication alters the interrelationship among subjects, because the *other* becomes an object to be manipulated (dominated, handled, and controlled) (cf. Pieper 1992, 22).

In the context of the power of language, its link to truth and reality, and its impact in human relationships, there are two divisions of tongues narrated in the Bible: the division of Babel, where men were scattered in their speech because of pride, and the division of Pentecost, when the Spirit sent out men of one dialect to speak all the languages of the earth and bring all men to unity. Both talk about speech, and its potentiality for *communion* and for *division*, in an urban setting—in the first case Mesopotamia, and in the second case Jerusalem. The next section focuses on the second bond mentioned above—the “inter-personal character of human speech” (Pieper 1992, 15)—using the passage of the Tower of Babel.

## The Division of Babel

In the book of Genesis, we read about the division of Babel (Genesis 11:1–9):<sup>1</sup>

- 1 The whole world had the same language and the same words.
- 2 When they were migrating from the east, they came to a valley in the land of Shinar and settled there.
- 3 They said to one another, “Come, let us mold bricks and harden them with fire.” They used bricks for stone, and bitumen for mortar.

---

<sup>1</sup> Version of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops; this version is the New American Bible Revised Edition.

4 Then they said, "Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the sky and so make a name for ourselves; otherwise we shall be scattered all over the earth."

5 The Lord came down to see the city and the tower that the people had built.

6 Then the Lord said: If now, while they are one people and all have the same language, they have started to do this, nothing they presume to do will be out of their reach.

7 Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that no one will understand the speech of another.

8 So the Lord scattered them from there over all the earth, and they stopped building the city.

9 That is why it was called Babel, because there the Lord confused the speech of all the world. From there the Lord scattered them over all the earth.

The content of the passage looks like other famous episodes of human origins: the one of Adam and Eve's selfishness, deciding to go their own way, and the resulting punishment. Or Noah's flood as a divine punishment and new beginning after the wickedness of the first generations (Cain and his descendants). The distinctive feature in Babel is that this rebellion is *collective* ("they said to one another," in verse 3), involving 600,000 people, Castello (2013, 274) says.

The project of Babel aims to be a self-affirmation based on technical capacities ("let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the sky," in verse 4). It is a project aimed to "make a name for ourselves" (verse 4), in order to "achieve a situation in which they can be proud of their own will and effort" (Castello 2013, 267). This foolish human purpose to compete with God is driven by distrust and fear ("Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the sky . . . otherwise we shall be scattered all over the earth," in verse 4), and this was the cause of confusion.

*Muddle* is the key word to define Babel (cf. Fokkelman 2004, 14). The text starts and ends with a reference to the entire world that conveys that moral message: "The *whole world* had the same language and the same words" (Genesis 11:1, emphasis added). It finishes by saying, "That is why it was called Babel, because there the Lord confused the speech of *all the world*. From there the Lord scattered them over *all the earth*" (Genesis 11:9, emphasis added). In addition, "More than the theme of [geographical] dispersion, the theme of the difference of languages prevails, explained through the confusion wanted by God to prevent the sense of human power to rise disastrously . . . losing sight of the intrinsic limit of being a creature" (Castello 2013, 273). Humankind, full of pride and arrogance, was seeking recognition and wanted to guarantee its security by itself reaching up to heaven.

However, examining language, I find noteworthy the irony underpinning the entire text. As Castello suggests, the text is rich in assonance that is hard to grasp in the translation, but that suggests irony. This is evident in the conclusion

of the passage when “the name of Babel is ridiculed by passing from the meaning of *God’s door* to that of *confusion*” (Castello 2013, 265; emphasis added). The final verses of the episode connect the fatal end of the project with the etiology of the word *Babel*: They called their city *Bab-ili* (gate of god), and here the narrator connects *babel* to the Hebrew root *balal*, “he confused,” with a similar sound. The effect is rather caricatured (Castello 2013, 269). The true meaning of Babel, interpreted in its narrative context, is “the ironic explanation of how the attempts of mankind to entrust to his own technical capacities and to his own power, the contact with the divinity have been vain” (Castello 2013, 273).

This etiology connects the meaning of this passage also with some historical and archeological findings (Cabello Morales 2019). The *ziggurats* were high buildings constructed in Mesopotamia as royal tombs, temples, or observatories (cf. Cabello Morales 2019, 191). These buildings had a square- or rectangular-shaped foundation, and, “above it, in the form of a stepped terrace, there were several levels or floors—up to seven times!—in the last of which there was a chapel or temple that was accessed through the stairs located perpendicular to the facade or attached to it” (191; translation mine).

In the area between the Tigris and Euphrates, we can still find the remains of a group of 32 *ziggurats*. There was a big one near Babylon, close to the temple of the god Marduk, called Etemenanki (which means “house of the foundation of heaven and earth”), described on the Esagil tablet preserved at the Louvre Museum, more than 90 meters high, with seven stories, and it seemed to be unfinished. This building was destroyed, so all we know comes from the descriptions made by Herodoto in the mid-fifth century BC (cf. Cabello Morales 2019, 192). Historians like Liverani (2003, 259–62) place the story of the Babel Tower in the context of Nebuchadnezzar, the expansion of Babylon, and the collapse of Assyria in 614–610 BC, where there was evidence of new urbanizations (cf. Castello 2013, 270).

The building techniques of the Mesopotamian world—in contrast with the very elementary ones in Canaan—were very much sophisticated and admired. The elevation of the building was considered enormous human progress. But, at the same time, this new model of civilization “concealed a subjugation of man (the anonymous collectivity) and its finalization to the production of the work” (Castello 2013, 274). So, in the eyes of the leaders of the construction, a *brick* became more important than the *life* of a human being: “If a man crashed and died no one paid attention, but if a brick fell everyone cried because it would take a year to replace it” (Castello 2013, 274), because to climb to the top of the building with the materials was difficult and arduous. In this same sense, even the women were compelled not to stop working unless they were about to give birth. In fact, Ginzberg (2008) says that women “gave birth forging bricks” (170).

The historical context of the Tower of Babel speaks of a project driven by the tyrannical purposes of political leaders. As Ravasi states, commenting on this passage, God detests tyranny and rejects those who have autonomous plans of conquest and not of dialogue, of oppression and not of collaboration: “The dream of imposing a unity of slaves is frustrated by the God of freedom” (1990, 163).

Ravasi thinks that the Jahvist version makes four key points: “a popular etymology of the name *Babel/Babylon*, the great capital of the eastern superpower; an explanation of the linguistic diversity spread across the earth; the diaspora of peoples in different and even opposing forms of culture; and the theme of urbanism, that is, the meaning and risks of gathering in the city, symbolically represented by the *tower*” (1990, 162).

## The Coming of the Spirit

During the Jewish feast of Pentecost, fifty days after Easter, the Church came together in the Cenacle of Jerusalem for the coming of the Spirit promised by Jesus before the Ascension. We read the following in the book of the Acts of the Apostles (2:1–11):

- 1 When the time for Pentecost was fulfilled, they were all in one place together.
- 2 And suddenly there came from the sky a noise like a strong driving wind, and it filled the entire house in which they were.
- 3 Then there appeared to them tongues as of fire, which parted and came to rest on each one of them.
- 4 And they were all filled with the holy Spirit and began to speak in different tongues, as the Spirit enabled them to proclaim.
- 5 Now there were devout Jews from every nation under heaven staying in Jerusalem.
- 6 At this sound, they gathered in a large crowd, but they were confused because each one heard them speaking in his own language.
- 7 They were astounded, and in amazement they asked, “Are not all these people who are speaking Galileans?”
- 8 Then how does each of us hear them in his own native language?
- 9 We are Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia,
- 10 Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the districts of Libya near Cyrene, as well as travelers from Rome,
- 11 both Jews and converts to Judaism, Cretans and Arabs, yet we hear them speaking in our own tongues of the mighty acts of God.

The disciples gathering “in one place together” (verse 1) and “the doors being shut where the disciples were” (John 20:19) God irrupted, throwing open the doors “through the strength of a wind that recalls *ruah*, the primordial breath and fulfils the promise of ‘power’ made by the Risen One before he takes his leave

(cf. Acts 1:8)" (Pope Francis 2019). The Spirit filled their minds and hearts, and the disciples started speaking all languages.

*Speaking different tongues* means difference, variety of languages, plurality of views . . . under a common teleological truth that is the fact of being human. This event sets communion and plurality as a common denominator (Peters 2005, 46). I consider that the first message of this event is that, as human beings, we all convey a common truth of what it means to be human. Modernity denied creaturehood, "[f]reeing man from his condition as a created being" (Von Hildebrand 1994, 10), in two ways: "[i]ndividualistic self-sufficiency . . . characterized by a rejection of all bonds linking us to God and to the moral law" (Von Hildebrand 1994, 11) and collectivistic antipersonalism as represented by Communism. This epistemological fracture coming from modernity distorted many things, creating problems related to speech, such as abusing freedom of expression in the name of free speech. With expression it also happens that if everything goes, nothing matters.

Language and speech have their own rules, and *speaking all tongues* does not mean that *everything goes*. We observe that some hateful expressions are a celebration of offense more than an exercise of free speech. Language and information do not only involve the *locutionary* dimension (just saying something), but also the *illocutionary* dimension (by saying something, we do something), because the words are really actions, and they also involve the listener and the *perlocutionary* dimension (its effects), because some possible effects of speech acts could be anticipated. There are some abuses of expression (in journalism, politics, cinema, and literature) where speakers or authors are subverting the fair use of the various types of discourse (Pujol, forthcoming).

Going back to the text, the enumeration of the origin of those who listened to the disciples (verses 5, 9–11), and the fact that they all understood the language spoken by the Apostles (verses 4, 6, 8, 11), evokes, by contrast, the *confusion* of tongues at Babel.

With this event, "[t]he Church was publicly displayed to the multitude, the Gospel began to spread among the nations by means of preaching, and there was presaged that union of all peoples in the catholicity of the faith by means of the Church of the New Covenant, a Church which speaks all tongues, understands and accepts all tongues in her love, and so supersedes the divisiveness of Babel" (Vatican Council II 1965, no. 4). It is the *language of truth and love*, which is a *universal language* (cf. Pope Francis 2019).

Pope Francis presented the Holy Spirit as "the *creator of communion*," comparing Him to "the conductor of an orchestra that plays the scores of praises for the 'great works' of God," emphasizing that the gift of tongues is "a *symphony of sounds that unite and harmonically form diversity* . . . removing barriers between Jews and Greeks, slaves and freemen, to make a single body" (Pope Francis 2019; emphasis added). In a similar line of thought, Pope Benedict XVI (2010) asked himself: "What does this new and powerful self-communication of God produce? The Spirit triggers a process of reunification of the divided and dispersed parts of

the human family. People, often reduced to individuals in competition or in conflict with each other, when touched by the Spirit of Christ open themselves to the experience of communion.”

We can conclude that the plurality of languages, cultures, and races is a positive element when it is an expression of freedom, but not when it comes from oppression and tyranny. In these cases, it is an expression of confusion and divisiveness. God wants the communion and unity of humanity created by Him in freedom, and rejects the projects of uniformity based on any political and social kind of slavery (cf. Ravasi 1990, 164).

## The Paradox of Promoting Difference and Building Common Ground

The question of a shared common *telos* of humanity and the necessary pluralism of the public sphere has been abundantly studied by political philosophy, communication, sociology, and law, offering complementary views. I cannot be systematic and offer a complete picture on this, because I need to get to my point without getting lost in many preliminary debates. On these topics, ethics and justice are intertwined (and I will use both in this section). Let me start with a pioneer on human rights.

Francis of Vitoria (1483–1546) was a Spanish Roman Catholic philosopher and theologian of the Renaissance, who was known as one of the “fathers of international law.” In the context of the *new world* in America, Vitoria developed the notion of *ius gentium*, the “law of peoples,” as a preexisting law for all humankind (intrinsically) based on their dignity as human beings. Therefore, the laws and rights of the Spanish Empire—also enforced overseas—included not only Christians but also pagans. This was a gigantic change of rules. This common ground of *humanity* was theorized philosophically and legally, as the earliest opening guide for the human rights project. However, the new public sphere created by the modern nation-states in Europe and the United States to defend the rights of citizens shared this Judeo-Christian universalism, though some authors tried to slash the link with that tradition. It will take us long to elaborate on this, so I will leave it here.

Within this tradition, we find Hannah Arendt (1958) who understands *pluralism* in the public sphere as a “common world” characterized by “human plurality” (52–54, 175). Balancing these two elements is the need to defend equality within the public sphere by fostering respect for difference (meaning by *equality* “same dignity” and *difference* “promotion of particularity”). The question would be: Where do we put the effort? The debate on these questions is endless. Following our argument here, I would respond: In both. We need to protect a common bond to reality (of what things are in nature), like a common dignity as humans. At the same time, we must protect human plurality because we are very different, and we must reflect on the notion of difference as something positive.

It is not by chance that with a better appreciation of the “common world” as common identity (a man or a woman like me), the relationships and differences

are perceived in a less negative way (cf. Donati 2008, 32). If we first look at what is common, recognizing the other as an *alter ego* with whom I share a common world, it will be easier to accept difference. It will be simpler to be more open, and to find something valuable on that person, or accept in his or her arguments something worthy of dialogue. Under this understanding, difference or *diversity* is not an individualistic feature.

Multiculturalism promises the recognition of all identities on the ground of epistemological relativism: “all different, all equal.” But that promise is not possible to achieve, because *recognition* means assigning a truth (cf. Ricœur 2004). Multiculturalism erases the common truth that we all convey as men and women, canceling any common bond to truth and nature (teleology), embracing moral indifference: “All different, all equal” forgets the key social notions of solidarity and reciprocity (cf. Donati 2008, 30). There are many authors that have addressed this challenge of recognition of identities and social relationships in the public sphere, proposing different kinds of universalisms (e.g., emphasizing *impartiality* or *dialogue* as values to guide relationships in the public sphere). Pierpaolo Donati thinks that this formulation is ambiguous and, in the end, inconsistent, because this recognition is based on the original dignity of each individual and at the same time is a “cultural recognition” of (isolated) identities. As Hobbes and other contemporary followers suggest, this process of recognition is guided by clashes among them (individuals and cultures). Under this Hobbesian mindset, recognition and respect for difference are a product of conflict, whereas other authors (such as Fichte, Ricœur, and Donati) see recognition of identities as a product of a *symbolic exchange*. The former model of recognition is negative (confrontational), with no shared common world (*telos*), and external (the State guiding the process of clashes), whereas the latter becomes a social *task*, relational and dialogical by nature, and based on social networks of solidarity and reciprocity (cf. Donati 2008, 48).

The understanding of *difference* in a dialogical and relational model is much more positive than in a multicultural one, where difference is a problem (difference as separation, opposition, exclusion), in the sense that there is no possibility of a common world between the poles. The only connection between the poles is the identification of problems (cf. Donati 2008, 82). The consideration of *what we are* (identity, common word) is not due to political negotiation, as it is with rival interests and opinions. Within the framework of a “common world of human plurality,” different values are not the object of negotiation but guided by a *relational and rational semantic* of intercultural reflection. For Donati, *respect* becomes a rational act (reflexive) and relational (there is a symbolic exchange or interchange).

## Differences in Roman Law between the Private and Public Spheres and the Common (Urban) Spaces

In Roman law, the notion of “common” is not physical (private or public). Common is not a “thing” (*res*) a space, but an activity, a process (*lis*). The fact of



being common is a matter of relationships, procedures, exchange . . . communication! The common is what we face ahead. For example, I think it is important not to focus only on the situation of public furniture. The condition of public equipment is important for the common, but not enough, because *common* means “what can happen between us” in a space—the city, the neighborhood—but is a process, an activity. And communication can help a lot on this.

Communication and freedom of expression as public discourse help to build the public sphere in an abstract way. At the same time, I consider that communication inspired by faith can be a catalyzer for the *common*. A city is a potential common space (of reciprocity), where one is a citizen (*civis*) in relationship to another citizen, with the need of recognition. The fact of *being a citizen* was not a bond to language or religion, but to the fact that we are “mutual beings”: we can make something new happen between us.<sup>2</sup>

We are concentrated on the urban setting, but before finishing this short section on the public and the common spheres, I would like to pose an open question. The *networked public sphere* (of the internet) is not private or public (following the classical division of realms). Can it be considered a *common space*? The concentration of power of the big tech companies, and their ability to moderate content and connect people: Is it a new Babel phenomenon? Or rather a Pentecost? To answer this question would require a follow-up article. Instead of unfolding that debate, I address the underpinning question of this article on the role of faith in urban settings.

## What Is the Role of Faith and Religion in All This?

When we talk about the interplay between faith and politics in the public sphere, we must start acknowledging that the message of Jesus Christ was totally innovative: “render unto Caesar what is Caesar’s, and to God what is God’s” (a passage included in Matthew, Mark and Luke). Thus, Jesus’s formula is *dualism*, that is, something opposed to theocratic systems. The Church must not look for an exclusivist position of religion in the public sphere, nor the reductionism of liberal orthodoxy excluding faith from the public realm. Faith and politics are different realms, and faith and reason are two different languages, not opposed but complementary.

Luther’s approach to faith and reason was the doctrine of *sola fides* (faith alone). Luther said very strongly: “Reason is the greatest enemy that faith has: it never comes to the aid of spiritual things” (Luther and Chalmers 1857, 164). Paradoxically, an approach that defended faith so boldly gave rise to the secularization of the Western world. And this is the reason why the Catholic Church defends (far before Luther) *fides et ratio* and not *sola fides*. This is because faith and reason work together, are complementary. Saint Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109) gave us a short and clear sentence about this when he defined *fides quaerens intellectum* (faith seeking understanding). To have faith does not mean “to

---

<sup>2</sup> The first natural relationship happens within the family, and it exists prior to the city. Family is the first society, though it is private.

put reason to sleep" (Barron 2012). Faith is reasonable. As Bishop Robert Barron (2012) likes to explain, "authentic faith is never *infra-rational*." Faith is never: Do not think, just light that candle, or repeat that prayer, or take holy water and believe . . . No! That is superstition, and it is bad. Superstition and credulity are *infra-rational*, but these are not Catholic. However, "authentic faith is *supra-rational*," super-rational, meaning that it sometimes overwhelms our capacities (Barron 2012). Is it sometimes a surrender? Yes, but on the side of reason! This is because there are realities that I cannot control or dominate. Anselm describes the sort of faith that "merely believes what it ought to believe" as "dead" (1996, 88). So "faith seeking understanding" means something like "an active love of God seeking a deeper knowledge of God" (Williams 2020).

Faith is reasonable; this is why the Church founded universities in the Middle Ages, precisely to spread culture and inquiry beyond the walls of convents and monasteries. The Church has been doing research in astronomy for more than 400 years. Two important telescopes in the world are run by the Church: one in Arizona (United States), and the other in Castelgandolfo (close to Rome, Italy).

Going to my point, and using John D. Peters's idea: Belief is public, and we enact our beliefs in all that we do. Reason operates in many tongues (Pujol 2019, 99). And Saint Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:5 calls the faithful to take seriously speech and public discourse: "I want you all to speak in tongues." Plurality of views and languages is not seen by the apostle as a problem: "If even lifeless instruments, such as the flute or the harp, do not give distinct notes, how will anyone know what is played?" (verse 7), and "There are doubtless many different languages in the world, and none is without meaning" (verse 10). Paul makes an explicit call to rationality and knowledge: "Do not be children in your thinking; be babes in evil, but in thinking be mature" (verse 20). Faith seeking understanding, and reason open to sacredness and mystery . . . This is not wishful thinking; it is about rebuilding the relationship between faith and reason (Pujol, forthcoming).

"God is a meta-legal concept; though the concept of God is not properly a legal concept like contract or testamentary will, it does have some legal significance. The meta-legal God requires recognition by secular legal systems" (Domingo 2020, 2). This recognition does not mean that God must be translated into positive law, because "God does not need legal protection" (Domingo 2020, 2).

As Domingo explains, there is no legal effect regarding the existence of God: just recognition. "The legal recognition of God never involves the demand that citizens make an act of faith. As a meta-legal concept, God illuminates the legal system from the outside, providing support for pillars such as dignity, equality, solidarity, and human rights. The recognition of God, therefore, does not constitute a sacrifice of democratic principles; instead, it constitutes a strong meta-legal support, even for the secular character of the legal system" (Domingo 2020, 2). As a meta-legal concept, God is a source of meaningful behavior and of social consistency.

Therefore, it is crucial for communication ethics (for dialogical ethics in urban settings) that we restore the relationship between faith and reason, which must be circular, reciprocal. And by "reciprocal" I mean a mutual exchange.

Quoting again a maxim from Anselm: *intellego ut credam* . . . “We think,” we ask ourselves questions, so that “we may believe,” which is based on Augustine’s *credo ut intellegam*, “I believe so that I may understand.” Faith gives meaning and purpose and, in doing that, helps each of us to understand.

Connecting this to dialogic ethics, I see faith and religion as *catalyzers* for political identity, providing a consistent tradition of social doctrine on common good, equality, networks of solidarity, etc. Christianity owns a patrimony of foundational values that must transcend the logic of negotiation, precisely because they have an intrinsic value that comes from the authority of truth and nature. I see faith and religion as catalyzers for personal flourishing, as ingredients for a community that provides purpose, sense, and meaning to the life of men and women. The faith and tongues of Pentecost are positive moral powers that offer a horizon; they build not only civil co-existence, but also a route for a meaningful life and happiness.

Let me finish with an image that will sound very familiar to you: “Faith and reason are like two wings on which the human spirit rises to the contemplation of truth; and God has placed in the human heart a desire to know the truth—in a word, to know himself—so that, by knowing and loving God, men and women may also come to the fullness of truth about themselves” (Pope John Paul II 1998).

This tradition is perfectly represented in the great seal of the United States. The American eagle (representing the nation), with two wings, can take flight because of both wings: the *thought* of political philosophers like John Locke, but also because the Founding Fathers, under the leadership of George Washington, believed that liberty depends as much on faith as on reason.

Saint John Paul II used this analogy in a beautiful way: “Faith and reason are like two wings on which the human spirit rises” (1988). Faith and reason are two languages, both needed. Or in a less patriotic analogy: faith and reason are the pair of shoes on your feet. You can travel farther with both than you can with just one.

*Rev. Jordi Pujol, PhD, is Associate Professor of Media Ethics and Communication Law at the School of Church Communications in the Pontifical University of Santa Croce in Rome. He is originally from Barcelona (1975) and has a master’s degree in law (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain) and a PhD in Moral Theology (Pontifical University of the Holy Cross). He has been Visiting Research Fellow at the Notre Dame Center for Ethics and Culture (University of Notre Dame, Indiana) and Visiting Scholar at the Columbia Journalism School (New York) and at the Berkman Klein Center at Harvard (Cambridge).*

*His research is particularly focused on the ethical dilemmas related to freedom of expression in Europe and the United States and the challenges of exercising freedom of expression online. His upcoming book published with Notre Dame University Press is The Collapse of Freedom of Expression: Reconstructing the Foundations of Modern Liberty (February 2023), which centers on transparency and Church communications, the right to information within the Church, and putting law and communication to work together, particularly in areas such as abuse and governance. Other recent books include Trasparenza e Segreto nella Chiesa Cattolica (Venezia: Marcianum Press, 2022), about privacy, digital identity, and data protection, particularly the impact of Europe’s General*

*Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Church governance, and Chiesa e protezione dei dati personali* (Roma: Edizioni Santa Croce, 2019).

## References

- Anselm. 1996. *Monologion and Proslogion with the Replies of Gaunilo and Anselm*. Translated by Thomas Williams. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Aquinas, Thomas. 1964. *Summa Theologiae I*, vol. 4. Edited by Thomas Gornall. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barron, Robert. 2012. "Faith and Reason." *Word on Fire*. May 2, 2012. <https://www.wordonfire.org/resources/video/faith-and-reason/239/>.
- Cabello Morales, Pedro. 2019. *Arqueología Bíblica*. Córdoba, Spain: Almuzara.
- Castello, Gaetano. 2013. *Genesi 1–11*. Trapani: Il pozzo di Giacobbe.
- Domingo, Rafael. 2020. "God and the Law in the Age of Secularization." *Canopy Forum*. April 14, 2020. <https://canopyforum.org/2020/04/14/god-and-the-law-in-the-age-of-secularization/>.
- Donati, Pierpaolo. 2008. *Oltre il Multiculturalismo*. Rome, Italy: Laterza.
- Ginzberg, Louis. 2008. *Le leggende degli ebrei*. Milan, Italy: Adelphi Edizioni.
- Fokkelman, J. P. 2004. *Narrative Art in Genesis*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- Liverani, Mario. 2003. *Oltre la Bibbia. Storia antica di Israele*. Bari, Italy: Laterza.
- Luther, Martin, and Alexander Chalmers. 1857. *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*. London: H. G. Bohn.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1999. *Dependent Rational Animals*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Peters, John D. 2005. *Courting the Abyss: Free Speech and the Liberal Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pieper, Josef. 1992. *Abuse of Language, Abuse of Power*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Pope Benedict XVI. 2010. "Holy Mass on the Solemnity of Pentecost." *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*. May 23, 2010. [https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2010/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_hom\\_20100523\\_pentecoste.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2010/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20100523_pentecoste.html).
- Pope Francis. 2019. "General Audience." *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*. June 19, 2019. [https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/audiences/2019/documents/papa-francesco\\_20190619\\_udienza-generale.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/audiences/2019/documents/papa-francesco_20190619_udienza-generale.html).
- Pope John Paul II. 1988. "Encyclical Letter 'Fides Et Ratio' on the Relationship between Faith and Reason." *Interdisciplinary Encyclopedia of Religion and Science*. September 14, 1988. <https://inters.org/Fides-et-Ratio>.
- Pujol, Jordi. 2019. "Colloquy with John Durham Peters at Yale University on Freedom of Speech." *Church, Communication and Culture* 4, no. 1: 96–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23753234.2019.1565921>.
- Pujol, Jordi. Forthcoming. *The Collapse of Freedom of Expression: Reconstructing the*

- Ancient Roots of Modern Liberty*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Ravasi, Gianfranco. 1990. *Il libro della Genesi 1–11*. Rome, Italy: Città Nuova.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Parcours de la reconnaissance. Trois études*. Paris, France: Stock.
- Taylor, Charles. 2016. *The Language Animal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vatican Council II. 1965. "Decree *Ad Gentes* on the Mission Activity of the Church." Accessed January 12, 2022.  
[https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651207\\_ad-gentes\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html).
- von Hildebrand, Dietrich. 1994. *The New Tower of Babel*. Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press.
- Williams, Thomas. 2020. "Saint Anselm." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Last modified December 8, 2020.  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/anselm/>.