





# ROMAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER XV 107 A.D. - 250 A.D. Page 228

## WHAT EARLY CHURCH FATHERS SAID AND DID ABOUT CONFUSION

Synagogue-Like Church VS Ekklesia-Body of Christ, Ignatius, Polycarp, Pliny, Shepard of Hermas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Montanism, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian

0 100 200 300 400 500 MILES

SCALE

SAMATIA

DACIA

GEORGIA

BLACK SEA

ARMENIA

PONTUS

Belgrade  
R. Danube

MOESIA

Naissus • Adnanople

CONSTANTINOPLE  
• Chalcedon  
• Nicomedia

BITHYNIA

CAPPADOCIA

Sarnosata  
• Caesarea

THRACE

Philippi

Nicaea

Phrygia

GALATIA

Antioch

Tarsus

MESOPOTAMIA

PERSIA

MACEDONIA

Thessalonica

Berea

GREECE

Corinth

ACHAIA

Smyrna

Ephesus

Patmos

Athens

Sardis

Tralles

Colossae

Rhodes

CILICIA

Lystra

Derbe

Antioch

Iconium

Antioch

Antioch

Tarsus

Antioch

ANTIOCH

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

Antioch

MEDITERRANEAN SEA

CRETE

CYPRUS

Tyre

Caesarea

Lydda

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

Jerusalem

ARABIA

ALEXANDRIA

Memphis

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Ptolemais

Cyrene

Memphis

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

Egypt

## CHAPTER XV

### WHAT EARLY CHURCH FATHERS SAID AND DID ABOUT CONFUSION

107 A.D. - 250 A.D.

Now, after the Apostle John had gone, the various ekklesia-churches absorbed the teachings he added to the Word. He mainly pleaded for the Christian groups to go back to the way they were in the beginning where the Holy Spirit controlled their meetings. There were two men, Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp of Smyrna who wrote immediately after John's time. From their writings we see diversity in the ekklesia-church. Evidently John's writings had done some good because neither showed as much influence coming from the Jewish Christians of the circumcision as did the epistle of Clement in 95 A.D.

Ignatius from Antioch certainly knew the deficiencies of the Judaizers; however, he was really hung up on the levels of leadership such as bishop, presbyters, and deacons. These leadership roles were probably left over from a synagogue-like organization in Antioch. Polycarp according to Irenaeus, his pupil, was a disciple of the Apostle John himself. He was more laid-back and not as institutionalized as Ignatius and told his cohorts to take care of each other. Ignatius, the older, was born around 30 A.D. and was probably raised in the area of Antioch in Syria. He was the bishop of the ekklesia-church in Antioch and for some reason had been arrested by the Roman officials in 107 A.D. As Ignatius was escorted to Rome to be killed in the Coliseum, the soldiers allowed him to stop and communicate with his fellow Christians along the way. As he visited with the leaders in Smyrna, he wrote to Christians in Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles and Rome. Then when he traveled to Troas, he wrote back to Philadelphia, Smyrna and his friend, Polycarp. From these letters we can see how he felt about being martyred and what the ekklesias were doing during this time.

For some reason, Ignatius craved martyrdom. He pleaded with the Christian group in Rome not to interfere in his behalf. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 74. For I am afraid of your love, lest it should do me an injury. For it is easy for you to accomplish what you please; but it is difficult for me to attain to God, if ye spare me . . . For if ye are silent con-***

*cerning me, I shall become God's; but if you show your love to my flesh, I shall again have to run my race. Pray, then, do not seek to confer any greater favour upon me than that I be sacrificed to God while the altar is still prepared; ANF Vol 1, pp 75. I write to the Churches, and impress on them all, that I shall willingly die for God, unless ye hinder me. I beseech of you not to show an unseasonable good-will towards me. Suffer me to become food for the wild beasts, through whose instrumentality it will be granted me to attain to God.* This occurred during the reign of Trajan (98-119A.D.) and, while there was no wholesale persecution during this time, the Christians were always subject to the whims of the local Roman officials.

The influence of the Jewish Christians of the circumcision had almost run its course in this area except for the embedded leaders passed along from the synagogue-like meetings. Ignatius, as opposed to Clement of Rome (95 A.D.) had seen the error of the Judaizers' ways. This new knowledge probably came from the writings of the Apostle John in 98 A.D. John actually called them "the synagogues of Satan" in his book of Revelations (Rev 2:9, 3:9). In Ignatius's letter to the Magnesians, he called the Judaizers a false doctrine. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 62. Be not deceived with strange doctrine, nor with old fables, which are unprofitable. For if we still live according to the Jewish law, we acknowledge that we have not received grace. ANF, Vol 1, pp 63. It is absurd to profess Christ Jesus and to Judaize. For Christianity did not embrace Judaism, but Judaism Christianity, that so every tongue which believeth might be gathered together to God.* And on the same subject he wrote to the Smyraens *ANF, Vol 1, pp 89. But consider those who are of a different opinion with respect to the grace of Christ which has come unto us, how opposed they are to the will of God.* All of these showed Ignatius fully understood the problem of the Jewish Christians of the circumcision and their dependence on the Law rather than the grace of God. He even indicated some had changed their meetings from the Sabbath to the Lord's Day. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 62. If, therefore, those who were brought up in the ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's Day, on which also our life has sprung up again by Him and by His death . . .* This showed some groups changed over to a more

ekklesia-type meeting and left behind the old Jewish ways. This might have included the group in Antioch. Evidently John's writings had something to do with this.

In his letter to the Trallians, Ignatius warned them about heresies. I believe heresies had become a problem because of the synagogue-like meetings. When the Holy Spirit was not active, the Christian groups came together for study and discussion. This was a breeding ground for heresies to develop because without the Spirit people looked at the Word with differing viewpoints and came up with differing answers. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 68. I therefore, yet not I, but the love of Jesus Christ, entreat you that ye use Christian nourishment only, and abstain from herbage of a different kind; I mean heresy. For those (that are given to this) mix up Jesus Christ with their own poison, speaking things which are unworthy of credit.*** When a man's mind was in control instead of the Spirit he would include "his own poison". One such heresy during this time was Docetism. ***Brown, Heresies, pp 52. The doctrine of Christ was a shared interest, however. Gnosticism produced docetism because it considered it intolerable to think that a pure spiritual being, Christ, could suffer as a man.*** Most heresies were created because people without revelations from the Holy Spirit would have differing views of the deity of Jesus. Ignatius in his letter to the Trallians warned them about Docetism. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 70. He was truly crucified, and (truly) died, in the sight of beings in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth. He was also truly raised from the dead, His Father quickening Him, even as after the same manner His Father will so raise up us who believe in Him by Christ Jesus, apart from whom we do not possess the true life. But if, as some that are without God, that is, the unbelieving say, that He only seemed to suffer...*** Heresy defined is nothing more than "parties"; however, in Christian history, it came to be a separation or split resulting from false faith. These "parties" always left out or added to the Word of God. The only way to combat heresies was for the ekklesia-Body of Christ to operate from the revelations from God. These Gifts of the Holy Spirit would reveal the Truth from Jesus which would unite everyone's mind.

It seemed Ignatius knew how to prevent these heresies. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 55. Take heed, then, often to come together to give thanks to God, and show forth His praise. For when ye assemble frequently in the same place, the powers of Satan are destroyed, and the destruction at which he aims is prevented by the unity of your faith.* He told the Ephesians the power of Satan was destroyed when they came together in unity. He knew the ekklesia operating through the Gifts would do the job. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 56. Let us therefore do all things as those who have Him dwelling in us, that we may be His temples, and He may be in us as our God, which indeed He is, and will manifest Himself before our faces. Wherefore we justly love Him.* "He will manifest Himself before our faces!" This was the secret because there was no chance of heresies when you saw God manifest Himself before your face. From the beginning this was the main reason for the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, so God could manifest Himself through the ekklesia-Body of Christ. It seemed Ignatius experienced some of these Gifts.

Ignatius had for many years been the leader in Antioch and had become like Clement of Rome, attached to this role. Until John revived their spirits many of the ekklesias had probably drifted into a form of synagogue-like meetings. Ignatius had not been able to loosen himself from this embedded leadership. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 61. I exhort you to study to do all things with a divine harmony, while your bishop presides in the place of God, and your presbyters in the place of the assembly of the apostles, along with your deacons, who are most dear to me . . .* And then to the Smyrnaeans he was more specific. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 89. See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the apostles; and reverence the deacons, as being the institution of God. Let no man do anything connected with the Church without the bishop.* The synagogue-like church had created this pecking order from the most learned to those lacking in knowledge. Ignatius showed this in his letter to the Trallians. *ANF, Vol 1, pp 68. Am I not able to write to you of heavenly things? But I fear to do so, lest I should inflict injury on you who are but babes (in Christ). Pardon me in this respect, lest, as not being able to receive (such doctrines), ye should be strangled by them.* When doctrines are mentioned, we know this came from the

synagogue-like meetings and here Ignatius said some of the doctrines were too complex for the babes in Christ. There was a real gap between this and what Jesus said in Luke 10:21. There He thanked God for revealing His works to the babes and the unlearned.

From Ignatius's writings we can deduce the Christian group in Antioch had some manifestations of the Holy Spirit; however, the leadership was invested in one man, the bishop. I'm sure this created monumental pressure on Ignatius and might have been reason he was so anxious to be martyred. His letter to the Romans sounded remorseful. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 76. For though I am alive while I write to you, yet I am eager to die. My love has been crucified, and there is no fire in me desiring to be fed; but there is within me a water that liveth and speaketh, saying to me inwardly, Come to the Father. I no longer wish to live after the manner of men, and my desire shall be fulfilled if ye consent.*** It was not healthy for him to feel this way. He said he had no fire to be fed. If the bishop was all that important why was he so anxious to leave and be with the Lord?

Possibly when he read John's writings, Ignatius realized the importance of the Body of Christ more fully and knew the "one man ruler" was not in the will of the Lord. He revealed this conclusion to his thinking at the end of the letter to the Romans. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 77. Remember in your prayers the church in Syria, which now has God for its shepherd, instead of me. Jesus Christ alone will oversee it, and your love (will also regard it).*** He was leaving and Jesus was now the shepherd of the Christians in Antioch. Ignatius probably knew at this point it should have been Him from the beginning.

Polycarp, who was the Bishop of Smyrna, wrote only one letter and that to the Philippians in about 115 A.D. Remember he played host to Ignatius who was under arrest on his way to Rome in 107 A.D. Irenaeus said he was a pupil of the Apostle John and I don't doubt it, because John in his prophesy to the ekklesia in Smyrna told them how they had been abused and slandered by the "synagogue of Satan" (Rev 2:9). Both Polycarp and John knew the problems the Judaizers had caused the ekklesias in that area.

In his letter to the Philippians, Polycarp first gave credit to the Apostle Paul. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 33. For neither I, nor any other such one, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorified Paul. He, when among you, accurately and steadfastly taught the word of truth in the presence of those who were then alive.*** He then told them what the presbyters should do in the ekklesia. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 34 And let the presbyters be compassionate and merciful to all, bringing back those that wander, visiting all the sick, and not neglecting the widow, the orphan, or the poor, but always "providing for that which is becoming in the sight of God and man;"*** The presbyters were to keep the Body of Christ together and serve their needs in everyway. The presbyters were to watch for those with unbelief. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 34 . . . and whosoever does not confess the testimony of the cross is of the devil; and whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lust and says that there is neither a resurrection nor a judgment . . .*** You can see the Judaizers and heresies continued to influence the ekklesia. Polycarp went on and told them to stand firm and love the brotherhood. ***ANF, Vol 1, pp 35. Stand fast, therefore, in these things, and follow the example of the Lord, being firm and unchangeable in the faith, loving the brotherhood and being attached to one another, ...Be all of you subject one to another, having your conduct blameless among the Gentiles, that ye may both receive praise for your good works, and the Lord may not be blasphemed through you.*** This sounded more like the true Body of Christ where everyone was subject to one another and acted as one. They were meeting as an ekklesia in the public because their conduct was blameless among the Gentiles. Polycarp was martyred when he was 81 years old. Irenaeus, a great Christian writer, was one of Polycarp's pupils.

About the same time as Ignatius and Polycarp, a Roman official left us some information about the ekklesia in Bithynia, a Roman province north of Smyrna. Pliny was sent there by Trajan the Emperor, as his official representative in 112 A.D. He was the author of a letter to Trajan explaining the arrest of some Christians. Pliny explained, he had executed some Christians who came before him, but they all said they had done nothing wrong. ***Bruce TSF, pp 170. But they maintained that their fault or error amounted to nothing more than this: they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before sun-***

**rise and reciting an antiphonal hymn to Christ as God, and binding themselves with an oath---not to commit any crime, but to abstain from all acts of theft, robbery and adultery, from breaches of faith, from denying a trust when called upon to honour it. After this, they went on, it was their custom to separate, and then meet again to partake of food . . .** The Christians were meeting as an ekklesia in a public place, probably a stoa in the Agora of a city. The reason they met before day light was probably because there was a great number and they didn't want to crowd the marketplace or infringe on the pagan temples. Before daylight! Imagine how much they wanted to meet and come together. They obviously were experiencing the Gifts of the Holy Spirit and not merely listening passively to someone expound on the Scriptures. Everybody had to bring their own light and food for their meal.

Pliny showed some resignation that there were so many in so many places that his efforts might be futile. **Bruce TSF, pp 170-171. The case seemed to me to be a proper one for consultation, particularly because of the number of those who were accused. For many of every age, every class, and of both sexes are being accused and will continue to be accused. Nor has this contagious superstition spread through the cities only, but also through the villages and the countryside. But I think it can be checked and put right. At any rate the temples, which had been well-nigh abandoned, are beginning to be frequented again;** As a result of all the activity of the ekklesia, the attendance was increasing for the pagan temples.

Trajan answered back with a letter which indicated he was not interested in making a big deal of these Christians. **Bruce TSF, pp 171. They must not be ferreted out; if they are charged and convicted, they must be punished, provided that anyone who denies that he is a Christian and gives practical proof of that by invoking our gods is to win indulgence...Anonymous documents which are laid before you should receive no attention in any case; they are a very bad precedent and quite unworthy of the age in which we live.** He told Pliny don't go after them unless there are many legitimate complaints.

In 124 A. D., Emperor Hadrian wrote to the proconsul of Asia about the Christians. ***Bruce TSF, pp 172. If the provincials, then, plainly wish to support this petition of theirs against the Christians by bringing some definite charge against them before the court, let them confine themselves to this action and refrain from mere appeals and outcries.*** Hadrian seemed to have about the same attitude as Trajan. This showed the persecution of the Christians was sporadic, unpredictable and nothing like the persecution of Nero in 64 A.D.

Around 120-130 A.D. an allegorical epistle appeared on the Christian scene. It was called, "The Shepherd of Hermas" and was written by a man named Hermas. He was reportedly the brother of Pius who became the Bishop of Rome in 158 A.D. We last heard from the Christians in Rome by the epistle of Clement in 95 A.D., and in his writings we saw there was an extreme hierarchical organization in Rome that could have only come from a synagogue-like group. The original public ekklesia-church had been wiped out by the carnage of Nero in 64 A.D.

The Apostle John had returned to Ephesus from prison and wrote The Revelation, his Epistles and the Gospel of John. In all these he promoted the workings of the Holy Spirit and was not pleased with the synagogue-like groups. John said in 1 John 2:27, they had no need that anyone instruct them because they had the Holy Spirit. John's influence was felt around the Christian world and I'm sure he had some effect on the Christians in Rome. His writings were available for all to read.

Allegories were written for reason. Usually, like a parable, you can state your case in an oblique way to make your point. I believe "The Shepherd of Hermas" was mainly about Jesus' ekklesia making a reappearance to the group in Rome. The Christian group in Rome in 95 A.D. was a long way from the ekklesia that Jesus had in mind. The synagogue-like ministry had spread from them to the Christian world and had caused the public ekklesia irreparable damage. John, when he came back, tried to rectify the situation as best he could even though he was a very old man. He did point out the "synagogues of Satan" (Rev. 2:9 and 3:9)

The allegory of the Shepherd started where the spirit carried Hermas away to meet an old woman. She said to him. **ANF Vol 2, pp 9 . . . "but hear the words which I am going to speak to you. God, who dwells in the heavens, and made out of nothing the things that exist, and multiplied and increased them on account of His holy Church, is angry with you for having sinned against me."** Right away it was about the church or ekklesia and Hermas wondered why he had sinned against the old woman. **ANF Vol 2, pp 12. "Who is it then?" say I. And he said, "It is the church." And I said to him, "Why then is she an old woman?" "Because," said he, "she was created first of all. On this account is she old. And for her sake was the world made."** So it was the ekklesia that had spoken to Hermas. The ekklesia-church was considered important to God because He had made the world just for her (ekklesia).

Then the angel explained to Hermas the workings of the Holy Spirit in a man. **ANF Vol 2, pp 27. Try the man who has the Divine Spirit by his life. First, he who has the Divine Spirit proceeding from above is meek, and peaceable, and humble, and refrains from all iniquity and the vain desire of this world.** Then, the angel explained what happened when the Gifts were manifested in the group. **ANF Vol 2, pp 27-28. When, then, a man having the Divine Spirit comes into an assembly of righteous men who have faith in the Divine Spirit, and this assembly of men offer up prayers to God, then the angel of the prophetic Spirit, who is destined for him, fills the man; and the man being filled with the Holy Spirit, speaks to the multitude as the Lord wishes. Thus, then, will the Spirit of Divinity become manifest. Whatever power therefore comes from the Spirit of Divinity belongs to the Lord.** This was a typical ekklesia-church taught by Paul in all his writings. It certainly wasn't anything at all like the group described by Clement in his epistle in 95 A.D. The angel went on to say you should not do this for money.

We stop here to show that F.F. Bruce in his "The Spreading Flame" said the word "assembly" mentioned in the last quote was actually "synagogue" in Greek. We will quote this passage from **Bruce TSF, pp 218. When the man who has the divine Spirit comes into a synagogue of**

***righteous men, who have faith in the divine Spirit, and intercession is made to God by the synagogue of those men, then the angel of the prophetic Spirit, who is in contact with him, fills the man, and the man,, filled with the Holy Spirit, speaks to the congregation as the Lord pleases.*** This showed the Gifts of the Holy Spirit to be operative in a synagogue-like setting. It also added credence to James 2:2 where James said Christians had their own synagogues. Because this story was an allegory, the big question was whether these Gifts were actually manifested in a synagogue-setting or was this, the wishes of the person responsible for the allegory itself. The answer is, we really don't know.

Hermas was then told about the Trinity. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 43. "I wish to explain to you what the Holy Spirit that spake with you in the form of the church showed you, for that Spirit is the son of God.*** Here again we see the Trinity as Jesus and the Holy Spirit are one. Jesus told the disciples this in John 14:17 when he said, He is with you now and will be in you, which would be of course at Pentecost. The angel then explained to Hermas more about Jesus' ekklesia. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 50. In like manner, also shall it be with the Church of God, after it has been purified, and has rejected the wicked, and the hypocrites, and the blasphemers, and the waverers, and those who commit wickedness of different kinds. After these have been cast away, the Church of God shall be one body, of one mind, of one understanding, of one faith, of one love,. And then the son of God will be exceeding glad, and shall rejoice over them, because He has received His people pure."*** This was what God had in mind for His ekklesia-church to make His people pure. The person who wrote this allegory certainly knew what the church "ought to be" with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. In my opinion, "the Shepard of Hermas" was an allegory from someone in the area of Rome pleading for the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.

In 132 A.D. a Jew named Bar Cochba, instigated another revolt against Rome. Hadrian the emperor had threatened to build a Temple to Jupiter on the site of the destroyed Temple in Jerusalem. The revolt was crushed in 135 A. D. by Severus and Jerusalem was renamed Aelia Capitolina. A temple to Jupiter was built on the old site and no

Jew was allowed in the area. All administrative work was located in Caesarea and Jerusalem was left in devastation for the next 200 years. After 300 A.D., the Emperor Constantine, the Great, who professed to be a Christian, encouraged people to visit the Jerusalem area.

Justin Martyr (110-165 A.D.), a Christian apologist writer, was active in the 140-160 A.D. time frame. He was born in Samaria and had spent time in Ephesus and Rome. He probably settled in Rome and suffered martyrdom under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius in 165 A.D. He was very well-educated and was considered to be a philosopher being a disciple of Plato and Socrates.

After becoming a Christian, his two main works were an Apology for Christianity and a Dialogue between himself and a Jew named Trypho which he used to explain his version of Christianity. In dealing with the philosophy of the day, he compared the hollow word of the pagans with the regenerating power of the Word of God.

In his Apology, Justin explained the charge that Christians were atheists because they worshiped only one God. He showed what Christians were looking for in a kingdom. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 166. And when you hear that we look for a kingdom, you suppose, without making any inquiry, that we speak of a human kingdom; whereas we speak of that which is with God, as appears also from the confession of their faith made by those who are charged with being Christians, though they know that death is the punishment awarded to him who so confesses.*** He said Christians were not looking for an earthly kingdom and that death could be an award for them.

He stated the coming of Jesus was prophesied by many prophets and His disciples carried on after Him. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 175-176. And that it did so come to pass, we can convince you. For from Jerusalem there went out into the world, men, twelve in number, and these illiterate, of no ability in speaking; but by the power of God they proclaimed to every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach to all the word of God;*** His disciples went out, not on their own, but by the power of God to teach the world about His Son Jesus Christ.

Then Justin in his Apology explained the ekklesia-church of his day. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 185-186. . . . we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader, has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen.*** This appeared to be an ekklesia-type meeting because a president was the leader instead of a bishop. They came together in one place also indicated they were in the public places and they exhorted to the good things. This probably meant some Gifts were manifested in their meetings. This along with the writings of Hermas showed more evidence the area around Rome was enjoying more ekklesia-type meetings instead of the synagogue-like gatherings.

Justin at the end of his Apology included a story from Marcus Aurelius. During a battle some Christians who were in the army prayed for badly needed rain. The rain came and provided them with water, but also, a withering hail on the enemy. After that, Marcus Aurelius said he only accused Christians of being Christians but they should be left alone.

In the Dialogue with Typo, Justin told Typo, the Jew, the Gifts were prophesied by the prophets of old. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 214 "Listen, O friend, for I am not mad or beside myself; but it was prophesied that, after the ascent of Christ to heaven, He would deliver us from error and give us gifts. The words are these: 'He ascended up on high; He led captivity captive; He gave gifts to men.' . . . For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God.*** He even told Typo, God was waiting for the Jews to accept the Gifts. This should have been convincing to a Jew who at this time knew his old Jewish world was in shambles. He also told Typo, the prophetic Gifts had been transferred.

***ANF Vol 1, pp 240. "for the prophetical gifts remain with us, even to the present time. And hence you ought to understand that (the gifts) formerly among your nation have been transferred to us."*** The prophetical Gifts were now a part of the ekklesia-church. He became more specific about the role of Jesus and His Gifts to His believers and how they were active amongst them at that time. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 243. The Scripture says that these enumerated powers of the Spirit have come on Him, not because He stood in need of them, but because they would rest in Him, i.e., would find their accomplishment in Him, so that there would be no more prophets in your nation after the ancient custom: and this fact you plainly perceive. For after Him no prophet has arisen among you . . . Now, it is possible to see amongst us women and men who possess gifts of the Spirit of God;*** It is hard to tell just how much Justin was involved in the Gifts of Holy Spirit, but he certainly knew of their existence and manifestations in the ekklesias-churches of his area. He mentioned women as well as men, so he was probably attending some home meetings of the Body of Christ as well as those in public.

Justin showed he understood Jesus when He told God in Luke 10:21, "I thank you Father for revealing these things to the babes, unskilled and unlearned," ***ANF Vol 1, pp 276. For neither by nature nor by human conception is it possible for men to know things so great and divine, but the gift which then descended from above upon the holy men, who has no need of rhetorical art . . . but to present themselves pure to the energy of the Divine Spirit, in order that the divine plectrum itself, descending from heaven, and using righteous men as an instrument like a harp or lyre, might reveal to us the knowledge of things divine and heavenly.*** Justin had amazing insight because this was that on which Jesus built his ekklesia (Matt 16:18). John referred to these revelations in 1 John 2:27, "you don't need teachers, you have the Holy Spirit". Justin knew the real meaning of the ekklesia-Body of Christ, which was obviously different from what Clement implied for the Christian group in Rome in 95 A.D. I believe Justin had read John's writings and probably became alarmed, like John, about the state of the ekklesia-church in the area of Rome.

Irenaeus (120-202 A.D.) probably spent his boyhood in Smyrna and was taught by Polycarp the Bishop of the local ekklesia. Polycarp was martyred in 155 A.D. at the age of eighty-one. He was probably around twenty years old when John wrote his Revelation and gave the ekklesia in Smyrna the prophesy from Jesus. You will remember the prophesy in Rev 2:9 told the Smyrneans, "the synagogue of Satan" who say they are Jews, but are not have already abused and reviled and slandered the ekklesia in Smyrna. What exactly happened is anybody's guess; however, it appears there was abuse coming from these so-called Christians who met in their own synagogues (James 2:2) A rivalry had probably developed between the ekklesia with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit and another group that met in synagogue-like meetings. These synagogue-like groups would be structured with leaders and teachers much like the Jewish synagogues. This was probably what John saw when he came back from prison and realized the ekklesia was losing the contest. Polycarp had been in the middle of this problem and I'm sure related his experiences and the teachings of the Apostle John to his pupils.

Irenaeus was made Bishop of Lyons in the frontier country of Gaul (France) in about 177 A.D. Pathinus, also a pupil of Polycarp, had been the previous bishop and he was martyred while Irenaeus was in Rome studying about the heresies. Irenaeus wrote a treatis called "Against Heresies" in about 182-188 A.D. From his writings we can see that Irenaeus was very much a believer in the ekklesia and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. I believe the Apostle John would have been very proud of Irenaeus, the pupil of Polycarp.

Irenaeus related how the Gospel came down to them from the public meetings of Jesus' ekklesia. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 414. We have learned from none others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the Gospel has come down to us, which they did at one time proclaim in public, and, at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures . . . For, after our Lord rose from the dead, (the apostles) were invested with the power from on high when the Holy spirit came down (upon them), were filled from all (His gifts), and had perfect knowledge. The power came from the Holy Spirit. They received the Gifts and handed down the Scriptures by***

**revelation knowledge.** Irenaeus told about Pentecost. *ANF Vol 1, pp 430. Again, when the Holy Ghost had descended upon the disciples, that they all might prophesy and speak with tongues, and some mocked them, as if drunken, for it was the third hour of the day; . . . The God, therefore, who did promise by the prophets, that He would send His spirit upon the whole human race, was He who did send; and God Himself is announced by Peter as having fulfilled His own promise...Thus the apostles did not preach another god, or another Fulness; nor, that the Christ who suffered and rose again was one, while he who flew off on high was another, and remained impassible; but that there was one and the same God the Father, and Christ Jesus who rose from the dead;* God had fulfilled his promise by sending His Holy Spirit and Jesus remained the same whether He was man or God.

Irenaeus gave an account of some of the heresies that people believed but then told of some manifestations of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. *ANF Vol 1, pp 409. Wherefore, also, those who are in truth His disciples, receiving grace from Him, do in His name perform (miracles), so as to promote the welfare of other men, according to the gift which each one has received from Him. For some do certainly and truly drive out devils, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently both believe (in Christ), and join themselves to the church. Others have foreknowledge of things to come: they see visions, and utter prophetic expressions. Other still, heal the sick by laying their hands upon them, and they are made whole. Yea, moreover, as I have said, the dead even have been raised up, and remained among us for many years. And what shall I more say? It is not possible to name the number of gifts which the church, (scattered) throughout the whole world, has received from God, in the name of Jesus Christ... For as she has received freely from God, freely also does she minister (to others). Nor does she perform anything by means of angelic invocations, or by incantations, or by any other wicked curious art; but, directing her prayers to the Lord, who made all things, in a pure, sincere, and straightforward spirit, and calling upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, she has been accustomed to work miracles for the advantage of mankind, and not to lead them into error.* Regardless of what some say, according to Irenaeus, the

Gifts continued to happen in the ekklesias after the time of the Apostles. This showed the ekklesia with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit continued to be an evangelistic tool as some who had been delivered from evil spirits were saved and joined the ekklesia. Irenaeus indicated by "what more can I say" that these Gifts were common occurrences in their ekklesias.

Irenaeus said by our faith we preserve and exhibit the Gifts to the ekklesia. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 458. For this gift of God has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was to the first created man, for this purpose, that all the members receiving it may be vivified; and the (means of) communion with Christ has been distributed throughout it, that is, the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the means of confirming our faith, and the ladder of ascent to God...For where the church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is truth.*** The Gift of Faith to the ekklesia was like breath to the first man. The members received life (vivified) from the manifestations of the Spirit. This is a beautiful description of the ekklesia-church.

Obviously, Irenaeus understood what Jesus meant in Matt 16:18 when He said, "On the revelation from God, I will build my ekklesia". ***ANF Vol 1, pp 520-521. God thus determining all things before hand for the bringing of man to perfection, for his edification, and for the revelation of His dispensations, that goodness may both be made apparent, and righteousness perfected, and that the Church may be fashioned after the image of His Son, and that man may finally be brought to maturity at some future time, becoming ripe through such privileges to see and comprehend God.*** The ekklesia-Body of Christ would be in the image of His Son and would act as His Son on this earth. The manifestations would be how man would see and comprehend God. Irenaeus was very clear about this.

Irenaeus told how the Gifts, including tongues, were manifested in his ekklesia. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 531. In like manner we do also hear many brethren in the church, who possess prophetic gifts, and who through the Spirit speak all kinds of languages, and bring to light for the general benefit the hidden things of men, and declare the myster-***

*ies of God, whom also the apostle term "spiritual", they being spiritual because they partake of the Spirit. . .* Here Irenaeus sounds just like Apostle Paul. These Gifts were for the benefit of man and when the Spirit was blended with man's soul. Man became more like God. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 532. But when the spirit here blended with the soul is united to (God's) handiwork, the man is rendered spiritual and perfect because of the outpouring of the Spirit, and this is he who was made in the image and likeness of God.*** The Holy Spirit in a man caused him to be in the likeness of God. This explains why Jesus said, "I in them".

I believe Irenaeus showed himself to almost be on par with Paul as a spiritual man. Here he showed his understanding of Paul's description of what happens to man when he is saved and filled with the Holy Spirit (Eph 1:13-14). ***ANF Vol 1, pp 533. "In which ye also, having heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, believing in which ye have been sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance." This earnest, therefore, thus dwelling in us, renders us spiritual even now and the mortal is swallowed up by the immortality. "For ye," he declares, "are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you". . . It will render us like unto Him, and accomplish the will of the Father; for it shall make man after the image and likeness of God.*** The Holy Spirit enables us to "get some of what we will receive a lot more of" when we see Jesus in heaven. In the meantime, we can accomplish His will if we are like Him on this earth.

Irenaeus said the ekklesia should be in the streets to show the public the manifestations of God. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 548. For to her is entrusted the light of God; and therefore the 'wisdom" of God, by means of which she saves all men, "is declared in (its) going forth; it uttereth (its voice) faithfully in the streets, is preached on the tops of the walls, and speaks continually in the gates of the city." For the Church preaches the truth everywhere.*** Irenaeus knew the ekklesia's place was to evangelize the world. The demeanor of Irenaeus was refreshing compared to Ignatius or Clement of Rome, who worried too much about the bishop's place.

All of this, the Holy Spirit and the ekklesia-Body of Christ, was meant to perfect man before God. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 548. These things, therefore, He recapitulated in Himself: by uniting man to the Spirit, and causing the Spirit to dwell in man, He is Himself made the head of the Spirit, and gives the Spirit to be the head of man: for through Him (the Spirit) we see, and hear, and speak.*** The Spirit controlled man was what God intended for His redemption process to accomplish, in bringing man back to God. The idealistic ekklesia-Body of Christ flourished in Lyons because it was located on the frontier area away from the distractions of the synagogue-like meetings. We would all do well to have an ekklesia-Body of Christ exactly like the one in Lyons.

About the same time (175 A.D.) as Irenaeus and the ekklesia were meeting in Lyons, where the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were being manifested, another very different kind of meeting was taking place in Asia. Several bishops were deciding to punish a group for participating in the very same Gifts of the Spirit as Irenaeus and his group in Lyons. This was an illustration of the dichotomy developing among the Christians because of the synagogue-like meetings.

The offending group were called Montanist after a man named Montanus from the village of Ardaba. As far as I could tell, this was very close to Philadelphia which was the subject of the prophesy in Rev 3:8-9. This was one of the prophesies that mentioned the synagogue of Satan and the trouble they were causing the ekklesia-church. Evidently the influence of these synagogues-like meetings had become so strong in this area that a meeting where the Gifts of the Spirit were manifested was not condoned by the surrounding bishops.

We hear about this meeting from a fragment of Asterius Urbanus' writings. He wrote about the meeting and offending group in 232 A.D. some sixty years after it all took place. ***ANF Vol 7, pp 335-336. There is said to be a certain village called Ardaba in the Mysia, which touches Phrygia. There, they say, one of those who had been but recently converted to the faith, a person of the name of Montanus . . . And this person was carried away in spirit; and suddenly being seized with a kind of frenzy and ecstasy, he raved, and began to***

*...speak and to utter strange things, and to prophesy in a manner contrary to the custom of the Church . . . But there were others too, who, as if elated by the Holy Spirit and the prophetic gift, and not a little puffed up, . . . and seductive spirit, being themselves cajoled and misled by him, so that there was no longer any checking him to silence . . . For he stirred up two others also, women and filled them with the spurious spirit, so that they too spoke in a frenzy and unseasonably, and in a strange manner, like the person already mentioned, while the spirit called them happy as they rejoiced and exulted proudly at his working . . .* These Montanist had received the Holy Spirit like the Samaritans in Acts 8:17; like Paul in Acts 9:17; like Cornelius and group, when they spoke in tongues and magnified the Lord in Acts 10:46, and the disciples at Ephesus, who had not heard of the Holy Spirit, but who spoke in foreign languages and prophesied in Acts 19:6. I wonder how Urbanus would have reacted if he had been present within the Temple Mount in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. One thing for sure, he had never been to an ekklesia-church meeting where the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were manifested by the people.

Urbanus said the offending Montanists were expelled from the Church. *ANF Vol 7, pp 336. For when the faithful throughout Asia met together often and in many places in Asia for deliberation on this subject, and subjected those novel doctrines to examination, and declared them to be spurious, and rejected them as heretical, they were in consequence of that expelled from the Church and debarred from communion.* In order for a group of bishops to come together and deliberate meant these synagogue-like churches were very organized and structured with many levels of leadership. These leaders decided to disassociate themselves from these people and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. Evidently Montanus and group had grown tired of the synagogue-like meetings and began to have meetings where the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were exhibited in public, like an ekklesia.

It is very difficult to study about the Montanist in church history because most all the information comes from those who were opposed to their very existence. Eusebius, the prominent church historian, wrote extensively about the Montanist in 321 A.D.; however, at that time, he was embroiled against a spiritual renewal by the

monks and his opinions were colored by his position in that controversy.

After they were excommunicated, three of the church fathers who were living during this time commented on the plight of Montanist. Irenaeus was the first to comment although he never mentioned their name. He was mainly concerned they were not a part of the ekklesia. ***ANF Vol 1, pp 429. Others, again (the Montanists), that they may set at nought the gift of the Spirit, which in the latter times has been, by the good pleasure of the Father, poured out upon the human race, do not admit that aspect (of the evangelical dispensation) presented by John's Gospel, in which the Lord promised that He would send the Paraclete; but set aside at once both the gospel and the prophetic Spirit. Wretched men indeed! Who wish to be pseudo-prophets, forsooth, but who set aside the gift of prophesy from the Church; acting like those (the Encratitae) who, on account of such as come in hypocrisy, hold themselves aloof from the communion of the brethren.*** Irenaeus, who had only heard about the Montanist at this point, showed some naivety. Evidently he didn't know they had been excommunicated by the bishops and couldn't imagine them not participating in an ekklesia with the Gifts. Irenaeus probably didn't know the bishops in Phrygia were opposed to the Gifts of the Spirit. I'm also sure Paul or the Apostle John never imagined something like this would happen under the guise of Christianity. This illustrated how far the synagogue-like meetings had deviated from the original ekklesia-Body of Christ.

Clement of Alexandria who was head of a Christian school in Alexandria mentioned the Montanist in 195 A.D. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 426. Let not the above-mentioned people, then, call us, by way of reproach, "natural men", nor the Phrygians either; for these now call those who do not apply themselves to the new prophesy "natural men".*** Clement who obviously was the product of the synagogue-like church resented the Montanist's spirituality. He certainly didn't consider himself a natural man.

Tertullian, a Christian apologist at Carthage, believed like Irenaeus, Paul and the Apostle John. He was active in the Gifts of the Spirit

before he heard about the action against the Montanists. He agreed with their tenets and said so in his writings. In 208 A.D., he described the timidity of the Bishop of Rome who was influenced to change his favorable position on the Montanists by a man named Praxeas. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 597. For after the Bishop of Rome had acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and, in consequence of the acknowledgment, had bestowed his peace on the churches of Asia and Phrygia, he, by importunately urging false accusations against the prophets themselves and their churches, and insisting on the authority of the bishop's predecessors in the see, compelled him to recall the pacific letter which he had issued, as well as to desist from his purpose of acknowledging the said gifts. By this Praxeas did a twofold service for the devil at Rome: he drove away prophesy, and he brought in heresy; he put to flight the Paraclete, and he crucified the Father.*** Tertullian said Praxeas through false accusations turned the Bishop of Rome against the Montanist and by this crucified the Father. He took up for the Montanist at every turn. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 102. It is these which raise controversy with the Paraclete; it is on this account that the New Prophecies are rejected: not that Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla preach another God, nor that they disjoin Jesus Christ (from God), nor that they overturn any particular rule of faith or hope, but that they plainly teach more frequent fasting than marrying.*** Tertullian said some didn't like them because they preached too much morality and virtue.

Asterius Urbanus in 232 A.D. argued the Montanist didn't last and fell by the wayside. ***ANF Vol 7, pp 337 . . . as they say, the women who attached themselves to Montanus succeeded to the gift of prophesy, let them show us which of them thus succeeded Montanus and his women. For the apostle deems that the gift of prophesy should abide in all the Church up to the time of the final advent. But they will not be able to show the gift to be in their possession even at the present time, which is the fourteenth year only from the death of Maximilla.*** Urbanus seemed relieved these Gifts didn't continue on to his time, and he called them a false spirit of prophesy.

The Spirit of Montanism continued to plague the organized synagogue-like formal church through the years and centuries. As long as

we have a Bible that says, "Do not quench the spirit" (1 Thes 5:19), it will continue to do so. The Montanists had to be the first Christian group penalized by another Christian group for their beliefs and actions. The Christians from the synagogue-like meetings obviously objected to the Montanist's use of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. This marks a turning point in church history where the more formal, studious and organized synagogue-like meetings had gained the upper hand over the more public ekklesias where the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were manifested to show the power of God. The synagogue-like group or formal church even organized a school in Alexandria to teach converts about their kind of Christianity.

At 200 A. D. we have two Christian writers who typify the differences in the Christian world at this time. One was Clement of Alexandria who was the leader of the school in Alexandria and had very little use for the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the other was located in Carthage some twelve hundred miles west of Alexandria. His name was Tertullian and he agreed with such stalwarts as Irenaeus, Apostle John, and Paul about the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. From his writings there was no question he participated in these Gifts.

Tertullian was and continues to be an anathema to most theological scholars because they know and recognize that he was articulate, intelligent, and very knowledgeable about the Scriptures.

What they don't like is he sided with the Montanists. Some say he was brilliant until he became a Montanist in 207-208 A.D., and after that he lost his brilliance. I will show evidence he definitely believed in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit as early as 192 A.D. when he wrote his "On Prayer".

A state of calm existed across the empire at the end of the second century under Emperor Commodus. The Christians emboldened by this calmness established a Christian school in Alexandria under the direction of Clement (150 to 210 A. D.). This was amazing in that Christianity was not yet a legal organization in the Roman Empire.

Before the Babylonian exile many Jews escaped to Egypt from Judea including the prophet Jeremiah. Alexandria was always noted for aca-

demics especially since the Greek leaders directed the Jews to make a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. This was called the Septuagint and was completed around 275 B.C. Barnabas you will recall wrote his Epistle from Alexandria in 78 A.D. after the destruction of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem

The school was created by and for the synagogue-like Christian groups who had need for more learned teachers and leaders. It looked as if the revival of the ekklesia instigated by the Apostle John and his writings was losing out to the more formal, scholarly and synagogue-like groups. The Montanists who were considered heretics because of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit had become an aberration to many of the Christian groups. John faced the same problem in 98 A.D. where he could see the synagogue-like meetings replacing the ekklesia and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Clement, who was in charge of the school, I'm sure felt compelled to write to the Christian groups and explain his position on the theological matters and his position on the ekklesia. Keep in mind the word ekklesia continued to be the basic unit of the democracy in the Roman Empire.

This school in Alexandria would have to be the first Christian seminary and Clement of Alexandria would have to be considered the first official theologian. Theology is an interesting word. We have biology which is the study of life, and geology which is the study of the earth. Theology would therefore be the study of God. Now man was created by God, in their, God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit's image. How much audacity does it take for man to study his own Creator? After all, man was supposed to be like Him. The theologian usually studies what other people think of God. What we must do is come to the knowledge of Him and this, according to the Word, comes to us by revelation from Him. It is extremely hard to study revelation knowledge.

In about 195 A.D. Clement wrote, "Exhortations to the Heathens, the Instructor and Stromata or (Miscellanies)" and they were distributed to the various formal churches. Clement, who was a philosopher before

becoming a Christian, always promoted knowledge. In fact, he equated ignorance with madness and said we must regard God's things with wisdom.

In the Instructor, he said through faith they received illumination and through illumination they received knowledge and through knowledge they received rest. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 216. And where faith is, there is the promise; and the consummation of the promise is rest. So that in illumination what we receive is knowledge, and the end of knowledge is rest . . . The darkness is ignorance, through which we fall into sins, purblind as to the truth. Knowledge, then, is the illumination we receive, which makes ignorance disappear, and endows us with clear vision. He said through ignorance we fall into sin, and through knowledge we see a clear vision.*** He seemed to equate knowledge with what the Holy Spirit could do for us.

These formal-groups must have met in the public accompanied by music but not the Gifts. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 249. In the present instance He is a guest with us. For the apostle adds again, "Teaching and admonishing one another in all wisdom, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your heart to God". . . This is our thankful revelry. And even if you wish to sing and play to the harp or lyre, there is no blame. Thou shalt imitate the righteous Hebrew king in his thanksgiving to God.*** He exhorted them to love their neighbors and worship with spiritual songs and hymns. Be like David and show Thanksgiving to the Lord. He then told them to bless the Creator before taking food. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 249. And as it is befitting, before parting of food, that we should bless the Creator of all; so also in drinking it is suitable to praise Him on partaking of His creatures. For the psalm is a melodious and sober blessing. The apostle calls the psalm "a spiritual song."*** Clement said here, the apostle called the psalm a "spiritual song". No, the Apostle Paul made a distinction between a "spiritual song" and a psalm (Eph 5:19, Col 3:16). The spiritual song was singing in tongues. You have to watch these theologians, for they will color the Word with their own point of view.

Because of the public nature of the meeting, Clement wanted a more sedate and orderly atmosphere. This was when the synagogue-like

meetings turned into the formal church. *ANF Vol 2, pp 249-250. For since all forms of speech flow from mind and manners, ludicrous expressions could not be uttered, did they not proceed from ludicrous practices. Plesantry is allowable, not waggery. Besides, even laughter must be kept in check; for when given vent in the right manner, it indicates orderliness, but when it issues differently it shows a want of restraint . . . Smiling even requires to be made the subject of discipline. If it is at what is disgraceful, we ought to blush rather than smile, lest we seem to take pleasure in it by sympathy; if at what is painful, it is fitting to look sad rather than to seem pleased. For to do the former is a sign of rational human thought; the other infers suspicion of cruelty.* He even instructed men and women how they should dress to be seen in public.

Clement as he discussed faith in his Stromata went into a very complex description but ended up saying that faith chose knowledge. *ANF Vol 2, pp 349. Unswerving choice then, gives considerable momentum in the direction of knowledge. The exercise of faith directly becomes knowledge, reposing on a sure foundation. Knowledge, accordingly, is defined by the sons of the philosophers as a habit, which cannot be overthrown by reason.* If we have enough knowledge, that will become a habit and will not be overthrown by reason. He went on and said the divine Scriptures were a demonstration. *ANF Vol 2, pp 349. He who believeth then the divine Scriptures with sure judgment, receives in the voice of God, who bestowed the Scriptures, a demonstration that cannot be impugned. Faith, then, is not established by demonstration.* Here he goes against the ekklesia and Body of Christ by saying, "faith is not established by demonstration". The very reason for the ekklesia-Body of Christ with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit was to demonstrate the power of God. This happened at Pentecost and Paul always said, "I did not come to you with brilliant speech but with power from the Holy Spirit". Clement in his own way was castigating the Montanist movement in Phrygia, and their demonstrations of the Holy Spirit. Obviously Clement did not have any regard for the Montanists (Phrygians) of his day. *ANF Vol 2, pp 426. Let not the above-mentioned people, then call us, by way of reproach, "natural men" nor the Phrygians either; for these now call those who do not apply themselves to the new prophesy*

**"natural men".** He resented being considered in any way a natural man, but had no desire to experience any of the manifestations of Holy Spirit.

Clement showed here his high regard for knowledge. It would be perfect if we could just perfect it. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 498. And as knowledge is not born with men, and the acquiring of it in its elements demands application, and training and progress; and then from incessant practice it passes into a habit; so, when perfected in the mystic habit, it abides, being infallible through love.*** It would be wonderful if we all had more knowledge and we should strive for more; however, that's one of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit to the Body of Christ, the Word of Knowledge. Why should we strive so, when's it's available to us through faith in the revelations from God.

It took knowledge to develop qualified people according to Clement. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 506. For it is not simply doing well, but doing actions with a certain aim, and acting according to reason, that the Scriptures exhibit as requisite. As, the, lyres ought not to be touched by those who are destitute of skill in playing the lyre, nor flutes by those who are unskilled in flute playing, neither are those to put their hand to affairs who have not knowledge, and know not how to use them in the whole of life.*** Here Clement tries to take Christianity back to the old Jewish way where only the learned ones were in charge. Jesus made this very clear in Luke 10:21 when He joyously told God, "I thank you Father!!! You have revealed these things to the babes and the untaught". Clement went on to build his case for knowledge. ***ANF Vol 2, PP 506. It is clear, then, that those who do not for knowledge perform good actions, do not know what is for their own advantage. And if so, neither are they capable of praying aright, so as to receive from God good things; nor should they receive them, will they be sensible of the boon; nor, should they enjoy them, will they enjoy worthily what they know not; both from their want of knowledge how to use the good things given them, and from their excessive stupidity, being ignorant of the way to avail themselves of the divine gifts.*** This appears like you could by your own efforts learn your way to receive the Gifts. If we could do that they wouldn't be called "Gifts". .

By having this knowledge, a hierarchy would develop whereby the Gnostic (the one with the knowledge) would direct the actions of the members. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 518. The Gnostic, accordingly, having received from God the power to be of service, benefits some by disciplining them, by bestowing attention on them; others by exhorting them, by assimilation; and others, by training and teaching them, by command. And certainly he himself is equally benefited by the Lord.*** Because of this knowledge, the leader would have the power to be of service. I don't think this was what Jesus had in mind for His ekklesia.

By his keen understanding, the Gnostic strived to perfect the mind. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 535 . . . And this power he strives to his utmost to acquire, by obtaining command of all the influences which war against the mind. . . furnished with great experience both in study and in life he has freedom of speech, not the power of a babbling tongue, but a power which employs plain language.*** In this quest for perfection, he had no use for the babbling tongues. Clement of Alexander rejected the Gifts of Tongues with this swipe at the Montanists. I guess this caught on as a slang term for the Montanists (Phrygians) through the years, because Athanasius in 358 A.D. used this term in one of his later letters when he referred to himself as one of the "babblers".

Clement considered the Montanists (Phrygians) as one of the heresies. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 555. Some take their designation from a place, as the Peratici;---some from a nation, as the (heresy) of the Phrygians;*** this would happen again in church history. In fact, in Emperor Constantine's time, Montanism was made illegal by an edict from the Emperor. By this time, for people like Clement, the word ekklesia had lost its true meaning. It was no longer a public democratic entity. To him, it was more of a synagogue-like, formal gathering. ***ANF Vol 2, pp 554. For we must never, as do those who follow the heresies, adulterate the truth, or steal the canon of the Church, by gratifying our own lusts and vanity . . .as we enter in, through the tradition of the Lord, by drawing aside the curtain; but bursting through the side door, and digging clandestinely through the wall of the Church, and stepping over the truth, they constitute themselves the Mystagogues***

***of the souls of the impious.*** These heresies (Montanist) burst into the church. They delved into the mysteries too much and Clement probably considered the Gifts of the Holy Spirit too mysterious for him. Because Clement never mentioned Pentecost, I wonder when and where he thought the ekklesia-church came into existence.

Clement's quest for knowledge was laudable; however, when you do this without the revelations from Holy Spirit, it becomes like the Sadducees and Pharisees. They continually studied the Law because they considered the Law to be perfect. The more they studied the Law, the more they would know about God. Jesus came to fulfill the Law and by the Holy Spirit, He put the Law in our hearts. By studying the Scriptures without the Holy Spirit, you remain in the same camp with the Sadducees and Pharisees. The ekklesia-church had its beginning on the day of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit came and filled the disciples. By this, Jesus came into their beings (John 14:17). When this happened, it was exhibited by physical manifestations. So when one rejects the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, they are also rejecting Jesus.

With Clement's brand of formalism, the ekklesia-church with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit began to fade from the public places. There were some pockets of spiritual activity that continued to flourish; however, the synagogue-like churches began to coalesce into the formal-church which would become the Catholic (Universal) Church.

Meanwhile, in Carthage, there was a lawyer named Tertullian, who was a master of the language. When you read his works, you find he was proud of this and consequently used more words than necessary. On the other hand, he was extremely articulate and accurate in describing spiritual events. He was thought to be a presbyter in Carthage in North Africa and wrote between 192 A.D. and 213 A.D. Tertullian became a Christian in 185 A.D. and scholars postulate he became a Montanist after 207 A.D. His writings are definitely pro-Montanist; however, I believe he was a very spiritual man all along and belonged to an ekklesia-church that was active in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.

One of his earliest writings was "On Prescription Against Heretics", where he described the beginnings of the ekklesia-church after Pentecost. *ANF Vol 3, pp 252 . . . they obtained the promised power of the Holy Ghost for the gift of miracles and of utterance; and after first bearing witness to the faith in Jesus Christ throughout Judaea, and founding churches (there), they next went forth into the world and preached the same doctrine of the same faith of the nations. They then in like manner founded churches in every city, from which all the other churches, one after another, derived the tradition of the faith.* He described how they went forth and established new ekklesias-churches based on the beliefs and actions of the previous ones.

Evidently, Tertullian and the ekklesia in Carthage maintained the public exposure; however, it was becoming the exception rather than the norm. The public demonstration of the ekklesia that Paul taught in the fourteenth Chapter of 1 Corinthians took a lot more faith than the synagogue-like meetings attended by many Christians. Tertullian described this problem in his "On Repentance", which he wrote in 192 A.D. *ANF Vol 3, pp 664. Yet most men either shun this work, as being a public exposure of themselves, or else defer it from day to day. I presume (as being) more mindful of modesty than of salvation . . . Truly you are honourable in your modesty; bearing an open forehead for sinning, but an abashed one for deprecating! I give no place to bashfulness when I am a gainer by its loss;* He saw no reason to be bashful in public. He went on to describe the Body of Christ as the brothers. *ANF Vol 3, pp 664. But among brethren and fellow-servants, where there is common hope, fear, joy, grief, suffering, because there is a common spirit from a common Lord and Father, why do you think these brothers to be anything other than yourself? The body cannot feel gladness at the trouble of any one member; it must necessarily join with one consent in the grief, and in labouring for the remedy. In a company of two is the church; but the church is Christ. When, then, you cast yourself at the brethren's knee, you are handling Christ, you are entreating Christ. In like manner, when they shed tears over you, it is Christ who suffers, Christ who prays the Father for mercy.* The body ministry operated through humility and by casting yourself at your brother's knees you entreated the ekklesia which was Christ to pray to the Father for mercy. This was a

great picture of the Body of Christ where the brothers were participants and not some High Priest type leader. This was Jesus being manifested on earth.

Tertullian wrote a treatise "On Prayer" in about 192 A.D. which according to the scholars was before he became a Montanist. Well, at this point, he obviously believed in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit because in this treatise he wrote an eloquent and beautiful description of speaking in "tongues". He began by telling them Jesus had determined for us a new kind of prayer. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 681. The Spirit of God, and the Word of God, and the Reason of God---Word of Reason, and Reason and Spirit of Word---Jesus Christ our Lord, namely, who is both the one and the other---has determined for us, the disciples of the New Testament, a new form of prayer; for in this particular also it was needful that new wine should be laid up in new skins, and a new breadth be sewn to a new garment.*** This was the new wine that needed new wine skins. This enriched prayer was called the choicest victim. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 690. For this is the spiritual victim which has abolished the pristine sacrifices. "To what purpose," saith He, "(bring ye) me the multitude of your sacrifices? I am full of holocausts of rams, and I desire not the fat of rams and the blood of bulls and of goats. For who hath required these from your hands?" What, then, God has required the Gospel teaches. "An hour will come," saith He, "when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and truth. For God is a spirit, and accordingly requires His adorers to be such." We are the true adorers and the true priests, who, praying in spirit, sacrifice, in spirit, prayer,---a victim proper and acceptable to God, which assuredly He has required, which He has looked forward to for Himself! This victim, devoted from the whole heart, fed on faith, tended by truth, entire in innocence, pure in chastity, garlanded with love, we ought to escort with the pomp of good works, amid psalms and hymns, unto God's altar, to obtain for us all things from God.*** The victim has taken the place of rams, goats, etc. Praying in the Spirit is sacrificing in the Spirit. The victim proper is us, our intellect, our soul which he requires. The Lord has looked forward to us worshipping in the Spirit. This victim (our will and our intellect) devoted from the whole heart (our spirit), fed on faith, (we have to speak on faith) tended by truth, (has to be truth

because it's not our words, but His) entire in innocence (completely innocent-not for some reason), and pure in chastity, garlanded in love, (we love Him or we wouldn't do it). Tertullian said we should escort this (speaking in tongues) with pomp and good works like it was something to be proud. About tongues, a friend of mine once said, "you don't have to speak in tongues, you get to".

Tertullian's description of praying in the Spirit happened before, according to the scholars, he became a Montanist. Tongues have always been a source of ridicule from believers like Clement of Alexandria, a scholarly gnostic who only believed part of the Word. Paul in the twelfth and fourteenth chapters of I Corinthians discussed tongues exhaustively and intimated tongues were the least of the Gifts. They may be the least, but they were the beginning, just like they were at Pentecost, like they were with the Samaritans and Cornelius, the Gentile. Tertullian explained it took faith to speak in tongues because you had to offer the victim of the sacrifice. To speak in tongues, one has to speak, make a sound and God will provide the language. If a person does not have the faith to speak, how would they have the faith to Prophecy, to speak a Word of Knowledge or Discern Spirits? That is why tongues are mentioned as a sign, because they are a sign of faith

In 193 A.D., Tertullian wrote his treatise "On Baptism". He said we are set free and admitted to eternal life. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 669. Happy is our sacrament of water, in that, by washing away the sins of our early blindness, we are set free and admitted into eternal life! A treatise on this matter will not be superfluous; instructing not only such as are just becoming formed (in the faith), but them who, content with having simply believed, without full examination of the grounds of the traditions, carry (in mind), through ignorance, an untried though probable faith.*** It showed an untried though probable faith. He explained baptism was the vehicle of divine operation where the guilt of Adam was removed and with that goes the penalty. Man was restored to God and has been conformed to the image of God. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 672. Not that in the waters we obtain the Holy Spirit; but in the water, under (the witness of) the angel, we are cleansed, and prepared for the Holy Spirit . . . Thus, too, does the angel, the***

*witness of baptism, "make the paths straight" for the Holy Spirit, who is about to come upon us, by the washing away of sins, which faith, sealed in (the name of) the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit, obtains.* He went on to tell what happened in his ekklesia-church after the baptism and after they anointed the person with oil. **ANF Vol 3, pp 677.** *After this, when we have issued from the font, we are thoroughly anointed with a blessed unction,---(a practice derived) from the old discipline, wherein on entering the priesthood, men were wont to be anointed with oil from a horn, ever since Aaron was anointed by Moses.* The members of the ekklesia-church then laid hands on the person and spoke in tongues with a Spirit of so clear a sound. **ANF Vol 3, pp 672.** *In the next place the hand is laid on us, invoking and inviting the Holy Spirit through benediction. Shall it be granted possible for human ingenuity to summon a spirit into water, and, by the application of hands from above, to animate their union into one body with another spirit of so clear sound; and shall it not be possible for God, in the case of His own organ, to produce, by means of "holy hands," a sublime spiritual modulation?* After this, shall it not be possible, for God to produce (from the person) by means of holy hands a sublime spiritual modulation? In other words, the person spoke in tongues and acquired a heavenly language which was a sign of the Holy Spirit. Only Tertullian could explain tongues with such clarity and skill.

Tertullian wrote his treatise "On the Shows or De Spectaculis" in 197 A.D. He told them nothing good came from the shows because whether it was chariot races, public shows, gladiator fights, or Olympic Games, the pagan gods were always honored at these events. **ANF Vol 3, pp 89-90.** *Let them tell us, then, whether it is right in Christians to frequent the show. Why, the rejection of these amusements is the chief sign to them that a man has adopted the Christian faith . . . For how monstrous it is to go from God's church to the devil's-from the sky to the sty, as they say; to raise your hands to God, and then to weary them in the applause of an actor;* Here we see a glimpse of the ekklesia in the public arena and the stark difference from its surroundings. This was what Jesus wanted to show by his ekklesia. Paul in his letter to the Corinthians discussed the exposure of the ekklesia. **AB I Corn 4:9.** *For it seems to*

*me that God has made an exhibit of us apostles, exposing us to view last (of all, like men in a triumphal procession who are) sentenced to death (and displayed at the end of the line). For we have become a spectacle to the world---a show in the world's amphitheatre---with both men and angels (as spectators).* The ekklesia was to be a spectacle in the world's amphitheater. Tertullian went on about the pleasures available to people from the ekklesia-church. **ANF Vol 3, pp 90-91.** *Even as things are, if your thought is to spend this period of existence in enjoyments, how are you so ungrateful as to reckon insufficient, as not thankfully to recognize the many and exquisite pleasures God has bestowed upon you. For what more delightful than to have God the Father and our Lord at peace with us, than revelation of the truth, than confession of our errors, than pardon of the innumerable sins of our past life? . . . What nobler than to tread under foot the gods of the nations----to exorcise evil spirits---to perform cures---to seek divine revealings---to live to God? These are the pleasures, these the spectacles that befit Christian men---holy, everlasting, free. Count of these as your circus games . . . If the literature of the stage delights you, we have literature in abundance of our own---plenty of verses, sentences, songs, proverbs; and these not fabulous, but true; not tricks of art, but plain realities. Behold unchastity overcome by chastity, perfidy slain by faithfulness, cruelty stricken by compassion, impudence thrown into the shade by modesty: these are the contests we have among us, and in these we win our crowns. Would you have something of blood too? You have Christ's.* How dramatic, what a show when the Gifts of the Holy Spirit are allowed to operate. Tertullian in his "On the Apparel of Women" described how the public was affected by the ekklesia-church. **ANF Vol 4, pp 25.** *The things which make us luminaries of the world are these---our good works. What is good, moreover, provided it be true and full, loves not darkness: it joys in being seen, and exults over the very pointings which are made at it.* God wants to manifest Himself to the ekklesia-church and He exults over the pointings made by the public. This was why the early ekklesia was such a success.

He wrote the "Apology" for Christianity to the pagan rulers of his area. It was written in about 190 A.D. and was quite critical of the pagan gods and their influence on mankind. By this time, the sophistication

of the people had rendered the myriad of gods as almost meaningless and they were looked upon with jest and sport. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 30. This it will be said, however, is all in sport. But if I add---it is what all know and will admit as readily to be the fact---that in the temples adulteries are arranged, that at the altars pimping is practiced, that often in the houses of the temple-keepers and priests, under the sacrificial fillets, and the sacred hats, and the purple robes, amid the fumes of incense, deeds of licentiousness are done, I am not sure but your gods have more reason to complain of you than of Christians.*** Tertullian pulls their tail a bit with "your gods are more upset with you than with the Christians". The general population was beginning to tire of the moral corruptness obvious in their gods; however, the temples were in the same area where the ekklesia-church had their meetings. He explained his God and the ekklesia-church. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 31-32. The object of our worship is the One God, He who by His commanding word, His arranging wisdom, His mighty power, brought forth from nothing this entire mass of our world, with all its array of elements, bodies, spirits, for the glory of His majesty; . . .The eye cannot see Him, though He is (spiritually) visible. He is incomprehensible, though in grace He is manifested. He is beyond our utmost thought, though our human faculties conceive Him. He is therefore equally real and great.*** It was through His grace, Jesus was manifested and the grace was the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. God showed Himself through His manifestations.

By 208 A.D. all the scholars agree Tertullian was a Montanist. In his treatise "Against Praxeas", he criticized Praxeas for speaking against the Montanists. Praxeas had convinced the Bishop of Rome to retract his support for the Montanist movement. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 597. For after the Bishop of Rome had acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca, and Maxmilla, and, in consequence of the acknowledgment, had bestowed his peace on the churches of Asia and Phrygia, he by importunately urging false accusations against the prophets themselves and their churches . . . By this Praxeas did a twofold service for the devil at Rome: he drove away prophesy, and he brought in heresy; he put to flight the Paraclete, and he crucified the Father.*** Tertullian forcefully said that Praxeas was a friend of the devil. Praxeas probably came from a synagogue-like church

where there were no manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Tertullian used this entire book "Against Praxeus" to justify, define, describe, and explain the Holy Spirit to Praxeus in "oh so many words".

It was in this exposition that Tertullian proposed the word "Trinity" to explain the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 606-607. Or was it because He was at once the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, that He spoke to Himself in plural terms, making Himself plural on that very account? Nay, it was because He had already His Son close at His side, as a second Person, His own Word, and a third Person also, the Spirit in the Word, that He purposely adopted the plural phrase, "Let us make;" and "in our image;" and "become as one of us." For with whom did He make man? And to whom did He make him like? (the answer must be), the Son on the one hand, who was one day to put on human nature; and the Spirit on the other, who was to sanctify man. With these did He then speak, in the Unity of the Trinity, as with His ministers and witnesses.*** Tertullian put himself in the hero's section of the theologians with this term and his explanation. We will all understand it clearly, bye and bye.

Most all of the problems that have vexed Christianity through the centuries came from failing to hold Jesus as God in the fullest of the Godhead. This began with the Judaizers in Paul's day and continued on to the Arians in 300 A.D. It continues on to these days with all the questions about Jesus. Tertullian recognized this and explained the problem to Praxeus. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 627. But, (this doctrine of yours bears a likeness to the Jewish faith, of which this is the substance-so to believe in One God as to refuse to reckon the Son besides Him, and after the Son the Spirit. Now, what difference would there be between us and them, if there were not this distinction which you are for breaking down? What need would there be of the gospel, which is the substance of the New Covenant, laying down (as it does) that the Law and the Prophets lasted until John the Baptist, if thenceforward the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are not both believed in as Three, and as making One Only God? God was pleased to renew His covenant with man in such a way as that His Unity might be believed in, after a new manner, through the Son and the Spirit, in order that God might now be known openly, in His proper Names and Persons,***

***who in ancient times was not plainly understood, though declared through the Son and the Spirit.*** He told Praxeaus, "you sound like a Jew" which showed the continuing influence of the Judaizers on the synagogue-like church even at this date. Praxeaus should come to know the importance of the "Trinity" and how God was going to work through His Spirit until the return of Jesus.

Tertullian was having an all too familiar problem with the nominal Christians or Psychics as he called them. They were saying the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were of the spirit of the devil. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 110. "It is the spirit of the devil", you say, O Psychic. And how is it that he enjoins duties which belong to our God, and enjoins them to be offered to none other than our God? On which side, then, do you think the Spirit is confirmed as existing among us; . . . so that our observances are supposed to have ceased in like manner as His benefits; and you thus deny that He still continued to impose duties, because, in this case again, "the Law and the prophets (were) until John." It remains for you to banish Him wholly, being, as He is, so far as lies in you, so otiose.*** The word otiose means idle or useless. He told them you might as well banish the Holy Spirit if He was going to be idle or useless to them. This is the main problem with an organization, the Holy Spirit will not contend with the interference of the organization.

Tertullian in his treatise on the "Resurrection of the Flesh" delivered a short statement that concisely summed up his beliefs about the work of the Holy Spirit. ***ANF Vol 3, pp 594. He has accordingly now dispersed all the perplexities of the past, and their self-chosen allegories and parables, by the open and perspicuous explanation of the entire mystery, through the new prophecy, which descends in copious streams from the Paraclete. If you will only draw water from His fountains, you will never thirst for other doctrine: no feverish craving after subtle questions will again consume you; but by drinking in evermore the resurrection of the flesh, you will be satisfied with the refreshing draughts.*** This is just as true today as it was in Tertullian's day. The Holy Spirit is available to us Christians here on this earth. There are streams of water from His fountains and drinking from this, we will search no more. By the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the mystery

kept through the ages was now plainly shown by the ekklesia-Body of Christ.

While Tertullian was writing and participating in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in Carthage, Origen (185- 255 A.D.) a brilliant young man of eighteen had been put in charge of the Christian school at Alexandria. He was selected by Demetius, the bishop of the formal church in Alexandria.

These formal-churches are from the synagogue-like meetings, only now they have more sophistication with more levels of management. They showed no evidence of participating in the Gifts of the Spirit.

By this time, the Christians may have numbered over two million across the Empire. A group this large was exerting a lot of influence in the Roman world. Sporadic persecutions only seemed to make the Christians more determined to meet together and try to live their lives as Christians. As Tertullian told the Roman officials, "when you kill a Christian, you only plant a seed that will multiply."

Another factor in the growth of Christianity was due to the decline in importance of the myriad of gods handed down from the Greeks. They were beginning to become fairy tales, which they always were, and their sexual overtones were becoming somewhat tedious, especially to the women. Whether it was the synagogue-like formal church or the public ekklesia-church, the women were drawn to the teachings of Jesus and the Christian love of the members. Women had more status in the Christian meetings than in the Roman culture as a whole. I'm sure the women felt they could now attend meetings without feeling like a prostitute.

Origen studied the Scriptures night and day and became well known for his Biblical knowledge around Alexandria. He went to Palestine in 216 A.D. when he was thirty-one years old and became friends with Bishop Alexander of Jerusalem and Bishop Theoctistus of Caesarea. Because of his knowledge of the Scriptures they prevailed on him to preach and teach in their public ekklesia meetings.

When the Bishop Demetius found out about this he was infuriated, mainly because these were ekklesia meetings but the excuse was Origen was a layman and as such could not teach bishops. This illustrated the amount of rules and the iron-fisted control the leadership developed in the formal church. The severely chastised Origen returned to his work and threw himself into his writing. This was when he published his "De Principiis" where he discussed points of doctrine of the Christian traditions. Origen in his preface to his "De Principiis" expounded about how much Christians differ in their beliefs. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 239. Since many, however, of those who profess to believe in Christ differ from each other, not only in small and trifling matters, but also on subjects of the highest importance, as e.g., regarding God, or the Lord Jesus Christ, or the Holy Spirit . . . Now it ought to be known that the holy apostles, in preaching the faith of Christ, delivered themselves with the utmost clearness on certain points which they believed to be necessary to every one, even to those who assumed somewhat dull in the investigation of divine knowledge; leaving, however, the grounds of their statements to be examined into by those who should deserve the excellent gifts of the Spirit, and who, especially by means of the Holy Spirit Himself, should obtain the gift of language, of wisdom, and of knowledge: while on other subjects they merely stated the fact that things were so, keeping silence as to the manner or origin of their existence.*** How come Origen was making such strong statements about the Gifts of the Holy Spirit? I'm sure this didn't set well with Demetius, his bishop. Origen went on and discussed the needs satisfied by the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 285 . . . so also I think is it with the Holy Spirit, in whom is contained every kind of gifts. For on some is bestowed by the spirit the word of wisdom, on other the word of knowledge, on other faith; and so to each individual of those who are capable of receiving Him . . . whereas the Gospel shows Him to be of such power and majesty, that it says the apostles could not yet receive those things which the Saviour wished to teach them until the advent of the Holy Spirit.*** Origen pointed out the apostles couldn't do much without the Spirit. I wonder if maybe Origen was writing about the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in this way to rile his own Bishop.

Origen then postulated the Gifts of the Holy Spirit may be what Jesus was referring to in His parable about the talents in the twentieth-fifth chapter of Matthew. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 296. But that fate also which is mentioned in the Gospels as overtaking unfaithful stewards . . . For if this Spirit is of divine nature, i.e., is understood to be a Holy Spirit, we shall understand this to be said of the gift of the Holy Spirit: that when, whether by baptism, or by the grace of the Spirit, the word of wisdom, or the word of knowledge, or of any other gift, has been bestowed upon a man, and not rightly administered, i.e., either buried in the earth or tied up in a napkin, the gift of the Spirit will certainly be withdrawn from his soul, and the other portion which remains, that is, the substance of the soul, will be assigned its place with unbelievers, being divided and separated from that spirit with whom, by joining itself to the Lord, it ought to have been one spirit.*** This was a very condemning interpretation for anyone who had professed a disdain for the Gifts. You know Demetius agreed with Clement of Alexandria about the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. The problem would be, where is "outer darkness"? (Matt 25:30)

About 228 A.D., Origen was sent to Greece and on the way he again visited his friends in Caesarea and Jerusalem. While there, Bishop Alexander and Theoctistius took it upon themselves to ordain him a presbyter, so he could legally preach and teach in their ekklesia-church. When his bishop, Demetius, heard about this, he had Origen excommunicated from the formal church in Alexandria and fired him from his job at the school. Some of his anger had been brewing over Origen's writings about the Gifts which I'm sure caused Demetius much anxiety among his peers.

Origen stayed in Caesarea for twenty-five years where he formed a school similar to the one in Alexandria. He wrote his treatise "Against Celsus" while in Caesarea. It was written as an answer to Celus who had written against Christianity in 176 A.D. In the treatise "Against Celsus", Origen seemed to know of signs and wonders happening in the ekklesia-churches during his time. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 415. And I shall refer not only to His miracles, but, as is proper, to those also of the apostles of Jesus. For they could not without the help of miracles and wonders have prevailed on those who heard their new doctrines and***

***new teachings to abandon their national usages, and to accept their instructions at the danger to themselves even of death. And there are still preserved among Christians traces of that Holy Spirit which appeared in the form of a dove. They expel evil spirits, and perform many cures, and foresee certain events, according to the will of the Logos.*** Gifts were obviously active among some of the Christians. Origen said, we ourselves have witnessed some of these miracles but he wasn't confident anyone would believe them. We see here how few and far between the signs and wonders had been in Origen's world. Origen reiterated he had seen people healed. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 473. And some give evidence of their having received through this faith a marvellous power by the cures which they perform, invoking no other name over those who need their help than that of the God of all things, and of Jesus, along with a mention of His history. For by these means we too have seen many persons freed from grievous calamities, and from distractions of mind, and madness, and countless other ills, which could be cured neither by men nor devils.*** These people, freed from illness, could not have been helped by men or devils, so it must have been God that was doing the healing.

Origen seemed to have a detached attitude toward these miracles, like he was standing on the side lines observing the action because I don't think Origen was ever involved in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. In fact, he continued to be over enamored with the organization of the formal-church even though he had been treated badly by the leadership. ***ANF Vol 4, pp 668. And those who rule over us well are under the constraining influence of the great king, whom we believe to be the Son of God, God the Word . . . And this service is at once necessary and right. They take charge of all--of those that are within, that they may day by day lead better lives, and of those that are without, that they may come to abound in holy words and in deeds of piety; and that, while thus worshipping God truly, and training up as many as they can in the same way, they may be filled with the word of God.*** This was from the end of his treatise "Against Celsus" and Origen seemed to be cowed by the apparent superiority of the leaders of the formal-church. This happens to so many people who lose their confidence to go forward with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit and see the

power of God. Instead, they hesitate and depend on the approval of some powerful leader.

It seemed impossible to me that a man like Cyprian could have followed Tertullian in Carthage by only forty years. They were nothing alike either in beliefs or knowledge of the Word. This illustrated how fast the ekklesia-church was deteriorating around 250 A.D.

Cyprian was born around 200 A.D. and had become a wealthy businessman. He was also from a wealthy family and was made Bishop of Carthage in 248 A.D. He had only been a Christian for two years when he received this honor. The formal-church at this time was becoming more-worldly and was installing persons of influence in the important jobs. Many of these had little or no knowledge of the Word and this included Cyprian. The formal-church was more organized than ever before and I'm sure that suited a businessman like Cyprian. He probably thought the more organized the better for a more efficient operation.

The political climate for Christianity was improving mainly because the emperors were very weak. Persecutions by Decius (249-251) and Valerian (253-260) were weak and ineffective. Houses were even being built to house the Christian meetings and their organizations. This further reduced the influence of public ekklesia-meetings and caused the formal-church to form an even more rigid hierarchy for the leadership

Cyprian wrote many letters and several treatises during his time as bishop in the middle of the third century. In his letter to Rogatianus, in 250 A.D. he started at the top with this business-like approach to the Christian organization. ***ANF Vol 5, pp 285. For although all the brethren ought to rejoice in this, yet, in the common gladness, the share of the bishop is the greatest. For the glory of the Church is the glory of the bishop . . . ANF Vol 5, pp 374-375. And they are the Church who are a people united to the priest, and the flock which adheres to its pastor. Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church is in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the Church.*** You can tell Cyprian

was used to being a manager. Here he told them right away who was in charge. The formal church and the Bishop were one.

Cyprian told Jubaianus in a letter that the heretics who came back to the church that had already received a legitimate baptism need only come to the prelates (leaders) of the formal-church. *ANF Vol 5, pp 381 . . . there was no need that they should be baptized any more, but only that which was needed was performed by Peter and John; viz., that prayer being made for them, and hands being imposed, the Holy Spirit should be invoked and poured out upon them, which now too is done among us, so that they who are baptized in the Church are brought to the prelates of the Church, and by our prayers and by the imposition of hands obtain the Holy Spirit, and are perfected with the Lord's seal.* Here the prelates (leaders) would by the imposition of the hands supply the Holy Spirit. Only a businessman like Cyprian could make receiving the Holy Spirit a duty. I doubt seriously if the Holy Spirit stood for that kind of invocation. I wish in a way God worked that way, but my experience has shown me, He expects man to reach some for whatever he received from God. This is what faith is all about. Somebody can tell you, you have the Holy Spirit but only you know for sure. The point is, don't let someone make a rule of this, if you are not sure, make sure, ask Jesus to baptize you with His Holy Spirit. You accept your salvation by faith from Jesus, and you ask for the power of the Holy Spirit by the same faith.

Cyprian in his letter to the lapsed gave his interpretation of Matt 16:18 and what Jesus meant by His prophesy. *ANF Vol 5, pp 305. "I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."* Thence, through the changes of times and successions, the ordering of bishops and the plan of the Church flow onwards; so that the Church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is controlled by these same rulers. He said the successions and ordering of the bishops flowed onwards from Peter so that the Church was founded on the bishops. This letter was written in 250 A.D. by the businessman and this made

perfect sense to him. Cyprian was always looking for some way to better organize this outfit. He was the first of the so-called church fathers to propose this interpretation. However, someone must have told him this puts power in the church at Rome, and this interpretation elevates the church in Rome above all the others. So a year later he changed his idea somewhat when he wrote his "On the Unity of the Church." **ANF Vol 5, pp 422. "I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it . . . shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. " He might set forth unity, He arranged by His authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one. Assuredly the rest of the apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honour and power;** Cyprian decided to make the other disciples equal to Peter.

He certainly didn't want any other bishops messing with him or his formal-church. **ANF Vol 5, pp 565. For neither does any of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, not by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience; since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another.** Cyprian said they would be no bishop of bishops I wonder what he would say if he had known the "Pope" was coming in another two hundred years. A man like Cyprian typified the insatiable desire of mankind to rely on men leaders rather than depend on God. I believe God wanted the Jews in the time of the Judges to depend completely on Him. He showed them one miracle after another, but they wanted a king like the other nations. I think we see a progression with Tertullian, Origen and now Cyprian. Tertullian knew the Word and acted on the Word, Origen knew the Word but was overawed by the leadership and Cyprian who probably knew very little about the Word but was completely infatuated with the organization. It seemed Christianity had retreated back to being like the Jews with their kings.