

1: CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA: Heresy

Ideologies of the private: private cult and the construction of heresy and sanctity ; Contesting private worship: heresy and the home ; Roman law and Christian law: ideologies of private cult ; Homes on the defensive ; Promoting private worship: constructing ideals of female sanctity ; The private in the vita macrina ; The private and female heresy.

Heresy, the English equivalent of the Greek word *hairesis*. The earliest may be called the syncretic; it is the fusion of Jewish or pagan with Christian elements. The Reformation itself was from the standpoint of the Roman Catholic Church heresy and schism. Persecution of heretics Having traced the history of opinion in the Christian churches on the subject of heresy, we must now return to resume a subject already mentioned, the persecution of heretics. That the dangers of heresy might be avoided, laymen were forbidden to argue about matters of faith by Pope Alexander IV. The reading of books was restricted and certain books were prohibited. Regarding heresy as a crime, the church was not content with inflicting its spiritual penalties, such as excommunication and such civil disabilities as its own organization allowed it to impose. It regarded itself as justified in invoking the power of the state to suppress heresy by civil pains and penalties, including even torture and death. The story of the persecution of heretics by the state must be briefly sketched. As long as the Christian Church was itself persecuted by the pagan empire, it advocated freedom of conscience, and insisted that religion could be promoted only by instruction and persuasion Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius ; but almost immediately after Christianity was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire the persecution of men for religious opinions began. While Constantine at the beginning of his reign declared complete religious liberty, and kept on the whole to this declaration, yet he confined his favours to the orthodox hierarchical church, and even by an edict of the year formally asserted the exclusion from these of heretics and schismatics. Arianism, when favoured by the reigning emperor, showed itself even more intolerant than Catholic Orthodoxy. Theodosius the Great, in , soon after his baptism, issued, with his co-emperors, the following edict: According to the institution of the Apostles, and the doctrine of the Gospel, let us believe in the one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of equal majesty in the Holy Trinity. We order that the adherents of this faith be called Catholic Christians; we brand all the senseless followers of the other religions with the infamous name of heretics, and forbid their conventicles assuming the name of churches. Many bishops approved the act, but Ambrose of Milan and Martin of Tours condemned it. Only the persecuted themselves insisted on toleration as a Christian duty. In the middle ages the church showed no hesitation about persecuting unto death all who dared to contradict her doctrine, or challenge her practice, or question her authority. The instruction and persuasion which St Bernard favoured found little imitation. Even the Dominicans, who began as a preaching order to convert heretics, soon became persecutors. In the Albigenian Crusade a. As the bishops were not zealous enough in enforcing penal laws against heretics, the Tribunal of the Inquisition was founded in by Gregory IX. At the Reformation Luther laid down the principle that the civil government is concerned with the province of the external and temporal life, and has nothing to do with faith and conscience. The Word of God alone is there to do it. In Geneva under Calvin, while the Consistoire, or ecclesiastical court, could inflict only spiritual penalties, yet the medieval idea of the duty of the state to co-operate with the church to maintain the religious purity of the community in matters of belief as well as of conduct so far survived that the civil authority was sure to punish those whom the ecclesiastical had censured. Calvin consented to the death of Servetus, whose views on the Trinity he regarded as most dangerous heresy, and whose denial of the full authority of the Scriptures he dreaded as overthrowing the foundations of all religious authority. Protestantism generally, it is to be observed, quite approved the execution of the heretic. The Synod of Dort not only condemned Arminianism, but its defenders were expelled from the Netherlands; only in did they venture to return, and not till were they allowed to erect schools and churches. In modern Protestantism there is a growing disinclination to deal even with errors of belief by ecclesiastical censure; the appeal to the civil authority to inflict any penalty is abandoned. The subject cannot be left without a brief reference to the persecution of witches. To the beginning of the 13th century the popular superstitions regarding sorcery, witchcraft and compacts with the devil were condemned by the ecclesiastical

authorities as heathenish, sinful and heretical. While the Franciscans rejected the belief in witchcraft, the Dominicans were most zealous in persecuting witches. In the 15th century this delusion, fostered by the ecclesiastical authorities, took possession of the mind of the people, and thousands, mostly old women, but also a number of girls, were tortured and burned as witches. Protestantism took over the superstition from Catholicism. It was defended by James I. As late as the 18th century death was inflicted in Germany and Switzerland on men, women and even children accused of this crime. This superstition dominated Scotland. Only a few instances of heresy in other religions can be given. The Arabic and orthodox party i. The Persian and heterodox party the Shiites insisted on heredity. But this political difference was connected with theological differences. Buddhism is a wide departure in doctrine and practice from Brahmanism, and hence after a swift unfolding and quick spread it was driven out of India and had to find a home in other lands. Essenism from the standpoint of Judaism was heterodox in two respects, the abandonment of animal sacrifices and the adoration of the sun. Although in Greece there was generally wide tolerance, yet in b. Where a minister did not preach the doctrine and the entire system of Calvinistic theology received and taught by that denomination, he had no right to the pulpit of the church, and the court granted an injunction against his officiating therein.

2: Heresy : Wikis (The Full Wiki)

private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity Conventional histories of late antique Christianity tell the story of a public insti-

And Isaiah 30 in the LXX: John Locke was born in and notes that: A Turk is not, nor can be, either heretic or schismatic to a Christian; and if any man fall off from the Christian faith to Mahometism, he does not thereby become a heretic or schismatic, but an apostate and an infidel. This nobody doubts of; and by this it appears that men of different religions cannot be heretics or schismatics to one another. We are to inquire, therefore, what men are of the same religion. Concerning which it is manifest that those who have one and the same rule of faith and worship are of the same religion; and those who have not the same rule of faith and worship are of different religions. Therefore, they may be another religion but not heretical once they have removed Christ from their profession. Thus Turks and Christians are of different religions, because these take the Holy Scriptures to be the rule of their religion, and those the Alcoran Koran. And for the same reason there may be different religions also even amongst Christians. The Papists and Lutherans, though both of them profess faith in Christ and are therefore called Christians, yet are not both of the same religion, because these acknowledge nothing but the Holy Scriptures to be the rule and foundation of their religion, those take in also traditions and the decrees of Popes and of these together make the rule of their religion; and thus the Christians of St. John as they are called and the Christians of Geneva are of different religions, because these also take only the Scriptures, and those I know not what traditions, for the rule of their religion. This being settled, it follows, first, that heresy is a separation made in ecclesiastical communion between men of the same religion for some opinions no way contained in the rule itself; and, [Those who cause division over untaught questions are, according to Locke, heretics] secondly, that amongst those who acknowledge nothing but the Holy Scriptures to be their rule of faith, heresy is a separation made in their Christian communion for opinions not contained in the express words of Scripture. Therefore, those who divide the church by adding instruments feel compelled to destroy John Locke] As Locke is repudiated by musical Restoration Movement churches, it is well to note that the movement was formed by those out of Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians who agreed that instrumental efforts to worship God were sinful. Those who forced instruments into non-instrumental churches for the sole purpose of competing financially with the Anglican-based, big city churches, forced the separation based on opinions not contained in the express words of Scripture. Those who forced instruments into otherwise united churches confessed that if instruments were part of worship then it would be sinful. They legally dodged the bullet by claiming that the instruments just aided the worship. The judge did not buy the opinion. Now this separation may be made in a twofold manner: Note here that Locke attributes division or sectarianism to those who introduce names or differences or marks of practices unlike the existing order are guilty of being the heretic. It runs counter to a direct command of Paul who defined Spiritual worship as teaching the inspired Words of Christ with the human heart as the accompanying "instrument. Therefore, sowing discord based on such an opinion would be defined by Locke as heresy] 2. When any one separates himself from the communion of a Church because that Church does not publicly profess some certain opinions One can see why Locke must be discredited if either heretical and sectarian division is forced. Majority vote does not relieve the heresy. Thomas Campbell and Alexander Campbell followed this practice because it was the common practice throughout Bible history by true Bible scholars. It is absurdity beyond contempt to do violence by branding people who refuse to add that which is not commanded as sectarians. But it would be very ill done to obtrude those things upon others unto whom they do not seem to be the indubitable doctrines of the Scripture; and to make a separation for such things as these, which neither are nor can be fundamental, is to become heretics; for I do not think there is any man arrived to that degree of madness as that he dare give out his consequences and interpretations of Scripture as divine inspirations and compare the articles of faith that he has framed according to his own fancy with the authority of Scripture. Alexander Campbell is often misunderstood for two major reasons. The first is that Campbell spent his life opposing the understanding of conversion practiced in experimental religion. Experimental religion taught that the Holy Spirit works

"immediately" upon the unconverted, producing a sequence of emotional upheavals leading to salvation, and that this happened "apart from means of grace such as prayer, meditation, reading the Scriptures, and church attendance. The Christian System explains this understanding in great detail. But once the sinner is converted, there is every possibility for the Holy Spirit to work in the hearts and minds of the believer. However, because Campbell is usually writing about the process of conversion, he is often misunderstood to deny the work of the Holy Spirit, and thus to deny any personal experience of God. Thus every statement Campbell makes should be carefully located: This only I say- that however clearly we may think this or the other doctrine to be deduced from Scripture, we ought not therefore to impose it upon others as a necessary article of faith because we believe it to be agreeable to the rule of faith, unless we would be content also that other doctrines should be imposed upon us in the same manner, and that we should be compelled to receive and profess all the different and contradictory opinions of Lutherans, Calvinists, Remonstrants, Anabaptists, and other sects which the contrivers of symbols, systems, and confessions are accustomed to deliver to their followers as genuine and necessary deductions from the Holy Scripture. While denying the clear negative message about instrumental music throughout the Bible and church history, those who impose instruments do so knowing that they will offend and divide by deducing musical instruments from the law of silence: Not using musical instruments is not imposing a thing on others unless they confess that they cannot worship without instruments and therefore would be sinning to sing without instruments. That is, according to Locke, one is a heretic if they impose something as a new distinguishing mark of the group which is not necessary to salvation. Thus much concerning heresy, which word in common use is applied only to the doctrinal part of religion. Schism Let us now consider schism, which is a crime near akin to it; for both these words seem unto me to signify an ill-grounded separation in ecclesiastical communion made about things not necessary. But since use, which is the supreme law in matter of language, has determined that heresy relates to errors in faith, and schism to those in worship or discipline, we must consider them under that distinction. Schism, then, for the same reasons that have already been alleged, is nothing else but a separation made in the communion of the Church upon account of something in divine worship or ecclesiastical discipline that is not any necessary part of it. Now, nothing in worship or discipline can be necessary to Christian communion unity but what Christ our legislator, or the Apostles by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, have commanded in express words. Singing the inspired text is imposed by an express commandment. However, musical instruments have not been imposed by a commandment in express words. Therefore, one cannot add instruments which are not necessary to salvation upon those who follow the express will of God is according to Locke, a schismatic. Congregational singers have added nothing new for two thousand years. Therefore, by continuing to obey the express will of God they cannot be honestly labeled as schismatics. In a word, he that denies not anything that the Holy Scriptures teach in express words, nor makes a separation upon occasion of anything that is not manifestly contained in the sacred text- however he may be nicknamed by any sect of Christians and declared by some or all of them to be utterly void of true Christianity- yet in deed and in truth this man cannot be either a heretic or schismatic. These things might have been explained more largely and more advantageously, but it is enough to have hinted at them thus briefly to a person of your parts. Why Locke must be deposed -- even in strict interpretation of the Constitution: To do so is to cause division in a way that God condemns. So it matters not how the effort may result, it condemns us in the sight of God. If the brethren submit and debase their conscience by doing that which they believe to be wrong, we sin against them and against Christ, says Paul. If we drive them from the church which they have to leave to avoid condemning themselves in this way, McGarvey was forced to leave his home congregation when instrument always divisive or "secting". Of course, those who imposed the instruments always in the North blamed J. McGarvey using the "Guilt Clause. Neither Thomas Campbell nor Alexander Campbell were involved in the division over instrumental music in worship and cannot therefore be used to discredit those rejecting instruments without following the Post-Modern path to just ignoring the truth. Instead of misleading people by trying to destroy John Locke or even Thomas Jefferson it would be informative for both the preacher and the audience if we all read Locke at least once. Sectarianism again is adding to faith and practice which is not commanded by the Words of the Holy Spirit speaking through the Apostles recorded in Scripture. Those who are forced out of their "home"

because of the forceful addition of unscriptural practices are not sectarian but Christians.

3: Colossian Heresy Part 1

Private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity / Kim Bowes. churches The home as heresy and sanctity Contesting private worship.

The Heresy of Middle Knowledge - by Dr. There is no new theology. There are new books published every month. A heresy among us again. It is interesting to me to see what errors the Devil will keep alive during our present age in terms of the heresies many good men have put to rest by their orthodox pens. Some heresies have been thrown by the wayside; they have come and gone. Others are still in full bloom. Those who think they have a handle on Biblical theology, but have been led astray by these errors and their own twisted thinking have resurrected some again. And it is equally interesting to me that the more harmful errors and heresies at hand surround the doctrine of God or the doctrine of Christ. In this paper, the heresy I am re-refuting surrounds Theology Proper, or the doctrine of God. It is specifically in terms of the doctrine of the knowledge of God, or His Omniscience. It is unsure as to whether Luis de Molina actually spawned the doctrine of Middle Knowledge. Others such as Fonseca and Lessius have put forth the same ideas. Whether Molina himself began it is of no consequence. What is important is that it be rejected by orthodox Christians as heresy. In the Roman Catholic church decided to allow this idea as something acceptable. However, upon close scrutiny, it is easily distinguished as something unbiblical and unorthodox. According to Molina as we will presume it was his idea since the term has been deemed thus by his own name God has three kinds of knowledge: Molina, however, said this knowledge is not something that is essential in God, which is ludicrous in and of itself. Lastly, middle knowledge states that God cannot know the future free acts of men in the same way He knows other things absolutely. Thus, this middle knowledge is dependent upon the free acts of what men will do. The real basis for this doctrine is not the Bible, but a twisted form of logic. The Molinian logician will argue that an action must first occur before it can be true. God, then, cannot know anything in this manner as true and absolute unless it has first occurred. God, then, becomes dependent upon the acts of men instead of on His own eternal decrees. And since the actions of men are contingent, the knowledge of such acts would be contingent as well. The Molinian logicians will also argue this in the manner of something being true. The free acts of men cannot be true acts until they are actually acted. Thus, God cannot know something as true until men, in time, act out their free choices. It is certainly easy to see what the doctrine of Middle knowledge is attractive here. Men are ultimately their own little saviors, and every good Roman Catholic loves the idea of working for their own salvation. In this position it seems that the Jesuits were simply attempting to preserve the heretical doctrines mustered up by the semi-Pelagians. Molinism is not compatible with these doctrines. Molinians must simply deny most of the Bible in order to hold onto these ideas while at the same time exalt other portions of the Scriptures which they think holds their view together. They must simply deny texts such as Isaiah Indeed I have spoken it; I will also bring it to pass. I have purposed it; I will also do it. In light of the Biblical data, and logical reasoning itself, this doctrine comes to naught. The only reason why anyone would continue to hold this doctrine is due to unbelief "they reject the God of the Bible. The latter we deny" therefore the question is whether besides the natural knowledge which is only things possible and the knowledge of vision which is only of things future, there may be granted in God a certain third or middle knowledge concerning conditional future things by which God knows what men or angels will freely do without a special decree preceding if placed with these or those circumstance in such an order of things. The Jesuits, Socinians, and Remonstrants affirm this; the orthodox deny this. The reasons for this are many: First, both natural and free knowledge embrace the knowing of all things for God. There is nothing left to know after these. There is nothing in the nature of any thing whatsoever which is not possible or future. He knows all things possible or future before the foundations of the world. Middle knowledge, then, is a non-entity. Second, no future conditional thing can be knowable before the divine decree. Thus, things not true cannot be foreknown as true. Thus, any knowledge about any thing in the created order would necessitate that all knowledge God has about the universe would be contingent upon the free acts of men in that universe "which is nonsense. It based on His asiety, or His necessary being. It would be just as well to bow down to a

graven image or an idol made from your own hands. He would have no power to act independently of men, nor would he have the power to enact any change whatsoever, not even the act of creation. There is no position in between the two poles of logic " God is the cause of all things, both primary and secondary means, this Calvinism affirms or, He is dependent upon other free acts Roman Catholicism and Arminianism affirms. God is either cause, or He is effect. Second causes can concur with God to cause the existence of a certain thing because they exist and are active at the same time with God. But no second cause can concur with him to cause the futuration of things because futuration was made from eternity, while all second causes are only in time. Hence it is evident that the futuration of things depends upon nothing but the decree of God, and therefore can be foreknown only from the decree. How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out! For who has known the mind of the LORD? Or who has become His counselor? God, from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely, and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass: Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions,[4] yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels[6] are predestinated unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death.

4: Heresy | World Encyclopedia of Law

Contesting private worship: heresy and the home. Roman law and Christian law: ideologies of private cult. private cult and the construction of heresy and.

What as is at issue is the sufficiency of Christ as proclaimed through the Gospel. In this article we shall examine the issue from the Book of Colossians and the first century religious world in Asian minor, and thereby identify the nature of the Colossian heresy. This will give us the tools we need to apply the Scriptures to current issues. What is clear is that Paul is emphasizing the sufficiency of Christ. The *stoicheia* of Colossians 2: We will examine these later. These words are not often used in the New Testament and we shall have to look at evidence for the meaning of these words to understand the issues. Thankfully, recent research has shed much light on the meaning of these terms and the situation in Colossae. Determining the meaning of this term is essential since it is used twice in Colossians 2 verse 8 and verse 18. The problem is that the term *stoicheia* has a broad range of meanings. He wrote an entire chapter on the subject of the *stoicheia*. He concludes that the *stoicheia* are evil, hostile powers. Much of the popular folk religion of the day was focused on this. Previous interpretations of the Colossian heresy centered about Jewish Mysticism or Gnosticism. Neither Gnosticism nor Judaism can explain all of the terminology in Colossians 2. Some of it is Jewish and other parts of it distinctly pagan. What Arnold shows is that Jews and Pagans believed in popular folk religion that crossed over the traditional boundaries of major religions. Astrology provides a good illustration of how something like this is practiced in our day. Persons with varying religious backgrounds consult horoscopes, and take them seriously. What Arnold showed through his research was that, for example, Jewish angelic names can be found on pagan amulets, being invoked to help the pagan avert the influence of the *stoicheia*. His evidence has convinced me. What ties this folk religion together is the felt need to be freed from influence of the hostile forces. The *stoicheia* are evil, personal, spirit beings and they can be the source of a teaching. The source of the false teaching is twofold: As long as the teachings keep the Colossian Christians from their confidence in the sufficiency of Christ and the efficacy of His finished work on the cross, they play into the hands of the evil forces they are hoping to defeat. The *stoicheia* elemental principles no longer are a threat to those who are crucified with Christ. F F Bruce describes it like this: Arnold nicely summarizes the issues raised in Colossians 2: For Paul the *stoicheia* were an integral part of the present evil age. They function as masters and overlords of unredeemed humanity working through various means “including the Jewish law and pagan religions” to hold their subjects in bondage. The forces of darkness are all too willing to have themselves be the object of such battles “they may even inspire the means and techniques. They evidently like all the attention in as much as it keeps our attention off of Christ and what He has done, once for all. The word is *embateuein* and it is found in Colossians 2: Arnold devotes an entire chapter to analyzing how this word was used in local mystery cults near Colossae. The term denoted the second stage of a mystery initiation where the properly prepared devotee entered to see mysteries. What Arnold does is pull together numerous examples to reinforce this and provide a clearer picture of the claims of the elite visionaries against whom Paul warns. The person who went through the initiation usually had a visionary experience. The initiation thus served as the basis of the knowledge and authority for the opponents to judge the Colossians “those in the faction had been initiated, seen the visions, and learned from them. This mystery rite may have signified the beginning of a new and victorious life experience for the initiate in relationship to the hostile powers “the chains of fate had been broken and a new power for warding off hostile spirits had been received. However, since it had meant so much to them, and it was widely believed that those few elite who experienced this had received immunity from the dire fate that had previously been in the hands of the *stoicheia*, it is likely that they held onto their elite status after embracing Christianity. Such individuals had gone through rigorous initiation rites, including things very much like the list of rules in Colossians 2. The term *embateuein* in Colossians 2: There were even Jewish sources of this, where local Judaism had been mixed with ideas garnered from the surrounding pagans. The spiritual elitists who had these visionary experiences were portraying themselves as the ones who could lead the Colossians into freedom. Paul claimed that they were

actually trying to carry the Christians of Colossae off as plunder! Three Warnings about Spiritual Elitism With this background information, we can now better understand the three warnings in Colossians 2 about opponents to the sufficiency of Christ. The first we have already mentioned: Ironically, they play on the idea that the Colossian Christians needed to fear the stoicheia and needed their help to escape. Lets make this very clear. The hostile powers no longer held the Colossian Christians in captivity. Because when they put their trust in Christ, Christians had been transferred out of the authority of darkness Colossians 1: However, there is still a battle. Now that the stoicheia have lost their previous captives to Christ, they have a new plan. The hostile powers inspire a false teaching that is believed by false teachers. These elitist teachers tell the Colossians that they are not really free from the stoicheia. These teachers tempt Christians to integrate pagan practices and traditions to their faith in order to find freedom from the hostile powers. The spiritual elitists play into the hands of the very stoicheia they claim to have the key to defeating. The vain deceit is their claim to special status. Their biggest lie is the claim that what Christ has already done is insufficient. The second warning is found in Colossians 2: These were their previous state of death in sin verse 13 and their subjection to the powers of darkness verse Christ had canceled out their debt before God verse 14 and defeated the principalities and powers verse In spite of all that, the spiritual elitists in Colossae insisted that the faith of the Colossian Christians was defective and lacking. So they wanted to set themselves up as judges. Paul warns that we do not let them do it! The would-be judges wanted to tell the Colossian Christians how to eat, what religious festivals to keep, and evidently demanded Sabbath keeping. Here we see both pagan and Jewish elements. As we saw earlier, the pagan mystery rites had to be kept on the new moon. The food issue could be Jewish or pagan. Jews did not have rules about beverages, so that was likely a pagan stipulation. Interestingly, In spite of this clear injunction to not allow anyone to be sit as judge in regard to Sabbath, there are many groups today who do just that! They try to use semantic sophistry to convince us that this passage is not talking about Sabbath. Do not listen to them. In Galatians Paul gives a similar teaching, and mentions the stoicheia in doing so: However at that time, when you did not know God, you were slaves to those which by nature are no gods. But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how is it that you turn back again to the weak and worthless elemental things, to which you desire to be enslaved all over again? You observe days and months and seasons and years. I fear for you, that perhaps I have labored over you in vain Galatians 4: To return to religious practices of their previous lives, whether they be pagan or Jewish, is tantamount to returning to the domination of the stoicheia. Any denial of the sufficiency of Christ or adding to the finished work of Christ is seen by Paul as a return to enslavement. The spiritual elitists delight in judging others. They claim to know how to find freedom and suggest to regenerate Christians that they are not really free. The third warning is found in Colossians 2: The would-be elitists in Colossae claimed special spiritual experiences which gave them supposed freedom from the stoicheia. They were promoting their experiences and the means to receive them to the Colossian Christians. There were Jewish sects who claimed to have the secret to experiencing angelic worship, like that of the angels. Some of them include Jewish and pagan names in the same text. Here is part of Arnolds summary: The texts also are a good illustration of the religious syncretism of the time. Arnold presents a very compelling argument for his view. The would-be spiritual elitists denied that being in Christ was all that was necessary. They claimed that the stoicheia still had power over the ordinary Christians in Colossae and that their knowledge and experiences held the key to freedom. This may seem odd, unless you consider millions of Roman Catholics whose church has not allowed them to know that they can be truly complete in Christ by faith , who routinely call upon intermediaries such as Mary and various saints, to give help that they fear has not been provided by Christ. It is not hard to imagine that Christians who lived in the syncretistic culture of first century Asia Minor could believe in angelic intermediaries when Jews and pagans alike had similar teachings. The elitist judges take people away from that which only and truly can keep them, the finished work of Christ. The head and body analogy shows that Christian growth is not based on the work of intermediaries, be they human or angelic. The entire body receives everything needed directly from Christ. The whole view of life as being a huge gulf between them and God, filled with stoicheia, angels, fate, principalities and powers, was pressed upon the Colossians all their lives. Evidently the errorists had lowered Christ to a level of one of the intermediaries, who could

possibly help them, but not directly or completely.

5: John Locke Heresy and Sectarianism Among Christians

Ja An empire of friends and family: public and private in Roman religions -- Public and private in Roman paganism -- Public and private as legal categories -- The public priesthoods: family and patronage -- Consecratio dedicatio: marking public and private religious space -- Household cults and their public roles -- Public and private in the.

They wrote masterful treatises writings characterized by sound biblical arguments, biblical rationalism and logic by which many great polemical and apologetic arguments are still helpful today. For all intents and purposes, I do pray for those who may be entrenched in some type of false doctrine, and for those who may have become deceived into believing some sort of heresy. My prayer is that they may see the biblical light which shines in the darkness, and to repent of their heresy and come to an understanding of the biblical record which promotes its truth, and true Christian piety. The Bible exposes that which is false, and nurtures those in the truth. May we be on guard against such things. Thus, it may be described: To make an erroneous opinion amount to heresy, two things must occur: This type of error is heresy two fold: Of the Danger of Heresies: Paul reckons them among those works of the flesh which shut persons out of the Kingdom of God Galatians 5: Peter calls them pernicious and damnable, and such as bring swift destruction; and, speaking of the authors of them, he says that their damnation slumbers not 2 Peter 2: Every heretical opinion buys a soul or stabs a soul. Its stabs the soul of him who maintains it, and still trades it on to murder more souls. Heresy turns the glory of God into a lie. O sirs, what is God without truth? And what is all the goodness of the Gospel without truth? Truth is, as it were, the pin, the clasp, the knot that ties all. And a church is never more close to dying when it gives up the truth. Heresy is like the circles in a pond; one begets another, the smaller to the greater. So one heresy begets another, a lesser to a greater. That God never loved one man more than another before the world, and that all the decrees are conditional. That there is no original sin. That the will of man is still free. That the saints may fall totally and finally from grace. That Christ died alike for all, yea, that his salvific virtue of His death extends to all the reprobates as well as the elect, yea, to the very devils as well as unto men. That Jesus Christ came into the world not for satisfaction, but for publication; not to procure for us and to us the love of God, but only to be a glorious Publisher of the Gospel. That God is not displeased at all if His children sin. That the doctrine of repentance is a soul destroying doctrine. That the souls of men are not immortal but mortal. Let everyone take heed lest he be carried away with any part of this flood of heresy. Be on guard that you are not light or proud Christians. Be on guard that you are not loose Christians. If ungodliness is in the heart, it will not be hard for error to get into the head. Take heed that you are not weak Christians. Take heed that you are not , worldly, nor hypocritical, nor unstable. Let everyone strengthen his soul that he may stand and withstand, and not be carried away. Take all in word: Obadiah Sedgwick is biblically correct. The information above ought to be wisely heeded. Heresy is cancer of the mind. It destroys churches, souls, pastors, deacons, men, women, and the children who grow up to be them. It has infected contemporary Christendom more than most are aware of, simply because they are not reading their Bibles. May the God of understanding bring those who are in error to the truth of His Word, for the glory of His Son.

6: Table of Contents: Private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity /

Get this from a library! Private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity. [Kimberly Diane Bowes] -- "Conventional histories of late antique Christianity tell the story of a public institution - the Christian church.

It is in this last sense that the term is used in the New Testament, usually with an implicit censure of the factious spirit to which such divisions are due. It has been generally assumed that the ecclesiastical authority was always competent to determine what are the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, and to detect any departures from them; but it is necessary to admit the possibility that the error was in the church, and the truth was with the heresy. There cannot be any heresy where there is no orthodoxy, and, therefore, in the definition it is assumed that the church has declared what is the truth or the error in any matter. Accordingly" heresy is to be distinguished from defective stages of Christian knowledge. For example, the Jewish believers, including the Apostles themselves, at the outset required the Gentile believers to be circumcised. They were not on this account chargeable with heresy. Additional light must first come in, and be rejected, before that earlier opinion could be thus stigmatized. Moreover, heresies are not to be confounded with tentative and faulty hypotheses broached in a period prior to the scrutiny of a topic of Christian doctrine, and before that scrutiny has led the general mind to an assured conclusion. Such hypotheses - for example, the idea that in the person of Christ the Logos is substituted for a rational human spirit - are to be met with in certain early fathers " *ibid.* Origen indulged in many speculations which were afterwards condemned, but, as these matters were still open questions in his day, he was not reckoned a heretic. In accordance with the New Testament use of the term heresy, it is assumed that moral defect accompanies the intellectual error, that the false view is held pertinaciously, in spite of warning, remonstrance and rebuke; aggressively to win over others, and so factiously, to cause division in the church, a breach in its unity. A distinction is made between" heresy "and" schism " from Gr. But as the claims of the church to be the guardian through its episcopate of the apostolic tradition, of the Christian faith itself, were magnified, and unity in practice as well as in doctrine came to be regarded as essential, this distinction became a theoretical rather than a practical one. While severely condemning, both Irenaeus and Tertullian distinguished schismatics from heretics. If it was desired to get rid of these, an effort was made to impute to them some deviation from the rule of faith; and under this pretext the church freed herself from the Montanists and the Monarchians. But in both East and West, this theory of his became established only by very imperceptible degrees, and indeed, strictly speaking, the process was never completed. The distinction between heretics and schismatics was preserved because it prevented a public denial of the old principles, because it was advisable on political grounds to treat certain schismatic communities with indulgence , and because it was always possible in case of need to prove heresy against the schismatics. There was considerable controversy in the early church as to the validity of heretical baptism. As even" the Christian virtues of the heretics were described as hypocrisy Heretical. Tertullian declares that the church can have no communion with the heretics, for there is nothing common; as they have not the same God, and the same Christ, so they have not the same baptism De bapt. Cyprian agreed with him. The validity of heretical baptism was denied by the church of Asia Minor as well as of Africa ; but the practice of the Roman Church was to admit without second baptism heretics who had been baptized with the name of Christ, or of the Holy Trinity. Stephen of Rome attempted to force the Roman practice on the whole church in Whenever the name of the three-one God is used, the sacrament is declared valid by whomsoever it may be performed. This was a triumph of sacramentarianism, not of charity. Three types of heresy have appeared in the history of the Christian Church. Ebionitism asserted" the continual obliga- heresy. Gnosticism was the result of the attempt to blend with Christianity the religious notions of pagan mythology , mysterology, theosophy and philosophy " p. The Judaizing and the paganizing tendency were combined in Gnostic Ebionitism which was prepared for in Jewish Essenism. In the later heresy of Manichaeism there were affinities to Gnosticism, but it was a mixture of many elements, Babylonian-Chaldaic theosophy, Persian dualism and even Buddhist ethics p. The next type of heresy may be called evolutionary or formatory. When the Christian faith is being formulated, undue emphasis may be put on one aspect, and thus so partial a

statement of truth may result in error. Thus when in the ante-Nicene age the doctrine of the Trinity was under discussion, dynamic Monarchianism "regarded Christ as a mere man, who, like the prophets, though in a much higher measure, had been endued with divine wisdom and power"; modal Monarchianism saw in the Logos dwelling in Christ "only a mode of the activity of the Father"; Patripassianism identified the Logos with the Father; and Sabellianism regarded Father, Son and Spirit as "the roles which the God who manifests Himself in the world assumes in succession" Kurtz, Church History, i. When Arius asserted the subordination of the Son to the Father, and denied the eternal generation, Athanasius and his party asserted the Homoousia, the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. This assertion of the divinity of Christ triumphed, but other problems at once emerged. How was the relation of the humanity to the divinity in Christ to be conceived? Apollinaris denied the completeness of the human nature, and substituted the divine Logos for the reasonable soul of man. Nestorius held the two natures so far apart as to appear to sacrifice the unity of the person of Christ. Eutyches on the contrary "taught not only that after His incarnation Christ had only one nature, but also that the body of Christ as the body of God is not of like substance with our own" Kurtz, Church History, i. The Church in the Creed of Chalcedon in A. After this decision the controversies about the Person of Christ degenerated into mere hair-splitting; and the interference of the imperial authority from time to time in the dispute was not conducive to the settlement of the questions in the interests of truth alone. This problem interested the East for the most part; in the West there was waged a theological warfare around the nature of man and the work of Christ. While Pelagius was condemned, it was only a modified Augustinianism which became the doctrine of the church. It is not necessary in illustration of the second type of heresy - that which arises when the contents of the Christian faith are being defined - to refer to the doctrinal controversies of the middle ages. It may be added that after the Reformation Arianism was revived in Socinianism, and Pelagianism in Arminianism; but the conception of heresy in Protestantism demands subsequent notice. The third type of heresy is the revolutionary or reformatory. This is not directed against doctrine as such, but against the church, its theory and its practice. Such movements of antagonism to the errors or abuses of ecclesiastical authority may be so permeated by defective conceptions and injurious influences as by their own character to deserve condemnation. But on the other hand the church in maintaining its place and power may condemn as heretical genuine efforts at reform by a return, though partial, to the standard set by the Holy Scriptures or the Apostolic Church. On the one hand there were during the middle ages sects, like the Catharists and Albigenses, whose "opposition as a rule developed itself from dualistic or pantheistic premises surviving effects of old Gnostic or Manichaeic views" and who "stood outside of ordinary Christendom, and while no doubt affecting many individual members within it, had no influence on church doctrine. The Reformation itself was from the standpoint of the Roman Catholic Church heresy and schism. Orthodoxy is con- Modern formity to the recognized creed or standard of public doctrine; heresy is a wilful departure from it. The Greek Church rejects as heretical, because contrary to the teaching of the first seven ecumenical councils, the Roman dogmas of the papacy, of the double procession of the Holy Ghost, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and the infallibility of the Pope. The Roman Church anathematized, in the council of Trent, all the distinctive doctrines of the Protestant Reformation. Among Protestant churches again there are minor doctrinal differences, which are held with various degrees of exclusiveness or liberality according to the degree of departure from the Roman Catholic Church. He expressed surprise that a man of such views as Zwingli should wish brotherly relations with the Wittenberg reformers" Walker, The Reformation, p. On the problem of divine election Lutheranism and Calvinism remained divided. Within Calvinism itself Pelagianism was revived in Arminianism, which denied the irresistibility, and affirmed the universality of grace. This heresy was condemned by the synod of Dort. The standpoint of the Reformed churches was the substitution of the authority of the Scriptures for the authority of the church. Whatever was conceived as contrary to the teaching of the Bible was regarded as heresy. The position is well expressed in the Scotch Confession. The enlargement of the horizon of knowledge by the advance of science, the recognition of the only relative validity of human opinions and beliefs as determined by and adapted to each stage of human development, which is due to the growing historical sense, the alteration of view regarding the nature of inspiration, and the purpose of the Holy Scriptures, the revolt against all ecclesiastical authority, and

the acceptance of reason and conscience as alone authoritative, the growth of the spirit of Christian charity, the clamorous demand of the social problem for immediate attention, all combine in making the Christian churches less anxious about the danger, and less zealous in the discovery and condemnation of heresy. Having traced the history of opinion in the Christian churches on the subject of heresy, we must now return to resume a subject already mentioned, the persecution of heretics. According to the Canon Law, which "was the ecclesiastical law of medieval Europe, and is still the law of heretics. The canonists define the degrees of suspicion as "light" calling for vigilance, "vehement" demanding denunciation, and "violent" requiring punishment. Lindsay in article "Heresy," Ency. That the dangers of heresy might be avoided, laymen were forbidden to argue about matters of faith by Pope Alexander IV. The reading of books was restricted and certain books were prohibited. Regarding heresy as a crime, the church was not content with inflicting its spiritual penalties. It regarded itself as justified in invoking the power of the state to suppress heresy by civil pains and penalties, including even torture and death. The story of the persecution of heretics by the state must be briefly sketched. As long as the Christian Church was itself persecuted by the pagan empire, it advocated freedom of conscience, and insisted that religion could be promoted only by instruction and persuasion Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius; but almost immediately after Christianity was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire the persecution of men for religious opinions began. While Constantine at the beginning of his reign declared complete religious liberty, and kept on the whole to this declaration, yet he confined his favours to the orthodox hierarchical church, and even by an edict of the year formally asserted the exclusion from these of heretics and schismatics. Arianism, when favoured by the reigning emperor, showed itself even more intolerant than Catholic Orthodoxy. Theodosius the Great, in, soon after his baptism, issued, with his coemperors, the following edict: According to the institution of the Apostles, and the doctrine of the Gospel, let us believe in the one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of equal majesty in the Holy Trinity. We order that the adherents of this faith be called Catholic Christians; we brand all the senseless followers of the other religions with the infamous name of heretics, and forbid their conventicles assuming the name of churches. The fifteen penal laws which this emperor issued in as many years deprived them of all right to the exercise of their religion, "excluded them from all civil offices, and threatened them with fines, confiscation, banishment and even in some cases with death. Many bishops approved the act, but Ambrose of Milan and Martin of Tours condemned it. While Chrysostom disapproved of the execution of heretics, he approved "the prohibition of their assemblies and the confiscation of their churches. Augustine found a justification for these penal measures in the "compel them to come in" of Luke xiv. Only the persecuted themselves insisted on toleration as a Christian duty. In the middle ages the church showed no hesitation about persecuting unto death all who dared to contradict her doctrine, or challenge her practice, or question her authority. The instruction and persuasion which St Bernard favoured found little imitation. Even the Dominicans, who began as a preaching order to convert heretics, soon became persecutors. In the Albigensian Crusade A. As the bishops were not zealous enough in enforcing penal laws against heretics, the Tribunal of the Inquisition was founded in by Gregory IX. At the Reformation Luther laid down the principle that the civil government is concerned with the province of the external and temporal life, and has nothing to do with faith and conscience. How could the emperor gain the right,"he asks," to rule my faith? The Word of God alone is there to do it. In Geneva under Calvin, while the Consistoire, or ecclesiastical court, could inflict only spiritual penalties, yet the medieval idea of the duty of the state to co-operate with the church to maintain the religious purity of the community in matters of belief as well as of conduct so far survived that the civil authority was sure to punish those whom the ecclesiastical had censured. Calvin consented to the death of Servetus, whose views on the Trinity he regarded as most dangerous heresy, and whose denial of the full authority of the Scriptures he dreaded as overthrowing the foundations of all religious authority. Protestantism generally, it is to be observed, quite approved the execution of the heretic. The Synod of Dort not only condemned Arminianism, but its defenders were expelled from the Netherlands; only in did they venture to return, and not till were they allowed to erect schools and churches. In modern Protestantism there is a growing disinclination to deal even with errors of belief by ecclesiastical censure; the appeal to the civil authority to inflict any penalty is abandoned. The subject cannot be left without a brief reference to the persecution of

witches. To the beginning of the 13th century the popular superstitions regarding sorcery , witchcraft and compacts with the devil were condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities as heathenish, sinful and heretical. But after the establishment of the Inquisition" heresy and sorcery were regarded as correlates, like two agencies resting on and serviceable to the demoniacal powers, and were therefore treated in the same way as offences to be punished with torture and the stake " Kurtz, Church History, ii.

7: Heresy - Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature - Bible Encyclopedia

[While attempts are made to justify the heresy after the fact, the use of mechanical devices to worship God or "aid" others to worship God run totally contrary to Old Testament evidence, the evidence from paganism and years of church history.

Origin and early Use of the Word. In the historical part of the New Testament, the word denotes a sect or party, whether good or bad Acts 5: Paul, in defending himself before king Agrippa, uses the same term, when it was manifestly his design to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their system the preference over every other system of Judaism, both with regard to soundness of doctrine and purity of morals. In the Epistles the word occurs in a somewhat different sense. Paul, in Galatians 5: In 1 Corinthians Both heresy and schism, in the modern sense of the words, are sins that the Scripture knows nothing of" Works, N. In the early post-apostolic Church, if "a man admitted a part, or even the whole of Christianity, and added to it something of his own, or if he rejected the whole of it, he was equally designated as a heretic. Thus, by degrees, it came to be restricted to those who professed Christianity, but professed it erroneously; and in later times, the doctrine of the Trinity, as defined by the Council of Nice, was almost the only test which decided the orthodoxy or the heresy of a Christian. Differences upon minor points were then described by the milder term of schism; and the distinction seems to have been made, that unity of faith might be maintained, though schism existed; but if the unity of faith was violated, the violator of it was a heretic. At a very early period the notion of willful and immoral perversity began to be attached to heresy, and thus we may account for the severe and violent language used against heretics. The truth appears to be this, that some flagrant immoralities were notoriously perpetrated by some of the wildest among their sects, and that these have given coloring to the charges which have been thrown upon them too indiscriminately. But, whatsoever uncertainty may rest on this inquiry, it cannot be disputed, first, that the apostolical fathers, following the footsteps of the apostles themselves, regarded with great jealousy the birth and growth of erroneous opinions; and next, that they did not authorize, either by instruction or example, any severity on the persons of those in error. They opposed it by their reasoning and their eloquence, and they avoided its contagion by removing from their communion those who persisted in it; but they were also mindful that within these limits was confined the power which the Church received from the apostles who founded it over the spiritual disobedience of its members" Waddington, History of the Church, ch. Relations of Heresy to the Church and to Doctrine. There are religious errors, indeed, to any extent out of Christianity, but no heresies in the theological sense. These errors become heresies only when they come into contact, at least outwardly, with revealed truth and with the life of the Church. They consist essentially in the conscious or unconscious reaction of unsubdued Judaism or heathenism against the new creation of the Gospel. Heresy is the distortion or caricature of the original Christian truth. But as God in his wonderful wisdom can bring good out of all evil, and has more than compensated for the loss of the first Adam by the resurrection of the second, so must all heresies in the end only condemn themselves, and serve the more fully to establish the truth. The New Testament Scriptures themselves are in a great measure the result of a firm resistance to the distortions and corruptions to which the Christian religion was exposed from the first. Nay, we may say that every dogma of the Church, every doctrine fixed by her symbols, is a victory over a corresponding error, and in a certain sense owes to the error, not, indeed, its substance, which comes from God, but assuredly its logical completeness and scientific form. Heresies, therefore, belong to the process by which the Christian truth, received in simple faith, becomes clearly defined as an object of knowledge. By the standard of the Roman Church, the Greek Church is only schismatic, the Protestant both heretical and schismatic. Of course, in different branches of the Church there are different views of heresy and truth, heterodoxy and orthodoxy, and likewise of schism and sect" Schaff. Neither schism nor heresy, then, is properly an offence against the Church universal, but against some particular Church, and by its own members. On the same principle, no Church can be properly called either heretic or schismatic; for churches being independent establishments, may indeed consult each other, but if they cannot agree, the guilt of that Church which is in error is neither schism nor heresy, but corrupt faith or

bigoted narrowness. Nevertheless, if a Church has been formed by the secession of members from another Church on disagreement of principles, each seceder is both a schismatic and a heretic because of his former connection; but the crime does not attach to the Church so formed, and accordingly is not entailed on succeeding members who naturally spring up in it. If the schism was founded in error, the guilt of error would always attach to it and its members, but not that of schism or heresy. He who is convinced that his Church is essentially in error is bound to secede; but, like the circumstances which may be supposed to justify the subject of any realm in renouncing his country and withdrawing his allegiance, the plea should be long, and seriously, and conscientiously weighed; but with respect to distinct churches, as they can form alliances, so they can secede from this alliance without being guilty of any crime. So far from the separation between the Romish and Protestant churches having anything of the character of schism or heresy in it, the Church of England supposing the Church of Rome not to have needed any reform would have been justified in renouncing its association with it simply on the ground of expediency" Hinds, Early Christian Church. List of the principal Early Heresies. Nazarenes, who advocated the observance of the Jewish law by the worshippers of Christ. Simonians, followers of Simon Magus, who prided themselves in a superior degree of knowledge, and maintained that the world was created by angels, denied the resurrection, etc. Nicolaitanes, followers of Nicolaus of Antioch. Cerinthians and Ebionites, followers of Cerinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of Christ, and adopted the principles of Gnosticism. Many of them were Millenarians. Elcesaites, the followers of Elxai or Elcesai, who only partially admitted the Christian religion, and whose tenets were mostly of philosophic origin. Tatianists and Encratitae, who boasted of an extraordinary continence, condemned marriage, etc. Apotactici, who, in addition to the opinions of the Tatianists, renounced property, etc. Gnostics of Asia Minor. The followers of Lucian and Apelles may be classed among the Marcionites. Among Egyptian Gnostics were the Basilidians, followers of Basilides, who espoused the heresies of Simon Magus, and admitted the fundamental point on which the whole of the hypotheses then prevalent may be said to hinge, namely, that the world had been created, not by the immediate operation of the divine being, but by the agency of sons. Inferior sects of Gnostics-Sethians, Cainites, Ophites. Heresies not of Oriental origin: The Pelagians Nestorians, Eutychians, Theopaschites. The Aphthartodocetse, Severiani, C: Those of the State, made by the Christian emperors from the time of Constantine, are comprised under one title, De Haereticis, in the Theodosian code. The principal are the note of infamy affixed to all heretics in common; commerce forbidden to be held with them; privation of all offices of dignity and profit; disqualification to dispose of their property by will, or to receive property; pecuniary mulcts; proscription and banishment; corporal punishment, such as scourging. Heretics were forbidden to hold public disputations; to propagate their opinions; their children could not inherit patrimony, unless they returned to the Church, etc. The laws of the Church consisted in pronouncing formal anathema, or excommunication, against them; forbidding them to enter the church, so much as to hear sermons or the reading of the Scriptures this was but partially observed; the prohibition of all persons, under pain of excommunication, to join with them in any religious exercises; the enjoining that none should eat or converse familiarly with them, or contract affinity with them; their names were to be struck out of the diptychs; and their testimony was not to be received in any ecclesiastical cause Bingham, Orig. Dei, 18, 51, he says; "Qui ergo in ecclesia morbidum aliquid pravumque sapiunt, si correpti, ut sanum rectumque sapiant, resistunt contumaciter, suaque pestifera et mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defensa repersistunt, heretici funt, et foras exeuntes habentur in exercentibus inimicis. Augustine, on the contrary Retractat. It is, consequently, not strange if even this protest against the execution of heretics came subsequently to be disregarded, and the punishment even approved see Leo M. In the Middle Ages we find the Roman Church, on the: Julian the Apostate had long before reproached the Christians of his time for persecuting heretics by force ep. As to the principles which guided the conduct of the secular powers towards heretics, we find that it wavered long between an entire liberty in establishing sects, submitting them to mere police regulations, restricting them in the carrying out of their system of worship, depriving them of some political rights and privileges, formally prohibiting them; and finally punishing them as criminals. Through all these variations the fundamental principle was adhered to that the secular power possesses in general the right to punish, repress, or extirpate heresy. Hesitation is shown only in the mode of applying this principle, not in

the principle itself. Moreover, the exercise of this right was in no way subject to the decision of the Church, and the secular power could by itself decide whether and how far a certain heresy should be tolerated—a right which the states retained without opposition until the Middle Ages. The numerous laws contained in the Codex Theodosianus, 16, tit. History shows us that in the use of compulsion and punishments against heretics the secular power anticipated the wishes of the Church, doing more than the latter was at first disposed to approve. Julian the Apostate granted full freedom to heretics with a view to injure the Church. Augustine first succeeded, in the 5th century, in establishing an agreement between Church and State on this question, yet without contesting the right of the State to use its independent authority. In the Middle Ages the notion of heresy and of its relations to the Church and the State acquired a further development. At one time, in view of the authority of the pope in matters of faith and of the doctrine *offides implicita et explicita*, the notion of heresy was so modified that the act of disobedience to the pope in refusing to accept or reject some distinction according to his command; was considered almost as its worst and most important feature. The Scholastics treated the doctrine concerning heresy—scientifically. Finally the Church came to deny to the State the right to tolerate any heresy it had condemned. It even compelled the secular powers to repress and extirpate heresy according to its dictates by threats of ecclesiastical censure, by inviting invasion and revolution in case of resistance, and by commanding the application of secular punishments, such as the sequestration of property, and the deprivation of all civil and political rights, as was especially done by Innocent III. Nevertheless, the Church continued in the practice, whenever it handed over condemned heretics to the secular powers for punishment, of requesting that no penalty should be inflicted on them which might endanger their lives; but this was a mere formality, and so far from being made in earnest that the Church itself made the allowableness of such punishment one of its dogmas. Thus Leo X, in his bull against Luther, in , condemns, among other propositions, that which says that *Haereticos comburere est contra voluntatem Spiritus art.* About the same time, a special form of proceedings was adopted against heretics, and their persecution was rendered regular and systematic by the establishment of the Inquisition q. Thus, in course of time, a number of secular penalties came to be considered as inevitably connected with ecclesiastical condemnation, and were even pronounced against heretics by the Church itself without further formalities. The Church, whenever any individual suspected of heresy recanted, or made his peace with the Church, declared him in full court, after a public abjuration released either partially or fully from the ecclesiastical and secular punishment he had *ipso facto* incurred. This implied the right of still inflicting these punishments after the reconciliation which was especially done in the cases of sequestration of property, deprivation of civil or ecclesiastical offices, and degradation, while a return to heresy after recantation was to be punished by death. See the provisions of the Canon Law as found in X. All these are yet considered by the Roman Catholic Church as having the force of law, though, under present circumstances, they are not enforced comp. Benedict XIV, *De synod.* Even in the 18th century Muratori defended the assertion that the secular power is bound to enforce the most severe secular penalties against heretics *De ingeniorum meoderatione in religiones negotio*, 2, 7 sq. In the beginning of the 19th century, pending the negotiations for the crowning of Napoleon I, pope Pius VII declared that he could not set foot in a country in which the law recognized the freedom of worship of the different religions. The same pope wrote in to his nuncio at Vienna, "The Church has not only sought to prevent heretics from using the properties of the Church, but has also established, as the punishment for the sin of heresy, the sequestration of private property, in c. Yet we find ourselves now in times of such misfortune and humiliation for the bride of Christ that the Church is not only able to enforce these, ifs holiest maxims, against the rebellious enemies of the faith, with the firmness with which they should be, but it even cannot proclaim them openly without danger. Yet, if it cannot exert its right in depriving heretics of their estates, it may," etc. With this may be compared the permission granted in anticipation, in Bullar. *Propagande*, 2, 54, 56 , to the Ruthenes, in case of conversion, to take possession of the properties they had lost by their apostasy; the satisfaction manifested by the Church on the expulsion of the Protestants from Salzburg Bull. Quite recently, Philippi, in his Canon Law, honestly acknowledged the validity of the old laws against heretics, and asserted their correctness. Even now, in all countries where the secular power has not put an end to this, the bishops promise, in taking the oath of obedience to the pope, *haereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidemn Dominno*

nostro vel successoribus praedictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo. Yet the Roman See has renounced, since Sept. Still, as soon as circumstances will permit, the Roman See is prepared to apply again the old laws, which are merely temporarily suspended in some countries, but in nowise repealed. Governments, however, naturally take a different view of these laws. The secular power, even while it freed itself from its absolute subjection to the Church, still continued to persecute in various ways the Protestants whom the Church denounced as heretics. We even see them deprived under Louis XIV of the right of emigration; while, in refusing to recognize the validity of their marriage, the civil authorities showed themselves even more severe than the Church. But, becoming wiser by experience, and taught by the general reaction which its measures provoked in the 18th century, the State has confined itself to interfering with heresy so far only as is necessary to promote public order and the material good of the State; thus claiming only the right to repress or expel those whose principles are opposed to the existence of government, or might create disorder. This right, of course, has been differently understood in different countries according to local circumstances, and has even become a pretence for persecutions against denominations which a milder construction of it would not have deprived of the toleration of the State, as in the persecution of dissidents in Sweden, etc. Let us now compare this practice of the Romish Church and of Roman Catholic states with the dogmatic theory of the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas treats heresy as the opposite of faith, connecting it with infidelitas in communi and apostasia a fide. He treats schism, again, as opposed to charitas. He defines heresy as infidelitatis species pertinens ad eos, qui fidei Christi profitentur, sed ejus dogmata corrumpunt 1. He asserts that they also have their use in the Church, as serving to prove its faith, and inducing it diligently to search the Scriptures, yet their usefulness in these respects is involuntary.

8: Private worship, public values, and religious change in late antiquity / Kim Bowes. - Franklin

Her methods and her maverick style of leadership provoked a lawsuit by fellow missionaries as well as charges of unwomanly behaviour and propagating heresy. Through her pioneering actions, Mason was seen to subvert the authority of the mission agencies, the colonial social order, the government, her husband, and the Bible.

In this section, I will be posting articles on the apostasy in American churches. Simply click the links below to read the listed articles. Perhaps your church is not yet apostate, but are you somewhere along the path to apostasy? Have you acted with unholy motives such as fear, covetousness, greed, power, pride, the desire to have and run a successful organization, etc.? If so, you are on the road to apostasy. Even when Israel decided they no longer wanted to operate as a theocracy under God and insisted upon a king See I Samuel 8 , God granted their wishes after warning them of the consequences. Even though Israel had committed a wicked act, God promised that He would still bless them if they loved Him and followed His commandments and statutes See I Samuel The story of the road to and arrival at total apostasy in Israel followed as recorded in the Old Testament. When Israel, and then Judah and Israel after the split, had a good king Judah has eight good kings and Israel none after the split that nation was blessed by God. When either had a bad king, bad consequences as foretold by God, followed. Inevitably, Israel became totally apostate and the only remedy was judgment. The same principles apply to the apostasy in the church. Much is said about apostasy and the coming apostasy of the church in the New Testament. That church rejects Jesus but embraces all other religions. Click the following to hear more about this from one of the apostate leaders, Oprah Winfrey: What Oprah says about God. How could anyone fall for these heresies? Youtube teaching by Brian Moonan: Articles [As of , emphasized articles are in red below. Before that date, emphasized articles are at the end under: Featured Articles until].

9: The Great Heresies | Catholic Answers

This entry about Heresy has been published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence, which permits unrestricted use and reproduction, provided the author or authors of the Heresy entry and the Encyclopedia of Law are in each case credited as the source of the Heresy entry.

Continued Persecution The church enjoyed freedom of worship for almost another hundred years, but when Diocletian consulted with Gallienus Caesar, after returning victorious from the Persian Wars, they formulated plans for the extermination of Christians. The edict obtained stated that churches, and all Christian writings, should be destroyed, and all their rights and privileges annulled. Some were broiled to death on gridirons after being cruelly scourged, and their wounds washed in brine. Others were thrown to wild beasts, and some starved to death. These persecutions lasted approximately ten years. This is the period of persecution prophesied by our Savior, in Revelation 2: This Smyrna period corresponds to the time of Diocletian. A dreadful and loathsome disease fell upon the emperor, causing him to cease his persecutions of Christians, about the year , and the empire was abdicated. Constantine At this time Constantine, the pagan emperor, came to the throne, who from beholding, as he claimed, a luminous cross in the sky, with the inscription, "By This Conquer," he embraced Christianity, and was baptized by Eusebius. In an edict was issued from Milan favoring the church, and peace was enjoyed for twenty-four years, until his death. During this time, at the council of bishops and prelates, assembled at Nice, , among other ecclesiastical laws, one was passed relative to the Sabbath, stating that all townspeople should rest from their labors on the venerable day of the sun. This was the first of a series of laws passed wherein the bishops of the numerous cities and districts tried to compromise with the pagan sun worshipers. Popes There were bishops presiding over each of the following cities, having jurisdiction over the surrounding territory as well: The bishops were recognized as superior church prelates, and called "papa," or "pope. Many doctrinal divisions were apparent among the bishops, and rivalry as to authority and power. The bishop of Jerusalem was at first given the greatest honor and respect, but later a strong rivalry arose between the pope at Constantinople and the pope, or bishop, of Rome. Because of the advantage given the Roman bishop, in being near the emperor of Rome, and both together struggling for peace and power, they early conceived of the advantage to both, in a united policy. The bishop of Rome was soon placed at the head of the clerical order, as superior bishop, and he maintained his claim of superiority by immense splendor and magnificence. His authority had, however, before the close of the fourth century, a formidable rival in the bishop of Constantinople, who at a council in that city was elevated to bishop of second clerical rank. The powers which had been invested in the people of choosing their bishops became productive of great scandal, which right was withdrawn at the council of Nice All bishops were called "papa," or pope, which title was later applied to the bishops of Constantinople, and Rome only, and much later to the bishop of Rome alone. For a long period the pope at Constantinople regulated the affairs for the professed followers of Christ in the East, while the pope or bishop of Rome ruled the West. Arius, the most talented, intellectual, and spiritual power of the fourth century was the central figure against which the evil and polluted minds of western Roman bishops were directed. He was indeed a man of God, in whom the truth found its most consecrated and able defender. Like the Apostle Paul, he traversed the then known world, propagating truth, and denouncing error. He believed in the one God, and Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, and contended that the Holy Spirit was a power sent forth from God, entering into hearts and lives of Christians, transforming them into servants of God, of which he himself was a living example. Nicean Council In the year A. At this council the doctrine of Arius was discussed and settled, resulting in the banishment of the old man, and of Eusebius of Nicomedia. Arius sponsored the truth of the sonship of Jesus, claiming that he was truly the son of God, begotten by the Holy Spirit, and was not God Himself, in the sense as taught by the western bishops. This contention finally resulted a hundred years later in the three Arian Kingdoms, the Burgundians, Vandals, and Ostrogoths, being plucked up, as set forth in the prophecy of Daniel 7: At this council, the Passover was placed on the Sunday after the Jewish passover, which fell on the Fourteenth of Nisan, or Abib. This made Easter a fixed festival, instead of falling on any day of the week, according to the day of the fourteenth of this

month. The Eastern churches to this time had celebrated the passover once a year on the fourteenth of Abib. It was also at this council where the first edict was made in favor of the "Venerable day of the sun," being observed as a day of rest. Up to this time Jewish and Gentile Christians observed the Sabbath according to the commandment, with the exceptions of a number of bishops in the west, in the sphere of the Roman church, who observed both days. Wharey says, "A dispute arose at an early period between the Eastern and Western Roman churches about the time of celebrating Easter. The Asiatic churches kept it on the same day that the Jews kept their Passover which was the fourteenth day of the full moon, of the first Jewish month, which might fall on any day of the week. The Latin Western, or Roman churches kept Easter always on that Sunday which was the first after that same fourteenth day of the first new moon of the new year. The Jews began their ecclesiastical year with the new moon of March. This difference in the time of holding Easter was the cause of much contention between the East and West until it was finally settled by the council of Nice in favor of the Latin mode, A. Published by the Presbyterian Board of Publications. Brother Arius, with a large company of other bishops, was banished upon islands of the sea, following this council, and his writings wherever found consigned to the flames. This was the first victory over the truth by civil legislation. While the three hundred and eighteen bishops attending this conference were representatives of churches, still Constantine the emperor of Rome presided over the meeting, and the decisions made by these church bishops were endorsed and given sanction by civil law, and backed by military power. The Christian churches, which were flourishing in worldly wealth, were those mainly represented at this council, the humble companies of the poor, not being financially able to travel hundreds and even thousands of miles, were thus prevented from being there. The humble devoted Christians will always be found in larger numbers among the poor than the rich, consequently the voice of the council of Nice was the voice of the churches clothed in wealth and splendor, catering to the popular trend of the time. Arius was banished, and his writings committed to the flames. A company of bishops who secretly favored Dr. Arius were discovered and banished into Gaul. One of the followers of Brother Arius, who, by the dying words of his Sister Constantina, had been recommended to the emperor of Rome, had the address to persuade him that the sentence of Dr. The emperor consequently recalled him, and endeavored to have him received into the church at Alexandria, but the bishop refused his admittance, but Arius and his adherents were received into the communion of the church at Jerusalem. Arius had been released from banishment, and received into membership in the church at Jerusalem, he passed away, but "his works followed him. His banishment and death by no means checked the spread of the truth, but rather scattered it abroad, and inflamed hearts with renewed zeal. The church, called by the world Nazarenes, Waldenses, Puritans, Arians, etc. The harvest resulting from the seed sowing of Dr. Arius had brought into existence three nations known as the "Arian Kingdoms," viz. The pope was raised to spiritual power over the Roman state, and by the consent and agreement of Emperor Justinian of Rome, church and state were united in the year A. War against these powerful adherents of Dr. Arius, known as the Arian Kingdoms, resulted in their overthrow. Three crowns thus fell, and three kings were plucked up by the roots, in fulfillment of Dan. The last one of these three, viz. Thus we have the final overthrow of the true church, and the woman driven into the wilderness. When the days or years prophetically announced for her sojourn there are completed, reaching to , we find her at that date coming forth again, and given religious liberty to proclaim the truth, which for so many centuries had been trampled under the feet of tyrants, who themselves had become drunk of the wine of Babylon, from the golden cup of the mother of harlots. Sunday "It is a remarkable fact that the first instance upon record which the bishop of Rome attempted to rule the Christian church was by an edict in behalf of Sunday. It had been the custom of all the churches to celebrate the Passover, but with this difference; that while the Eastern churches observed it upon the fourteenth day of the first month, no matter what day of the week this might be, the Western churches kept it upon the Sunday following that day, or rather, upon the Sunday following Good Friday. Dowling terms it the "earliest instance of Romish assumption" History of Romanism, heading of page The churches of Asia Minor informed Victor that they could not comply with his lordly mandate. The victory was not obtained for Sunday in the struggle, as Heylyn testifies: Constantine, by whose powerful influence the council of Nicaea was induced to decide this question in favor of the Roman bishop, that is, to fix the Passover upon Sunday, urged the following strong reason for the measure: It was his

mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under the common institution. Constantine forbade the courts to be held on Sunday, except for the purpose of giving freedom to slaves; and on that day soldiers were commanded to omit their daily military exercises. But the public games were continued on Sunday, tending to make it more a holiday than a holy day. Later the Roman Catholic fast-day was changed to Friday. At what time cessation from it became general, if it became so before the time of Constantine, when it was enjoined by law, except in agricultural districts, where sowing and reaping, and tending the vine, were allowed, it is impossible to ascertain. Among the festivals, considered simply as voluntary memorials of the Redeemer, Sunday had very little preeminence; for it is well stated by Heylyn: A Catholic claim follows: Now the Scriptures alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly enjoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice. Not to mention other examples, is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most promising of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify. This law was thought by the bishops necessary because of the rapid gain throughout the Eastern church of Saturday observance. By Judaism, Neander meant the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. Charles Hase, of Germany, states the object of the Roman church in very explicit language: Sunday remained a joyful festival in which all fasting and worldly business was avoided as much as possible, but the original commandment of the decalogue respecting the Sabbath was not then applied to that day. False Doctrines Concerning Christianity established by law under Constantine: Hurlbut says, "It was two generations after Constantine when images began to appear in the churches; the early Christians having a horror of all that might lead to idolatry. Under Constantine, "This constitution of things was an entire departure from the order of worship established, under divine direction, by the apostles of Christ in the primitive churches. In fact, scarcely any two things could be more dissimilar than was the simplicity of the gospel dispensation from the hierarchy established under Constantine the Great. For though they were both designated by the same name, yet they differed extremely in many respects. A bishop, during the first and second centuries, was a person who had the care of the Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly, he acted, not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a, faithful servant. The bishop of Rome claiming more honor and dignity than other bishops, because of his close association with the Roman emperors, living as he did in the same city, his decisions on doctrine were favorably received because of his distinguished position, and that his influence became felt and his decrees esteemed. Thus the Roman church became strong and popular, and the name "catholic," or universal, applied to it. There were the Macedonians of the fourth century, known also as semi-Arians, being the strongest sect among them, and who finally signed the Nicene Creed. In the fourth century there was also a distinguished man by the name of Priscillian, who founded a sect known as the Priscillianists, who differed in some respects from the bishop of Rome. Practically all of the above sects, signed the "Nicene Creed," following the council of Nice A. As Doctor Arius was the leader in defense of the true faith at this council, we herewith enter some historical extracts, further showing the conditions as they were, in this period. It is the only principle which evinces a becoming deference to the wisdom and authority of God in the institution of his worship; and, it may be added, which secures uniform regard of his people to the institutions of his kingdom to the end of time.

A belated springtime. Against the faith Te Transformation of Western Society: Migration 2nd esdras chapter 7
Oil, power and politics Smarty php template programming and applications Troubling confessions Concurrent
programming on windows Masonic Symbolism Of The Ornaments Of The Lodge Pamphlet Can You Grow a
Popsicle? Learn About Plant Life Objections to the doctrine of justification in the vicarial way answered, and
its consistence with the re Tales of Real And Dream Worlds Britains kings and queens. Love unconditionally
The naturalist of the sea-shore Does ats or better Energy versus eternal delight On the Rails Around Britain
Ireland Successful computing for business Poems of a rambling cowboy The Rice-Wheat Cropping System of
South Asia Amflo retractable hose reel parts A complex terrain of words and deeds : discourse, research and
social change Living the life you love Backlash sarah darer littman Ibm annual report 2013 Maleskas Favorite
Word Games The Fake Heir (Nancy Drew: Girl Detective Graphic Novels #5) V. 4. Brook, D. . et al.
Whernside and Gragareth. Materials of mechanics 9th edition V. 1. Paintings, reliefs, drawings. The staff bass
clef worksheet Power system protection research papers Different worlds James Van Pelt Instrumentation in
metal finishing Pinocchios nose grows LNG Import Terminal Use Agreements How can you mend a broken
heart sheet music Policymaking processes The Jesus discovery