

# The Christian Sun.

A Religious and Miscellaneous Newspaper, devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, General Intelligence, and the support of the Principles of the Christian Church.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

"THE LORD GOD IS A SUN AND SHIELD."

\$1:50 PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.

VOLUME IX.

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA, SEPTEMBER 15, 1852.

NUMBER 37.

## CHURCH HISTORY,

BY N. SUMMERBELL.

(Continued.)

The Inquisition first invented under the bloody tyrant and heretic Theodosius, of the fourth century, was perfected by a fiend in human form called St. Dominic, Oh Lord what saints! Who in company with Bishop Oama, said to the inhabitants concerning the Christians:

"Why do you not drive them out?"

"Why do you not exterminate them?"

The reply was, we cannot, we have been brought up with them, and are spectators of their exemplary conduct."—Jones, 2: 279.

Their friends. The most formidable of the friends of the Christians, were Count Raymond of Thoulouse and Raymond Roger his nephew, Earl of Beziers. Count Raymond was time-serving, vacillating, uncertain, and weak in his measures—confiding too much in the thrice perjured heretics of Rome, his efforts were crippled and his defences weakened. Count Roger was decided, firm, not to be so soon deceived—yet too weak to be successful. Count Raymond in the early part of the conflict, gave himself up in the hope of saving the people. He was excommunicated A. D. 1207, and in a letter from the Pope, he was commanded to join the army against the Albigenses, weak of heart, he engaged in the cause of the Pope, so as to save his own cities, (Jones, 2: 280.) But Roger, his nephew, prepared to defend his territories. At the siege of Carcassonne, they offered to let Roger leave with twelve others, if he would give up the city, this he refused; but he was not proof against their hypocrisy. He with three hundred knights, while treating with the Legate under a guarantee of safety, were basely made prisoners. The rest of the citizens, principally, made their escape by a secret cavern, some were caught in attempting to escape, who with the Knights, altogether four hundred were burned alive, and fifty hanged.—Jones, 2: 313.

Beziers was also taken, and the inhabitants to the number of a thousand, butchered in cold blood. How shall we describe the Catholics and heretics? that is Christians—le A. "Kill them all," replied Arnold the Abbot, "God will destroy the rest." (Wad. 293.) his advice was followed. It was the crusading army now amounted to three hundred knights, and the war was continued by succeeding Popes, and the castle was permanently established. They took the castle by surprise, and offered the inhabitants quarter on condition of accepting the new religion. On their refusing, the Earl, his wife, his sister, daughter and domestics were all shut up in a castle, which was then burnt to ashes.—Jones, 2: 121.

forwards when called Montfort, had accepted the task of converting the Christians, for the possession of their dominions. The Earl of Thoulouse was held out to him, but in the year 1208, he had fallen before the walls of the city; but when the city was taken, they enacted laws ordering all houses, cellars, forests &c. &c. guarded against fugitives; to take all means to detect them; children of the age of twelve were to take a horrid oath, binding them to the dragon's interest; and all laymen were prohibited possessing any copies of the scriptures.—Waddington, 294.

Captives were often burnt amid the most heart rending cries from the sufferers; but affording the most rapturous joy to the Catholics.—Br. His. Alb. 2. b. 3. ch.

At the taking of the castle of Bron, one hundred of the inhabitants had their eyes plucked out, and were sent under guard of a comrade with one eye, to warn other cities. When Minerva was taken, the Christians were at prayer, both men and women. Refusing to become Romans, one hundred and forty were burned on one pile of wood. The taking of Lavaur, is thus described by a Catholic monk: "Very soon they dragged out eighty knights, these the noble Count Montfort ordered to be hanged, but the gallows falling with the first, they were ordered to be massacred on the spot. A lady was thrown into a pit which was then filled up with stones, afterwards our pilgrims collected innumerable heretics and burned them alive with the utmost joy." (Bern. Guid. riti incomb. III. 482.) The army finally swelled to five hundred thousand, (Jones, 2: 285.) City after city was taken. "The war continued about twenty years in which time it was computed that about a million and a half of persons bearing the name of Albigenses were put to death. (Ben. His. Bap. p. 29.) "Thus the Albigenses were consigned, without hope or mercy to the eager hand of the inquisitors," consumed and annihilated A. D. 1253, and the thirteenth century closes the history of the Christians in France, where they had existed from Apostolic times.

Arrived at the darkest period in the history of the true Church, and at the highest summit of Rome's triumphant career; like the traveler upon some high hill, mid-way of his journey, we pause, and look back over the dark wilderness which we have passed. We have seen the Christian Church with life and power from God, meeting in fierce encounter the statesman and philosophers of the world; we have seen her boldly plant the wild domain of heathen heart and mind, with Gospel faith and Christian graces, and successfully cultivate it, until the wilderness became a beautiful vineyard of the Lord. But Rome again devastated those fields, and enveloped the world in a night, darker than heathenism. As the good man turns aside, nor crushes the young reptile in his path—so was the infant heresy spared, till its monster heads became united in one body, and its beastly horns centered in one head, and its dragon mass rolled itself into form. Then, in the cities was heard a wail of sorrow, in the towns, a loud cry of anguish; and throughout the land from nation to nation, sorrow and woe. The dragon was making war upon the saints, and crushing nations, smothered in its folds; until over nature's last barrier, in Europe, it rolled its snaky form, a horrid mass. The raging fires of unnumbered cities, told of the destroyer's presence, and the agonizing groans of expiring saints, said: "Rome is come." The fair face of heaven was for centuries blackened by smoke from the martyrs funeral pile; and the loveliest provinces of earth despoiled, and drenched with the blood of saints. Rising prayers ascended to heaven, and the martyrs entered paradise. Loud shrieks filled the earth, and Rome triumphed.

In tracing the history of these dark periods, I have refused

to follow the sectarian historians, in calling the great body of the Church in the fourth century Arians; as there is not the least authentic history that they ever recognized the name, or believed the doctrine of Arius; but history shows that the name was a libel of very injurious tendency, deceiving the uninformed as to the real principles of the Christians of that age, and as such, to be deprecated by all lovers of truth.

The following summary, attested by the best authors, will show the real number of Arians; and to display the disposition of the relative parties, as to prove to all lovers of truth the deep wrong inflicted on the followers of Bible truth by calling them Arians. The Christians who are confounded with the Arians by the uninformed or bigoted historians, were the "numerous party." "Dominant Church party," and "middle party," who held to the "older system of subordination," Neander, 2: 424, and wished to settle the divinity of Christ in scripture phraseology—p. 374, who "adhered tenaciously to simple Bible doctrine," "and were for teaching nothing that they could not prove with the exactness of verbal testimony from the Bible—p. 424. They are denominated "peace-loving"—p. 378, "mediators," and "authors of peace," who held the "dominant Church doctrine," (p. 378.) Those authors of peace erred through charity when preferring Bible language for themselves; they proposed for the contending factions who did not, the various Homousion compromises, approved by Hilary.—Gibbon, 2: 250.

The more numerous dominant, or middle party, in vain strove for peace. Eusebius "laid before the council a confession of faith," which distinctly expressed the doctrine of Christ's divinity, "composed for the most part, of scriptural phraseology, which was considered by the party of Eusebius as being a peculiar merit in the creed of Arius, as in the formula of the Homousion, they especially censured the use of expressions not conformed to the language of the scripture."—Neander, 2: 374-5. And in vol. 1: 578, Neander says, "The Trinity constituted from the beginning the fundamental consciousness of the Catholic Church," and on page 572, that the Trinity "does not strictly belong to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith"—and is expressed in "no one particular passage of the New Testament," but is the result of other principles. Yet his Trinity is a "threefold gradation," page 578, and equality; and he calls the subordination system of the semi-Arians, the "older in opposition to the new Nicene form," vol. 1: 607, and vol. 2: 361, 363, 364, 365, 424, etc. While Hawies 1: 292, thinks it "contemptible evasion," "to vindicate from the charge of Arianism," those who hold to this subordination view. But Neander calls it the anti-Nicene "mode" of apprehending the doctrine of the Trinity,—p. 424. So that the Christians, now called "Arians," were then the only true defenders of what is now called the anti-Nicene Trinity; and as such, Neander actually presents Auxentius. Compare page 423 with 424. They were the more numerous party at the council (p. 373) out of 318 Bishops—p. 376, and although they rejected Arianism, yet they were called Arians by the creed makers—p. 390, 391. In the middle of the fourth century they were still called the "majority," and "dominant party," in opposition to the "smaller number" of "Arians proper," when it is said, that "the Arian party (meaning the Christians), had obtained the victory throughout the whole Roman Empire," p. 399. At the Antioch assemblies in 341 and 345, they condemned the Arian formulas, by which the Son of God was made a creature, asserting in the strongest terms the similarity of essence; but objecting to Homousion, because it was a badge of strife, chosen to offend; and they were lovers of peace.—Neander, 2: 373, 376, and preferred Bible language; so thought Dionysius the Great, and afterwards Eusebius the historian, two men in whom truth and love, faith and charity, greatness and gentleness seemed met in heavenly concord, and blended with every Christian grace, in strange contrast with their opposers.—See Neander, 1: 107. 2: 374-376. To the Christian ranks of the primitive ages, also belong Hegesippus and Eusebius, the only primitive historians; also Philostorgius of the 5th century if Neander's conclusions (from Eterovision 2: 217 and Ousion, p. 408) are correct. While all the fathers were of this more numerous party. Their Bishops, Basil and Georgius—Neander, 2: 405, were celebrated in the 4th century for their opposition to the Arians proper—p. 116, 405. In the majority at Rimini A. D. 380, they referred the question back to the Scriptures, condemning both Arianism and Athanasianism—p. 408-9. But they were persecuted by the Arian Emperor, Valens, and his Bishop Eudoxus; so that some are said to have sided with the Homousions—p. 418. Then Theodosius established the Trinity, A. D. 380; he encountered them every where—near a score of nations were Christians, now called Arians; but there was no Trinitarian nation; and more; there was no Trinitarian found in any of those nations, except as imported thither from Rome. All the nations, with all their Kings, Nobles, Bishops, Priests and laymen, all rejected the Trinity; but they were not Arians. Such a charge needs proof, but the proof is to the contrary, as already shown. Besides, how could Arianism without friends or means, in spite of Emperors, Bishops, Bibles, and preconceived faith; spread in the midst of opposition and persecution, from the centre of the Empire to the remotest nations, converting, universally kings and subjects; Patriarch and Plebeian Priests and laymen to condemn heterodoxy in the short space of 25 years? It did not. In speaking of the Christian bishop Auxentius, Neander positively calls "semi-Arianism," the Anti-Nicene doctrine, and says that those nations were "first instructed by teachers who were attached to those principles; and held fast to the form in which they had once received Christianity"—this "mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Trinity," being, "better suited to them than the completely developed Nicene view"—it being a "peculiarity of their Semi-Arian teachers," that "they adhered most tenaciously to the simple Bible doctrine," "teaching nothing which they could not prove with the exactness of verbal testimony from the Bible."—Neander, 2: 423. Which they had in their own tongue, (p. 124,) and studied in the dead languages—p. 120, and were renowned for their knowledge of; even urging the establishment of Bible Schools among the Romans, (p. 160.) They believed that the Son was subordinate, but "not created."—Wad. 115-117. The story that those numerous nations were converted by the refugee, Arians,

of the fourth century, is too monstrous for the Philosopher, and too contrary to facts for the historian; while the idea that they were converted before, but proselyted by those Arians then, is not only contrary to all known facts in history; but, it is too monstrously absurd, to suppose that a party of seventeen condemned Bishops, could proselyte as many nations from the Trinity to Arianism in thirty-five years, so as not to leave in the most of them, a single true believer to tell the woful tale of the universal Apostacy, or make a single note of the great revolutions. Where were the orthodox shepherds? Where the Trinitarian Kings? to defend with fire and sword? Shame, to protestants, who relate such Catholic tales. These nations as far as converted were all Christians of the Anti-Nicene School. (See note, Nean. 2: 117.) It is them, and not the Arians, that Jerome means, when he says—"The whole world wandered to find itself Arian."—Wad. 99. Gib. 2: 252. Nean. 2: 399. Too easily pleased, or too highly offended the various Trinitarian historians, from their dizzy mount of orthodoxy; are puzzled to distinguish between friends and enemies; but bless and curse, with their varying fancy; the same men, as Orthodox and Arians; and so moulded by their plastic hands; the evidence "honored as a God."—(Neander 2: 51,) which makes Christ supreme, leaves Mark an Arian, and makes the Arian "full God," heresy, and the Constantine's worship of Christ and Pagan Gods, orthodoxy. So also the Christians who hold the Son of God before the council of Nice; are doubtfully, or dogmatically appealed to as Trinitarians; while those living after that period are grudgingly, or pettishly consigned over to Arianism; and Sabellius, is now, a heretic while Dr. Adam Clarke with the same views, is an oracle.—Nean. 1: 598.—Clarke Com. Linko 1: 86. Again, the early fathers, Clement, A. Ireneus &c., who only saw in Christ the Logos, and Sarx, that is the divine soul, and flesh—for "Tertullian was the first to express distinctly, and clearly the doctrine, that Christ possessed a proper human soul."—Nean. 1: 634, 635. These fathers, who denied the human soul, up to the council held against Beryll, (p. 593), which first settled that doctrine, are considered orthodox; and those who had no knowledge of the equality of the Holy Spirit, Trinitarians.

When the foundation of the Roman Catholic Church, was laid by Constantine in the beginning of the 4th century, those Christians whose religion was dictated by the Roman Government, came into an entire new Church organization, of which the emperor was "bishop," "supreme head," and "sovereign Pontiff;" who "extended its powers," (Grey & Rut. 92.) Organized for the Episcopal government, by conforming the Church to the state of government, and bishops to magistrates,"—p. 94. "He secured its revenues," making "allotments of land" and "instituting tithes," (p. 95,) and made it the "State Religion."—Nean. 2: 230. The decisions of the bishops, he made legally binding, (p. 189,) with "privileges and penalties," for the obedient and the refractory,—p. 138, and dictated the Nicene Creed,—p. 37, as the test of temporal and eternal salvation.

The first elements of the creed originated in the platonism of the Alexandrian School.—(Nean. 2: 249.) The Bishop, Alexander (Mosh. 1: 125) maintained that the Son was of the same eminence, dignity, and essence of the Father. (Wad. 93.) Arius a presbyter, entertaining entirely different views from those of Plato, (ibid Mosh.) disputed this. "The Church had frequently decided that there was a real difference between the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from both," but the relative dignity had not been defined by "any particular set of ideas."—The Christian Doctors entertained different sentiments upon the subject without giving the least offence.—Mosh. 1: 124. "The prevailing view in the Western Church came to this; one divine essence in the Father and the Son; but at the same time, a subordination in the relation of the Son to the Father."—Neander 1: 605, thus agreeing with the Eastern Church."—Haw. 2: 272. "Where the subordination Theory long maintained its place."—Nean. 1: 716. So that all the Fathers—Justin, Origin, Tertullian, Pantaneus, and many others," long before Arius was born; are now condemned for "Arianism."—Haw. 1: 164, 169, 199, 203. Give we up all whom they condemn; and what have the Orthodox left? For Neander says that "Arius did not believe that he was preaching a new doctrine, but only bringing out and establishing the Old Church subordination system."—Nean. 2: 361. For "the older, more simple form of Church doctrine—before it had undergone any further change—would have satisfied the Arians" who thought it "needed no correction—as they had preserved unaltered from the beginning,—p. 117, so "following the older mode of apprehension, he considered the incarnation of the Logos, to consist simply in its union with a human body,"—and was intending simply to defend the old doctrine of the Church concerning the Trinity—p. 364, 365. A popular error is constantly confirmed; by the duplicity of most modern historians, who compromise the truth, for the creed by recognizing a fictitious Trinitarian, and a fractional Arian, as the only religious parties of the 4th century, while they know that the Arians could muster but seventeen bishops at Nice, and passing the Heterodoxy of such Orthodox heroes, as Ambrose, who held to partial, and Gregory Nazianzan to the universal restoration; as taught by Origin,—Grey & Rut. 90. The Tritheism of Hosius and Sabellianism of Alexander;—the "prevailing subordination of the Son view," as expressed by Hilary Duclan. Inst. 459, and his denial of the human nature of Christ with Clement Alexandrius, Nean. 2: 427. Their views of the Holy Ghost were "vague," some holding with Justin, that it "stood in some relation to the Angels."—Nean. 1: 609, most of the Eastern Church that it was "subordinate to the Son."—p. 716. While Nazianzan confessed in 380, that their "Theologians were divided," as to whether it was a "mode," "creature of God," or "God." Hilary knowing it only as the spirit of God.—Neander 2: 419. So that there was no Trinitarian party. Gibbon makes three parties, all heretics, viz: Arians, Sabellians, and Tritheists. With the Arians he confounds the Christians. The Sabellians, were strict Unitarian Christians. The Sabellians, Mosh. 1: 95. The Tritheists, believed in three Gods. He says that the Tritheists and Sabellians united, against the Arians, which is true; See Note.—Neander 2: 375, and the elements of Tritheism and the

Humanitarian—Unitarianism are distinctly seen in the Trinity to this day. Neander presents three parties, viz: "Arians, Homousions, and the more numerous party," vol. 2, contents xxi. Neander's "Arians" comprise but seventeen bishops, out of Gibbons Arian party, (Nean. 2: 377,) and his "more numerous party," of no Sectarian name, make up the rest of Gibbons Arians; and were the Christians who stood aloof from all parties,—p. 372. His Homousions are Gibbons combination of Sabellians and Tritheists,—p. 375. Neander's words are page 372. "Those who agreed entirely with the doctrine of Arius, which was but a small party; then the advocates of Homousion, who likewise in the Eastern Church, (also, Western Church see preceding page) composed but a comparatively small party; and finally those who occupied the middle ground between the two parties, and entertained similar views with those of Eusebius of Caesarea—that is, the true Son of God doctrine." From these last sprang up afterwards the party called Semi-Arians. "Many of the decided expressions of Arius, concerning the nature of the Son of God must, beyond question, have appeared offensive even to the dominant middle party,"—p. 373. This "more numerous party" afterwards called Arians—p. 390, censured both the Arian and Nicene creeds, as unscriptural—p. 374, contended for "Christ's divinity," strove to "establish peace," and are called the "authors of peace." Early infected with the monarchian heresy.—Nean. 1: 579. Rome was the natural enemy of the personal divine existence of the Son of God. And when Dionysius the great, found it necessary to stem the Sabellian current in A. D. 255 by opposing to it the true Son of God, doctrine; Dionysius of Rome, not only attacked the Son of God, doctrine, falsely accusing him of holding the Son to be a creature; but also vigorously assailed the Tritheistic heresy,—p. 606, 608. But now, when Constantine, who—regarding the bishop, as the representatives of God," Nean. 2: 371, would have willingly acquiesced in the condemnation of Arius, but for the general dissatisfaction, dispatched Hosius his favorite—p. 371 to Alexander, to procure a reconciliation between him and Arius. Alexander, under the Tritheistic influence of Athanasius—Gib. 2: 247, having combined with Hosius to support Homousion—Nean. 2: 375, against the Son of God doctrine, thus uniting the whole strength of the court, Tritheists and Sabellians, rejected all overtures; and the "violent measures of the laity" forced the Emperor to call a council—p. 371, when "a condemnation of the Arian propositions might have been easily carried through—if the party defending the Homousions had not also raised an opposition to the dominant Church doctrine of the East."—p. 373. Thus the four parties were arrayed. Eusebius representing the Christians, i. e. dominant Church party, urged Bible language, charity and peace. Eusebius of Nicomedia, with Arius, contended for his peculiar theory. While Hosius and Alexander led on the united strength of the Sabellians and Tritheists to support Homousion. Thus by imperial authority—p. 375, terror of banishment, and the compromise of heretics; the Homousion condemned at Antioch in A. D. 269, was established at Nice in A. D. 325, contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Council.—Nean. 1: 606, and explained by each party to suit their own theory.—Nean. 2: 378. Gib. 2: 247. Each objected to the others—that the Son of God doctrine, presented the Son between God and creatures, in a medium, which does not exist; or that the Arian full God created out of nothing, was not the Son, but a creature; or that the Tritheist lost the suffering Son, for two useless Gods which was idolatry; or that the Sabellian Homousion held to an eternal infant and mortal God; or denied the Sonship of the divinity, and the divinity of the sacrifice; thus ending the theological flight of orthodoxy, with but one God and a human Savior, far below Arianism.

The various heresies now called orthodox, arose in the following chronological order:

1. Trinity, of ancient date among the heathens, the word was introduced among Christians by Theophilus of Antioch, after the middle of the 2d century.—Gib. 2: 239.
2. A human soul in Christ, originally held by some Gnostics and Ebionites, was first taught among those now called orthodox, by Tertullian, in the beginning of the 3d century.—Neander, 1: 634.
3. According to Trinitarian authors, the Trinity received its "finishing touch" at the council of Constantinople A. D. 381.—Moshem, 1: 128.
4. But the procession of the Holy Ghost from both Father and Son, settled in Spain first at Toledo, A. D. 653.—Moshem, 1: 225. But never adopted by the Greeks.—Gibbon, 3: 450.
5. The Athanasian creed and John—5: 7. (See Clarke, Barnes and others,) were forged in Africa, probably after the 5th century.—Gerard Vosius, tom. 6: 516-522. When Genadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, first saw the Athanasian creed, he pronounced it to be "the work of a drunken man."—Gibbon, 3: 445.
6. The doctrine of two natures, or two wills in Christ, after three centuries of contention and war, and the loss of very many lives; was settled by law at Constantinople in what is falsely called the VI General Council A. D. 680 to 681.—Gibbon, 4: 423.
7. A. D. 380, Theodosius the tyrant, the tenth professedly Christian Emperor of Rome, was the first baptized in the faith of the Trinity; and Clovis the robber, King of France, is called the eldest son of the Church, because that among many Kings had been long before, and also at that time were Christians; yet he was the first Trinitarian King.—Waddington, 98, Gibbon, 4: 71-461. Moshem, 1: 133.

(To be continued.)

I have had six children, and I bless God that they are either with Christ, or in Christ, and my mind is now at rest concerning them. My desire was, that they should have served Christ on earth; but if God will rather choose to have them serve him in heaven, I have nothing to object to it.—EPIST.

The water that flows from a spring does not congeal in the winter. And those sentiments of friendship which flow from the heart cannot be frozen in adversity.

Once give your mind up to suspicion and fear, and there will be sure to be food enough for it. In the stillest night the air is filled with sounds for the wakeful ear that is resolved to listen.