

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 1 : Apostasy in the church and false doctrines of men - CHRISTIAN ANTI-BLASPHEMY CENTRA

Blasphemy of the Holy Spirit is an unforgivable sin. Blasphemy of the Holy Spirit is understood within its biblical context as stating or believing that Jesus did his miracles by the power of the devil (Matt.) and is an unforgivable sin (Mark).

Exactly what is being described by this expression, found in Mark 3: Several observations are in order. First, the object of this "blasphemy" is the Holy Spirit, who is clearly distinguished in the context from Jesus Christ, the Son of Man, who may be blasphemed by someone who yet is forgiven Matthew Second, the result of this blasphemy is that the blasphemer cannot be forgiven by God. Third, the consequence of this blasphemy is eternal unforgivability. Mark calls this the "eternal sin, " a term found in modern translations; the KJV has "eternal judgment. What is this sin? Both Mark and Luke use the term "blaspheme" while Matthew has the more ordinary "speaks against, " showing that all three have in mind some kind of verbal repudiation or denunciation of the Spirit of God in the ministry of Jesus. Ancients believed in the power of words and uttering imprecations, curses, and blasphemies were taken seriously. The verb "blaspheme" means to speak abusively or insultingly of someone or something Acts In the Old Testament the term was used specially for derisive language and attitudes toward the God of the covenant with Israel 2 Kings The fundamental notion inherited by New Testament authors, and Jesus in particular, is expressed in Leviticus Furthermore, the Spirit is the sign of the new age and the reception of the Spirit is the focus of hope in some Old Testament visions. The prayer is that God would rend his heavens and come down to his people and make his name great among the nations One suspects that the advent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism of Jesus fulfills this Old Testament hope, and yet Israel remains hardened and grieves the Spirit once again cf. What we find then is double accountability: Consequently, when we come to the text of the Synoptic Gospels there is a history of interpretation and applications that prohibit anyone Leviticus What Jesus claims is that a similar type of sin is being committed whenever one speaks against the Holy Spirit as revealed powerfully in his ministry. What caused stoning in the Old Testament, now incurs eternal condemnation; such a sin is unforgivable. What are the specific symptoms of this sin? There have been many suggestions in the history of interpretation, including breaking the third commandment Exodus Others have given up on finding the meaning. While the various proposals may have some merit, it is best to examine "blasphemy against the Spirit" in the Gospels themselves to see what light they shed on what is being addressed. The contexts of the Gospels provide the important clues. While Jesus contends that one might miss the revelation of God in his lowly person Matthew Luke puts this same saying in a slightly different context: Jesus says it is one thing to deny him publicly; it is quite another thing to repudiate the power of the Holy Spirit Luke Thus, the unforgivable sin here seems to be public repudiation of the power of the Spirit in the ministry of the apostles of Jesus. What we see here is probably an application: After all, the Spirit purifies and enables holiness Psalm After the earthly ministry and death of Christ, the emphasis on the Spirit as the object of the blasphemous words and attitudes will give way to an emphasis on Jesus Christ cf. Blasphemy against the Spirit and apostasy are related. Apostasy, whether defined in the Calvinistic or Arminian sense, is committed by those who have had some relationship to God through Christ. Thus, apostasy is acceptance followed by repudiation of Jesus Christ Hebrews 6: It describes overt repudiation before any kind of commitment is made. While we may distinguish these two sins in this manner, it also needs to be observed that the two sins amount to largely the same stance. Berkouwer, Sin ; H. Turner, Christian Words ; G. Twelftree, Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels, pp. Edited by Walter A. Bibliography Information Elwell, Walter A. Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 2 : Eternal sin - Wikipedia

Blasphemy is known as the unforgivable or unpardonable sin because it is speaking against or evil about God. This sin would curse someone to hell. Learn more about the Biblical meaning.

Here I wish to refresh this article by adding a few more things in it. Many people are asking me what exactly is the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit? The best examples we have are those ones in the Scriptures in Mt. When Jesus performed the miracle of the dumb and demoniac man, healing him, the Pharisees who hated Him when hearing of this merciful act said: This means that people who calumniate the True Life in God Messages despite being aware of these signs of the Holy Spirit, risk blaspheming against the Holy Spirit. I would not have been able to do this tremendous task on my own had it come from me, but all the signs show that the Messages come from God. The Messages have reached now the four corners of the earth, spreading like He foretold, from a rivulet into a river and from a river gushing into an ocean. No one can fight God. There are many evident signs, e. There are evident miracles of healing performed by the same Spirit as well that have been recorded. Still, some people ignore these evident fruits and prefer to take the risk of committing the sin against the Holy Spirit. So let us look for a moment at some examples in the history of theology and in particular mystical theology that underline this danger. The book is based on Prof. That is, any person talking against a true prophet risks committing the sin against the Holy Spirit, since the true prophet speaks by the power of the Holy Spirit. Herein lies a serious consequence of prophecy to those charged with discernment: But that does not mean that prophets are not to be tested. God inspired the Saints to explain the blasphemy as well in their own words of which I will give some examples here below. They are continually being scandalized by My Works, which are all just, and all performed in truth through love and mercy. With this false judgment and with the poison of envy and pride, the works of My Son were slandered and unjustly judged, and with lies did His enemies say: Let us then inquire: The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is to attribute His operations to the opposite spirit, as Basil the Great says. How does one do this? Whenever one sees miracles brought about by the Holy Spirit or any of the other divine gifts in any of his brethren - that is: But he also blasphemes against the Holy Spirit who works in them, who says that those who, as sons of God, are led by the divine Spirit perform the commandments of their God and Father, are being deceived by demons. This is what the Jews of old said against the Son of God. They should obey what Christ said in the Scriptures and not judge, Mt 7: Christ had asked St Gertrude to publish and make known His words to her, but she hesitated for fear of disbelief and calumny. He then said to her: Strictly speaking all sins can be forgiven, but this one, of its nature, cannot be because it includes what the Church has described as final impenitence which means the refusal to accept forgiveness and the decision to remain stubborn.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 3 : Blasphemy | blog.quintoapp.com

Apostasy, whether defined in the Calvinistic or Arminian sense, is committed by those who have had some relationship to God through Christ. Thus, apostasy is acceptance followed by repudiation of Jesus Christ (Heb ; ; 1 John); blasphemy against the Spirit is not preceded by acceptance.

The metaphysics of meaning, part II: Must we mean what we say and define what we mean when we say? Must we define what we mean when we say so that we say what we mean? Though that could be the subject of an entire essay, that is not my primary focus here. My concern is that if it be true that our language contains profoundly vital information for our lives at all levels, how important is it that we understand the definitions and implications of our terms used? Does it really matter in any very serious sense how we define our terms and the words we choose to communicate? More to the point, does it matter with regard to our expressions of faith and concepts about it? After all, is it not more important that people see our heart, our compassion and sincerity, not so much how we define and use our terms? The same could be asked about historical accuracy in our discourse: Depending on how we answer such questions, we must also consider whether legal documents like deeds and mortgages and contracts and constitutions depend on accuracy of language and historical fact? Do government, the economy, the scientific enterprise, architecture and art, medicine, and the diagnosis of illness in heart, mind, and body, depend on accuracy in definition of terms and agreement regarding the use of each distinct discipline of discourse? Does not even the weather broadcaster communicate life and death information that depends upon factuality and truthfulness? Indeed, it could be argued that our very existence depends upon our God-given ability and task to name things, [2] and with accurate consistency. If this task of naming taxonomy could be understood to relate to the biblical principle of having dominion, and that it continues in every generation, would it not therefore especially include the theological endeavor, as well? Particularly, therefore, we can assert that when speaking of God and the eternal concerns of theological ideas, beliefs, doctrines, and formulations for faith, the need for clarity and accuracy must be accompanied with the zeal for carefulness in definitions. Sloppiness will not work in building bridges and high rise buildings, nor in programming computers that can fly humans to the moon. It might be countered that theological language is not a scientific enterprise, and not as much depends upon it for human safety and survival as does the science of geometry and calculus in constructing the wonders of civilization upon which we have built our modern world. Yet, to counter this objection to my claim to the contrary, the world and its civilizations depend upon the ideas that define their identity, character, morals and visions for what constitutes a just and honorable society that lead to human flourishing for all, and therefore human beliefs theological ideas about origins, God, human nature, the relationships between all created things, people, and creatures. In sum, we can therefore conclude that all knowledge in every sphere is theologically potent, in the sense that even mathematics and quantum physics are rooted in theological and metaphysical frameworks. Yes, not just contextually, but that they originate from theological conceptions. Despite all this, there are endless examples in our world of disregard for definitions and received terms. In fact, entire industries as advertising and politicking depend upon distortion, and sometimes obfuscation, of meaning in order to achieve objectives. Dictators and totalitarian regimes also depend upon their power to control the meaning, definitions, and use of terms. Empires sometimes have been able to extend their dominions through controlling the lexicon; but we can be thankful that such tyranny is always tenuous, since humans are inclined to resist in their need to communicate truthfully, in spite of all efforts to hinder and prevent it, and of course of necessity must do so for their survival. Even in our free society, there are many who would take total control to rewrite our lexicons for their political purposes, financial gain, or for ideological agendas. Nevertheless, in the nature of human language and communication, meaning and the necessity for meaning to be determinate and not indeterminate, requires that words consistently correspond sufficiently with reality to be meaningful. Engineers, scientists, architects, doctors, and astronauts have not generally followed the Postmodernists in practice, if even in

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

theory, for which are most grateful. In the pendulum swings in linguistics and politics from totalitarianism to anarchy, humans will always gravitate towards what will allow them to be free, but also necessarily towards what requires them to be responsible. A great danger with freedom is whenever it is not accompanied by responsibility. History has taught us this at least: This is profoundly true especially with our language, the greatest gift of God besides life, to communicate meaningfully. Therefore, we have the supreme responsibility to employ it rightly and faithfully. Identifying and classifying is the fundamental function of human language, differentiating things so we establish in regards to everything that A is not non A in the law of non-contradiction. Language enables us to see the unity and distinctions of all things which are absolutely essential for human society to be possible. This naming, and the interpretative role of language in gathering knowledge of the created world, its proper interpretation and the discovery of new insights, is the foundation of all science, art, literature, philosophy, architecture, and theology. Most significantly, theological language is the source and ongoing context of the meaning of all else, since it originates in revelation from God in order for us to have the interpretative matrix upon which to construct an accurate interpretive narrative for all of known reality. Therefore, as all of our language must correspond to reality in a coherent and comprehensible way, it is critical that we attend to our theological language with the utmost zeal and care. Inconsideration of God, or misrepresentation of his nature, are as agreeable to corrupt nature, as the disowning the being of a God is contrary to common reason. We are all daily inclined to this, our motives and reasoning being so corrupted. All-the-same, we are in Scripture held to the high standards of truth and justice, honesty and faithfulness, consistency and integrity, in all of our words and our actions. This is the moral nature of our discourse, requiring proper definitions, exposition, and interpretations of reality; this is the life and death nature of our words and our lexicons. This is just one of many important reasons to avoid confusion in our language, especially when speaking of God and matters of the faith. A humility that understands that I am not God. And there is more to know. Even if not intentional, it is in any case seriously problematic. Bell has done this on a number of theological issues, and has generated Much Controversy among Christians with his slippery use of, and misuse of, theological language. Yet, we really have no idea what his motives were, nor whether his heart is right with God despite his poorly worded verbiage. I would like to hope that he was just being careless, even if seriously, but this kind of loose theological affirmation, even if for the sake of a perceived effort to point others to a more intimate relationship with God, is deeply concerning. It could have been intended to make the gospel message more palatable to unbelievers who find many aspects of biblical history and faith distasteful but I wrongly digress into unknown motives. Even so, if we attempt to redefine biblical doctrine, and language, in order to make it more acceptable to people who sincerely believe they are on a higher moral plane than God, and that we must justify the God of Scripture to them, since they find many things in the Bible morally indefensible, then our motives become entirely irrelevant to the question of whether we are being faithful to the gospel of Jesus and the Scripture in our definitions and use of theological terms. As an academic, I also understand, and always fully support, the idea of having and allowing for others the freedom to ask questions of God, the deepest questions that concern us. But biblically, there is a universe of difference between lament, painfully crying out to God for answers to those questions, and blasphemy and arrogance. And, historically and biblically, blasphemy meant God-hating arrogance and rebellion against God; it is not rooted in a humble heart nor in humility; it is shaking the fist at God in foolish anger and arrogant stupidity. It is the condition of our hearts when God, or the god we imagine is God, is despised and rejected. As stated, I zealously agree with the conviction that we must encourage questions, but it is because we know with certitude that God has given us answers, and sufficient answers, in the revelation of the canon of Scripture. These are what we must live for and work for through study, reflection, prayer, and teaching, to learn of God and his ways and to share in fellowship and rejoicing with the body of Christ in the glories of the gospel. Questions themselves are not blasphemy, but neither is blaspheming simply asking questions. And, I would add, the gospel makes very good logical sense. Indeed, the gospel is the only theological system in the world that makes perfect logical sense, because it is entirely true. In fact, the gospel is the key to all of reality, since

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Jesus is the one who is the LOGOS by whom, through whom, and for whom the universe was made. This is particularly the reason we must strive to accurately define all of our terms in discussing God and matters of our faith, and to be consistent when using those terms. Our language matters immensely, because what we think we may be meaning in discourse could be a serious misconstrual and miscommunication of colossal proportions. In the Gospel of Christ, the mysteries of God are made known Col 1: In conclusion therefore, we are responsible to properly and fully define all of the terms of that Gospel, based solely on the canon of Scripture. This does not mean we have comprehension of God and all things, since he is infinite and eternal, but we can have sufficient and reasonable faith and understanding. We can also grow daily in fuller understanding, as we will for all eternity increase in our knowledge of Him, never ceasing. In sum, ignorance of, distortion of, and unbelief in the gospel of Christ are not a result of its incomprehensibility, but rather the hardness of the human heart, and the inclination to mis-represent, mis-define, and mis-interpret. Missing the mark, we then speak past one another and reality itself, properly defined. Mis-representing the terms of the gospel is therefore to by-pass its reality for fantasies and fairy tales of our own imagining. Some biblical texts on blasphemy Ex They are like unreasoning animals, creatures of instinct, born only to be caught and destroyed, and like animals they too will perish. Some biblical texts on arrogance Lk 1: Thank God that our sins of arrogance and blasphemy are also forgivable! Quotes on words and language Words differently arranged have a different meaning, and meanings differently arranged have different effects. Harvard University Press, , p. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker* pp. The arrival of a powerful metaphor alters the geography of our thoughts and forces us to redraw our conceptual maps. Michael Glazier, , p. Chronicles, Feb , p. This is because man cannot, through his abuse of words, distort the concept of the divine Nature without distorting his understanding of human nature along with it, as Orwell and other critics of the human language have understood. God, in other words, is structured into human language, because He is encoded in the human mind and in human thought. In the degree that men deny the reality and integrity of language, they reject the idea of Model-Modeler and Modeled, and with it the possibility for the coherent and respectful human activity and behavior they once called decency and manners. Thomas Nelson, , p. Baker Books, , two volumes in one, vol. Zondervan, , p. Suffice it to say that Rob Bell has shifted from some fundamental biblical perspectives over the years, and has taught theological concepts at odds with traditional orthodoxy. Grimm on 2 Macc. The proper object of the verb is the name of God, which is cursed or reviled instead of being honoured. In the first reference it is a half-caste Israelite who sins in this way; and, generally speaking, blasphemy is committed by pagans 2 Ki. Moore, *Judaism*, 2, 30, p. In the New Testament Here there is an extension of the meaning. God is blasphemed also in his representatives. So the word is used of Moses Acts 6: Because these representatives embody the truth of God himself and our Lord in a unique way , an insulting word spoken against them and their teaching is really directed against the God in whose name they speak so Mt. Saul of Tarsus fulminated against the early followers of Jesus and tried to compel them to blaspheme, i. His misdirected zeal, however, was not simply against the church, but against the Lord himself 1 Tim. The term is also used, in a weaker sense, of slanderous language addressed to men e. These verses condemn a prevalent vice; but their warning may be grounded in a theological as well as an ethical context if we remember Jas. There are two problem texts.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 4 : CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA: Holy Ghost

Some pastors and church leaders say that if they are doing something by the power of the Holy Spirit, and someone else challenges them and says that they are of the devil, then the questioner has committed blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and will never be forgiven.

In English "blasphemy" denotes any utterance that insults God or Christ or Allah, or Muhammed and gives deeply felt offense to their followers. In several states in the United States and in Britain, blasphemy is a criminal offense, although there have been few prosecution in this century. In Islamic countries generally no distinction is made between blasphemy and heresy, so that any perceived rejection of the Prophet or his message, by Muslims or non-Muslims, is regarded as blasphemous. The biblical concept is very different. In both Testaments the idea of blasphemy as something that offends the religious sensibilities of others is completely absent. The Old Testament At least five different Hebrew verbs are translated "blaspheme" in English translations. No special verb is reserved for cursing or insults directed at God. However, to curse or insult God is an especially grave sin. It can be done by word or by deed. There is little distinction between the sinner who deliberately abuses the name of the Lord Leviticus For both, the death penalty is prescribed. Similarly, the prayer of the Levites in Nehemiah 9 calls "awful blasphemies" all that Israelites did when they made the golden calf 9: The Greek root blasphem- [Mark Jesus is accused of blasphemy for pronouncing forgiveness and for claiming a unique relationship with God Matthew Jesus picks up the Numbers 15 passage about blasphemy in his famous saying about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit Matthew Jesus teaches that the blasphemy for which there is no forgiveness is that against the Holy Spirit; all other blasphemies, particularly those against "the Son of Man, " may be forgiven. Insults thrown at "the Son of Man" may be forgiven because they are committed in ignorance of who he really is: This downgrading of the significance of blasphemy against Christ marks an important difference between Christianity and Islam. Whereas Muslims are bound to defend the honor of the Prophet, for Christians Jesus is the one who says, "The insults of those who insult you have fallen on me" Romans He deliberately accepts the vilification of others and prays for the forgiveness of those who insult him Luke In this, he sets an example for Christians to follow. According to Peter 1 Peter 2: There is only one kind of blasphemy that Christians must resist: Howard Marshall, Theology 67 Blasphemy and the Law in a Plural Society. Edited by Walter A. Bibliography Information Elwell, Walter A. Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 5 : Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit Part 1: How Confusion Thwarts Holiness

Blasphemy is the act of insulting or showing contempt or lack of reverence to a deity, or sacred things, or toward something considered sacred or inviolable.. Some religions consider blasphemy to be a religious crime.

Blasphemy Greek blaptein, "to injure", and pHEME, "reputation" signifies etymologically gross irreverence towards any person or thing worthy of exalted esteem. In this broad sense the term is used by Bacon when in his "Advancement of Learning" he speaks of "blasphemy against learning". Paul tells of being blasphemed 1 Corinthians 4: Meaning While etymologically blasphemy may denote the derogation of the honour due to a creature as well as of that belonging to God, in its strict acceptance it is used only in the latter sense. It is to be noted that according to the definition 1 blasphemy is set down as a word, for ordinarily it is expressed in speech, though it may be committed in thought or in act. Being primarily a sin of the tongue, it will be seen to be opposed directly to the religious act of praising God. Blasphemy, by reason of the significance of the words with which it is expressed, may be of three kinds. It is heretical when the insult to God involves a declaration that is against faith, as in the assertion: It is imprecatory when it would cry a malediction upon the Supreme Being as when one would say: It is simply contumacious when it is wholly made up of contempt of, or indignation towards, God, as in the blasphemy of Julian the Apostate: Again, blasphemy may be 1 either direct, as when the one blaspheming formally intends to dishonour the Divinity, or 2 indirect, as when without such intention blasphemous words are used with advertence to their import. The malice of blasphemy Blasphemy is a sin against the virtue of religion by which we render to God the honour due to Him as our first beginning and last end. Thomas says that it is to be regarded as a sin against faith inasmuch as by it we attribute to God that which does not belong to Him, or deny Him that which is His II-II. De Lugo and others deny that this is an essential element in blasphemy De just. Thomas see in the contempt expressed in blasphemy the implication that God is contemptible--an implication in which all will allow there is attributed to God that which does not belong to Him. What is here said is of blasphemy in general; manifestly that form of the sin described above as heretical is not only opposed to the virtue of religion but that of faith as well. Blasphemy is of its whole nature ex toto genere suo a mortal sin, the gravest that may be committed against religion. The seriousness of an affront is proportioned to the dignity of the person towards whom it is directed. Since then the insult in blasphemy is offered to the ineffable majesty of God, the degree of its heinousness must be evident. Nevertheless because of slight or no advertence blasphemy may be either a venial sin only or no sin at all. Thus many expressions voiced in anger escape the enormity of a grave sin, except as is clear, when the anger is vented upon God. Again, in the case where blasphemous speech is uttered inadvertently, through force of habit, a grave sin is not committed as long as earnest resistance is made to the habit. If, however, no such effort is put forth there cannot but be grave guilt, though a mortal sin is not committed on the occasion of each and every blasphemous outburst. It has been said that heretical blasphemy besides a content directed against religion has that which is opposed to the virtue of faith. Similarly, imprecatory blasphemy is besides a violation of charity. These forms of the sin being specifically distinct from the simpler kind, it is necessary to specify their character in confession. Whether blasphemy has been direct or indirect, however, calls not for specification on the part of the penitent, since both these forms are specifically the same, though clearly differing in the degree of malice. The question has been raised whether blasphemy against the saints differs in kind from that uttered immediately against God. While De Lugo thinks that such a difference obtains De Poenit. Alphonsus seems more tenable, for as the latter theologian observes, the saints, ordinarily speaking, are not blasphemed because of their own excellence but because of their close relationship to God Theol. To this question St. Bonaventure in 2, dist. So also Sporer Theol. Thomas In 2, dist. IX; Billuart diss. The penalties attached to blasphemy In the Old Law the blasphemer was punished by death. And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, dying let him die: He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, dying let him die" Leviticus Upon hearing blasphemy the Jews were wont in detestation of the crime to rend

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

their clothes 2 Kings Among the Athenians blasphemy was actionable and according to Plutarch, Alcibiades was made to suffer the confiscation of his goods for ridiculing the rites of Ceres and Proserpine Plutarch, Alcibiades. Among the ancient Romans blasphemy was punishable, though not by death. In the time of Justinian we find most severe enactments against this sin. In a constitution of A. The prefect of the city is commanded to apprehend all such as shall persist in their offence after this admonition and put them to death , that so the city and the empire may not suffer because of their impiety Auth. Among the Visigoths , anyone blaspheming the name of Christ or expressing contempt of the Trinity had his head shorn, was subjected to a hundred stripes, and suffered perpetual imprisonment in chains. Among the Franks , according to a law enacted at the Diet of Aachen , A. In the Gospels blasphemy is described as one of "the things that defile a man" Matthew Medieval canon law punished the blasphemer most severely. By a decree of the thirteenth century one convicted of blasphemy was compelled to stand at the door of the church during the solemnities of the Mass for seven Sundays , and on the last of these days, divested of cloak and shoes, he was to appear with a rope about his neck. Obligations of fasting and alms-giving were likewise imposed under heaviest penalties Decret. The rigours of the ancient discipline were insisted upon by Pius V in his Constitution "Cum primum apostolatus" p. According to the law herein laid down, the layman found guilty of blasphemy was fined. The fine was increased upon his second offence, and upon his third he was sent into exile. If unable to pay the fine, he was upon the first conviction condemned to stand before the door of the church, his hands tied behind him. For the second offence he was flogged, and for the third his tongue was pierced, and he was sentenced to the galleys. If enjoying no benefice , he was first subjected to a fine and bodily punishment; on repeating the offence he was imprisoned , and still persisting, he was degraded and condemned to the galleys. Blasphemy in civil law Blasphemy cognizable by common law is defined by Blackstone to be "denying the being or providence of God , contumelious reproaches of our Saviour Jesus Christ , profane scoffing at the Holy Scripture , or exposing it to contempt or ridicule". The United States once had many penal statutes against blasphemy, which were declared constitutional as not subversive of the freedom of speech or liberty of the press Am. In the American Decisions Vol. V, we read that "Christianity being recognized by law therefore blasphemy against God and profane ridicule of Christ or the Holy Scripture are punishable at Common Law", Accordingly where one uttered the following words "Jesus Christ was a bastard and his mother was a whore", it was held to be a public offence, punishable by the common law. The defendant found guilty by the court of common pleas of the blasphemy above quoted was sentenced to imprisonment for three months and to pay a fine of five hundred dollars. About this page APA citation. In The Catholic Encyclopedia. Robert Appleton Company, This article was transcribed for New Advent by Janet Grayson. Farley, Archbishop of New York. The editor of New Advent is Kevin Knight. My email address is webmaster at newadvent. Dedicated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 6 : CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA: Blasphemy

Blasphemy is speaking evil of God or denying Him some good which we should attribute to Him. It could also be understood to be acting in any impious, mocking or contemptuous way toward any member of the Trinity.¹ The word blasphemy comes from the Greek w.

Blasphemy is communicating contempt, hatred, derision, or disdain toward God. In some religions, many followers believe that it warrants execution. It is not about voicing honest anger about God or toward God. God also seeks repentance. Even the truest saints have done such things, partly because they were so true that they could be honest with God and humankind. When you were a child, you probably said things that brought your parents to tears and anger. If so, you abused them the way you can abuse God. Or, think of someone you had a close friendship with, but somehow your trust was betrayed. Blasphemy is when someone does it willfully, with malicious intent and meaning. God forgives blasphemy, and tries to do something about the separation. And so they seal their future. The bigger problem is that too often others join in the harangue, and when that happens, those others are also separated from God. Many, even within mainstream Islam, believe that the proper sentence for blasphemy is death. But a large opposing stream of thought says no, the blasphemer is simply to be treated as non-Muslim. This way of thinking is ancient, dating back hundreds of years, but today is most typical of Muslims who support a secular form of government. A small minority of Islamic teachers over the years have even claimed that there should be no punishment at all. Increasingly, blasphemy laws are being applied to non-Muslims. In some places especially, recently in Pakistan, pro-executionists have executed their Muslim opponents for the blasphemy of opposing executions for blasphemy. Christians were once like that, too, as recently as years ago. But that era taught us how destructive that was to society as a whole. The faith itself calls for acts of love rather than hate or anger. Blasphemy is rarely punished among Christians anymore, even within the churches. Even formal action by the churches means less than it used to. The reported blasphemer is usually free to join some other group or strike an independent path, as so many have done. Non-Muslim governments have for the most part gotten rid of their blasphemy laws. One is not a heretic for raising questions or thinking thoughts. In Greek, the term was at first simply used to describe the mere taking of sides, specifically the side that dissents from the expected or typical viewpoint. As arguments got more intense, all such terms took on a much more polemic meaning, especially in the Hellenistic Judaism of the century before Jesus. When Christianity formed, it continued the negative use of the term. In most religions that have a god, being truthful about that god is taken very seriously. If God is really supreme, then God deserves the supreme honor of our taking the time and care not to run off rashly at the mouth claiming this or that thing is true about or is done by God, especially not to gain personal fame. This is the root of the concept of heresy. Early Christian heresies were a bit different. Sure, a few of their leaders made them up to challenge for personal power or fame, but that was actually uncommon. Usually, those who came up with the heretical idea were honestly trying to better understand what Jesus was about. They thought they had succeeded. Then other Christians sifted the idea in detail to see where it led. Honest probings, unfortunately, can go honestly and seriously off course. The new ideas usually grew from seeing Christian beliefs through the lens of their general culture or some rising group within it. Usually, a heresy gave birth to a sect, a group which was more restrictive than the rest of the Church. The sect would not accept the legitimacy of the more mainstream Christian churches. The struggle over heretical teachings was done mostly within the Church, rather than outside of it, and usually took a generation or two. The sifting process winnowed out the failed experiments and traps and kept what rang true. The process helped to refine Christian beliefs, and develop a clearer, more mature Christian identity. Yet, the reasons they use to justify wrongful actions can be judged heretical. You can express your viewpoint that certain ideas or practices are indeed heretical as I myself do in Spirithome. That takes a strong consensus generated over the course of more than a generation of watching the idea or its practitioners develop. Beliefs have consequences, and time will help sort

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

out the heresy. An apostasy is a defection; abandonment of what one once held or believed. One who commits apostasy is an apostate. Yet the word itself is about a change that happens all too often in real life. Apostasy and Change How can one tell the difference between apostasy and just plain change? Sometimes, change happens when someone finds out that their position has been built upon lies and accusations and anger instead of love and truth, and the truth demands that they rethink what they believe. The switch would be an act of spiritual honesty. Sometimes, the switch is made to get a better shot at power or acceptance, or to take advantage of the opportunities of the moment. We all go through changes in how we view the world around us. We wonder, doubt, test, probe, evolve, retrace. A healthy faith community will give lots of space for that. But there comes a time when doubts and differing ideas harden into personal convictions, which lead to actions. The gathered body of believers is within its rights to demand spiritual honesty. Eventually, they begin to adjust to it. Or, one can get there by little nudges and small decisions, each taken as part of a journey of thought or of life. But there comes a time when the switch has been made. These heresies keep coming back in new forms, with similar results of belief or practice; for instance, gnosticism. Thus, a passion for truth is the root of the concept of heresy. Those in a position of power routinely claim the power to define heresy. Then they use it against all those who challenged their authority, sometimes all the way to murder and war. Even major leaders like John Calvin did it: If the New Testament is right, such reasoning tells lies about God - and that means they are themselves heretics. And their actions of murder mark them as apostates. Most religions take apostasy, blasphemy, and heresy seriously. We all go through changes in how we view the world around us, and we wonder, doubt, test, probe, evolve, retrace. But there comes a time when doubts and differing ideas harden into personal convictions and are taught and acted upon. At such a time, the body of believers is within its rights to demand spiritual honesty. The action of how to treat apostates is much like those which are used by ethnic or political groups, clubs, and schools of thought to define their membership circles. Those too can be harsh. For most religions, blasphemy and apostasy are given the stiffest punishments only when the deaths of others are or may easily be caused by it. Often the degree of punishments will hinge on: If all this punishment-talk sounds harsh, remember that groups have a right to define themselves. Apostasy is analogous to treason in the affairs of nations, or side affairs in a romantic relationship. Those affairs are taken seriously too. The relationship is often ended. A nation may execute its traitor. This points to the main problem with terms like apostasy: Christ calls us to love even our enemies - including the apostate who used to be with us. How can Christians honor the concern behind the concept of heresy, without letting it be a weapon of the powerful? The best way is to have full, frank and open discussion of such matters. This must be done among a people who take seriously their duty to keep testing and prodding, prayerfully applying the Bible and the tools of discernment. And not putting up with any attempt to manipulate the dialogue, whether subtle or up front. Excommunication is the action of disfellowshipping a person, barring them from holy communion and the other services and privileges of the church community; to expel from a group. The biblical Greek word for it is anathema. Excommunication was done by most ideologies, nations, religions, and social groups long before Christianity. For Christians, the idea of excommunication has some roots in the Bible. The first step is to talk to the sinner in private. If there is no change, then it is discussed in front of two or three, then to the whole local gathering. If the person does not change, then they are to be treated as what they are: He warns them not to even eat with such a person. This is drawn from the law of Moses. This may best be taken in the light of 2 Thessalonians 3:

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 7 : Blasphemy Against the Holy Spirit Definition and Meaning - Bible Dictionary

The Church is crystal clear that there are "no limits to the mercy of God." (CCC) Jesus Christ died for everyone's sins, and anyone who repents of his sins and follows Christ can receive forgiveness and new life.

Blasphemy law In some countries with a state religion , blasphemy is outlawed under the criminal code. In some states, blasphemy laws are used to protect the religious beliefs of a majority, while in other countries, they serve to offer protection of the religious beliefs of minorities. Blasphemy is treated as a capital crime death penalty in some Muslim nations. France did so in to allow freedom of religion and freedom of the press and blasphemy was abolished or repealed in Sweden in , England and Wales in , Norway with Acts in and , the Netherlands in , Iceland in , Malta in and Denmark in Those laws may condone penalties or retaliation for blasphemy under the labels of blasphemous libel , [19] expression of opposition, or "vilification," of religion or of some religious practices, [20] [21] religious insult, [22] or hate speech. It is spoken of in Mark 3: However, there is dispute over what form this blasphemy may take and whether it qualifies as blasphemy in the conventional sense; and over the meaning of "unforgivable". In 2 Kings 18, the Rabshakeh gave the word from the king of Assyria,[clarification needed] dissuading trust in the Lord, asserting that God is no more able to deliver than all the gods of the land. Blasphemy has been condemned as a serious sin by the major creeds and Church theologians apostasy and infidelity [unbelief] were generally considered to be the gravest sins, with heresy a greater sin than blasphemy, cf. Punishment[edit] The most common punishment for blasphemers was capital punishment through hanging or stoning, justified by the words of Leviticus And speak to the people of Israel, saying, Whoever curses his God shall bear his sin. Whoever blasphemes the name of the Lord shall surely be put to death. All the congregation shall stone him. The sojourner as well as the native, when he blasphemes the Name, shall be put to death. In the 18th and 19th centuries, this meant that promoting atheism could be a crime and was vigorously prosecuted. It ended with the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act which abolished the common law offences of blasphemy and blasphemous libel. Disputation of Paris[edit] During the Middle Ages a series of debates on Judaism were staged by the Roman Catholic " including the Disputation of Paris , the Disputation of Barcelona , and Disputation of Tortosa "14 - and during those disputations, Jewish converts to Christianity, such as Nicholas Donin in Paris and Pablo Christiani in Barcelona claimed the Talmud contained insulting references to Jesus. It followed the work of Nicholas Donin , a Jewish convert to Christianity , who translated the Talmud and pressed 35 charges against it to Pope Gregory IX by quoting a series of alleged blasphemous passages about Jesus , Mary or Christianity. A commission of Christian theologians condemned the Talmud to be burned and on June 17, , twenty-four carriage loads of Jewish religious manuscripts were set on fire in the streets of Paris. It is said to be equivalent to committing one of the five grave sins or the Maha Patkas in Hinduism [48] If a person commits any of the Maha Patkas, the sin shall never leave them until their death, ultimately leading them to hell. Islam and blasphemy Blasphemy in Islam is impious utterance or action concerning God , Muhammad or anything considered sacred in Islam.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 8 : What is replacement theology / supersessionism?

BLASPHEMY Speaking against God in a contemptuous, scornful, or abusive manner. Included under blasphemy are offenses committed by thought, word, or action. Serious contemptuous ridicule of the.

Apostasy in the church and false doctrines of men
Apostasy in the church and false doctrines of men
By Don Koenig
The reason for this article
Most of the major Christian denominations have deviated from biblical Christianity in one way or another. It is not the purpose of this article to point a finger at any one group, or to tell true Christians to get out of their denomination or not to fellowship. I understand that this article will not win me any popularity contest but very few others are talking about the apostasy in the church institutions identified with Christianity and the false doctrines of men within these church institutions that now deviate from true biblical Christianity. The one true Church of God is interwoven in all Christian denominations. I have noticed in my own experiences that there is at least a small core of believers in just about every church in every denomination. I have at one time in my life been part of all the major groups listed below and I have first hand knowledge of what they practice except the Orthodox Catholics. My purpose is to expose the darkness so that the true light of the gospel of Christ will shine. I do not believe that true Christians can significantly change an overwhelmingly apostate carnal Christian church. Who is a Christian? There are two billion people on the earth who identify themselves as Christians, but there are significantly fewer that are really part of the body of Christ. Jesus said you can not enter the kingdom of heaven unless you are born of the Spirit. The new birth from the Holy Spirit occurs when a person truly believes that Jesus is the son of God and trusts in the finished work of Jesus on the cross to atone for their own sins and to justify them before God. The scriptures say you are saved by faith, not by your own works, lest anyone should boast. We cannot judge if a person who identifies with Christianity is really trusting in Christ or in their religion to save them. If they are trusting in their religion to save them they are no more part of the body of Christ than a Jew or Moslem or any other religion. Christianity is a personal relationship with Jesus. This relationship does not depend on having all the correct theology but correct theology will result in more fruitful Christianity. Religion is basically satanic. All religion contains methods, rituals and practices for man to become righteous enough to ascend or evolve to God. All religion thus believes in the need for one to become self righteous. True Christianity is the complete opposite. Because of His righteousness, Jesus the creator, died for our sins and breached the gap between God and man. True Christianity believes God provides a free gift of eternal life to anyone who trusts in Him has faith that God is graceful and sent His Son to save those who believe in His righteousness. Apostate Christianity departure from true biblical Christianity in its final analysis cannot be distinguished from any other religion in the world in its quest for God. No wonder apostate Christianity will be willing to join with all the other religions of the world. These nominal Christians think they are Christian just because it is part of their culture and because they believe in a higher power. Even demons believe in a higher power. Apostate Christianity has nothing to do with a born again experience with the evidence of a Holy Spirit changed life. Some in religious training were taught that Jesus died for their sins and that they are saved or justified, but in their lives there is no evidence by works of the Spirit. Do they really have Jesus or do they only have head knowledge about Him? Do they have Churchianity or Christianity? Those that trust in their own good works to save them are self deceived and still in their sins. Yet Judaism did not fail because through the tribe of Judah a Savior from God was born. True Christianity Jesus being born a man but being also God perfectly fulfilled the law. At the cross He took the curse upon Himself for it is written "cursed is anyone who hangs on a tree" Gal 3: Death could not hold the Creator and He rose to begin a new creation and in doing so condemned the old fallen creation to its eternal destruction. Those who trust Him are born again into this new new creation of believers called the "Body of Christ". After we are born into this new creation, God no longer sees us as the sinners we were but He sees us as the sinless "body and bride of Christ". The scripture says in marriage the two shall become one flesh - Paul used this as the example of Christ and the Church - Eph 5:

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

What do the large Christian denominations now confess? Unfortunately, Most of the large Christian denomination leadership has become infiltrated by the elite of Satan and much of the institutional church has fallen away from the true faith and have followed doctrines of men. Some have a different Jesus then the Jesus of scripture. After the rapture of the faithful Christians the apostate church will go on without skipping a beat. In the following paragraphs I give my reasons for saying there is now apostasy in the church throughout the major institutional churches that identify with Christianity. The Roman Catholic Church. The membership of this church is more than half of all that are identified as Christianity over one billion people but the majority of Catholics baptized into the denomination do not even regularly practice their religion. Additionally, many Catholics know little about their own beliefs or they ignore the doctrine. Many integrate it with native pagan religions. This denomination teaches that you are saved by grace, faith and works of merit. The priests are grace dispensers and the church is infallible. If you accumulate enough merit you will go to heaven. Otherwise you will have to go through the fires of purgatory or to hell. The writings of the church fathers and the traditions of the church have equal weight with the holy scriptures. The members of this church are in the process of being saved by their works of merit. The Catholic Church has become like the corrupted Judaism that Jesus condemned. It is largely a church of Pharisees and of blind ritual -- a church of idolatry, rote prayer, and traditions of men. To rid most of Christianity of apostasy in the Church we first would have to go to the root of apostasy and purge out most of the doctrines that have infiltrated the Catholic Church. The seven sacraments The seven Sacraments of the Catholic Church are rituals for grace. The church believes that the ritual itself will dispense grace from God. It appears that the church puts the cart before the horse. No spiritual grace come from ritual, but power from the Holy Spirit is given to those who listen to God and obey Him. The sacrament of the baptism of infants is not scriptural or logical. The ritual of baptism is for identifying believers with the death and resurrection of Jesus. Babies do not believe. True baptism is dying with Christ and by faith being born into a new creation called the "body of Christ". The Sacrament of contrition and penance is contrary to scripture. The scriptures say that Jesus is the only intermedicator. The doctrine that you can have your sins forgiven by confession to a priest who then intermediates and gives absolution if you do the penance he dictates, abolishes what Jesus did for us on the cross for all sin. Who is sinless enough to intermediate for us with God except Jesus, and which sin did Jesus not pay for? This church teaches that the sacrament of confirmation is where you get the power of the Holy Spirit. The scriptures however, teach that you get the Holy Spirit when you believe and you get power to do His will when you earnestly pray for it. Marriage is a union between two people. There is no reason given in scripture for it to be a Church sacrament or for the ceremony to be performed by a priest or clergy -- not that the practice of getting married by the elder of any church is wrong. The ordination of a special priesthood is contrary to New Testament scripture. The scripture teaches that all in Christ are kings and priests. The sacrament of Extreme Unction indicates that the dying get some special grace by having a priest say some ritualistic prayers over them. This is a distortion of the true biblical practices of elders praying over the sick. The cult of Mary A large sect in this church teaches that Mary is co-Redeemer and that she was without sin. The scripture says that there is salvation in no other name than Christ Jesus. The scriptures also say that all have sinned including Mary. Jesus said that John the Baptist was the greatest of all born of women. Why did He not say His mother was if she was without sin? When the natural mother of Jesus and His brothers yes, Jesus had brothers according to scripture thought He went crazy and wanted to talk to Him, Jesus said His mother and brothers are those that do the will of His Father. Mary is not the mother of God, she is the mother of the natural body that God incarnated. Mary is not the mother of the Church. She had to believe to be saved and had to receive the Holy Spirit and become a member of the "body of Christ" like everyone else. How can Mary be the mother of a membership that includes herself? The idea that Mary is interceding for the Christians and appearing to many and giving statements to people that are often contrary to the scriptures is an insult to Mary. The bottom line of these apparitions at the very least is a message of salvation by works which will save no one. Furthermore, many Catholics are now into witchcraft and things forbidden in the Bible because they believe in these lies. Much of what is being said by apparitions

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

attributed to Mary parallels pagan new age teachings and doctrine of demons. Jesus said to pray to the Father. If He wanted people to pray to his earthly mother He would have said so. Furthermore, how in the world could anyone really believe that Mary would want to hear the same prayer over and over and over again? Do people think that she or they get power from their chanting? Even common sense should tell them that no one wants to hear the same thing over and over again. I am sure the real Mary of the Bible would tell the people who chant these prayers to please shut up. Many times the real reasons for the rote prayer is not even addressed in the prayer service. Their ritualistic chanting leaves the body of Christ open to much ridicule by unbelievers and all of this is a counterfeit substitution for real prayer to God about the real situation that is needing prayer.

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Chapter 9 : Blasphemy | Definition of Blasphemy by Merriam-Webster

Blasphemy cognizable by common law is defined by Blackstone to be "denying the being or providence of God, contumelious reproaches of our Saviour Jesus Christ, profane scoffing at the Holy Scripture, or exposing it to contempt or ridicule".

Synopsis of the dogma The doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the Holy Ghost forms an integral part of her teaching on the mystery of the Holy Trinity , of which St. Augustine On the Holy Trinity I. The essential points of the dogma may be resumed in the following propositions: He proceeds, not by way of generation, but by way of spiration, from the Father and the Son together, as from a single principle. Such is the belief the Catholic faith demands. Chief errors All the theories and all the Christian sects that have contradicted or impugned, in any way, the dogma of the Trinity, have, as a logical consequence, threatened likewise the faith in the Holy Ghost. Among these, history mentions the following: In the fourth century and later, the Arians and their numerous heretical offspring: Anomans or Eunomians , Semi-Arians , Acacians , etc. Arianism had been preceded by the Subordination theory of some ante-Nicene writers, who affirmed a difference and a gradation between the Divine Persons other than those that arise from their relations in point of origin. In the sixteenth century, the Socinians explicitly rejected, in the name of reason , along with all the mysteries of Christianity , the doctrine of Three Persons in One God. In addition to these systems and these writers, who came in conflict with the true doctrine about the Holy Ghost only indirectly and as a logical result of previous errors , there were others who attacked the truth directly: Towards the middle of the fourth century, Macedonius , Bishop of Constantinople, and, after him a number of Semi-Arians , while apparently admitting the Divinity of the Word , denied that of the Holy Ghost. They placed Him among the spirits , inferior ministers of God , but higher than the angels. Since the days of Photius , the schismatic Greeks maintain that the Holy Ghost, true God like the Father and the Son, proceeds from the former alone. The first statement is directly opposed to Monarchianism and to Socinianism ; the second to Subordinationism, to the different forms of Arianism , and to Macedonianism in particular. The same arguments drawn from Scripture and Tradition may be used generally to prove either assertion. We will, therefore, bring forward the proofs of the two truths together, but first call particular attention to some passages that demonstrate more explicitly the distinction of personality. Scripture In the New Testament the word spirit and, perhaps, even the expression spirit of God signify at times the soul or man himself, inasmuch as he is under the influence of God and aspires to things above; more frequently, especially in St. Paul , they signify God acting in man ; but they are used, besides, to designate not only a working of God in general, but a Divine Person , Who is neither the Father nor the Son, Who is named together with the Father, or the Son, or with Both, without the context allowing them to be identified. A few instances are given here. We read in John The spirit of truth , whom the world cannot receive"; and in John Peter addresses his first epistle, 1: The Spirit of consolation and of truth is also clearly distinguished in John In several places St. Paul speaks of Him as if speaking of God. In other places he uses the words God and Holy Ghost as plainly synonymous. Thus he writes 1 Corinthians 3: Peter asserts the same identity when he thus remonstrates with Ananias Acts 5: Thou hast not lied to men , but to God. It is in His name, as in the name of the Father and of the Son , that baptism is to be given Matthew It is by His operation that the greatest of Divine mysteries , the Incarnation of the Word , is accomplished Matthew 1: It is also in His name and by His power that sins are forgiven and souls sanctified: Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them" John He is essentially the Spirit of truth John With these Apostles He will abide for ever John Having descended on them at Pentecost, He will guide them in their work Acts 8: He is the source of graces and gifts 1 Corinthians And as he dwells in our bodies sanctifies them 1 Corinthians 3: But he operates especially in the soul , giving it a new life Romans 8: Paul ends his Second Epistle to the Corinthians Tradition While corroborating and explaining the testimony of Scripture , Tradition brings more clearly before us the various stages of the evolution of this doctrine. As early as the first century, St. Clement

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

of Rome gives us important teaching about the Holy Ghost. His "Epistle to the Corinthians" not only tells us that the Spirit inspired and guided the holy writers 8. The same doctrine is declared, in the second and third centuries, by the lips of the martyrs, and is found in the writings of the Fathers. Epipodius spoke more distinctly still Ruinart, "Acta mart. Considered with regard to the Church, the same Spirit is truth, grace, a pledge of immortality, a principle of union with God; intimately united to the Church, He gives the sacraments their efficacy and virtue III. Hippolytus, though he does not speak at all clearly of the Holy Ghost regarded as a distinct person, supposes him, however, to be God, as well as the Father and the Son Against Noetus 8, Tertullian is one of the writers of this age whose tendency to Subordinationism is most apparent, and that in spite of his being the author of the definitive formula: And yet his teaching on the Holy Ghost is in every way remarkable. He seems to have been the first among the Fathers to affirm His Divinity in a clear and absolutely precise manner. In his work "Adversus Praxean" he dwells at length on the greatness of the Paraclete. The Holy Ghost, he says, is God 13; of the substance of the Father 3 and 4; one and the same God with the Father and the Son 2; proceeding from the Father through the Son 4, 8; teaching all truth 2. Gregory Thaumaturgus, or at least the Ekthesis tes pisteos, which is commonly attributed to him, and which dates from the period, gives us this remarkable passage P. One the Lord, one of one, God of God, invisible of invisible. One the Holy Ghost, having His subsistence from God. Perfect Trinity, which in eternity, glory, and power, is neither divided, nor separated. Unchanging and immutable Trinity. Vincent said Ruinart, op. Athanasius who does so in his "Letters to Serapion" P. He had been informed that certain Christians held that the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity was a creature. To refute them he questions the Scriptures, and they furnish him with arguments as solid as they are numerous. They tell him, in particular, that the Holy Ghost is united to the Son by relations just like those existing between the Son and the Father; that He is sent by the Son; that He is His mouth-piece and glorifies Him; that, unlike creatures, He has not been made out of nothing, but comes forth from God; that He performs a sanctifying work among men, of which no creature is capable; that in possessing Him we possess God; that the Father created everything by Him; that, in fine, He is immutable, has the attributes of immensity, oneness, and has a right to all the appellations that are used to express the dignity of the Son. Most of these conclusions he supports by means of Scriptural texts, a few from amongst which are given above. But the writer lays special stress on what is read in Matthew What did God stand in need of? Did He need to join to Himself a being of different nature? No, the Trinity is not composed of the Creator and the creature. Basil, Didymus of Alexandria, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Ambrose, and St. Gregory of Nyssa took up the same thesis ex professo, supporting it for the most part with the same proofs. All these writings had prepared the way for the Council of Constantinople which, in, condemned the Pneumatomachians and solemnly proclaimed the true doctrine. This teaching forms part of the Creed of Constantinople, as it is called, where the symbol refers to the Holy Ghost, "Who is also our Lord and Who gives life; Who proceeds from the Father, Who is adored and glorified together with the Father and the Son; Who spoke by the prophets". Was this creed, with these particular words, approved by the council of ?

Procession of the Holy Ghost We need not dwell at length on the precise meaning of the Procession in God. It will suffice here to remark that by this word we mean the relation of origin that exists between one Divine Person and another, or between one and the two others as its principle of origin. The latter truth will be specially treated here. A That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father has always been admitted by all Christians; the truth is expressly stated in John But the Greeks, after Photius, deny that He proceeds from the Son. And yet such is manifestly the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Fathers. These terms imply a relation of the Spirit to the Son, which can only be a relation of origin. This conclusion is so much the more indisputable as all admit the similar argument to explain why the Holy Ghost is called the Spirit of the Father. Augustine argues Tractate 99 on the Gospel of John, nos. Likewise you hear the Apostle declare: Could there then be two spirits, one the spirit of the Father, the other the spirit of the Son? Just as there is only one Father, just as there is only one Lord or one Son, so there is only one Spirit, Who is, consequently, the Spirit of both. Why then should you refuse to believe that He proceeds also from the Son, since He is also the Spirit of the

DOWNLOAD PDF HOW THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH DEFINED BLASPHEMY

Son? If He did not proceed from Him, Jesus , when He appeared to His disciples after His Resurrection , would not have breathed on them, saying: What, indeed, does this breathing signify, but that the Spirit proceeds also from Him? Athanasius had argued in exactly the same way De Trinit. For he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak; and the things that are to come, he shall shew you. He shall glorify me; because he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it to you. All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine. Therefore I said, that he shall receive of mine, and shew it to you. What the Paraclete will receive from the Son is immanent knowledge , which He will afterwards manifest exteriorly. But this immanent knowledge is the very essence of the Holy Ghost.