

Chapter 1 : Rationalism - Wikipedia

Hahn, a German Rationalist, defined Rationalism as "that manner of thought by which the human reason is considered to be the only source and the only judge of all kinds of knowledge" (Hahn, De Rationalismi,).

Bring fact-checked results to the top of your browser search. Religious rationalism Stirrings of religious rationalism were already felt in the Middle Ages regarding the Christian revelation. Aquinas , the greatest of the medieval thinkers, was a rationalist in the sense of believing that the larger part of revealed truth was intelligible to and demonstrable by reason , though he thought that a number of dogmas opaque to reason must be accepted on authority alone. Expansion of religious rationalism Religious rationalism did not come into its own, however, until the 16th and 17th centuries, when it took two chief forms: Galileo was a pioneer in astronomy and the founder of modern dynamics. The rationalism of Descartes, as already shown, was the outcome of philosophical doubt rather than of scientific inquiry. The uneasiness that the church soon felt in the face of such a test was not unfounded, for Descartes was in effect exalting the natural light into the supreme court even in the field of religion. He argued that the guarantee against the possibility that even this natural light might be deceptive lay in the goodness of the Creator. But then to prove this Creator, he had to assume the prior validity of the natural light itself. Logically, therefore, the last word lay with rational insight, not with any outside divine warrant see Cartesian circle. Descartes was inadvertently beginning a Copernican revolution in theology. Before his time, the truths regarded as most certain were those accepted from revelation; afterward these truths were subject to the judgment of human reason, thus breaking the hold of authority on the European mind. Four waves of religious rationalism The rationalist attitude quickly spread, its advance forming several waves of general interest and influence. The first wave occurred in England in the form of Deism. Deists accepted the existence of God but spurned supernatural revelation. The earliest member of this school, Lord Herbert of Cherbury , held that a just God would not reveal himself to a part of his creation only and that the true religion is thus a universal one, which achieves its knowledge of God through common reason. Attacking revelation, the freethinking polemicist Anthony Collins maintained that the prophecies of the Hebrew Bible Old Testament failed of fulfillment; and the religious controversialist Thomas Woolston urged that the New Testament miracles, as recorded, are incredible. Matthew Tindal , most learned of the English Deists, argued that the essential part of Christianity is its ethics , which, being clearly apparent to natural reason, leaves revelation superfluous. Thus the Deists, professing for the most part to be religious men themselves, did much to reconcile their public to the free play of ideas in religion. The second wave of religious rationalism, less moderate in tone and consequences, was French. This wave, reflecting an engagement with the problem of natural evil , involved a decay in the natural theology of Deism such that it merged eventually with the stream that led to materialistic atheism. Its moving spirit was Voltaire , who had been impressed by some of the Deists during a stay in England. Like them, he thought that a rational person would believe in God but not in supernatural inspiration. Hardly a profound philosopher, he was a brilliant journalist, clever and humorous in argument , devastating in satire, and warm in human sympathies. In his *Candide* and in many other writings, he poured irreverent ridicule on the Christian scheme of salvation as incoherent and on the church hierarchy as cruel and oppressive. In these attitudes he had the support of Denis Diderot , editor of the most widely read encyclopaedia that had appeared in Europe. The rationalism of these men and their followers, directed against both the religious and the political traditions of their time, did much to prepare the ground for the explosive French Revolution. The Newberry Library, Louis H. Silver Collection purchase, The next wave of religious rationalism occurred in Germany under the influence of Hegel , who held that a religious creed is a halfway house on the road to a mature philosophy , the product of a reason that is still under the sway of feeling and imagination. This idea was taken up and applied with learning and acuteness to the origins of Christianity by David Friedrich Strauss , who published in , at the age of 27, a remarkable and influential three-volume work, *Das Leben Jesu The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined* , Relying largely on internal inconsistencies in the Synoptic Gospels , Strauss undertook to prove these books to be unacceptable as revelation and unsatisfactory as history. He then sought to show

how an imaginative people innocent of either history or science, convinced that a messiah would appear, and deeply moved by a unique moral genius, inevitably wove myths about his birth and death, his miracles, and his divine communings. The battle raged with bitterness for several decades but died away as the theory of evolution gained more general acceptance. Status of rationalism Religious With increasing freedom of thought and wider acceptance of scientific views, rationalism in religion lost its novelty and much of its controversial excitement. To the contemporary mind, it is too obvious to warrant debate that reason and revelation cannot both qualify as sources of ultimate truth, for, were they to conflict, truth itself would become self-contradictory. Hence theologians sought accommodation through new interpretative principles that discern different grades of authenticity within the Scriptures and through new views of religious truth, existential rather than cognitive, that turn from propositional dogmas to the explication of lived human existence. Criticism of supernaturalism, however, was still carried on by such societies as the Rationalist Press Association, in Great Britain, and the Humanist Association, in the United States. Ethical Rationalism in ethics suffered its share of criticism. Regarding its lists of rules—on the keeping of promises, the return of loaned goods, etc. On the other hand, if without exceptions, they would often prove to be tautologies: After enduring a period of eclipse, however, during which noncognitive theories of ethics emotive and existential and relativism had preempted the field, rationalistic views, which agree in holding that moral standards do not depend upon the varying attitudes of persons or peoples, received renewed attention in the mid-20th century. Metaphysical Typical of the ways of reasoning employed by rationalists were two approaches taken to the metaphysical doctrine that all things are connected by internal relations: An internal relation is one that could not be removed without affecting the terms themselves between which the relation holds. Hence everything is so connected with everything else that it could not be what it is unless they were what they are. The appeal to internal relations played an important part in the philosophies of Hegel, F. Bradley, and A. The other line of argument is causal. Every event, it is maintained, is connected with every other, either directly or indirectly. Sir James Jeans, an astrophysicist and popularizer of science, argued that if the law of gravitation is valid, people cannot crook their little fingers without affecting the fixed stars. Here the causal relation is direct. But if this had been different, all its consequences would presumably have been different; thus, an indirect and internal relation proves to have been present. Many rationalists held with Spinoza that the causal relation is really a logical one—that a causal law, if precisely stated, would reveal a connection in which the character of the cause logically necessitates that of its effect; and if this is true, they maintained, the facts and events of the world must thus compose a single rational and intelligible order. In the 20th century, such rationalism met with a new and unexpected difficulty presented by quantum mechanics. According to the indeterminacy principle, formulated in by the German physicist Werner Heisenberg, it is impossible to discover with precision both the position and the velocity of a moving electron at the same time. This implies that definite causal laws for the behaviour of these particles can never be attained, but only statistical laws governing the behaviour of immense aggregates of them. Causality, and with it the possibility of rational understanding, seemed to be suspended in the subatomic world. Some interpreters of the new physics, however, notably Max Planck, Albert Einstein, and Bertrand Russell, sustained the hopes of the rationalists by insisting that what was excluded by the indeterminacy principle was not the fact of causality in this realm but only the precise knowledge of it. Indeed, some leaders of 20th-century science took the new developments in physics as on the whole supporting rationalism. Protons and electrons, they contended, though beyond the reach of the senses, can still be known, and their behaviour, at least in groups, is increasingly found to conform to mathematical law.

Chapter 2 : Rationalism vs. Empiricism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

German nationalism is the nationalist idea that Germans are a nation, promotes the unity of Germans and German-speakers into a nation state, and emphasizes and takes pride in the national identity of Germans.

His father was a master harness maker, and his mother was the daughter of a harness maker, though she was better educated than most women of her social class. Pietism was an evangelical Lutheran movement that emphasized conversion, reliance on divine grace, the experience of religious emotions, and personal devotion involving regular Bible study, prayer, and introspection. Leibniz was then very influential in German universities. But Kant was also exposed to a range of German and British critics of Wolff, and there were strong doses of Aristotelianism and Pietism represented in the philosophy faculty as well. For the next four decades Kant taught philosophy there, until his retirement from teaching in at the age of seventy-two. Kant had a burst of publishing activity in the years after he returned from working as a private tutor. In and he published three scientific works – one of which, *Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens*, was a major book in which, among other things, he developed what later became known as the nebular hypothesis about the formation of the solar system. Unfortunately, the printer went bankrupt and the book had little immediate impact. To secure qualifications for teaching at the university, Kant also wrote two Latin dissertations: The following year he published another Latin work, *The Employment in Natural Philosophy of Metaphysics Combined with Geometry, of Which Sample I Contains the Physical Monadology*, in hopes of succeeding Knutzen as associate professor of logic and metaphysics, though Kant failed to secure this position. Both works depart from Leibniz-Wolffian views, though not radically. Kant held this position from to , during which period he would lecture an average of twenty hours per week on logic, metaphysics, and ethics, as well as mathematics, physics, and physical geography. In his lectures Kant used textbooks by Wolffian authors such as Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten and Georg Friedrich Meier, but he followed them loosely and used them to structure his own reflections, which drew on a wide range of ideas of contemporary interest. These ideas often stemmed from British sentimentalist philosophers such as David Hume and Francis Hutcheson, some of whose texts were translated into German in the mids; and from the Swiss philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who published a flurry of works in the early s. From early in his career Kant was a popular and successful lecturer. After several years of relative quiet, Kant unleashed another burst of publications in , including five philosophical works. *The False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures* rehearses criticisms of Aristotelian logic that were developed by other German philosophers. The book attracted several positive and some negative reviews. *The Prize Essay* draws on British sources to criticize German rationalism in two respects: In *Negative Magnitudes* Kant also argues that the morality of an action is a function of the internal forces that motivate one to act, rather than of the external physical actions or their consequences. Finally, *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime* deals mainly with alleged differences in the tastes of men and women and of people from different cultures. After it was published, Kant filled his own interleaved copy of this book with often unrelated handwritten remarks, many of which reflect the deep influence of Rousseau on his thinking about moral philosophy in the mids. These works helped to secure Kant a broader reputation in Germany, but for the most part they were not strikingly original. While some of his early works tend to emphasize rationalist ideas, others have a more empiricist emphasis. During this time Kant was striving to work out an independent position, but before the s his views remained fluid. In Kant published his first work concerned with the possibility of metaphysics, which later became a central topic of his mature philosophy. In , at the age of forty-six, Kant was appointed to the chair in logic and metaphysics at the Albertina, after teaching for fifteen years as an unsalaried lecturer and working since as a sublibrarian to supplement his income. Kant was turned down for the same position in In order to inaugurate his new position, Kant also wrote one more Latin dissertation: Inspired by Crusius and the Swiss natural philosopher Johann Heinrich Lambert, Kant distinguishes between two fundamental powers of cognition, sensibility and understanding intelligence, where the Leibniz-Wolffians regarded understanding intellect as the only fundamental power. Moreover, as the title of the *Inaugural Dissertation* indicates, Kant

argues that sensibility and understanding are directed at two different worlds: The Inaugural Dissertation thus develops a form of Platonism; and it rejects the view of British sentimentalists that moral judgments are based on feelings of pleasure or pain, since Kant now holds that moral judgments are based on pure understanding alone. After Kant never surrendered the views that sensibility and understanding are distinct powers of cognition, that space and time are subjective forms of human sensibility, and that moral judgments are based on pure understanding or reason alone. But his embrace of Platonism in the Inaugural Dissertation was short-lived. He soon denied that our understanding is capable of insight into an intelligible world, which cleared the path toward his mature position in the Critique of Pure Reason, according to which the understanding like sensibility supplies forms that structure our experience of the sensible world, to which human knowledge is limited, while the intelligible or noumenal world is strictly unknowable to us. Kant spent a decade working on the Critique of Pure Reason and published nothing else of significance between and Kant also published a number of important essays in this period, including Idea for a Universal History With a Cosmopolitan Aim and Conjectural Beginning of Human History, his main contributions to the philosophy of history; An Answer to the Question: Jacobi's "accused the recently deceased G. Lessing" of Spinozism. With these works Kant secured international fame and came to dominate German philosophy in the late s. But in he announced that the Critique of the Power of Judgment brought his critical enterprise to an end 5: In his chair at Jena passed to J. Kant retired from teaching in For nearly two decades he had lived a highly disciplined life focused primarily on completing his philosophical system, which began to take definite shape in his mind only in middle age. After retiring he came to believe that there was a gap in this system separating the metaphysical foundations of natural science from physics itself, and he set out to close this gap in a series of notes that postulate the existence of an ether or caloric matter. Kant died February 12, , just short of his eightieth birthday. See also Bxiv; and 4: Thus metaphysics for Kant concerns a priori knowledge, or knowledge whose justification does not depend on experience; and he associates a priori knowledge with reason. The project of the Critique is to examine whether, how, and to what extent human reason is capable of a priori knowledge. The Enlightenment was a reaction to the rise and successes of modern science in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The spectacular achievement of Newton in particular engendered widespread confidence and optimism about the power of human reason to control nature and to improve human life. One effect of this new confidence in reason was that traditional authorities were increasingly questioned. For why should we need political or religious authorities to tell us how to live or what to believe, if each of us has the capacity to figure these things out for ourselves? Kant expresses this Enlightenment commitment to the sovereignty of reason in the Critique: Our age is the age of criticism, to which everything must submit. Religion through its holiness and legislation through its majesty commonly seek to exempt themselves from it. But in this way they excite a just suspicion against themselves, and cannot lay claim to that unfeigned respect that reason grants only to that which has been able to withstand its free and public examination Axi. Enlightenment is about thinking for oneself rather than letting others think for you, according to What is Enlightenment? In this essay, Kant also expresses the Enlightenment faith in the inevitability of progress. A few independent thinkers will gradually inspire a broader cultural movement, which ultimately will lead to greater freedom of action and governmental reform. The problem is that to some it seemed unclear whether progress would in fact ensue if reason enjoyed full sovereignty over traditional authorities; or whether unaided reasoning would instead lead straight to materialism, fatalism, atheism, skepticism Bxxxiv, or even libertinism and authoritarianism 8: The Enlightenment commitment to the sovereignty of reason was tied to the expectation that it would not lead to any of these consequences but instead would support certain key beliefs that tradition had always sanctioned. Crucially, these included belief in God, the soul, freedom, and the compatibility of science with morality and religion. Although a few intellectuals rejected some or all of these beliefs, the general spirit of the Enlightenment was not so radical. The Enlightenment was about replacing traditional authorities with the authority of individual human reason, but it was not about overturning traditional moral and religious beliefs. Yet the original inspiration for the Enlightenment was the new physics, which was mechanistic. If nature is entirely governed by mechanistic, causal laws, then it may seem that there is no room for freedom, a soul, or anything but matter in motion. This

threatened the traditional view that morality requires freedom. We must be free in order to choose what is right over what is wrong, because otherwise we cannot be held responsible. It also threatened the traditional religious belief in a soul that can survive death or be resurrected in an afterlife. So modern science, the pride of the Enlightenment, the source of its optimism about the powers of human reason, threatened to undermine traditional moral and religious beliefs that free rational thought was expected to support. This was the main intellectual crisis of the Enlightenment. In other words, free rational inquiry adequately supports all of these essential human interests and shows them to be mutually consistent. So reason deserves the sovereignty attributed to it by the Enlightenment. In a way the Inaugural Dissertation also tries to reconcile Newtonian science with traditional morality and religion, but its strategy is different from that of the Critique. According to the Inaugural Dissertation, Newtonian science is true of the sensible world, to which sensibility gives us access; and the understanding grasps principles of divine and moral perfection in a distinct intelligible world, which are paradigms for measuring everything in the sensible world. So on this view our knowledge of the intelligible world is a priori because it does not depend on sensibility, and this a priori knowledge furnishes principles for judging the sensible world because in some way the sensible world itself conforms to or imitates the intelligible world. Soon after writing the Inaugural Dissertation, however, Kant expressed doubts about this view. As he explained in a February 21, letter to his friend and former student, Marcus Herz: In my dissertation I was content to explain the nature of intellectual representations in a merely negative way, namely, to state that they were not modifications of the soul brought about by the object. However, I silently passed over the further question of how a representation that refers to an object without being in any way affected by it can be possible. And if such intellectual representations depend on our inner activity, whence comes the agreement that they are supposed to have with objects – objects that are nevertheless not possibly produced thereby? The position of the Inaugural Dissertation is that the intelligible world is independent of the human understanding and of the sensible world, both of which in different ways conform to the intelligible world. But, leaving aside questions about what it means for the sensible world to conform to an intelligible world, how is it possible for the human understanding to conform to or grasp an intelligible world? If the intelligible world is independent of our understanding, then it seems that we could grasp it only if we are passively affected by it in some way. But for Kant sensibility is our passive or receptive capacity to be affected by objects that are independent of us 2: So the only way we could grasp an intelligible world that is independent of us is through sensibility, which means that our knowledge of it could not be a priori. The pure understanding alone could at best enable us to form representations of an intelligible world. Such a priori intellectual representations could well be figments of the brain that do not correspond to anything independent of the human mind. In any case, it is completely mysterious how there might come to be a correspondence between purely intellectual representations and an independent intelligible world. But the Critique gives a far more modest and yet revolutionary account of a priori knowledge. This turned out to be a dead end, and Kant never again maintained that we can have a priori knowledge about an intelligible world precisely because such a world would be entirely independent of us. The sensible world, or the world of appearances, is constructed by the human mind from a combination of sensory matter that we receive passively and a priori forms that are supplied by our cognitive faculties. We can have a priori knowledge only about aspects of the sensible world that reflect the a priori forms supplied by our cognitive faculties. So according to the Critique, a priori knowledge is possible only if and to the extent that the sensible world itself depends on the way the human mind structures its experience. Kant characterizes this new constructivist view of experience in the Critique through an analogy with the revolution wrought by Copernicus in astronomy: Up to now it has been assumed that all our cognition must conform to the objects; but all attempts to find out something about them a priori through concepts that would extend our cognition have, on this presupposition, come to nothing. Hence let us once try whether we do not get farther with the problems of metaphysics by assuming that the objects must conform to our cognition, which would agree better with the requested possibility of an a priori cognition of them, which is to establish something about objects before they are given to us. This would be just like the first thoughts of Copernicus, who, when he did not make good progress in the explanation of the celestial motions if he assumed that the entire celestial host revolves around the observer, tried to see if he might not

have greater success if he made the observer revolve and left the stars at rest.

Chapter 3 : Introduction: Reappraising Aesthetic Rationalism - Oxford Scholarship

In philosophy, rationalism is the epistemological view that "regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge" or "any view appealing to reason as a source of knowledge or justification". More formally, rationalism is defined as a methodology or a theory "in which the criterion of the truth is not sensory but intellectual and deductive".

This atheistic philosophy has wormed its way into modern science, education, and even into modern theology. Yet most educators and ministers do not know it! It has filled the churches with doubting skepticism about the inspiration of the Bible, and even the very existence of God. It has led this present generation to "abandon religion as a basis of life, and put its confidence in science" Denver Post, June 4, It has filled our schools with the permissive modernism that is fast making our people a nation of rebellious criminals. You need to know why this philosophy has caused such famous men as Dr. Just what is German Rationalism? Hahn, a German Rationalist, defined Rationalism as "that manner of thought by which the human reason is considered to be the only source and the only judge of all kinds of knowledge" Hahn, *De Rationalismi*, The Rationalist exalts human reason and declares that only through reason can man find the answers to life. It even tries to do away with God Himself. Rationalism is not modern. The ancient Greeks had it. The early Catholics accepted it from the Greeks, and the Protestant Reformers took it from the early Catholic writers. From the Protestant Reformers, the modern form of Rationalism stems. They rationalized that it would be "good" to substitute the worship of Halloween, Christmas, and Easter. Origen rationalized that Christ never really performed any divine miracles of healing. He said the miracles of Christ were not real, but were only symbolic or allegorical. He said the miracle of healing the blind only meant that the spiritually blind now saw; the miracle of healing the deaf only meant that the spiritually deaf now heard; the healing of the lame man that the heart of the former heathen now leapt like a deer Hagenbach, p. The heathen temples became the so-called "Christian churches. The corruption and worldliness of this church of the Middle Ages forced men to accept as truth superstitious beliefs and observances that would have horrified the apostles Peter and Paul! The people of Europe began to cry out for relief from the political and financial tyranny of Rome. Men like Wyclif, Huss, and Savanarola, who attempted to reform the church from within, were killed. Revolt Against Authority The principal cause of the Reformation was the obvious corruption of this pagan church. The Reformation was successful because by the time of Luther the power of the Pope and the Holy Roman Empire had declined, making it possible for nationalistic monarchs to oppose the power of the Pope of Rome. Most of the princes and nobility of Protestant Europe backed the Reformation because they wanted to be free from the authority of the Church Alzog, p. Martin Luther rebelled against doing the penance and the ritualistic "works" which the Catholic Church demanded. He became obsessed with the idea of getting around any need for obedience to these godless, pagan practices. Then Martin Luther let Satan deceive him into adding a word to Romans 1: He merely replaced the authority of the Catholic Church with his own authority. Rationalism in Protestantism The principle of Protestantism, the belief in freedom to decide for yourself what is truth, differs very little from the philosophy of Rationalism. The Reformers tried to reject what they believed to be error and superstition in the Catholic Church. They espoused sets of doctrines which the people would like and accept. Rationalism continued to develop, especially in Germany. German youths who studied theology were not taught to seek for Truth in the Scriptures. They were taught to study the writings of the founders of their church and to accept whatever truth seemed good to them. By palming off superstition as the Revelation of Jesus Christ, Satan instilled in thinking people a contempt for God and the Bible. There is a reason why Satan deceived his false church into teaching ridiculous superstitions which it claimed to be both scriptural and scientific truth. For example, Copernicus, in , rediscovered that the earth revolved around the sun. Galileo and his telescope confirmed this fact. But the Catholic Church had claimed as scriptural truth the teaching of the Egyptian monk, Cosmas Indicipleustes, that the sun, moon, and stars were all set in a canopy in the sky, and all revolved around the earth. Pope Urban VIII in tortured Galileo until he "confessed" that he was wrong and the earth was flat, and the sun revolved around the earth Schoel, *Histoire de la Litterature Grecque*, vol. Men of learning found such ignorance revolting! The discovery of America by Columbus and the voyage of Magellan

in around the world was a great shock to professing Christians who had been taught that it was the revelation of Jesus Christ and Scripture that the world was flat. An undercurrent of skepticism developed. In the 17th and 18th centuries those thinkers who rejected Christian theology and the Bible were mainly influenced by the inconsistencies, contradictions, and absurd superstitions preached in the Middle Ages as the "Truth of God. Isidore of Seville had given the church the doctrine that "bees are generated from decomposed veal, beetles from horseflesh, grasshoppers from mules, scorpions from crabs. Men of learning naturally assumed that Redi, who discovered that life can come only from life, had disproved the Biblical account, when actually all he had disproved was the ignorant superstition of the Middle Ages. These new rationalists never really looked into the Bible for themselves! Development of German Rationalism Germany became the first nation in Europe to grant religious liberty. It was left to the ruler of each German state to impose upon his subjects whichever of the three religions, Catholic, Lutheran, and the Reformed Church of Calvin and Zwingli, he chose. More religious liberty was granted in when Frederick the Great wrote that everyone should be allowed to get to heaven in his own way. Then full religious liberty was granted in when the Prussian Territorial Code guaranteed the unrestricted liberty of conscience. John David Michaelis tried to explain the miracles of Christ in a natural manner Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, p. John Solomon Semler , the Professor of Theology in the University of Halle, represented the Sacred Scriptures as being a local account of local events. He used the history of Catholic doctrines to show the changeableness of the doctrines of Christianity Hagenbach, p. John Frederic Gruner proved that the doctrines of the Catholic Church never originated from the Apostolic Church, and that the doctrines of the Apostolic Christianity had been exchanged at a very early date for the Platonic-oriental philosophy of the Alexandrian school Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, p. Later archeologists and geologists blindly accepted the rebellious concepts of this period. Conrad Philip Henke , the Professor of Theology at the University of Helmstedt, taught, but could not prove, that the belief in Christ and the inspiration of the Bible was superstition. Emmanuel Kant tried to subject the human understanding to what he called "searching examination. Schleiermacher even said, "Life to come The modern system of speculative philosophy, as we know it in the United States, first made its appearance in the University of Berlin when Fichte was the professor of philosophy lived Hahn defined Rationalism as "that mode of thought by which the human reason is considered as the only source and the only judge of all kinds of knowledge. But he had no proof! Finally Eichborn and Machaelis tried to degrade the Bible to the rank of the other oriental religious books. What are the new German Rationalists plotting today? And what are our own Ambassador Colleges doing about it?

Chapter 4 : Immanuel Kant (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Translation for 'rationalism' in the free English-German dictionary and many other German translations.

Here is amazing proof that the God-rejecting theories of Evolution, Nazism, and Communism were inspired by the German Rationalists and the shocking undercover plot they are now perpetrating. This atheistic philosophy has wormed its way into modern science, education, and even into modern theology. Yet most educators and ministers do not know it! It has filled the churches with doubting skepticism about the inspiration of the Bible, and even the very existence of God. It has filled our schools with the permissive modernism that is fast making our people a nation of rebellious criminals. You need to know why this philosophy has caused such famous men as Dr. Just what is German Rationalism? The Rationalist exalts human reason and declares that only through reason can man find the answers to life. It even tries to do away with God Himself. Rationalism is not modern. The ancient Greeks had it. The early Catholics accepted it from the Greeks, and the Protestant Reformers took it from the early Catholic writers. From the Protestant Reformers, the modern form of Rationalism stems. Origen rationalized that Christ never really performed any divine miracles of healing. He said the miracles of Christ were not real, but were only symbolic or allegorical. He said the miracle of healing the blind only meant that the spiritually blind now saw; the miracle of healing the deaf only meant that the spiritually deaf now heard; the healing of the lame man that the heart of the former heathen now leapt like a deer Hagenbach, p. The corruption and worldliness of this church of the Middle Ages forced men to accept as truth superstitious beliefs and observances that would have horrified the apostles Peter and Paul! The people of Europe began to cry out for relief from the political and financial tyranny of Rome. Men like Wyclif, Huss, and Savonarola, who attempted to reform the church from within, were killed. Revolt Against Authority The principal cause of the Reformation was the obvious corruption of this pagan church. The Reformation was successful because by the time of Luther the power of the Pope and the Holy Roman Empire had declined, making it possible for nationalistic monarchs to oppose the power of the Pope of Rome. Most of the princes and nobility of Protestant Europe backed the Reformation because they wanted to be free from the authority of the Church Alzog, p. He became obsessed with the idea of getting around any need for obedience to these godless, pagan practices. Then Martin Luther let Satan deceive him into adding a word to Romans 1: He merely replaced the authority of the Catholic Church with his own authority. Rationalism in Protestantism The principle of Protestantism, the belief in freedom to decide for yourself what is truth, differs very little from the philosophy of Rationalism. The Reformers tried to reject what they believed to be error and superstition in the Catholic Church. They espoused sets of doctrines which the people would like and accept. Rationalism continued to develop, especially in Germany. German youths who studied theology were not taught to seek for Truth in the Scriptures. They were taught to study the writings of the founders of their church and to accept whatever truth seemed good to them. By palming off superstition as the Revelation of Jesus Christ, Satan instilled in thinking people a contempt for God and the Bible. There is a reason why Satan deceived his false church into teaching ridiculous superstitions which it claimed to be both scriptural and scientific truth. For example, Copernicus, in , rediscovered that the earth revolved around the sun. Galileo and his telescope confirmed this fact. But the Catholic Church had claimed as scriptural truth the teaching of the Egyptian monk, Cosmas Indicipleustes, that the sun, moon, and stars were all set in a canopy in the sky, and all revolved around the earth. Men of learning found such ignorance revolting! The discovery of America by Columbus and the voyage of Magellan in around the world was a great shock to professing Christians who had been taught that it was the revelation of Jesus Christ and Scripture that the world was flat. An undercurrent of skepticism developed. Men of learning naturally assumed that Redi, who discovered that life can come only from life, had disproved the Biblical account, when actually all he had disproved was the ignorant superstition of the Middle Ages. These new rationalists never really looked into the Bible for themselves! Development of German Rationalism Germany became the first nation in Europe to grant religious liberty. It was left to the ruler of each German state to impose upon his subjects whichever of the three religions, Catholic, Lutheran, and the Reformed Church of Calvin and Zwingli, he

chose. More religious liberty was granted in when Frederick the Great wrote that everyone should be allowed to get to heaven in his own way. Then full religious liberty was granted in when the Prussian Territorial Code guaranteed the unrestricted liberty of conscience. John David Michaelis tried to explain the miracles of Christ in a natural manner Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, p. John Solomon Semler , the Professor of Theology in the University of Halle, represented the Sacred Scriptures as being a local account of local events. He used the history of Catholic doctrines to show the changeableness of the doctrines of Christianity Hagenbach, p. John Frederic Gruner proved that the doctrines of the Catholic Church never originated from the Apostolic Church, and that the doctrines of the Apostolic Christianity had been exchanged at a very early date for the Platonic-oriental philosophy of the Alexandrian school Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, p. Later archeologists and geologists blindly accepted the rebellious concepts of this period. Conrad Philip Henke , the Professor of Theology at the University of Helmstedt, taught, but could not prove, that the belief in Christ and the inspiration of the Bible was superstition. The modern system of speculative philosophy, as we know it in the United States, first made its appearance in the University of Berlin when Fichte was the professor of philosophy lived But he had no proof! Finally Eichborn and Machaelis tried to degrade the Bible to the rank of the other oriental religious books. What are the new German Rationalists plotting today? And what are our own Ambassador Colleges doing about it? To be continued next issue Share this:

The German school of theological Rationalism formed a part of the more general movement of the eighteenth-century "Enlightenment". It may be said to owe its immediate origin to the philosophical system of Christian Wolff (), which was a modification, with Aristotelean features, of that of Leibniz, especially characterized by its.

Introduction The dispute between rationalism and empiricism takes place within epistemology, the branch of philosophy devoted to studying the nature, sources and limits of knowledge. The defining questions of epistemology include the following. What is the nature of propositional knowledge, knowledge that a particular proposition about the world is true? To know a proposition, we must believe it and it must be true, but something more is required, something that distinguishes knowledge from a lucky guess. A good deal of philosophical work has been invested in trying to determine the nature of warrant. How can we gain knowledge? We can form true beliefs just by making lucky guesses. How to gain warranted beliefs is less clear. Moreover, to know the world, we must think about it, and it is unclear how we gain the concepts we use in thought or what assurance, if any, we have that the ways in which we divide up the world using our concepts correspond to divisions that actually exist. What are the limits of our knowledge? Some aspects of the world may be within the limits of our thought but beyond the limits of our knowledge; faced with competing descriptions of them, we cannot know which description is true. Some aspects of the world may even be beyond the limits of our thought, so that we cannot form intelligible descriptions of them, let alone know that a particular description is true. The disagreement between rationalists and empiricists primarily concerns the second question, regarding the sources of our concepts and knowledge. In some instances, their disagreement on this topic leads them to give conflicting responses to the other questions as well. They may disagree over the nature of warrant or about the limits of our thought and knowledge. Our focus here will be on the competing rationalist and empiricist responses to the second question. Some propositions in a particular subject area, S, are knowable by us by intuition alone; still others are knowable by being deduced from intuited propositions. Intuition is a form of rational insight. Deduction is a process in which we derive conclusions from intuited premises through valid arguments, ones in which the conclusion must be true if the premises are true. We intuit, for example, that the number three is prime and that it is greater than two. We then deduce from this knowledge that there is a prime number greater than two. Intuition and deduction thus provide us with knowledge a priori, which is to say knowledge gained independently of sense experience. Some rationalists take mathematics to be knowable by intuition and deduction. Some place ethical truths in this category. Some include metaphysical claims, such as that God exists, we have free will, and our mind and body are distinct substances. The more propositions rationalists include within the range of intuition and deduction, and the more controversial the truth of those propositions or the claims to know them, the more radical their rationalism. Rationalists also vary the strength of their view by adjusting their understanding of warrant. Some take warranted beliefs to be beyond even the slightest doubt and claim that intuition and deduction provide beliefs of this high epistemic status. Others interpret warrant more conservatively, say as belief beyond a reasonable doubt, and claim that intuition and deduction provide beliefs of that caliber. Still another dimension of rationalism depends on how its proponents understand the connection between intuition, on the one hand, and truth, on the other. Some take intuition to be infallible, claiming that whatever we intuit must be true. Others allow for the possibility of false intuited propositions. The second thesis associated with rationalism is the Innate Knowledge thesis. The Innate Knowledge Thesis: We have knowledge of some truths in a particular subject area, S, as part of our rational nature. The difference between them rests in the accompanying understanding of how this a priori knowledge is gained. The Innate Knowledge thesis offers our rational nature. Our innate knowledge is not learned through either sense experience or intuition and deduction. It is just part of our nature. Experiences may trigger a process by which we bring this knowledge to consciousness, but the experiences do not provide us with the knowledge itself. It has in some way been with us all along. According to some rationalists, we gained the knowledge in an earlier existence. According to others, God provided us with it at creation. Still others say it is part of our nature through natural selection.

Once again, the more subjects included within the range of the thesis or the more controversial the claim to have knowledge in them, the more radical the form of rationalism. Stronger and weaker understandings of warrant yield stronger and weaker versions of the thesis as well. The third important thesis of rationalism is the Innate Concept thesis. The Innate Concept Thesis: We have some of the concepts we employ in a particular subject area, S, as part of our rational nature. According to the Innate Concept thesis, some of our concepts are not gained from experience. They are part of our rational nature in such a way that, while sense experiences may trigger a process by which they are brought to consciousness, experience does not provide the concepts or determine the information they contain. Some claim that the Innate Concept thesis is entailed by the Innate Knowledge Thesis; a particular instance of knowledge can only be innate if the concepts that are contained in the known proposition are also innate. Others, such as Carruthers, argue against this connection, pp. The content and strength of the Innate Concept thesis varies with the concepts claimed to be innate. The more a concept seems removed from experience and the mental operations we can perform on experience the more plausibly it may be claimed to be innate. Since we do not experience perfect triangles but do experience pains, our concept of the former is a more promising candidate for being innate than our concept of the latter. Two other closely related theses are generally adopted by rationalists, although one can certainly be a rationalist without adopting either of them. The first is that experience cannot provide what we gain from reason. The Indispensability of Reason Thesis: The knowledge we gain in subject area, S, by intuition and deduction, as well as the ideas and instances of knowledge in S that are innate to us, could not have been gained by us through sense experience. The second is that reason is superior to experience as a source of knowledge. The Superiority of Reason Thesis: The knowledge we gain in subject area S by intuition and deduction or have innately is superior to any knowledge gained by sense experience. How reason is superior needs explanation, and rationalists have offered different accounts. Another view, generally associated with Plato Republic ec, locates the superiority of a priori knowledge in the objects known. What we know by reason alone, a Platonic form, say, is superior in an important metaphysical way, e. Most forms of rationalism involve notable commitments to other philosophical positions. One is a commitment to the denial of scepticism for at least some area of knowledge. If we claim to know some truths by intuition or deduction or to have some innate knowledge, we obviously reject scepticism with regard to those truths. We have no source of knowledge in S or for the concepts we use in S other than sense experience. Insofar as we have knowledge in the subject, our knowledge is a posteriori, dependent upon sense experience. Empiricists also deny the implication of the corresponding Innate Concept thesis that we have innate ideas in the subject area. Sense experience is our only source of ideas. They reject the corresponding version of the Superiority of Reason thesis. Since reason alone does not give us any knowledge, it certainly does not give us superior knowledge. Empiricists generally reject the Indispensability of Reason thesis, though they need not. The Empiricism thesis does not entail that we have empirical knowledge. It entails that knowledge can only be gained, if at all, by experience. Empiricists may assert, as some do for some subjects, that the rationalists are correct to claim that experience cannot give us knowledge. The conclusion they draw from this rationalist lesson is that we do not know at all. I have stated the basic claims of rationalism and empiricism so that each is relative to a particular subject area. Rationalism and empiricism, so relativized, need not conflict. We can be rationalists in mathematics or a particular area of mathematics and empiricists in all or some of the physical sciences. Rationalism and empiricism only conflict when formulated to cover the same subject. Then the debate, Rationalism vs. The fact that philosophers can be both rationalists and empiricists has implications for the classification schemes often employed in the history of philosophy, especially the one traditionally used to describe the Early Modern Period of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries leading up to Kant. It is standard practice to group the major philosophers of this period as either rationalists or empiricists and to suggest that those under one heading share a common agenda in opposition to those under the other. We should adopt such general classification schemes with caution. The views of the individual philosophers are more subtle and complex than the simple-minded classification suggests. See Loeb and Kenny for important discussions of this point. Descartes and Locke have remarkably similar views on the nature of our ideas, even though Descartes takes many to be innate, while Locke ties them all to experience. Thus, Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz are

mistakenly seen as applying a reason-centered epistemology to a common metaphysical agenda, with each trying to improve on the efforts of the one before, while Locke, Berkeley and Hume are mistakenly seen as gradually rejecting those metaphysical claims, with each consciously trying to improve on the efforts of his predecessors. One might claim, for example, that we can gain knowledge in a particular area by a form of Divine revelation or insight that is a product of neither reason nor sense experience. What is perhaps the most interesting form of the debate occurs when we take the relevant subject to be truths about the external world, the world beyond our own minds. A full-fledged rationalist with regard to our knowledge of the external world holds that some external world truths can and must be known a priori, that some of the ideas required for that knowledge are and must be innate, and that this knowledge is superior to any that experience could ever provide. The full-fledged empiricist about our knowledge of the external world replies that, when it comes to the nature of the world beyond our own minds, experience is our sole source of information. Reason might inform us of the relations among our ideas, but those ideas themselves can only be gained, and any truths about the external reality they represent can only be known, on the basis of sense experience. This debate concerning our knowledge of the external world will generally be our main focus in what follows. The debate raises the issue of metaphysics as an area of knowledge.

Chapter 6 : GERMAN RATIONALISM, IN ITS RISE, PROGRESS, AND DECLINE - DR. K. R. HAGENBAC

With Reverso you can find the English translation, definition or synonym for rationalism and thousands of other words. You can complete the translation of rationalism given by the English-German Collins dictionary with other dictionaries such as: Wikipedia, Lexilogos, Larousse dictionary, Le Robert, Oxford, GrÃ©visse.

This shocking second installment First reveals proof that the God rejecting theories of Evolution, Nazism, and Communism were all inspired by the German Rationalists. We remember the one prime example these Rationalists hit upon was the error of the Egyptian Catholic monk, Cosmos Indicipleustes. He claimed that the earth was boxlike in shape and therefore flat. He misquoted Isaiah He falsely reasoned that the hand of God moved stars, sun and moon around a flat earth. Monfaucon, Collection Nova Patrum, Paris, , vol. The discovery of America by Columbus and the voyage of Magellan around the earth were a great shock to ignorant Middle Age professing Christians. They had been taught the superstition of a flat earth as the revelation of Jesus Christ and Scripture. A strong undercurrent of skepticism developed. Rationalists Revolt Rationalism began to develop ONLY in Germany after the Reformation because Germany was the only nation that had relative freedom of religion and thought. The development of wild speculative free thinking was held back for two hundred years in many other nations. Church leaders persecuted or killed those who dared express their opinions, but in Germany scholars were usually free to openly attack the ridiculous unscientific teachings of the Middle Ages. These teachings were utterly false pagan myths, ridiculous superstitions from the rank paganism of ancient Babylon. They soon ignorantly concluded there was no God! Thus all truth, every book of the Bible, every doctrine of belief came under their vicious attacks. They assumed twat-man,-his religion, and his civilization must have developed from the primitive to the complex without God. The author made his blasphemous claim: The atheist Bruno Bauer went one step further than Strauss. He dared without proof to write in that the Gospels were forgeries, that Jesus had never existed. He rationalized that Christ was a figment of the imagination of the early Christians, and that Christianity was a fraud Skousen, The Naked Communist, p. Teller, Liifiler, Thiess, Henke, J. German parents sent their sons to the universities to be educated by these world-famous scholars. The young unsuspecting theology students who went to be taught about God, were met by the Rationalist professors who did not believe in God!! These men who were trying to destroy the knowledge of God and the Bible from the face of the earth cunningly planned to make atheists out of their young students Hurst, p. They then became the ministers of the German churches. They shocked their congregations by preaching the very same Rationalism they had themselves been taught. What else had they to preach, since they had never heard the Word of God? They explained to their congregations that the world was much wiser than it had been in the days when the Protestant movement began, that the modern-day scientists and philosophers had discovered new truths. Thus, the very leaders of the German church, the respected theologians, the acknowledged spiritual shepherds of the German churches rationalized away the inspiration of the Bible and the authority and the power of God over the lives of the people. Some of the German ministers were atheistic Rationalists who had deliberately become preachers in order to destroy the Church from within Hurst, p. These leading scholars of Germany taught that it was a mark of superstition to believe in a miraculous event. Wells, in , added to this theory by claiming that natural selection accounted for the varieties in the human race White, p. Darwin added his concept of the survival of the fittest to the already well-developed theory of evolution White, p. Before and After, p. Evolution soon became a fad in America and Britain. Educated classes soaked up the popular evolutionary writings of Spencer. The American public drank in this poison through novels, magazines, and newspapers. The purpose of the theory of evolution is to extend time and man so far back into the past that the account of Creation in Genesis would appear to be a myth. Scientists soon began to claim that man had lived on earth for tens of thousands to millions of years. They studied in the world-famous German Universities which were recognized throughout the world as centers of learning. In these institutions Americans and Englishmen were instructed by famous atheistic teachers of Rationalism, of materialistic evolution, and of destructive criticism of the Bible McPherson, p. The American scholars were instructed by their German masters to view the Genesis account of

Creation, the Virgin Birth, Resurrection of Christ, the redemption through His blood, as mythological, something to be viewed with intellectual contempt McPherson, p. Armed with a Ph. These returning scholars believed it to be their duty to emancipate their fellow Americans from the shackles of religion, just as their masters at Heidelberg, Bonn, Berlin, and Jena had done to their fellow Germans. This has been added to the growing American philosophy of materialism and Pragmatism and to English Naturalism, all of which are merely different forms of atheistic Rationalism. Modern Theology Shocking though it may sound, modern theology is merely combination of German Rationalism, materialistic evolution, and higher criticism of the Bible as is now being taught in our American and British universities, colleges, and seminaries. Note this daring quote from an American college textbook: They are unwilling to learn that when those men of learning proved the superstitions of the Dark Ages to be false, they erroneously assumed the Bible also to be false. They doubt the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the second coming of Jesus Christ, the purpose, the authority of the Gospel of Christ. They do not believe there is a Devil, or Satan, as your Bible plainly states. The graduates of our seminaries are teaching the same old German Rationalism they learned in college. Men have not changed. They teach the unsuspecting public the very same skepticism which they were taught in college by their atheistic and agnostic professors. Consider what a noted Bishop of California is teaching the gullible public. He recently startled many United States churchgoers when he declared that he does not believe the Biblical account of the virgin birth of Christ. Neither is the evolutionist to be ignored, for his philosophy permeates every facet of American life. An even more surprising statement was made by John B. They have never been taught the simple rule: Who Is to Blame? The result is chaos and lawlessness and wretchedness. Werner of Columbus, Ohio, recognized that something is wrong. What Your Bible Says! John also said to the obedient Spirit-filled Christian: But John also said of the modern-day preachers: Examiner, December 6, Bishop Kennedy is not the first man who has recognized this fact. Over years ago Isaiah wrote: God condemns people who have allowed themselves to be deceived by such lies. God will punish this nation until we acknowledge that God is God: Your immediate future is of your own choosing. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return. Read the following articles which will help you understand the Bible: These articles are absolutely free.

German rationalism, in its rise, progress, and decline, in relation to theologians, scholars, poets, philosophers, and the people: a contribution to the church history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The architectural notions of the time gravitated more and more to the belief that reason and natural forms are tied closely together, and that the rationality of science should serve as the basis for where structural members should be placed. Viollet-le-Duc rejected the concept of an ideal architecture and instead saw architecture as a rational construction approach defined by the materials and purpose of the structure. Architects such as Henri Labrouste and Auguste Perret incorporated the virtues of structural rationalism throughout the 19th century in their buildings. By the early 20th century, architects such as Hendrik Petrus Berlage were exploring the idea that structure itself could create space without the need for decoration. This gave rise to modernism, which further explored this concept. Architettura razionale thrived in Italy from the 1920s to the 1930s. Their declared intent was to strike a middle ground between the classicism of the Novecento Italiano movement and the industrially inspired architecture of Futurism. The hallmark of the earlier avant garde was a contrived impetus and a vain, destructive fury, mingling good and bad elements: This must be clear The new architecture, the true architecture, should be the result of a close association between logic and rationality. Orioni, and Mario Pagano and Persico featured the work of the rationalists in the magazine, and its editorials urged the Italian state to adopt rationalism as its official style. The Rationalists enjoyed some official commissions from the Fascist government of Benito Mussolini, but the state tended to favor the more classically inspired work of the National Union of Architects. Architects associated with the movement collaborated on large official projects of the Mussolini regime, including the University of Rome begun in 1930 and the Esposizione Universale Roma EUR in the southern part of Rome begun in 1934. The EUR features monumental buildings, many of which evocative of ancient Roman architecture, but absent ornament, revealing strong geometric forms. Like the earlier rationalists, the movement, known as the Tendenza, was centered in Italy. The Italian design magazine Casabella featured the work of these architects and theorists. The work of architectural historian Manfredo Tafuri influenced the movement, and the University Iuav of Venice emerged as a center of the Tendenza after Tafuri became chair of Architecture History in 1936. A Tendenza exhibition was organized for the Milan Triennale. He also writes of the importance of monuments as expressions of the collective memory of the city, and the idea of place as an expression of both physical reality and history. In Germany, Oswald Mathias Ungers became the leading practitioner of German rationalism from the mids.

Chapter 8 : GERMAN RATIONALISM Exposed! - Part I - Plain Truth Magazine

German literature: Rationalism This recovery was accompanied by a new understanding of man's ability to master nature and by a belief in his rational capacity to set his own moral course. Enlightenment optimism envisioned progress as attainable through education and science.

The Reformation and Rationalism. De Luthero rationalismi praecursore. History of Rationalism in Europe. New York, , revised pages. The Roman Catholic Church makes Scripture and tradition the supreme rule of faith, laying the chief stress on tradition, that is, the teaching of an infallible church headed by an infallible Pope, as the judge of the meaning of both. Evangelical, Protestantism makes the Scripture alone the supreme rule, but uses tradition and reason as means in ascertaining its true sense. Rationalism raises human reason above Scripture and tradition, and accepts them only as far as they come within the limits of its comprehension. It makes rationality or intelligibility the measure of credibility. We take the word Rationalism here in the technical sense of a theological system and tendency in distinction from rational theology. The legitimate use of reason in religion is allowed by the Catholic and still more by the Protestant church, and both have produced scholastic systems in full harmony with orthodoxy. Christianity is above reason, but not against reason. The Reformation is represented as the mother of Rationalism both by Rationalistic and by Roman Catholic historians and controversialists, but from an opposite point of view, by the former to the credit, by the latter to the disparagement of both. The Reformation, it is said, took the first step in the emancipation of reason: Rationalism took the second step: Thou hast redeemed us from the yoke of tradition: Who will at last bring us a Christianity such as thou would teach us now, such as Christ himself would teach! Hasak, in his book "Dr. Luther Regensburg, , takes as his motto: The violent suppression of the Reformation in France ended at last in a radical overthrow of the social order of the church. In Roman Catholic countries, like Spain and Mexico, revolution has become a chronic disease. Romanism provokes infidelity among cultivated minds by its excessive supernaturalism. An intelligent faith is the best protection against infidelity; and a liberal government is a safeguard against revolution. The connection of the Reformation with Rationalism is a historical fact, but they are related to each other as the rightful use of intellectual freedom to the excess and abuse of it. Rationalism asserts reason against revelation, and freedom against divine as well as human authority. It is a one-sided development of the negative, protesting, antipapal and antitraditional factor of the Reformation to the exclusion of its positive, evangelical faith in the revealed will and word of God. It denies the supernatural and miraculous. It has a superficial sense of sin and guilt, and is essentially Pelagian; while the Reformation took the opposite Augustinian ground and proceeded from the deepest conviction of sin and the necessity of redeeming grace. The two systems are thus theoretically and practically opposed to each other. And yet there is an intellectual and critical affinity between them, and Rationalism is inseparable from the history of Protestantism. It is in the modern era of Christianity what Gnosticism was in the ancient church—a revolt of private judgment against the popular faith and church orthodoxy, an overestimate of theoretic knowledge, but also a wholesome stimulus to inquiry and progress. It is not a church or sect unless we choose to include Socinianism and Unitarianism , but a school in the church, or rather a number of schools which differ very considerably from each other. Rationalism appeared first in the seventeenth century in the Church of England, though without much effect upon the people, as Deism, which asserted natural religion versus revealed religion; it was matured in its various phases after the middle of the eighteenth century on the Continent, especially in Protestant Germany since Lessing d. Let us first consider the relation of the Reformation to the use of reason as a general principle. The Reformation was a protest against human authority, asserted the right of private conscience and judgment, and roused a spirit of criticism and free inquiry in all departments of knowledge. It allows, therefore, a much wider scope for the exercise of reason in religion than the Roman church, which requires an unconditional submission to her infallible authority. It marks real progress, but this progress is perfectly consistent with a belief in revelation on subjects which lie beyond the boundary of time and sense. What do we know of the creation, and the world of the future, except what God has chosen to reveal to us? Human reason can prove the possibility and probability of the existence

of God and the immortality of the soul, but not the certainty and necessity. It is reasonable, therefore, to believe in the supernatural on divine testimony, and it is unreasonable to reject it. The Reformers used their reason and judgment very freely in their contest with church authority. Luther refused to recant in the crisis at Worms, unless convinced by testimonies of the Scriptures and "cogent arguments. The words seem to assign to reason an independent position by, the side of the Scriptures, but in case of conflict Luther always allowed the decision to the Scriptures. For a while he was disposed to avail himself of the humanistic movement which was skeptical and rationalistic in its tendency, but his strong religious nature always retained the mastery. He felt as keenly as any modern Rationalist, the conflict between natural reason and the transcending mysteries of revelation. He was often tormented by doubts and even temptations to blasphemy, especially when suffering from physical infirmity. A comforter of others, he needed comfort himself and asked the prayers of friends to fortify him against the assaults of the evil spirit, with whom he had, as he thought, many a personal encounter. He confessed, in , how glad he would have been five years before in his war with papal superstition, if Carlstadt could have convinced him that the Eucharist was nothing but bread and wine, and how strongly he was then inclined to that rationalistic view which would have given a death blow to transubstantiation and the mass. For having almost wholly lost Christ, I was driven about by storms and tempests of despair and blasphemy against God. But God, moved by the prayers of the saints, begins to have pity upon me, and has drawn my soul out of the lowest hell. Do not cease to pray for me, as I do for you. I believe that this agony of mine pertains to others also. In such trials and temptations he clung all the more mightily to the Scriptures and to faith which believes against reason and hopes against hope. He knew the enemy, but overcame it; his faith triumphed over doubt. In his later years he became more and more a conservative churchman. He repudiated the mystic doctrine of the inner word and spirit, insisted on submission to the written letter of the Scriptures, even when it flatly contradicted reason. He traced the errors of the Zwickau prophets, the rebellious peasants, the Anabaptists, and the radical views of Carlstadt and Zwingli, without proper discrimination, to presumptuous inroads of the human reason into the domain of faith, and feared from them the overthrow of religion. He so far forgot his obligations to Erasmus as to call him an Epicurus, a Lucian, a doubter, and an atheist. Much as he valued reason as a precious gift of God in matters of this world, he abused it with unreasonable violence, when it dared to sit in judgment over matters of faith. He here represents reason as the fountain of gross and subtle idolatry, and says: Diesem Glauben muss die Vernunft unterthan und gehorsam sein. It is noteworthy that Luther first abused reason in his book on the Slavery of the Human Will against the semi-Pelagianism of Erasmus. But his assaults on Aristotle and the scholastic theology began several years earlier, before Certainly, Luther must first be utterly divested of his faith, and the authorship of his sermons, catechisms and hymns must be called in question, before he can be appealed to as the father of Rationalism. He would have sacrificed his reason ten times rather than his faith. Zwingli was the most clear-headed and rationalizing among the Reformers. He had no mystic vein, but sound, sober, practical common sense. He always preferred the plainest sense of the Bible. He rejected the Catholic views on original sin, infant damnation and the corporeal presence in the eucharist, and held advanced opinions which shocked Luther and even Calvin. But he nevertheless reverently bowed before the divine authority of the inspired Word of God, and had no idea of setting reason over it. His dispute with Luther was simply a question of interpretation, and he had strong arguments for his exegesis, as even the best Lutheran commentators must confess. Calvin was the best theologian and exegete among the Reformers. He never abused reason, like Luther, but assigned it the office of an indispensable handmaid of revelation. He constructed with his logical genius the severest system of Protestant orthodoxy which shaped French, Dutch, English and American theology, and fortified it against Rationalism as well as against Romanism. His orthodoxy and discipline could not keep his own church in Geneva from becoming Socinian in the eighteenth century, but he is no more responsible for that than Luther for the Rationalism of Germany, or Rome for the infidelity of Voltaire. Let us now consider the application of the principle of free inquiry to the Bible. The Bible, its origin, genuineness, integrity, aim, and all its circumstances and surroundings are proper subjects of investigation; for it is a human as well as a divine book, and has a history, like other literary productions. The extent of the Bible, moreover, or the Canon, is not determined by the Bible itself or by inspiration, but by church authority or tradition, and was not fully agreed

upon till the close of the fourth century, and even then only by provincial synods, not by any of the seven oecumenical Councils. It was therefore justly open to reinvestigation. The Church of Rome, at the Council of Trent, settled the Canon, including the Apocrypha, but without any critical inquiry or definite theological principle; it simply confirmed the traditional usage, and pronounced an anathema on every one who does not receive all the books contained in the Latin Vulgate. There were, however, protesting voices in the council: Sarpi censures the council for its decision, and there are Catholic divines as Sixtus Senensis, Du Pin, Jahn, who, in spite of the decision, make a distinction between protocanonical and deuterocanonical books. She also checked the freedom of investigation by requiring conformity to a defective version and a unanimous consensus of the fathers, although such an exegetical consensus does not exist except in certain fundamental doctrines. The Reformers re-opened the question of the extent of the Canon, as they had a right to do, but without any idea of sweeping away the traditional belief or undermining the authority of the Word of God. On the contrary, from the fulness of their faith in the inspired Word, as contained in the Scriptures, they questioned the canonicity of a few books which seem to be lacking in sufficient evidence to entitle them to a place in the Bible. They simply revived, in a new shape and on doctrinal rather than historical grounds, the distinction made by the Hebrews and the ancient fathers between the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and the Eusebian distinction between the Homologumena and Antilegomena of the New Testament, and claimed in both respects the freedom of the ante-Nicene church. They added, moreover, to the external evidence, the more important internal evidence on the intrinsic excellency of the Scripture, as the true ground on which its authority and claim to obedience rests; and they established a firm criterion of canonicity, namely, the purity and force of teaching Christ and his gospel of salvation. They did not reject the testimonies of the fathers, but they placed over them what Paul calls the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power" 1 Cor. Luther was the bold pioneer of a higher criticism, which was indeed subjective and arbitrary, but, after all, a criticism of faith. He made his central doctrine of justification by faith the criterion of canonicity. Paul wishes to know nothing but Christ 1 Cor. That which does not teach Christ is not apostolic, though St. Peter and Paul should teach it; again, that which preaches Christ is apostolic, though Judas, Annas, Pilate and Herod should say it. He thus placed the material or subjective principle of Protestantism above the formal or objective principle, the truth above the witness of the truth, the doctrine of the gospel above the written Gospel, Christ above the Bible. Romanism, on the contrary, places the church above the Bible. But we must remember that Luther first learnt Christ from the Bible, and especially, from the Epistles of Paul, which furnished him the key for the understanding of the scheme of salvation. He made a distinction, moreover, between the more important and the less important books of the New Testament, according to the extent of their evangelic purity and force, and put Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation at the end of the German Bible. Carlstadt divided the books of the canon into three ordines: He states his reason in the Preface to the Hebrews as follows: The four that follow have been differently esteemed in olden times.

The dispute between rationalism and empiricism concerns the extent to which we are dependent upon sense experience in our effort to gain knowledge. Rationalists claim that there are significant ways in which our concepts and knowledge are gained independently of sense experience.

These social and pedagogic changes were bound up with new tendencies in philosophy. Sir Francis Bacon of England was one who criticized the teachers of his day, saying that they offered nothing but words and that their schools were narrow in thought. He believed that Types and expressions of rationalism Rationalism has somewhat different meanings in different fields, depending upon the kind of theory to which it is opposed. Similarly, rationalism is opposed to transactionalism, a point of view in psychology according to which human perceptual skills are achievements, accomplished through actions performed in response to an active environment. On this view, the experimental claim is made that perception is conditioned by probability judgments formed on the basis of earlier actions performed in similar situations. These presettings, which have their basis in the brain, set the pattern for all experience, fix the rules for the formation of meaningful sentences, and explain why languages are readily translatable into one another. It should be added that what rationalists have held about innate ideas is not that some ideas are full-fledged at birth but only that the grasp of certain connections and self-evident principles, when it comes, is due to inborn powers of insight rather than to learning by experience. Common to all forms of speculative rationalism is the belief that the world is a rationally ordered whole, the parts of which are linked by logical necessity and the structure of which is therefore intelligible. Thus, in metaphysics it is opposed to the view that reality is a disjointed aggregate of incoherent bits and is thus opaque to reason. In particular, it is opposed to the logical atomisms of such thinkers as David Hume (1711-1776) and the early Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951), who held that facts are so disconnected that any fact might well have been different from what it is without entailing a change in any other fact. Rationalists have differed, however, with regard to the closeness and completeness with which the facts are bound together. In the field where its claims are clearest—in epistemology, or theory of knowledge—rationalism holds that at least some human knowledge is gained through a priori prior to experience, or rational, insight as distinct from sense experience, which too often provides a confused and merely tentative approach. In the debate between empiricism and rationalism, empiricists hold the simpler and more sweeping position, the Humean claim that all knowledge of fact stems from perception. Rationalists, on the contrary, urge that some, though not all, knowledge arises through direct apprehension by the intellect. What the intellectual faculty apprehends is objects that transcend sense experience—universals and their relations. A universal is an abstraction, a characteristic that may reappear in various instances: Though these cannot be seen, heard, or felt, rationalists point out that humans can plainly think about them and about their relations. This kind of knowledge, which includes the whole of logic and mathematics as well as fragmentary insights in many other fields, is, in the rationalist view, the most important and certain knowledge that the mind can achieve. Such a priori knowledge is both necessary and sufficient. In the critical philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), epistemological rationalism finds expression in the claim that the mind imposes its own inherent categories or forms upon incipient experience see below Epistemological rationalism in modern philosophies. In ethics, rationalism holds the position that reason, rather than feeling, custom, or authority, is the ultimate court of appeal in judging good and bad, right and wrong. Among major thinkers, the most notable representative of rational ethics is Kant, who held that the way to judge an act is to check its self-consistency as apprehended by the intellect: Is theft, then, right? In religion, rationalism commonly means that all human knowledge comes through the use of natural faculties, without the aid of supernatural revelation. Reason, for the rationalist, thus stands opposed to many of the religions of the world, including Christianity, which have held that the divine has revealed itself through inspired persons or writings and which have required, at times, that its claims be accepted as infallible, even when they do not accord with natural knowledge. Religious rationalists hold, on the other hand, that if the clear insights of human reason must be set aside in favour of alleged revelation, then human thought is everywhere rendered suspect—even in the reasonings of the

theologians themselves. There cannot be two ultimately different ways of warranting truth, they assert; hence rationalism urges that reason, with its standard of consistency, must be the final court of appeal.