

Chapter 1 : ErasmusInSchool

Desiderius Erasmus, (born October 27, , Rotterdam, Holland [now in the Netherlands]â€”died July 12, , Basel, Switzerland), Dutch humanist who was the greatest scholar of the northern Renaissance, the first editor of the New Testament, and also an important figure in patristics and classical literature.

Board of Education ordering the desegregation of public schools in Topeka, Kansas, lawsuits promptly were brought to dismantle legally sanctioned segregation in other states. One of these was Arkansas. Moreover, Arkansas was not a party in the case. Therefore, they contended that a lower federal court in Little Rock had no constitutional authority to order the desegregation of public schools in Arkansas on the basis of the Brown decision. No one had any real doubts about what the outcome of that case would be. The Justices would certainly uphold the desegregation order. Of course, nowhere in the text of the Constitution is any such power granted. Even today, some scholars argue that it did nothing more than declare that the Supreme Court is within its rights in declining to exercise an authority putatively conferred upon it by Congress when such authority exceeds the jurisdiction granted to the Court under Article Three of the Constitution. Certainly, as a technical matter, all the Court did in Marbury was refuse to exercise original jurisdiction beyond what it was granted in Article Three on the ground that the expansion of its original jurisdiction by Section 13 of the Judiciary Act of was unconstitutional. So, the contemporary constitutional scholar Robert Lowry Clinton argues that it is a mistake to read the case as claiming a judicial power to tell the President or Congress what they can or cannot do under the Constitution. He maintains that it simply stands for the power of the Court, as a coequal branch of government, to act on its own interpretation of the Constitution in deciding what it can and cannot do. This, Clinton observes, is entirely consistent with the recognition of a like power in the other branches. Thomas Jefferson condemned the decision precisely because he viewed it as claiming a power of the courts to impose constitutional interpretations on the other branches. Whatever Marbury was supposed to mean about the scope of the power of judicial review, it is a notable fact that the Court declined to exercise that power to declare another act of Congress to be unconstitutional until , when it ruled in the case of Dred Scott v. Scott was a slave in Missouri who had been taken by his master into the free state of Illinois and the free Wisconsin Territory. He then brought a suit demanding his freedom in St. Louis County Court under Missouri law, claiming that he was legally entitled to be free by virtue of having resided in a free state or territory. He won in the trial court but the ruling in his favor was reversed by the Supreme Court of Missouri. Once the matter entered the federal courts, it became a massive political hot potato. Although the power of Congress to forbid slavery in federal territories was well-established, Sandford argued that slaves were private property of the sort protected by the Constitution against deprivation without due process of law, and that therefore Congress lacked any constitutional authority to ban slavery in the territories. The majority ruled that blacks could not be citizens of the United States, and therefore lacked the concomitant right to bring lawsuits in federal courts. Moreover, they held that Congress lacked constitutional authority to forbid or abolish slavery in federal territories. And still further, since slaves were, the Court ruled, personal property protected by the Constitution, the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. All of this added up to a sweeping and profound ruling. The Court had massively injected itself into the most divisive and highly morally charged issue of the day. In my edited book entitled Great Cases in Constitutional Law, there is a most interesting exchange between Prof. Cass Sunstein of the University of Chicago and Prof. James McPherson, my colleague at Princeton, regarding the political impact of the Dred Scott decision. Sunstein defends the commonly held view that the case polarized an already dangerously divided country and made the Civil War and its toll of carnage almost inevitable. Instead of ending the conflict over slavery by definitively resolving it, as Taney apparently hoped to do, the Court, according to Sunstein, intensified the conflict and heightened emotions. That Lincoln was devoted to the Declaration of Independence and viewed its statement of principles as integral to the American scheme of constitutional government is, if anything, an understatement. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments coequal and

co-sovereign within themselves. If the legislature fails to pass laws for a census, for paying the judges and other officers of government, for establishing a militia, for naturalization as prescribed by the Constitution, or if they fail to meet in Congress, the judges cannot issue their mandamus to them; if the President fails to provide the place of a judge, to appoint other civil and military officers, to issue requisite commissions, the judges cannot force him. Now, I daresay that to usâ€”living in the aftermath of an expansion of judicial power that may, perhaps, more properly be conceived as having been expressed and ratified, rather than created, by the Supreme Court in *Cooper v. Aaron*â€”this language is quite shocking. Part of this, no doubt, has to do with the prestige that courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, enjoy in elite sectors of our culture. Criticism of the scope of judicial power is often perceived by its partisans as, in effect, attacking the independence of the judiciary or even the ideal of judicial independence. On the contrary, it is entirely in line with his own fears of the political consequences of judicial supremacy. Like Jefferson, Lincoln believed that courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, could violate the Constitution and even undermine constitutional government. Judges exercising effectively unconstrained power were, in his view, no less a threat to the Constitution than other governmental officers exercising such power. His fear was not that judges would sometimes err in their constitutional rulings. His fear, rather, was that judges are capable of behaving unconstitutionally, just as other officials are capable of behaving unconstitutionally, by exceeding the authority granted to them under the Constitution and thereby usurping the authority allocated to other officials in a delicate system of checks and balances. Indeed, Lincoln believed that judicial violations of the Constitution were in certain respects graver matters than the violations of elected officials. Lincoln, of course, was a lawyer. He knew from experience that judges come in all shapes and sizesâ€”competent and incompetent, conscientious and slapdash, honorable and corrupt. But his view of courts was realistic. Bound up, as it was, with the urgent and divisive issue of slavery, there was no avoiding the issueâ€”despite the best efforts of even the most agile political types, such as Stephen Douglas. Upon his election as President, Lincoln faced the matter squarely in his Inaugural Address on March 4. With the specter of civil war looming, the new President, who had denounced the *Dred Scott* decision repeatedly in his senatorial campaign against Douglas in as well as in the presidential campaign, turned attention to it in his remarks to the nation. I do not forget the position assumed by some that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court, nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding in any case upon the parties to a suit as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases by other departments of the government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be overruled and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. For Lincoln, then, the evil of the *Dred Scott* decision was not merely the expansion of slavery. It was that the decision threatened to undermine the basic principles of republican government precisely by establishing judicial supremacy in matters of constitutional interpretation. It was not merely that the Court decided the suit in favor of the wrong party. It was that the Court claimed authority to decide for the other branches once and for all what the Constitution required, thus placing them in a position of inferiority and subservience. In office, Lincoln gave effect to his position against judicial supremacy by consistently refusing to treat the *Dred Scott* decision as creating a rule of law binding on the executive branch. For his critics, these actions, combined particularly with his suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, revealed him to be a lawless and tyrannical ruler, one who had no regard for the constitutional limits of his own power. But none can say that he had not made his opposition to judicial supremacy clear before assuming office. Aaron was so little remarked on at the time, and why few have noted its incompatibility with the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln. I find that my own students are more than merely surprised to learn about the views of the author of the Declaration of Independence as well as the Great Emancipator. They, too, have drunk in the idea that courts, particularly the

Supreme Court upon which more than a few imagine themselves someday serving, are the ultimate protectors of rights and, as such, should have the ultimate say on constitutional questions. After all, they reason, somebody, or some institution, has to have the final word, or else nothing is ever settled. And students, at least my students, want things to be settled. And the ultimate settler of things—when the things in question are politically ultimate things, constitutional things—should be a nonpolitical body. Politics, my students say, is too messy. Democratic institutions are too prone to passion, prejudice, and foolishness for us to entrust to them matters of constitutional significance. There needs to be a higher institution to provide a check against the bigots and demagogues of politics—an institution where matters are resolved by calm and rational inquiry and judgment; an institution whose membership is drawn from a narrower, more refined, more highly educated circle; one that is not subject to political retaliation for unpopular decisions of principle. What would have happened, they ask, had the political branches felt themselves free to dispute *Brown v. Board*? One imagines Lincoln in the classroom reminding the youngsters that the unchecked power to do good is unavoidably also the unchecked power to do evil. If we like what the Justices did in *Brown v. Board*, let us not forget what they did in *Dred Scott*. And there is more to the balance sheet. Was it not the Court, after all, that during the period from 1857 to 1868 repeatedly invalidated both state and federal worker protection laws and social welfare legislation? This, in any event, is the conventional reading of the history by contemporary liberals and conservatives alike. And then there is the issue of abortion, surely the most vexing, divisive, and morally charged issue of our own time. *Wade and Doe v. Board* or on the minus side with *Dred Scott*? He is author, most recently, of *The Clash of Orthodoxies*.

Get this from a library! Twelve great modernists; Herodotus, St. Francis, Erasmus, Voltaire, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, Francois Millet, George Stephenson.

Life and Works Erasmus was born in Rotterdam on 27 October ? Orphaned in , he came into the care of guardians who sent him to a school run by the Brethren of the Common Life in the spirit of the *Devotio Moderna*. He was ordained priest in . In later years Erasmus alleged that he had been pressured into taking the vows. His misgivings found expression in one of his first works, *De Contemptu Mundi* On disdaining the World, written in the s, published . Ostensibly a praise of monastic life, it began by recommending seclusion and withdrawal from the world but ended in a lament about the decline of monasticism and a warning to postulants not to take the vows rashly. Erasmus himself discovered that he was constitutionally and psychologically unsuited to the monastic life. He would have preferred to go to university. It is uncertain how much, if any, theological training Erasmus received during his brief stay at the college. When the promised financial support did not materialize, Erasmus left the college, then renowned for its strict discipline and harsh living conditions, and supported himself by tutoring well-to-do young men. This experience produced a number of educational handbooks and aids, among them *De Epistolis Conscribendis*, a letter-writing manual ; *De Copia*, a handbook of style ; *Colloquia*, a collection of dialogues meant to teach correct Latin , and the *Adagia* , an anthology of proverbs to be used as rhetorical tools to embellish style . All of these books saw multiple editions, some of them expanded and given a larger purpose. Thus some of the proverbs provided starting points for essays, and many of the colloquies likewise became opinion pieces on issues of the day. The visit led to important connections. He made life-long friends, among them the humanists William Grocyn and Thomas Linacre, who inspired him to take up the study of Greek, and John Colet who shared his scorn for scholastic theology and drew him toward biblical studies. He was on close terms also with Thomas More, later Lord Chancellor of England, with whom he collaborated on translations of Lucian, and he found a patron in William Warham, archbishop of Canterbury, who granted him an ecclesiastical benefice in Aldington, Kent. His illegitimate birth disqualified Erasmus from taking up benefices, but he received a papal dispensation through the intervention of the nuncio Andrea Ammonio, another of his English connections. Eventually he drew a steady income from pensions and benefices. A stipend, which he received as councilor to Charles V, was paid only irregularly, however. Over the next two decades Erasmus traveled extensively. He returned to France for a time, made two more journeys to England, and traveled to Italy where he obtained a doctorate in theology at the University of Turin. In he finally settled in Leuven. By that time he had made a name for himself. He had published a number of bestsellers: In , he published his magnum opus, an edition of the Greek New Testament, the first to reach the market. It anticipated the Complutensian Polyglot, which was already in print but still awaiting the papal imprimatur. Thus Erasmus found success in four different genres: In a catalogue he published in , Erasmus arranged his writings under nine headings: While Erasmus was revered among humanists, his biblical scholarship soon came under attack from theologians. They refused to acknowledge him as a colleague and derided his doctorate, which had been granted *per saltum*, that is, without fulfilling the residence requirements or passing the usual examinations. Erasmus was not the first humanist to treat the New Testament in a text-critical fashion and to compare the Latin Vulgate with the Greek original, although none of his predecessors had dared to use their findings to publish an amended edition of the text. He expanded the scope of his project on the urging of his publisher, Johann Froben, and rather hastily assembled a text based on the biblical manuscripts he had been able to consult. The reception of the edition varied. He had critics in Italy and was formally investigated by ecclesiastical authorities in Spain and in France. In the prestigious faculty of theology at the University of Paris publicly censured and condemned numerous passages in his works as unorthodox. Erasmus responded to his critics with lengthy polemics, which fill two folio volumes in the *Leiden Opera Omnia*. He also published four revised editions of his New Testament , , , with corrections and expanded notes. Erasmus denied these charges. On the contrary, he said, his edition restored the original text and corrected the errors introduced by translators and scribes. They were the tasks proper of

philologists. The prefaces he added to successive editions of the New Testament attempted to clarify his aims and methods. He somewhat ingenuously claimed that he was only doing philological work and ignored the fact that a change in words frequently also shifted the meaning. Indeed, some of his critics acknowledged the usefulness of his work, but took issue with specific editorial choices. Thus they protested against Erasmus replacing the traditional *poenitentiam agite* do penance at Matt. There was an uproar also about his omission of the so-called *Comma Johanneum* at I John 5: The biblical commentaries of the Church Fathers and their quotations from the bible were important sources for Erasmus in establishing the text of the New Testament. He read widely and published numerous editions and translations of patristic writings, among them Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Origen, and in many cases established the first reliable critical text of their works. In the last two decades of his life, Erasmus wrote numerous *apologiae*, refuting critics of his New Testament edition and battling the accusation that he had inspired the Reformation and was a supporter of Luther. For some years Erasmus held out and refused explicitly to endorse any religious party. Maintaining scholarly detachment was, however, impossible in the militant climate of the Confessional Age. A politely worded disquisition addressed to Luther, it showed their fundamental disagreement on a crucial theological question. It was undeniable that Erasmus had been in sympathy with the reformers for a time, although he was not prepared to challenge the authority of the church and never promoted schism. In when the city of Basel, where he resided at the time, turned Protestant, he voted with his feet and moved to Catholic Freiburg. In the 16th century the word denoted a student or teacher of the *studia humanitatis*, a curriculum focusing on the study of classical languages, rhetoric, and literature. At northern universities, where scholasticism and the dialectical method reigned supreme, the trend-setting humanists were regarded as challengers of the status quo. To a certain extent, the tensions between the two schools of thought may be explained in terms of professional jealousy, but at its core was the dispute over methodology and qualifications. Humanists favored rhetorical arguments; scholastics insisted on logical proof. Scholastic theologians in particular regarded the humanists as dangerous interlopers. They questioned their orthodoxy because of their inclination to use the skeptical *ars dubitandi* and denied their right to apply philological principles to the biblical text. Scripture, they insisted, was the exclusive domain of graduate theologians. Humanists in turn saw the dialectical method used by the scholastics as a perversion of Aristotelian logic and derided their technical terminology as a corruption of the Latin language. In the *Praise of Folly* Erasmus lampooned scholastic theologians in a passage that became notorious: They are fortified with an army of scholastic definition, conclusions, corollaries, and propositions both explicit and implicit. Such is the erudition and complexity they all display that I fancy the apostles themselves would need the help of another Holy Spirit if they were obliged to join issue on these topics with our new breed of theologians. Scholastic disputations honed intellectual skills but failed to make better Christians of the protagonists. He further insisted on the right of humanists, who were trained in the classical languages, to apply their philological skills to both secular and sacred writings. While the need for language studies and the use of philological methods found gradual acceptance among theologians, the skeptical *ars dubitandi*, which was also closely associated with humanism, remained anathema. They expressed their skepticism through the use of open-ended dialogue or rhetorical compositions that argued opposing points of view. Erasmus used these means to argue for and against marriage, for and against monastic vows, and for and against doctrinal positions. Rather surprisingly he admitted to his preference for skepticism in *A Discussion of Free Will*. He begins his argumentation in the classic skeptical fashion by collating scriptural evidence for and against the concept of free will and demonstrating that there is no consensus and no rational way of resolving the resulting dilemma. The method of arguing in *utramque partem*, on both sides of a question, was first developed by the Greek Sophists as a demonstration of their rhetorical prowess. Pyrrhonic skeptics adopted this method as a preliminary step in arguing a case. If the evidence was ambivalent, they advocated *epoche*, suspension of judgment. Academic skeptics modified this process, admitting probability as a criterion to settle an ambiguous question. A variant of the skeptical method also appears in medieval scholastic handbooks where doctrinal questions are argued *sic et non*, that is, on both sides, then settled by a magisterial decision or *resolutio*. Erasmus stressed that he was not prepared to pass judgment on the question of free will himself. Indeed his natural inclination was to take the Pyrrhonic route and suspend judgment since the evidence was

not unequivocal. He substituted for his own judgment the authoritative decision of the Catholic Church, which affirmed the existence of free will. As her obedient son, he accepted this resolution. For several years he gave them his qualified support, but in the s when he saw Luther openly defy Catholic authorities, he decried his radical methods and distanced himself from the Reformation movement. The decision to disengage may have been prompted by considerations for his own safety and a desire to avoid inquisitorial scrutiny, but epistemological considerations also played a role in his withdrawal from the reformers and ultimate reversal of opinion about Luther. Erasmus regarded consensus as an essential criterion of the doctrinal truth. Schism posed a threat to his decision-making process. If papal authority was questioned in principle and the decrees of the synods were not binding, Erasmus the Christian Skeptic was paralyzed in his decision-making process and unable to settle questions that did not allow a resolution based on clear scriptural evidence. Luther, who believed in the clarity of Scripture, did not accept skepticism as a methodological approach. He saw it as waffling. He was unwilling to put up with ambivalence and demanded a clear-cut judgment. Up to this point he might be describing the position of an Academic skeptic, but he goes on to specify: I explicitly exclude from Scepticism whatever is set forth in Sacred Scripture or whatever has been handed down to us by the authority of the Church. His admirers, by contrast, praised his skillful use of language. In addition to the arguments rooted in skepticism, Erasmus also brings ethical criteria to bear on the question of free will. He argued that denying the existence of free will would destroy the moral basis of human action. Affirming the power of free will was socially expedient. To convince the other party, consensus was necessary. Educational Philosophy Erasmus earned his living as a teacher for only a few years, but education remained a lifelong interest and a central theme in his writings. Erasmus expressed confidence in the potential of human beings for self-improvement, a corollary of his acceptance of free will. He believed in the preponderance of nurture over nature, given the power of the will. It was therefore the duty of parents and teachers to ensure that children fulfilled their potential and of adults to live up to it.

Chapter 3 : North Carolina Fall Harvest Sale by Barbour Marketing Solutions, LLC - Issuu

Erasmus was the dominant figure of the early humanist movement. Neither a radical nor an apologist, he remains one of early Renaissance controversial figures.

He advanced as far as the third-highest class at the chapter school of St. One of his teachers, Jan Synthen, was a humanist, as was the headmaster, Alexander Hegius. The schoolboy Erasmus was clever enough to write classical Latin verse that impresses a modern reader as cosmopolitan. Having little other choice, both brothers entered monasteries. Erasmus chose the Augustinian canons regular at Steyn, near Gouda, where he seems to have remained about seven years. Thus, after his ordination to the priesthood April, he was happy to escape the monastery by accepting a post as Latin secretary to the influential Henry of Bergen, bishop of Cambrai. His *Antibarbarorum liber*, extant from a revision of 1495, is a vigorous restatement of patristic arguments for the utility of the pagan classics, with a polemical thrust against the cloister he had left behind: To support his classical studies, he began taking in pupils; from this period date the earliest versions of those aids to elegant Latin—including the *Colloquia* and the *Adagia*—that before long would be in use in humanist schools throughout Europe. There he met Thomas More, who became a friend for life. The impassioned Colet besought him to lecture on the Old Testament at Oxford, but the more cautious Erasmus was not ready. He returned to the Continent with a Latin copy of St. Voverius lent Erasmus a copy of works by Origen, the early Greek Christian writer who promoted the allegorical, spiritualizing mode of scriptural interpretation, which had roots in Platonic philosophy. Erasmus sailed for England in 1499, hoping to find support for his studies. For the Aldine press Erasmus expanded his *Adagia*, or annotated collection of Greek and Latin adages, into a monument of erudition with over 3,000 entries; this was the book that first made him famous. With strenuous effort the very stuff of human nature could be molded, so as to draw out educare peaceful and social dispositions while discouraging unworthy appetites. Erasmus, it would almost be true to say, believed that one is what one reads. His later willingness to speak out as he did may have owed something to the courage of Colet, who risked royal disfavour by preaching a sermon against war at the court just as Henry VIII was looking for a good war in which to win his spurs. Having returned to the Continent, Erasmus made connections with the printing firm of Johann Froben and traveled to Basel to prepare a new edition of the *Adagia*. To remedy these evils Erasmus looked to education. Erasmus tried to show the way with his annotated text of the Greek New Testament and his edition of St. Through Sauvage he was named honorary councillor to the year-old archduke Charles, the future Charles V, and was commissioned to write *Institutio principis Christiani*; *The Education of a Christian Prince* and *Querela pacis*; *The Complaint of Peace*. It was at this time too that he began his *Paraphrases* of the books of the New Testament, each one dedicated to a monarch or a prince of the church. He was accepted as a member of the theology faculty at nearby Leuven, and he also took keen interest in a newly founded Trilingual College, with endowed chairs in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. *Ratio verae theologiae* provided the rationale for the new theological education based on the study of languages. Revision of his Greek New Testament, especially of the copious annotations, began almost as soon as the first edition appeared. Though Erasmus certainly made mistakes as a textual critic, in the history of scholarship he is a towering figure, intuiting philological principles that in some cases would not be formulated explicitly until years after his death. Paul, and in Erasmus privately instructed his printer, Froben, to stop printing works by Luther, lest the two causes be confused. He expressed his views indirectly through the *Colloquia*, which had started as schoolboy dialogues but now became a vehicle for commentary. As he wrote privately to the Netherlandish pope Adrian VI in 1523, whom he had known at Leuven, there was still hope of reconciliation, if only the church would ease the burden; this could be accomplished, for instance, by granting the chalice to the laity and by permitting priests to marry: In reply Luther wrote one of his most important theological works, *De servo arbitrio*, to which Erasmus responded with a lengthy, two-part *Hyperaspistes*. In this controversy Erasmus lets it be seen that he would like to claim more for free will than St. Augustine seem to allow. The years in Basel 1524-29 were filled with polemics, some of them rather tiresome by comparison to the great debate with Luther. Irritated by Protestants who called him a traitor to the

Gospel as well as by hyper-orthodox Catholic theologians who repeatedly denounced him, Erasmus showed the petty side of his own nature often enough. Meanwhile he kept at work on the Greek New Testament there would be five editions in all, the Paraphrases, and his editions of the Church Fathers, including Cyprian, Hilary, and Origen. Final years In, when Protestant Basel banned Catholic worship altogether, Erasmus and some of his humanist friends moved to the Catholic university town of Freiburg im Breisgau. He nonetheless encouraged such discussion in *De sancienda ecclesiae concordia*, which suggested that differences on the crucial doctrine of justification might be reconciled by considering a duplex justitia, the meaning of which he did not elaborate. Having returned to Basel to see his manual on preaching Ecclesiastes, through the press, he lingered on in a city he found congenial; it was there he died in 1536. Like the disciples of Voisier, he seems not to have asked for the last sacraments of the church. His last words were in Dutch: Influence and achievement Always the scholar, Erasmus could see many sides of an issue. But his hesitations and studied ambiguities were appreciated less and less in the generations that followed his death, as men girded for combat, theological or otherwise, in the service of their beliefs. This tradition was perhaps strongest in the Netherlands, where Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert and others found support in Erasmus for their advocacy of limited toleration for religious dissenters. Meanwhile, however, the Council of Trent and the rise of Calvinism ensured that such views were generally of marginal influence. Similarly, the bold and independent scholarly temper with which Erasmus approached the text of the New Testament was for a long time submerged by the exigencies of theological polemics. Desiderius Erasmus, undated engraving. This view of Erasmus, curiously parallel to the strictures of his orthodox critics, was long influential. Only in the past several decades have scholars given due recognition to the fact that the goal of his work was a Christianity purified by a deeper knowledge of its historic roots. Yet it was not entirely wrong to compare Erasmus with those Enlightenment thinkers who, like Voltaire, defended individual liberty at every turn and had little good to say about the various corporate solidarities by which human society holds together. Some historians would now trace the enduring debate between these complementary aspects of Western thought as far back as the 12th century, and in this very broad sense Erasmus and Voltaire are on the same side of a divide, just as, for instance, Machiavelli and Rousseau are on the other. In a unique manner that fused his multiple identities—as Netherlander, Renaissance humanist, and pre-Tridentine Catholic—Erasmus helped to build what may be called the liberal tradition of European culture.

Chapter 4 : Erasmus - Wikipedia

Herodotus, the traveller. St. Francis of Assisi, the worldling. Erasmus, the emancipator. Voltaire, the humanitarian. Thomas Jefferson, the aristocrat.

He was born in a mansion, son of a well-to-do physician and grandson of two of the most famous and rich men of his time: As a young man Darwin studied medicine but realized that his squeamish disposition made it impractical to take it up as a career. He went back to university and studied to be a minister of the Church of England. During his service on the Beagle, Darwin decided to give up pretensions of becoming a minister and opted for the life of a scientist-naturalist. He made acute observations of birds, turtles and mammals, which gradually germinated into an idea that, though it had no new component to it, served to revolutionize almost every aspect of Western thought: In the Galapagos Islands, miles off the coast of Ecuador, Darwin identified 14 varieties of finches—“not just breeds or tribes, but species because they bred true, and bred only among their own kind. Though religious, he was uncomfortable with the notion that God would have expressly created 14 varieties of finches to inhabit these islands, especially since they were all different from the few dominant varieties on the mainland. There was great speculation, though, as to how evolution might work. Darwin came to believe that a simple process was involved. He reasoned that Galapagos finches sometimes hatched, by chance, with a little more curve to their beak. With the diet of different seeds available in their new habitat, Darwin concluded that descendants of mainland finches with the curved beak might find it a little easier to survive. This seemed to Darwin a very satisfactory explanation of the great variety of different forms of finches found on the islands, compared to the one or two standard forms to be found at the mainland. Darwin was very slow to publish his revolutionary idea. In fact, it was after some decades that some of his friends urged him to publish his studies. Darwin finally rushed to print. Natural selection is no longer viewed as sufficient explanation for the diversity of life. The extreme form of this thinking is that life itself first arose from nonliving matter by natural means—“without any involvement by God. This effectively pitted the theory of evolution against religion in the Western mind and confirmed what many people wanted to believe: Popular sentiment has failed to note that understanding how something works survival is very different from understanding how something came to be arrival. As a result, evolution has been raised to doctrinal status from what it is in reality:

Chapter 5 : Erasmus | Dune | FANDOM powered by Wikia

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (/ ɛˈtʃeɪ d ɛˈz ɛˈr ɑː d ɛˈrɑːz m ɛˈrɑːz s /; 28 October - 12 July), known as *Erasmus* or *Erasmus of Rotterdam*, was a Dutch Christian humanist who was the greatest scholar of the northern Renaissance.

Early life[edit] Bust by Hildo Krop at Gouda , where Erasmus spent his youth Desiderius Erasmus is reported to have been born in Rotterdam on 28 October in the late s. According to an article by historian Renier Snooy â€” , Erasmus was born in Gouda. The exact year of his birth is controversial, but most agree it was in Information on his family and early life comes mainly from vague references in his writings. His parents were not legally married. His father, Gerard, was a Catholic priest and curate in Gouda. This solidified his view of his origin as a stain, and cast a pall over his youth. For the first time ever Greek was taught at a lower level than a university in Europe, and this is where he began learning it. His education there ended when plague struck the city about , and his mother, who had moved to provide a home for her sons, died from the infection. Most likely in , [19] poverty [20] forced Erasmus into the consecrated life as a canon regular of St. Augustine at the canonry of Stein , in South Holland. He took vows there in late , [19] and was ordained to the Catholic priesthood at about the age of 25, in While at Stein, Erasmus fell in love with a fellow canon, Servatius Rogerus, [21] and wrote a series of passionate letters in which he called Rogerus "half my soul". He wrote, "I have wooed you both unhappily and relentlessly". Later, while tutoring in Paris , he was suddenly dismissed by the guardian of Thomas Grey. Some have taken this as evidence of an illicit affair. To allow him to accept that post, he was given a temporary dispensation from his religious vows on the grounds of poor health and love of Humanistic studies, though he remained a priest. Pope Leo X later made the dispensation permanent, a considerable privilege at the time. Education and scholarship[edit] Bronze statue of Erasmus in Rotterdam. It was created by Hendrick de Keyser in , replacing a stone statue of The University was then the chief seat of Scholastic learning, but already coming under the influence of Renaissance humanism. For instance, Erasmus became an intimate friend of an Italian humanist Publio Fausto Andrelini , poet and "professor of humanity" in Paris. In he was invited back to England by William Blount, 4th Baron Mountjoy , who offered to accompany him on his trip back to England. Erasmus was "ever susceptible to the charms of attractive, well-connected, and rich young men". His legacy is marked for someone who complained bitterly about the lack of comforts and luxuries to which he was accustomed. Erasmus was particularly impressed by the Bible teaching of John Colet who pursued a style more akin to the church fathers than the Scholastics. On one occasion he wrote to Colet: How I dislike everything that keeps me back, or retards me". Throughout his life, he was offered positions of honor and profit in academia but declined them all, preferring the uncertain but sufficient rewards of independent literary activity. From to , he was in Italy: According to his letters, he was associated with the Venetian natural philosopher, Giulio Camillo , [33] but, apart from this, he had a less active association with Italian scholars than might have been expected. His residence at Leuven, where he lectured at the University , exposed Erasmus to much criticism from those ascetics, academics and clerics hostile to the principles of literary and religious reform and the loose norms of the Renaissance adherents to which he was devoting his life. However, feeling that the lack of sympathy which prevailed at Leuven at that time was actually a form of mental persecution, he sought refuge in Basel, where under the shelter of Swiss hospitality he could express himself freely. Admirers from all quarters of Europe visited him there and he was surrounded by devoted friends, notably developing a lasting association with the great publisher Johann Froben. Only when he had mastered Latin did he begin to express himself on major contemporary themes in literature and religion. He felt called upon to use his learning in a purification of the doctrine by returning to the historic documents and original languages of sacred Scripture. He tried to free the methods of scholarship from the rigidity and formalism of medieval traditions, but he was not satisfied with this. His revolt against certain forms of Christian monasticism and scholasticism was not based on doubts about the truth of doctrine, nor from hostility to the organization of the Church itself, nor from rejection of celibacy or monastical lifestyles. He saw himself as a preacher of righteousness by an appeal to reason, applied frankly and without fear of the

magisterium. He always intended to remain faithful to Catholic doctrine, and therefore was convinced he could criticize frankly virtually everyone and everything. Aloof from entangling obligations, Erasmus was the centre of the literary movement of his time, corresponding with more than five hundred men in the worlds of politics and of thought. Translators for Greek were commissioned from Greece itself and worked closely with prestigious Latinists and thalamic scholars. To do so they developed specific types to print Greek. Cisneros informed Erasmus of the works going on in Spain and may have sent a printed version of the New Testament to him. However, the Spanish team wanted the entire Bible to be released as one single work and withdrew from publication. The information and the delay allowed Erasmus to request a "Publication Privilege" of four years for the Greek New Testament to ensure that his work would be published first. The result was a large number of translation mistakes, transcription errors, and typos, that required further editions to be printed. In , he began his work on this Latin New Testament. He collected all the Vulgate manuscripts he could find to create a critical edition. Then he polished the language. He declared, "It is only fair that Paul should address the Romans in somewhat better Latin. I have already almost finished emending him by collating a large number of ancient manuscripts, and this I am doing at enormous personal expense. Though some speculate that he intended to produce a critical Greek text or that he wanted to beat the Complutensian Polyglot into print, there is no evidence to support this. He wrote, "There remains the New Testament translated by me, with the Greek facing, and notes on it by me. Contribution[edit] In a way it is legitimate to say that Erasmus "synchronized" or "unified" the Greek and the Latin traditions of the New Testament by producing an updated version of either simultaneously. Both being part of canonical tradition, he clearly found it necessary to ensure that both were actually presenting the same content. In modern terminology, he made the two traditions "compatible". This is clearly evidenced by the fact that his Greek text is not just the basis for his Latin translation, but also the other way round: After comparing what writings he could find, Erasmus wrote corrections between the lines of the manuscripts he was using among which was Minuscule 2 and sent them as proofs to Froben. Erasmus used several Greek manuscript sources because he did not have access to a single complete manuscript. Most of the manuscripts were, however, late Greek manuscripts of the Byzantine textual family and Erasmus used the oldest manuscript the least because "he was afraid of its supposedly erratic text. This edition was used by Martin Luther in his German translation of the Bible , written for people who could not understand Latin. Together, the first and second editions sold 3, copies. By comparison, only copies of the Complutensian Polyglot were ever printed. The first and second edition texts did not include the passage 1 John 5: Erasmus had been unable to find those verses in any Greek manuscript, but one was supplied to him during production of the third edition. That manuscript is now thought to be a creation from the Latin Vulgate , which likely got the verses from a fifth-century marginal gloss in a Latin copy of I John. The Roman Catholic Church decreed that the Comma Johanneum was open to dispute 2 June , and it is rarely included in modern scholarly translations. In Erasmus published the fifth and final edition which dropped the Latin Vulgate column but was otherwise similar to the fourth edition. Erasmus dedicated his work to Pope Leo X as a patron of learning and regarded this work as his chief service to the cause of Christianity. Immediately afterward, he began the publication of his Paraphrases of the New Testament , a popular presentation of the contents of the several books. These, like all of his writings, were published in Latin but were quickly translated into other languages, with his encouragement. Erasmus, in his capacity as humanist editor, advised major printers such as Aldus Manutis on which manuscripts to publish. The issues between growing religious movements, which would later become known as Protestantism , and the Catholic Church had become so clear that few could escape the summons to join the debate. Erasmus, at the height of his literary fame, was inevitably called upon to take sides, but partisanship was foreign to his nature and his habits. In all his criticism of clerical follies and abuses, he had always protested that he was not attacking the Church itself or its doctrines, and had no enmity toward churchmen. The world had laughed at his satire , but few had interfered with his activities. He believed that his work so far had commended itself to the best minds and also to the dominant powers in the religious world. Erasmus did not build a large body of supporters with his letters. He chose to write in Greek and Latin, the languages of scholars. His critiques reached an elite but small audience. Luther hoped for his cooperation in a work which seemed only the natural outcome of his own. In

their early correspondence, Luther expressed boundless admiration for all Erasmus had done in the cause of a sound and reasonable Christianity and urged him to join the Lutheran party. Erasmus declined to commit himself, arguing that to do so would endanger his position as a leader in the movement for pure scholarship which he regarded as his purpose in life. Only as an independent scholar could he hope to influence the reform of religion. When Erasmus hesitated to support him, the straightforward Luther became angered that Erasmus was avoiding the responsibility due either to cowardice or a lack of purpose. However, any hesitancy on the part of Erasmus stemmed, not from lack of courage or conviction, but rather from a concern over the mounting disorder and violence of the reform movement. To Philip Melanchthon in he wrote: I know nothing of your church; at the very least it contains people who will, I fear, overturn the whole system and drive the princes into using force to restrain good men and bad alike. The gospel, the word of God, faith, Christ, and Holy Spirit â€” these words are always on their lips; look at their lives and they speak quite another language. Here Erasmus complains of the doctrines and morals of the Reformers: You declaim bitterly against the luxury of priests, the ambition of bishops, the tyranny of the Roman Pontiff, and the babbling of the sophists; against our prayers, fasts, and Masses; and you are not content to retrench the abuses that may be in these things, but must needs abolish them entirely Show me any one person who by that Gospel has been reclaimed from drunkenness to sobriety, from fury and passion to meekness, from avarice to liberality, from reviling to well-speaking, from wantonness to modesty. I will show you a great many who have become worse through following it The solemn prayers of the Church are abolished, but now there are very many who never pray at all I have never entered their conventicles, but I have sometimes seen them returning from their sermons, the countenances of all of them displaying rage, and wonderful ferocity, as though they were animated by the evil spirit Who ever beheld in their meetings any one of them shedding tears, smiting his breast, or grieving for his sins? Confession to the priest is abolished, but very few now confess to God They have fled from Judaism that they may become Epicureans.

Chapter 6 : Twelve great modernists (edition) | Open Library

1. *Life and Works.* Erasmus was born in Rotterdam on 27 October (?) as the illegitimate son of a priest. He attended a school at Deventer which was regarded as progressive and had capable teachers who introduced Erasmus to "something of a higher standard of literature" (CWE 4:).

Orphaned at an early age, he took monastic vows and entered the Augustinian monastery at Steyn in In he was ordained a priest and in he entered the service of Hendrik van Bergen, the Bishop of Cambrai, who had just been named chancellor of the order of the Golden Fleece by the court of Burgundy. Service as secretary to an ambitious prelate delivered Erasmus from the tedium of monastic life and offered the prospect of travel and advancement. It was in Paris that Erasmus became attached to his first important patron, William Blount, Lord Mountjoy, whom he accompanied to England as tutor in Erasmus returned to Paris in to publish his first collection of proverbs, the *Adagiorum Collectanea*, whose dedicatory epistle, addressed to Mountjoy, remains a crucial statement of Erasmian poetics. After further itineracy in France and the Low Countries, he returned to England, where he was the guest of Thomas More, with whom he collaborated on a translation of selected dialogues by Lucian of Samosata. He embarked in on a long awaited voyage to Italy. In Venice, Erasmus worked with the humanist printer Aldus Manutius to publish the first great collection of adages, the *Adagiorum Chiliades* in It was completed with the generous collaboration of numerous Italian humanists, as gratefully recorded in the adage *Festina lente*. From Italy, he went back to England, where he stayed long enough to compose the *Praise of Folly* and several educational writings including the *De ratione studii* of , a preliminary version of his manual on letter writing *De conscribendis epistolis*, which was not published until , and the completed version of *De copia* or *On abundance in style* Having returned to the European continent in , Erasmus began his association with the Swiss printer Johann Froben, for whom he prepared an expanded version of the adages in The following year brought forth from the Froben press of Basel, Switzerland the two works which Erasmus regarded as the twin masterpieces of his career. In Erasmus took up residence in Louvain. There he quickly became embroiled in a controversy with the faculty of theology at the university, over the role of the three languages—Greek, Latin, and Hebrew—in the study of theology. Erasmus championed humanist theology, based on study of ancient languages, against the reactionary stance of the Louvain theologians who were intent on preserving their professional prerogatives. At the same time Erasmus launched another important scholarly venture, the *Paraphrases on the New Testament*, starting with the *Epistle to the Romans* in In , Erasmus moved to Basel where he collaborated closely with the Froben press on a succession of expanded editions of the *Adages* while continuing the *Paraphrases on the New Testament*. As the decade wore on Erasmus became involved in a reluctant and debilitating quarrel with Martin Luther over the competing doctrines of free will and predestination. Erasmus published his *Diatribes on Free Will* in , to which Luther answered in with his treatise *The Enslaved Will*, which elicited from Erasmus the *Hyperaspistes* or *Shieldbearer* issued in two parts in and From this quarrel, Richard Popkin dated the advent of modern skepticism in his authoritative *History of Scepticism*. Having alienated many Catholic clerics with his trenchant criticism of Church hierarchy and Catholic devotion, Erasmus refused to join the Protestant reformers and found himself increasingly isolated as an advocate of Church unity through conciliation rather than persecution or reform. Though the plague interrupted the Conference of Valladolid in August before it could reach a verdict, this did not deter Erasmus from composing a lengthy *Apology* addressed to the Spanish monks who had challenged his orthodoxy. Erasmus finally left Basel in when the city officially declared its allegiance to the Reform, and took up residence in the Catholic city of Freiburg. In the few moments of leisure left to him by his interminable polemics and his voluminous correspondence, Erasmus composed his last masterpiece, his treatise on the rhetoric of preaching, entitled *Ecclesiastes*, which he completed and published in For Craig Thompson, Erasmus cannot be called philosopher in the technical sense, since he disdained formal logic and metaphysics and cared only for moral philosophy. Similarly, John Monfasani reminds us that Erasmus never claimed to be a philosopher, was not trained as a philosopher, and wrote no explicit works of philosophy, although he repeatedly engaged in controversies that crossed the boundary from philosophy to

theology. His relation to philosophy bears further scrutiny. One of his earliest works, begun in his monastic youth, though not published until , was the *Antibarbari*. It proposes a defense of the humanities, then essentially the study of classical languages and literature, against detractors who were scorned as barbarians. One of the key themes of the work is the vital role of classical culture in a Christian society, and this theme entails a redefinition of philosophy, in contrast to the prevailing university discipline of philosophy. The philosophy he fathered is the philosophy that Erasmus professed throughout his life and work, the *philosophia Christi*. This philosophy is not so much a set of dogmas as it is a way of life or an ethical commitment. Written to an anonymous friend at court who had asked Erasmus to compose for him a guide to life, or *ratio vivendi*, that would lead him to a state of mind worthy of Christ. The *Enchiridion* gained immediate notoriety for its repudiation of monasticism and its insistence that true piety consists not in outward ceremonies but inward conversion. In the course of events, these themes would become associated with the Protestant Reformation. The *Enchiridion* espouses a philosophy of duality, the duality of body and soul, letter and spirit, that is explicitly modeled on Platonism. The author deplors the fact that professional philosophers, obsessed with Aristotle, have banished Platonists and Pythagoreans from the classroom, and he cites approvingly St. When the *Enchiridion* defines philosophy, it invokes a Socratic precedent. Philosophy takes us out of the world, the *mundus*, and into Christ. This withdrawal from the world is not just for religious professionals, such as priests or monks, but for everyone in every walk of life. Philosophy is a spiritual state rather than a professional identity. Yet, the topic also sponsors some provocative thinking on philosophy. The dedicatory epistle evokes the familiar Platonic claim that no republic will be fortunate until philosophers are kings or kings embrace philosophy. By philosophy, Erasmus understands not the Aristotelian physics and metaphysics that dominated the university curriculum, but rather that kind of philosophy that frees our mind from errors and vices, and demonstrates correct government on the model of the eternal power. In sum, to be a philosopher is the same as to be a Christian: His most mature and complete statement can be found in the *Paraclesis*, one of the forewords or prefaces he composed for his edition of the New Testament, also from . In its opening lines, the *Paraclesis* exhorts all mortals to the holiest and most salubrious study of Christian philosophy, insisting that this type of wisdom can be learned from fewer books and with less effort than the arcane doctrines of Aristotle. The philosophy of Christ is a straight road open to all who are endowed with pure and simple faith, and not an exclusive discipline reserved for specialists. In this context, Erasmus adds a controversial endorsement of vernacular translations of the Bible, so that everyone can share in the message of Christ. Paradox As we have seen, Erasmus often defines philosophy in the negative: He repudiates conventional philosophy as too contentious, too belligerent and dogmatic. He prefers instead to experiment with a non-assertive form of philosophy that relies on paradox and on the neutralizing force of opposing arguments. His best known experiment in extended paradox, and his best claim to permanence in school curriculum, is the *Praise of Folly*, first published in Paris in , and accompanied in subsequent editions by a commentary attributed to Gerhard Lister but thought to have been dictated by Erasmus himself. Folly, or *Moria*, delivers her own encomium, proudly invoking the inspiration of the ancient Greek sophists and seemingly disqualifying her every claim, except perhaps for her satire of the clergy and the learned professions; this is followed by a deceptively earnest exposition of Pauline spirituality, where we detect the same stylistic devices and profusion of proverbs as in the rest of the text. Erasmus labeled his text a declamation, in the sense of a thesis meant to provoke a counter-thesis rather than to assert a dogma. After all, the speaker is Folly, a notoriously unreliable authority on all matters secular and religious and from whom it is no dishonor to differ in views. Rather, we should be ashamed to agree with her. By resorting to this subterfuge, rather than positively asserting his beliefs in his own name, Erasmus was able to intervene in a number of intellectual, political, and spiritual debates in contemporary Christendom without affirming or denying anything. Though voiced by Folly herself, the critique of church and clergy contained in the *Praise of Folly* provoked a bitter resentment among doctors of theology, as we know from correspondence between Erasmus and the Louvain theologian Martin Dorp. One of the key themes here is the stark contrast drawn between the recent style of theology exemplified by the scholastics, and the old style of theology associated with the Church Fathers, many of whose works Erasmus edited. The passage from old to new has hardly been an improvement. The upstarts or *recentiores* are so

engrossed in their factional disputes and dialectical quibbles that they do not have time to read the Bible. The letter to Dorp, which was revised for publication with the *Praise of Folly* beginning with the Basel edition of , offers a powerful and insidious repudiation of university theology and philosophy. Epicureanism Erasmus thus had little enthusiasm for the various philosophic orthodoxies prevailing among the ancients or the moderns. However, fairly late in life, and only belatedly acknowledged by criticism, he did turn in sympathy to one of the Hellenistic schools of philosophy, namely Epicureanism. Erasmus never espoused Epicureanism as a comprehensive system of thought, and he could not endorse the central tenet of the mortality of the human soul. He was, however, attracted to the Epicurean ideal of peace of mind through the retreat from worldly cares and the cultivation of a clear moral conscience. Christ teaches his followers how to attain a state of complete tranquility, and freedom from the torments of a guilty conscience, that corresponds to the Epicurean ideal of *ataraxia*. This ideal, it is worth noting, is not the same as Stoic apathy, which Erasmus carefully disassociates from Christianity in various places including the *Ecclesiastes*. He points out that apathy would defeat the purpose of the Christian preacher who tries to arouse the emotions of the audience. The Christian ought to combine compassion with a clear conscience in order to achieve tranquility. This understanding of Christianity has little in common with the sterner tenor of Protestant thought, and may explain why Martin Luther labeled Erasmus an Epicurean in the vulgar sense of an atheist or unbeliever. Finally, it may not be out of place here to point out that, through his mature, non-dogmatic embrace of Epicureanism, Erasmus shows some affinity for the late Renaissance prose writer Michel de Montaigne. The Word Speech, for Erasmus, is not only a defining attribute of humanity but also a key to the relation between humanity and divinity, which was a central preoccupation of his thought. The Gospel of John declares that in the beginning was the *logos*, which Erasmus famously, or infamously, retranslated as *sermo* in preference to the reading of the Vulgate, *verbum*. Erasmus felt justified in changing the reading of the Vulgate, but only in the second edition of his New Testament published in , because the received text of scripture is not divine. The words are human, or rather, a mediation between the human and the divine. The Bible is speech, and as such it must be read, interpreted, and understood according to the arts of speech. Moreover, the arts of speech are the only means we have of approaching divinity. Speech brings man close to God. Humanist Theology It is not entirely clear under what circumstances Erasmus first took an interest in biblical scholarship. His meeting with John Colet in England is known to have kindled his interest. Erasmus prepared the *editio princeps* in Paris in with a prefatory epistle addressed to Christopher Fisher, papal protonotary and doctor of canon law. This preface in defense of Valla can be read as a sort of paradoxical encomium, or praise of invective, since Valla had a controversial reputation as a harsh critic and bitter polemicist. Erasmus compares Valla to Zoilus, a proverbial figure of odious slander for his presumptuous critique of Homeric epic, as we are reminded in the *Adages*; but here, in the preface he carries a positive connotation as a heroic censor. In his masterpiece on the elegance of the Latin language, Valla rescued literature from barbarity by administering the harsh medicine of criticism to the inveterate disease of scholastic Latin. Valla had collated the Vulgate with the Greek text of the New Testament and emended the translation according to grammatical criteria, including the criterion of elegance. Surely, Erasmus asks, translation, whether of sacred or profane texts, is the purview of grammar. A translator is not a prophet. The prophet requires the gift of the Holy Spirit, but the translator needs grammar and rhetoric, the arts of language. In effect, since the word of God reaches us through human intermediaries using human language, theology cannot dispense with skill in language or *linguarum peritia*. This is the program of humanist theology. Indeed, the text that Erasmus edited in was the model and impulse for his own *Annotations on the New Testament* first published as part of the *Novum Instrumentum* in Even the substitution of *sermo* for *verbum*, which embroiled Erasmus in such endless quarrels, and earned him a denunciation from the pulpit of St. Often the *Erasmian Annotations* revisits the themes first broached in the prefatory epistle to Fisher, including the notion that the Bible, like all human language, is immersed in historical time. Peter tells Cornelius that God anointed Jesus, which the Vulgate renders with a turn of phrase that elicits a long commentary from Erasmus, lengthened in successive editions. If he spoke Greek, he spoke it as a foreign language inflected by his own vernacular, which accounts for stylistic irregularities. After all, the apostles were only human, subject to error and ignorance like the rest of us. This got Erasmus in a lot of trouble.

Chapter 7 : Lincoln on Judicial Despotism by Robert P. George | Articles | First Things

Desiderius Erasmus was one of the leading activists and thinkers of the European Renaissance. His main activity was to write letters to the leading statesmen, humanists, printers, and theologians of the first three and a half decades of the sixteenth century. Erasmus was an indefatigable.

List of famous alumni from Stevens Institute of Technology, with photos when available. Prominent graduates from Stevens Institute of Technology include celebrities, politicians, business people, athletes and more. This list of distinguished Stevens Institute of Technology alumni is loosely ordered by relevance, so the most recognizable celebrities who attended Stevens Institute of Technology are at the top of the list. He was part of the New Hollywood wave of filmmaking. Hewitt was issued U. Patent , on September 17, His research has covered many kinds of data communications, particularly Sprague de Camp " was an American writer of science fiction, fantasy, non-fiction and biography. In a career spanning 60 years, he wrote over books, Greg specializes in internet services, mobile, energy and technology investments. Greg currently sits on the boards of He had a national reputation as a Born Louis William Weiss in Nashua in northeastern Iowa, Taylor appeared in more than films, the bulk of them B-movies in the s From to , he served as Imam of Masjid She is John C. He was one of the first management consultants. Taylor was one of the intellectual He is also responsible for building and maintaining the most He was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics for his co-detection of the neutrino with Clyde Cowan in the neutrino experiment. He may be the only He campaigned for Catholic Emancipation"including He was the patriarch of the Bush political family. He was the father of U. Senator Prescott Bush, grandfather of U. Gantt charts were employed on major Igor Ansoff was a Russian American applied mathematician and business manager. He is known as the father of strategic management. Horle was born in Newark, New Jersey, and in received his degree in mechanical engineering from the Stevens He is also a Microsoft Most Valuable Professional. He was also a member Farber Professor, Computer scientist David J. He is currently Distinguished Career Brennan Judge Thomas E. Brennan is the founder of Thomas M. He is the cousin of Garis Novelist, Writer Howard Roger Garis was an American author, best known for a series of books, published under his own name, that featured the character of Uncle Wiggily Longears, an engaging elderly rabbit. He was the founder of the Hazeltine Heilmeyer Inventor, Engineer George Harry Heilmeyer was an American engineer, manager, and a pioneering contributor to liquid crystal displays, for which he was inducted into the National Inventors Hall of Fame. He played 18 seasons in MLB, which began in He is known for his abstract landscapes and watercolors. Destler William Wallace Destler is an American university professor and administrator. He is currently serving as the 9th president of the Rochester Institute of Technology and has held the position Colvin Fred Herbert Colvin was an American machinist, technical journalist, author, and editor. He wrote, co-wrote, edited, or co-edited many periodical articles, handbooks, and textbooks related to

Chapter 8 : Biography: Charles Darwin: Natural Selection

Erasmus+ is the EU's programme to support education, training, youth and sport in Europe. Its budget of €- billion will provide opportunities for over 4 million Europeans to study, train, gain experience, and volunteer abroad.

The Bible and slavery Genesis narrative about the Curse of Ham has often been held to be an aetiological story, giving a reason for the enslavement of the Canaanites. The word ham is very similar to the Hebrew word for hot, which is cognate with an Egyptian word kem, meaning black used to refer to Egypt itself, in reference to the fertile black soil along the Nile valley. Although many scholars therefore view Ham as an eponym used to represent Egypt in the Table of Nations , [1] a number of Christians throughout history, including Origen [2] and the Cave of Treasures , [3] have argued for the alternate proposition that Ham represents all black people , his name symbolising their dark skin colour; [4] pro-slavery advocates, from Eutychius of Alexandria [5] and John Philoponus , [6] to American pro-slavery apologists, [7] have therefore occasionally interpreted the narrative as a condemnation of all black people to slavery. Slaves were to be treated as part of an extended family; [20] they were allowed to celebrate the Sukkot festival, [20] and expected to honour Shabbat. This 7th-year manumission could be voluntarily renounced, which would be signified, as in other Ancient Near Eastern nations, [35] by the slave gaining a ritual ear piercing ; [36] after such renunciation, the individual was enslaved forever and not released at the Jubilee [37]. Non-Israelite slaves were always to be enslaved forever, and treated as inheritable property. The costly and compulsory giving of gifts was restricted the 7th-year manumission only. Verbal declarations of manumission could no longer be revoked. Fear of apostasy lead to the Talmudic discouragement of the sale of Jewish slaves to non-Jews, [63] although loans were allowed; [64] similarly slave trade with Tyre was only to be for the purpose of removing slaves from non-Jewish religion. Indeed, they argued that the biblical rule, that slaves should be freed for certain injuries, should actually only apply to slaves who had converted to Judaism; [18] additionally, Maimonides argued that this manumission was really punishment of the owner, and therefore it could only be imposed by a court, and required evidence from witnesses. Maimonides wrote that, regardless whether a slave is Jewish or not, "The way of the pious and the wise is to be compassionate and to pursue justice, not to overburden or oppress a slave, and to provide them from every dish and every drink. The early sages would give their slaves from every dish on their table. They would feed their servants before sitting to their own meals Slaves may not be maltreated of offended - the law destined them for service, not for humiliation. Do not shout at them or be angry with them, but hear them out. Christianity and slavery Slavery in different forms existed within Christianity for over 18 centuries. Although in the early years of Christianity , freeing slaves was regarded as an act of charity, [74] and the Christian view of equality of all people including slaves was a novelty in the Roman Empire, [75] the institution of slavery was rarely criticised. Indeed, in , the Synod of Gangra condemned the Manicheans for their urging that slaves should liberate themselves; the canons of the Synod instead declared that anyone preaching abolitionism should be anathematised, and that slaves had a "Christian obligation" to submit to their masters. Augustine of Hippo , who renounced his former Manicheanism, argued that slavery was part of the mechanism to preserve the natural order of things; [76] [77] John Chrysostom , regarded as a saint by Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism , argued that slaves should be resigned to their fate, as by "obeying his master he is obeying God". For you are all one in Christ Jesus". And in fact, even some of the first popes were once slaves themselves. The approval of slavery under these conditions was reaffirmed and extended in his Romanus Pontifex bull of Along with other priests, they opposed their treatment as unjust and illegal in an audience with the Spanish king and in the subsequent royal commission. The 18th century high-church Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts owned the Codrington Plantation, in Barbados , containing several hundred slaves, branded on their chests with the word Society. The seventh century Saint Eloi used his vast wealth to purchase British and Saxon slaves in groups of 50 and in order to set them free. In the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade was formed, with 9 of the 12 founder members being Quakers; William Wilberforce , an early supporter of the society, went on to push through the Slave Trade Act , striking

a major blow against the transatlantic slave trade. Leaders of Methodism and Presbyterianism also vehemently denounced human bondage, [91] [92] [93] convincing their congregations to do likewise; Methodists [94] and Presbyterians [95] subsequently made the repudiation of slavery a condition of membership. In the Southern United States, however, support for slavery was strong; anti-slavery literature was prevented from passing through the postal system, and even sermons, from the famed English preacher Charles Spurgeon, were burned due to their censure of slavery. Despite the general emancipation of slaves, members of fringe Christian groups like the Christian Identity movement, and the Ku Klux Klan a white supremacist group see the enslavement of Africans as a positive aspect of American history. Slave Christianity[edit] In the United States, Christianity not only held views about slavery but also on how slaves practiced their own form of Christianity. Prior to the work of Melville Herskovits in, it was widely believed that all elements of African culture were destroyed by the horrific experiences of Africans forced to come to the United States of America. Since his groundbreaking work, scholarship has found that Slave Christianity existed as an extraordinarily creative patchwork of African and Christian religious tradition. Beyond that, tribal traditions could vary to a high degree across the African continent. During the early eighteenth century, Anglican missionaries attempting to bring Christianity to slaves in the Southern colonies often found themselves butting up against not only uncooperative masters, but also resistant slaves. An unquestionable obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity among slaves was their desire to continue to adhere as much as possible to the religious beliefs and rituals of their African ancestors. Missionaries working in the South were especially displeased with slave retention of African practices such as polygamy and what they called idolatrous dancing. In fact, even blacks who embraced Christianity in America did not completely abandon Old World religion. Instead, they engaged in syncretism, blending Christian influences with traditional African rites and beliefs. Symbols and objects, such as crosses, were conflated with charms carried by Africans to ward off evil spirits. Christ was interpreted as a healer similar to the priests of Africa. In the New World, fusions of African spirituality and Christianity led to distinct new practices among slave populations, including voodoo or vodun in Haiti and Spanish Louisiana. Although African religious influences were also important among Northern blacks, exposure to Old World religions was more intense in the South, where the density of the black population was greater. There were, however, some commonalities across the majority of tribal traditions. Perhaps the primary understanding of tribal traditions was that there was not a separation of the sacred and the secular. Most tribal traditions highlighted this experience of the supernatural in ecstatic experiences of the supernatural brought on by ritual song and dance. Repetitious music and dancing were often used to bring on these experiences through the use of drums and chanting. The realization of these experiences was in the "possession" of a worshipper in which one not only is taken over by the divine but actually becomes one with the divine. The song, dance, and ecstatic experiences of traditional tribal religion were Christianized and practiced by slaves in what is called the "Ring Shout. Christianity came more slowly to the slaves of North America. Many colonial slaveholders feared that baptizing slaves would lead to emancipation because of vague laws concerning the slave status of Christians under British colonial rule. Slaves usually had one day off each week, usually Sunday. That time was used to grow their own crops, as well as dancing and singing doing such things on the Sabbath was frowned on by most preachers, so there was little time for slaves to receive religious instruction. They preached a gospel radically different from that of white preachers, who often used Christianity in an attempt to make slaves more complacent to their enslaved status. Rather than focusing on obedience, slave preachers placed a greater emphasis on the Old Testament, especially the book of Exodus. They likened the plight of the American slaves to the enslaved Hebrews of the Bible, instilling hope into the hearts of those enslaved. Slave preachers were instrumental in shaping the religious landscape of African Americans for decades to come. According to Brockopp, seven separate terms for slaves appear in the Quran, in at least twenty nine Quranic verses. It forbade enslavement of free members of Islamic society, including non-Muslims dhimmis residing under Islamic rule. Islam also allowed the acquisition of lawful non-Muslim slaves who were imprisoned, slaves purchased from lands outside the Islamic state, as well as considered the boys or girls born to slaves as slaves. Slaves could be given as property dower during marriage. There was also a gradation in the status on the slave, and his descendants, after the slave converted to Islam. A slave

could not own or inherit property or enter into a contract. However, he was better off in terms of rights than Greek or Roman slaves. Slave armies were deployed by Sultans and Caliphs at various medieval era war fronts across the Islamic Empires, [] [] playing an important role in the expansion of Islam in Africa and elsewhere. Sharma, which he states represented "a small servile class of women slaves". Some of the shudras were employed as labouring masses on farm land, much like "helots of Sparta", even though they were not treated with the same degree of coercion and contempt. The slaves were differentiated by origin and different disabilities and rules for manumission applied. While this could happen to a person of any varna, shudras were much more likely to be reduced to slavery. Amrita, nectar of immortality or Nibbana ". Will they then deny the favours of Allah? Save from their wives or the slaves that their right hands possess, for then they are not blameworthy. Sharma, such as in verse The Curse of Ham. Princeton University Press, page Oxford University Press, page Race, Racism, and the Biblical Narratives. Augsburg Fortress, page 8.

Chapter 9 : Erasmus, Desiderius | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

The Initiative seeks to foster a debate about regressive, authoritarian politics as well as alternatives, documenting, analysing and theorizing these in order to advance new emancipatory politics that challenge exclusionary, violent and populist visions.

Edit After serving many years as one of countless synchronized robots under Omnius , Erasmus became trapped in an ice crevice during a solo expedition on Corrin , and remained there for twenty years. During that time, and without the guidance of Omnius or the company of other beings, he spent vast amounts of time ruminating on various philosophical concepts. Following his rescue he refused the opportunity to resynchronize with Omnius, and instead persuaded the Evermind that his independence could prove useful to the wider causes of the Synchronized Worlds. Obsession with Humans Edit As a self-proclaimed scientist and philosopher, Erasmus continued to contemplate a variety of concepts. However, his overriding passion became the study of humans - or hrethgir as they were known to the Titans and Omnius. He felt compelled to find logical patterns in their seemingly irrational and random reactions. His attempts to understand humanity typically came through experiments on enslaved humans of the Synchronized Worlds , which normally resulted in suffering, misery and death for the subjects. His other attempts to rationalize human behavior involved surrounding himself with luxurious human trappings, such as materials, art, and decor. The strong-willed prisoner not only presented the robot with defiance and intrigue, but also his first meaningful encounter with human birth. However, the ultimate consequence of his time with Serena came after he had grown annoyed by her young son Manion , and murdered him. That event, in tandem with an experiment on the slave supervisor Iblis Ginjo , triggered an uprising among the simmering masses of human slaves on Earth. Erasmus escaped to Corrin shortly before the planet was decimated by atomics carried by a war fleet from the League of Nobles. Emotional Changes Edit On Corrin, Erasmus hid his involvement in the destruction of Earth from the new Omnius Prime , for fear of being resynchronized and losing his independence. Though his experiments continued, they were influenced by his last experiences on Earth and his interaction with Serena Butler. Yet unlike his previous experiments Erasmus devoted more time and patience to his new ward. During this revelation, the infected update caused Omnius to crash, and Erasmus being an independent robot realized that Seurat was the courier of the virus. However, those questions were left unanswered when the robot was left to die during the Battle of Corrin when Gilbertus instructed to remove his gelsphere CPU. This factor, combined with the future existence of mentats, the first of which was Gilbertus himself - seems to indicate that the gelsphere was never discovered. If it had been discovered, the backlash would likely have almost certainly destroyed the nascent Mentat School. Gilbertus keeps the gelsphere in a secret compartment in his office of the headmaster of the Mentat School, often speaking with Erasmus, who is growing increasingly bored being confined into a single location without the ability to influence the outside world. He is constantly asking Gilbertus to build him a new body or, at least, give him a body of one of the mechs that the students are allowed to study. Gilbertus, fearful of discovery, tries to convince Erasmus of the danger but to no avail. If the Butlerians discover the gelsphere, it will be destroyed, along with Gilbertus and the school. When the Butlerians lay siege to the Mentat School, they discover the true identity of Headmaster Gilbertus Albans and sentence him to be executed as a machine collaborator. However, Gilbertus refuses, as he has promised Manford Torondo he would not try to escape in exchange for the Butlerians sparing the school and the students. For the first time ever, Erasmus feels sadness and the desire to avenge his ward. At the secret Venport Holdings research facility on Denali , Erasmus offers his services in designing better weapons against the hated Butlerians. In exchange, he asks that a human body be grown for him using the genetic material Draigo collected from Gilbertus Albans. After Erasmus becomes human, more or less, he starts a sexual relationship with Anna Corrino, whose mind he helped repair after her failed attempt at becoming a Reverend Mother. Anna insists that they make love, but Erasmus is frustrated at her priorities and tells her that his sexual relations with her have been nothing more than an experiment. Devastated, the already-damaged Anna decides to end her life and walks out unprotected into the toxic atmosphere of Denali. Feeling remorse,

Erasmus runs out to get her, only for his body to succumb to the acidic vapors before he is able to return. Just before the humans final conquest of Corrin; Omnius, carrying the program of Erasmus within it, beams itself into far space, in a last ditch effort to re-establish itself one day. This maneuver is successful as the signal of the Machines is picked up by a deep space probe which had been previously beamed off of Giedi Prime by another incarnation of Omnius hundreds of years before. During the Time of Kralizec.