



CHAPTER XVII 381 A.D. - 451 A.D.

Page 320

WHAT HAPPENED THAT CAUSED THE FORMAL CHURCH TO BE CONTROLLED BY ONE MAN
 Formal Church VS Holy Spirit, Ambrose, Priscillian, Augustine, Leo I (the Pope) and Council of Chalcedon 451 A.D.

0 100 200 300 400 500 MILES

SCALE



CHAPTER XVII

WHAT HAPPENED THAT CAUSED THE FORMAL CHURCH TO BE CONTROLLED BY ONE MAN 381 A.D. - 451 A.D.

The Arians because of their unbelieving ways were at last losing ground in the formal churches. The actions of Martin of Tours coming on the heels of Hilary's plea for the Holy Spirit sparked a ray of hope toward the formal church in the western empire. Most of this revival was occurring in the more remote areas. Milan, one of the more populated areas of the west, was located in the northern part of Italy. The formal church in Milan was headed by an Arian named Auxentius, but in 374 A.D., after his death, he was replaced by a bishop who disagreed with the Arian beliefs. His name was Ambrose and he came from a prominent political family. Prior to this he had been a magistrate for the courts. He was thirty four years old when he was made bishop, but had not received baptism at that time. This had become common place under the Arians where the bishops were selected primarily because of their political or social positions and not their religious beliefs or knowledge of the Word.

Because Milan was one of the main cities for the Roman hierarchy, Ambrose was noticed by Gratian the emperor. Gratian probably saw something in Ambrose that was different from most of the Arian leaders. Very soon after Ambrose became a bishop, the emperor asked him to write a treatise on the Christian faith and not long after that, he told him to write another on the Holy Spirit. These were tough assignments especially for a neophyte Christian even though he was the head of a large formal church. Ambrose addressed this problem in his "Duties of the Clergy". *NPNF2, Vol 10, pp 1. For we can no longer now escape from the duty of teaching which the needs of the priesthood have laid upon us, though we tried to avoid it . . . for I was carried off from the judgment seat, and the garb (infulis) of office, to enter on the priesthood, and began to teach you, what I myself had not yet learnt. So it happened that I began to teach before I began to learn.* At least he admitted he was having to teach before he began to learn. Unfortunately most of Ambrose's main writings were published before

he had very much Christian experience. Ambrose said he was a good magistrate but he wasn't sure if he was a good bishop; however, compared to the former Arian bishops, I'm sure he was like a breath of fresh air.

Ambrose was not at all bashful and took his job very seriously as the bishop. Once he made Theodosius, the emperor, do penance for the deaths of thousands in an uprising in Thessalonica. Another time he stood up to the empress mother, Justina, an Arian, in her quest to secure a building for the Arians in Milan.

In his treatises on faith, Ambrose jumped right into the deep water of theology. According to his knowledge he firmly established that Peter was the rock, the foundation of the church in Matt 16:18. Ambrose explained it this way. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 269. To the same Apostle, again, when on a former occasion he said, "thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God," He made answer: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build My church, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Could He not, then, strengthen the faith of the man to whom, acting on His own authority, He gave the kingdom, whom He called the rock, thereby declaring him to be the foundation of the Church?*** Supposedly this was written in 379 A.D. only five years after becoming a bishop. In his interpretation of these verses, he disagreed with most of the Christian writers prior to his time. Ambrose seemed to agree more with Cyprian who died in 258 A.D. Cyprian was also a neophyte Christian and a businessman when he was made bishop of the formal church in Carthage. I seriously doubt if Ambrose knew what Cyprian had written and he probably had no idea that later on some church leaders would use his words to promote the one-man rule of the formal church, i.e. the "pope". Since both Cyprian and Ambrose were active in worldly ventures, prior to becoming bishops, they both probably thought this interpretation would give the leadership more authority and therefore cause a more efficient operation.

In his treatise on the Holy Spirit, which was done at the behest of Emperor Gratian, Ambrose profusely quoted scripture about the works and divinity of the Holy Spirit. He discussed the Gifts at length but

seemed to be in the past tense which would indicate little or no experience on his part. Most of the benefits were couched to enhance the individual rather than the ekklesia-church or Body of Christ. Here he discussed how the Spirit, the Father and the Son gave the same Gifts. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 134-135. To one is given through the Spirit the gift of healings, to another divers kinds of tongues, to another prophesy. So, then, the Spirit gives the same gifts as the Father, and the Son also gives them. There is, then, unity of authority, unity of appointment, unity of giving. For if you separate appointment and power, what cause was there (for maintaining) that those whom Christ appointed as apostles, God the Father appointed, and the Holy Spirit appointed? Unless, perhaps, as if sharing a possession or a right, they, like men, were afraid of legal prejudice, and therefore, the operation was divided, and the authority distributed.*** Ambrose seemed to be looking for someone with supreme power. He used the legal term "legal prejudice", which usually meant "going beyond their bounds". Ambrose said the apostles were afraid to take control or "go beyond their bounds", so the operation was divided and the authority distributed. Here, Ambrose, in my opinion, missed the whole point of Jesus' ekklesia. In the Arian churches, Ambrose had not experienced the "Body of Christ" as taught by the Apostle Paul. He thought a single leader should be in charge and not allow the authority to be distributed and divide the operation.

In 384 A. D. Ambrose wrote three books on Penitence or "Concerning Repentance". They were mainly against the Novatians who were a vigorous Christian group who resented those that denied being a Christian during times of persecution. The persecutions were sporadic and this caused the Novatians to be a continual problem for the formal church. The Arians, because they believed Jesus to be less than God, were probably more prone to denial than the others. The formal church in Milan had a large number of Arian members and I'm sure this was why Ambrose took such a strong stand against the Novatians.

In book number one "Concerning Repentance", Ambrose again treads in controversial waters. Here he, according to his interpretation, told who can forgive sins. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 330. They affirm that they are showing great reverence for God, to Whom alone they reserve***

the power of forgiving sins. But in truth none do Him greater injury than they who choose to prune His commandments, and reject the office entrusted to them. For inasmuch as the Lord Jesus Himself said in the Gospel: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit; whosoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," who is it that honours Him most, he who obeys His bidding or he who rejects it? The church holds fast its obedience on either side, by both retaining and remitting sin; Ambrose chided the Novatians for saying only God can forgive sins. He then quoted John 20: 22-23, where Jesus after the resurrection, breathed the Holy Spirit onto the disciples and told them they would both retain and forgive sins. Ambrose then chided those that disagreed with him and then stated the church (formal church) would retain and remit sins, therefore, the bishop should forgive sins.

I believe, when Jesus put His Spirit on the disciples by breathing on them after the resurrection he was empowering them to go back to Jerusalem and remain until the Holy Spirit came at Pentecost. In view of the times and previous events, this would take a lot of courage on the part of the disciples. Several verses in the Gospels tend to go against Ambrose chiding, where he took such a narrow view of John 20:22-23. First when Jesus told the disciples about His ekklesia in **AB Matt 16:17-19 . . . For flesh and blood (men) have not revealed this to you, but My Father Who is in heaven. And I tell you, you are Peter (Petros, masculine, a large piece of rock), and on this rock (petra, feminine, a huge rock like Gibraltar) I will build My church, and the gates of Hades (the powers of the infernal region) shall not overpower it---or be strong to its detriment, or hold out against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind---that is, declare to be improper and unlawful---on earth must be already bound in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth---declare lawful---must be what is already loosed in heaven.** Jesus said His ekklesia would operate through revelations (the Gibraltar size rock) from God. The power of governing forces (gates of Hades) would not overcome it and the keys of the kingdom would be provided because of these revelations. By this, the ekklesia would agree with God in heaven. Because of this agreement whatever was bound on earth would be bound in heaven and whatever was bound in heaven would be bound

on earth. This was repeated by Jesus when he told the ekklesia-church **AB Matt 18:17b-18. Tell it to the church; and if he refuses to listen even to the Church, let him be to you as a pagan and tax collector. Truly, I tell you, whatever you forbid and declare to be improper and unlawful on earth must be what is already forbidden in heaven, and whatever you permit and declare proper and lawful on earth must be already permitted in heaven.** Jesus said the ekklesia-church was qualified to decide the issue. This agreement was solidified by the Apostle Paul's later teaching concerning the Body of Christ and its accompanying Gifts which were revelations from God. Jesus in the Gospel of Mark told what the disciples would be after Pentecost. **AB Mark 16:17-18. And these attesting signs will accompany those who believe: in My name they will drive out demons; they will speak in new languages; They will pick up serpents, and (even) if they drink anything deadly, it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick, and they will get well.** This was a prophecy about the coming ekklesia or Body of Christ. Another time Jesus, before He ascended, prophesied about the coming power to the Body of Christ. **AB Luke 24:49. And behold, I will send forth upon you what My Father has promised; but remain in the city (Jerusalem) until you are clothed with power from on high.** They would be clothed with power from God and this would cause the agreement between the ekklesia - Body of Christ and God in heaven. This agreement was then illustrated again by the Apostle John in **AB John 20:21-23. Then Jesus said to them again, Peace to you! (Just) as the Father has sent Me forth, so I am sending you, and having said this, He breathed on (them) and said to them, Receive (admit) the Holy Spirit! (Now, having received the Holy Spirit and being led and directed by Him) if you forgive the sins of any one they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any one, they are retained.** Prior to His assentation, Jesus put His spirit on the disciples similar to Moses, David and Zacharias. This would agree with the other teachings of Jesus about the coming Body of Christ. The power was for the ekklesia-Body of Christ as a group and through this group the will of the Father would be manifested and agreed to by all.

Because of Ambrose's worldly ways he saw no reason to entrust anything to the group. He went even further and declared the power for forgiving sins had been entrusted to the priest. **NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 330**

. . . Each is allowed to the Church, neither to heresy, for this power has been entrusted to priests alone. Rightly, therefore, does the Church claim it, which has true priests; heresy, which has not the priests of God, cannot claim it. And by not claiming this power heresy pronounces its own sentence, that not possessing priests it cannot claim priestly power . . . Consider, too, the point that he who has received the Holy Ghost has also received the power of forgiving and of retaining sin. For thus it is written: "Receive the Holy Spirit: whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." So, then he who has not received power to forgive sins has not received the Holy Spirit. The office of the priest is a gift of the Holy Spirit, and His right it is specially to forgive and to retain sins. He pointed out the Novatians had no priest of God and therefore no priestly power. He used John 20:20-23 again and said the office of the priest was a Gift of the Holy Spirit and the priest had the right "especially to forgive and retain sins". It sounds like, only the priest receive the Holy Spirit.

Ambrose was already on record as saying Peter was the foundation of the church from Matt 16:18. He also believed in the succession from Peter to the priests of the formal churches. So how is it, when Peter in Acts 8, after having prayed for the Samaritans to receive the Holy Spirit was accosted by Simon Magus who wanted to duplicate Peter's efforts? At that, Peter denounced him in no uncertain terms and told Simon "your heart is all wrong in God's sight". Peter then told Simon to repent and pray to the Lord. ***AB Acts 8:22. So repent of this depravity and wickedness of yours, and pray to the Lord that, if possible, this contriving thought and purpose of your heart may be removed and disregarded and forgiven you.*** Peter, himself, told Simon to repent and go the Lord and ask for forgiveness. I don't see any indication that Peter, although having already received the Holy Spirit, ever considered either retaining or remitting the sins of Simon Magus. For a man who was listening to legal cases five years before, Ambrose certainly made some huge waves in Christendom. He proposed that Peter was the foundation of the church and because all priest succeeded from him they were able to forgive sins. In my opinion, Ambrose went against the teaching of Jesus and Paul by these far reaching assertions. The ekklesia-church was built on the revelations

from God and not on the one man Peter. Peter did not forgive man's sins because only God can do that job!

During the time of Ambrose, a Christian group in Spain began a movement that would rock the foundations of the formal church. This was more manifestations of the Holy Spirit similar to the monks, only this time it was within the formal church and included some bishops. They had meetings in their churches and at mountain retreats where the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were manifested among themselves. The main instigator of this movement was a man named Priscillian. He was very wealthy, cultured, and had the social standing of a Senator. As a layman, he was very knowledgeable of the Word and for that reason was another one who had discovered what the Word actually said about the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. Priscillian had probably heard about the ministry of Martin of Tours on the frontier of Gaul and they knew of Hilary of Poitiers, Basil, and the trials of Athanasius down in Alexandria.

By 380 A.D. this movement had spread to several churches and alarmed some of the surrounding bishops who had Arian beliefs. These bishops assembled at Saragossa to judge Priscillian and his group. Only twelve bishops showed up for the council which indicated a less than overwhelming resistance to Priscillian and his beliefs. However, once the wheels were set in motion there was no stopping them. The council of Arian bishops thereby decided to excommunicate Priscillian's group and said further that anyone who took communion with them would suffer the same fate.

The reason for this action was stated by the "Canons of Saragossa". Notice in these canons, not one word was mentioned about the manifestations or works of the Holy Spirit. ***Priscillian of Avila, Chadwick, pp 14. The canons of Saragossa deplore many things in the situation: (a) women attending Bible readings in the houses of men to whom they are unrelated; (b) fasting on Sundays and withdrawal from the worship of the church during Lent and in the period from 17 December to 6 January; (c) receiving the eucharistic elements in the church without immediately consuming them; (d) recession into cells and mountain retreats; (e) walking with unshod feet; (f) clergy aban-***

doing the duties of their office to become monks; (g) virgins taking the veil before the age of forty and without doing so formally in the presence of the bishop; (h) the title of 'teacher' being granted to unauthorized persons (presumably laymen). This was so typical of the organized formal church when making decisions adverse to the Holy Spirit. Nothing was said that would indicate an opposition to the works of the Holy Spirit. The Arians themselves originated from this kind of duplicity because of the monks and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. The canons revealed the Arian bishops didn't want Scriptures to be studied in private homes especially with women. They also didn't approve of Priscillian having retreats for several days in the mountains. Also by allowing laymen to teach, they were a threat to the organization of the formal church. This was a direct slap at Priscillian who was himself a laymen but very knowledgeable about the Scriptures. A future problem was also made evident by the bishops having to approve a woman taking the veil of a virgin. This showed the formal church had encroached on the heretofore independent monastic societies. These canons by themselves certainly didn't require anyone to be excommunicated from the formal church. But the real reason, of course, was the manifestations of the Holy Spirit and they, of course, were never mentioned.

After the council, Priscillian and his group were probably prepared to live with excommunication and go their separate ways. They elevated Priscillian to a bishop to give their group more statute; however, this only infuriated the Arian bishops and caused them to proceed with another step. ***NPNF2 Vol 11, pp 120. But then Ydacius and Ithacius pressed forward their measures more ardently, in the belief that the mischief might be suppressed at its beginning. With unwise counsels, however, they applied to secular judges that by their decrees and prosecutions the heretics might be expelled from the cities.***

By going to the secular courts, the Priscillianist could be declared heretics. This raised the stakes considerably because being a heretic was against Roman law. This law probably came from the edict of Constantine in 332 A.D. where Montanism was declared illegal at the behest of Eusebius and the Arians. This was a part of the "Mother of All Church Fights" and had essentially prevented Athanasius or any-

one else from defending the spirituality of the monks. If the Arian bishops really pushed this edict in the secular courts, Priscillian and his group didn't stand a chance because they were doing the same Gifts of the Spirit, the Montanists did back in 175 A.D. If convicted, the guilty parties would have their property confiscated and be banished to far away lands.

I'm sure Priscillian could see the handwriting on the wall, so he and two bishops from the group decided to personally take their case to the two most prominent bishops of the west, Ambrose of Milan and Damasus of Rome. Damasus refused to see them and Ambrose not only refused to see them but indicated they and a lot of others were heretics. So this became another effort of the organized formal church to put down a move of the Holy Spirit.

Old scholars assumed Priscillian's writings had been destroyed by the formal church, but in 1885 a man named Schepps discovered the Priscillian Tractates in a codex at the Library of Wurzburg University. Even today not much is known or published about Priscillian and his writings. I had to engage a Latin expert to translate his writings into English. Henry Chadwick published a book about Priscillian in 1976 called "Priscillian of Avila, the Occult and Charismatic in the Early Church". Someone in the academic community should publish an English version of Priscillian's works.

Because the leaders of the formal church would not come forward with support, Priscillian resorted to worldly ways. He knew how corrupt the Roman officials had become, so he bribed one of the judges and had the secular case thrown out of court. ***NPNF2 Vol 11, pp 120. Then they changed their plans, with the view that, as they had not got the better of the two bishops, who were at that time possessed of the highest authority, they might, by bribery and flattery, obtain what they desired from the emperor. Accordingly, having won over Macedonius, who was the master of public services, they procured a rescript, by which, those decrees which had formerly been made being trampled under foot, they were ordered to be restored to their churches.*** Priscillian hated to do this because what he wanted was

exoneration from the formal church not some crooked government official.

It was probably during this momentary break in the action that he decided to write a treatise explaining the scriptural basis for the Priscillianist beliefs. He hoped this would gain some support from those who weren't Arians in the formal church.

In his Tractates, Priscillian tried to justify their actions and beliefs to the formal church. He quoted freely from the Scriptures in his writings which showed his immense knowledge of the Word. I'm sure these tractates were hard for him, a man of Senatorial rank to write, because by now most considered him to be a heretic. Priscillian had to justify his beliefs to people who for the most part did not know the Scriptures and Priscillian knew his beliefs and actions came directly from the Word of God.

In tractate #1 Priscillian started with a slight dig at the formal church and its organization. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1413. Although our faith is impeded by no offenses of life, and advancing its march to God is free of the supreme authority of the catholic (universal) development, nevertheless, because when we beaten by the attacks of disparagement in this, it is the more proven, and we see, most blessed priests as glorious for us.*** He admitted this faith didn't come from the formal church, but the more it was put down the more it was proven and was glorious for them. He went on to say all heresies must be condemned. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1414 . . . all the doctrine which seems against Christ must be condemned and those things which are for Christ must be commended, nevertheless even now, because you want it just as it is written (they are always prepared for confession to everyone demanding of us the reason for faith and hope which is in us I Peter 3:15) we are unwilling to be silent, just because you order it. For it is permitted by repeated confession before your eyes and may be established to all by which we (live in the light of the faith, and that we follow no secret shadowy associations cf Isa 9:2) . . .*** He said we are unwilling to be silent just because you say so, for we live in the light of faith and not some shadowy association. The senatorial rank was showing in this statement from

Priscillian. He went on and said, "For these things (Gifts of the Holy Spirit) were performed through us". ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1414. For to these things, so that you yourselves know, having been carried through to all experiences of human life and having repudiated the associations of our evils we have entered as if it were a harbor of secure quiet. For recognizing since (no man might ascend into the kingdom of heaven unless reborn from water and the Holy Spirit John 3:5) (we purify our souls for obeying the faith through the Spirit 1 Peter 1:22)*** He stated, we take these Gifts into our everyday life and this made for us a safe harbor of secured quite. This was the kingdom of heaven and it came from the Holy Spirit.

In the next passage, Priscillian, the senator, showed his disdain for having to justify his faith by the Word of God. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1415. And because you want us to go through the facts one at a time so that we may declare what we believe is it all right for us to study (to be amazed) concerning you?. . .*** He was probably talking to the Arians when he said maybe we should be questioning you. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1415 . . . because you also want us to prove to you what you already know, we seek the pardon if either defending our faith or distributing those things which error sneaks in for corrupting the minds of infidels, that we may declare more widely. For the blame is theirs, who, while men fabricate more things in relation to Christ, make us reject more freely those things which they set up as a barrier for themselves.*** I'm sure this was hard for a man of senatorial rank and especially with Priscillian having more knowledge of the Word than his Arian detractors. He felt he had to explain his beliefs to those people who had fabricated things about Christ. This was a dig at the Arians. It was hard for Priscillian to be a contrite person.

Here he used all Scripture to make a statement about spiritual things. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1418. We however knowing because (the law is spiritual Rom 7:14) (and all prophecies need interpretation II Peter 1:20) having Christ God in a sense as a demonstrator, though whom also (if otherwise we might feel also these things were revealed to us Philip 3:15) we established (to serve the justice of the Lord in sanctification Rom 6:19) . . .*** Scriptures said the Law was spiritual but

Priscillian said Jesus was the demonstrator and these spiritual things were revealed by Him.

For the Arian's sake he said we know what we have believed about Jesus. *Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1420. Finally, as having been initiated in Christ we retain the first rudiments of accepted faith, we know that we have believed what we believe of God and that we have renounced what we have renounced of the devil. . . God however is what Christ Jesus is. Just as the apostle also says: (for the concern of God is not about oxen, but he speaks about us, since he who plows ought to plow in hope and do his threshing to harvest fruit for his hope 1 Corn 9:9-10). Therefore no man may impute to us an intellect of peculiar perversity; (each one by his words will be condemned and by his words will be justified Matt 12:37); we confess what we believe and (examining the scriptures cf. Jo 5:39) we rejecting the appearance of demons comprehend, just as it is written (the deep secrets of Satan Apoc, Rev 2:24) knowing, as the apostle says,(since no man will free them from the body of this death unless by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, Rom 7:24-25) . . .* He told them God is what Jesus is and no man can impute to us a perverse peculiar intellect. By the discerning of spirits we know the deep secrets of Satan and we are free from death by the grace of Jesus. This showed how perverse the formal church had become by calling this man a heretic.

Priscillian said he and his group had the anointing of the Holy Spirit. *Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1422. However for us to live is Christ, life is Christ, faith is Christ, knowing what anointing we have by the Holy Spirit (and not by corruptible silver and gold were we redeemed from our vain behaviors of paternal tradition but by the precious blood as it were of the uncontaminated and immaculate lamb of Jesus Christ I Peter 1:18-19) in which having been established (no man following the philosophy of the world and not following Christ may capture us Col 2:8).* He said we have Christ in us by the Holy Spirit and anyone following the world may not capture us. He went on to tell about the Holy Spirit with only the Scriptures. *Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1424 . . . about which the apostle well says (an unspiritual man, he says, does not perceive those things which are of the Spirit of God; for he is not able; (for stupidity is his and he is not able to judge; the spiri-*

tual man however can judge all things, moreover he himself is judged by no man I Cor 2:14-15), and as it is written: (those who are of the flesh are wise in the things of the flesh, indeed those who are of the Spirit in the things of the Spirit, and the wisdom of the flesh is death, however the wisdom of the Spirit is life and peace Rom 8:5-7). The Scriptures say without the Spirit there is no wisdom and man is stupid without it. A man who is of the Spirit is wise about things of the Spirit (Gifts). He compared the ways of the world which is death with the works of the Spirit. Priscillian Tract 1, pp 1426 . . . so the works of the flesh are manifest, which are adultery, fornication, worldliness, unchastity, luxury, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, quarreling, rivalry, angers, brawls, dissensions, heresies, envy, homicide, drunkenness, carousing, and others like these Gal 5:19-21) . . . (so the works of the Spirit are manifest, which are love of mankind, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, generosity, faith, continence, chastity, benevolence and love Gal 5:22-23); in which Christ appearing as a God said (we are His temple cf. I Cor 3:16) and in this, which in us He Himself has made, He wants to live. . . Priscillian showed the difference the Spirit made in man. Paul showed the difference in his letter to the Galatians. Priscillian said his group was the temple of God because Jesus was in them by the Holy Spirit. He wants to live in us this way.

He tried to quell rumors that the Priscillians were involved with the Manicheans. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1426. May he be cursed who does not condemn Manetes and his works, principles, and teachings; whose disgraces we might send personally, following him with the sword, if it could be done, to the infernal regions and to whatever is worse than gehenna and torments sleepless; (where neither fire is extinguished nor worms die out Marc 9:43).*** This heretical sect relied to some extent on magical arts. There were some signs and wonders associated with the Priscillianist movement and I'm sure the Arians looked on these as some sort of magical arts; however, Priscillian disassociated himself from the Manicheans. On page 1427 of Tract #1, Priscillian condemned a whole list of heresies including Arianism. I'm sure there were a lot in the formal church who disagreed with this.

Priscillian at this point takes off the gloves. He defended prophecy from God for the Christians of his day. He was quite emphatic by saying, "We embrace it." ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1432. And this is the one opinion of all of us, that, whether what is said (the speaking) of prophets or apostles or angels may be offered by any name, if it foretells or predicts Christ God and also following Moses and the prophets and the gospel condemning worldly vices, speaks of God, if it agrees with universal faith, we embrace it; if however because it is evil, it denies Jesus God and dissenting from Moses, the gospel, and the prophets persuades (speaks for) the sacrilege of the wretched dogma, which is not permitted, it is neither prophet nor apostle nor angel; even if it displays for itself a holy name, still by us it will be held accursed and (cf. Gal 1:8-9), just as it is written (because no man in the Holy Spirit says a curse to Jesus and no man except in the Holy Spirit calls Jesus Lord I Cor. 12:3)..*** Here Priscillian told why they accept prophesy. They embrace prophesy if it agrees with the universal faith. If prophesy denies Jesus God and promotes sacrilege is it not of God. He then quoted from Peter's sermon at Pentecost. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1433 . . . (as it is written: I shall pour my Spirit upon all flesh and their sons and daughters shall prophesy and their young men will see visions and the old men will dream dreams, and indeed upon my servants and handmaids I shall pour out my Spirit and I shall give prodigies in the sky above and signs on the earth below; the sun will be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before the great day of the Lord shall come; and it will be: everyone who has called on the name of the Lord will be saved Acts 2:17-21). In which also we do not despair to speak about Him, because holding back or cutting off none certainly he included the spirit of prophesy with a purpose, so that all who believe Him, freely about Him may be permitted to speak; . . .*** Priscillian deduced from Peter's sermon that we should all prophesy and all that believe be permitted to speak. These are the revelations from God.

I'm sure most all of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit were manifested in the meetings of the Priscillianists; however, in this discussion he only tried to convince them about prophesy. Priscillian probably figured if they won't accept prophesy, they sure wouldn't accept the other Gifts.

Priscillian then pleaded his case to those in authority. ***Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1434. And therefore, most blessed priests, if it is enough that heresies and dogmas having been condemned and our faith having been explained by our defense, and that you think we are giving testimony to the truth to God and to you, set us free from the envy of evil-wishing verbal malice, and referring to your brothers, (you) correct those matters which are vexed by the words of slanderers, since the result of this life is to be demonstrated by those who seek faith by truth, not by those who under the name of the religious pursue personal hostilities.*** Set us free he said from these people (Arians) with their personal hostilities. This plea was the end of Tractate Number One.

Priscillian addressed Tractate #2 to Damasus the bishop at Rome from whom he had previously tried to obtain an audience. He told him we have so little time but we have been injured by bishop Hydatius. ***Priscillian Tract 2, pp 1435 . . . since those things relying on their own truth do not require skill of interpreting, the apostle saying: (avoid disputes of law Tit 3:9), nevertheless with necessity of time compelling, as the injury inflicted on us through the bishop Hydatius puts it upon us, granted that we follow always the directions of patience and there has been an eagerness to hold back rather than to move on someone, . . . Finally in the convention of bishops which was at Caesaraugusta (Saragossa) no man from ours as defendant was held, no man accused, no man convicted, no man condemned, no crime of life to our name was either proposed or presented, no man that was summoned I may say had need nor worry.*** Priscillian was pleading with Damasus to consider their case. He said we want to avoid the disputes with the Law. He told Damasus you are our senior and we will depend on you for consideration and he went on the discredit the council at Saragossa in 380 A.D. He pointed out no man was accused or charged. This was typical of the proceedings against the Works of the Holy Spirit.

Since most of the bishops who opposed the Priscillianist had Arian backgrounds, he made a point to validate the Trinity. ***Priscillian Tract 2, pp 1437. Again all those guarding doctrines established teachings or dogmas of heresy, which disputes they made for themselves not by***

ingenuity, but by careful study, we condemn by the universal Word, (baptizing, as it is written, in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost Matt 28:19) He does not say moreover in the names as if in many, but in One, because One august God is a three-fold power (Christ all things and in all Col 3:11) . . . For who is able with catholic ears to believe the evil of the Arian heresy, which dividing what is one and wanting more gods, defiles the light of the prophetic sermon, not reading Moses' saying (hear, Israel, the Lord God your God is one Deut 6:4); to which the Lord speaking bore testimony in the gospel: (what Moses wrote, he wrote about Me John 5:46). Since the charges had come from the Arian Christians, Priscillian pointed out how they were wrong about Jesus being a created creature. Priscillian probably didn't help his case with this statement.

To Damasus, he again condemned Manicaeians. *Priscillian Tract 2, pp 1438. Nevertheless we know the wretchedness of those sects by the witness Christ God from the stories of the common people, not from some conversation of dispute . . . among all these things just the same we condemn the Manicaeians, not only are they heretics, but idolatrous and evil servants of the Sun and the Moon, imported demons with all their originators, sects, customs, institutions, books, teachers and disciples.* He couldn't do more than this to dispel rumors; however, when the Priscillianists were eventually tried before the Roman officials they were convicted of sorcery. This showed how patently unfair was their trial in Trier.

Of interest, Priscillian mentioned Ambrose to Damasus. *Priscillian Tract 2, pp 1446. Also to your brother who would bear watching, bishop Ambrosius, the whole affair is mentioned, and when a reply had been carried to him under the name of a sect which no man of ours does not condemn he swooped down on all Christians, even calling Hyginus a heretic with us, . . .* You can tell he didn't trust Ambrose because Ambrose would rather believe some heretic rather than listen to the Christians like Priscillian. Finally he pleaded with Damasus to set up a hearing for their cause. *Priscillian Tract 2, pp 1441. Therefore we seek your venerable understanding, so that if the faith of our profession is according to what you hand down as left to you by the apostles, stands in God, if the testimonies of our church-*

es written in peaceful letters are not lacking, if we are not able nor ought we to be able to feel otherwise about the scriptures, if no man of ours has been a defendant, no man has been heard, no man has been brought before the council, no man even when he was a layman was condemned by proof of any accusation brought, it is permitted that priest of the priesthood can not be brought under charges by something harmful who before as a layman deserved to be condemned, we pray for a hearing, our guardian, because you are the senior of all and you are the first; . . . Damasus could have ended the conflict right here. At this point there were too many Arians and not enough Christians who believed the power of the Holy Spirit was needed in the formal church. So Damasus looked the other way.

The scholars say the first part of Tractate No. 3 has been lost; however, Priscillian continued on with his justification for the Gift of Prophecy. *Priscillian Tract 3, pp 1445. Certainly no small amount of the works given is spread before us to believe God and to prepare for us as it were a (path) of divine journey by testimonies of the prophecies, from which God was unwilling to turn aside, so that He might verify that He Himself had spoken in the one who had prophesied; . . . The Scripture of God is a solid thing; it is a true thing not chosen by man but given to many by God of Whom (if the first fruit is holy, so the whole harvest is holy Rom 11:16).* He emphasize the sign (the Scriptures) as been given of God. He said we must obey the Scriptures and not dispute about them. Priscillian could not understand why the Christians seemed to ignore the Scriptures. To him, this was not an option. This was why he was in trouble with the formal church. He knew what the Word said and he couldn't understand why the formal church chose to ignore the Scriptures, and neither do I.

Priscillian said God spoke through his prophesies, both written and those that were spoken. *Priscillian Tract 3, pp 1449. For the divine speech was strong, since it was everything which He had said of Himself, as if to say by Him speaking, not written by another, but what He offered from Himself; saying however it was written necessarily offering to us by the trouble of reading, and He did not omit his own glory about which the prophecies had been and the gratitude*

owed any who prophesied for posterity. Certainly I between both (am a debtor (cf. Rom 1:14) to both, so that also that one who prophesied I shall ready and I shall believe God. For who is not delighted that Christ was prophesied in the ages before not by a few, but by all? He was delighted Jesus was prophesied by all of the prophets. He went on and reminded them what Jesus said about the people extolling God. (Luke 19:40) *Priscillian Tract 3, pp 1449. But any who is of this kind may see that the Lord said: (if those be silent, the rocks will shout Luke 19:40), and he may understand since, if hardness of rocks by nature dead is animated for giving testimony for God in the use of human speech, how is the tongue of the holy which is spurred on for confessing both its nature and the divine grace to be stopped?* If the rocks would shout, how can the Christians keep the tongue silent or stop this divine grace (Gift of Prophecy)?

Priscillian then described the way pagans predict the future such as using bird entrails. He wanted to know how the Christians could possibly begrudge the Priscillianist for their divine prophecies concerning the future. *Priscillian Tract 3, pp 1450 . . . and so sacrilege is called zeal by them, ignorance is called wisdom by those unaware that (they sacrifice not to God but to demons cf. 1 Cor. 10:20): if there is glory in such things among them, how do we reject divine prophecies and while we are obedient to our wishes, begrudge those who have prophesied God while abandoning the apostolic teachings which say: (don't extinguish the spirit; don't reject the prophecies? 1 Thess 5:19-20).* To him, this was abandoning the teachings of Paul who told the Thessalonians "don't reject the prophecies." Priscillian made the point, divine prophecies were certainly better than bird entrails.

In Tractate No 5, Priscillian described the results of prophecy. *Priscillian Tract 5, pp 1455. The model of prophetic instruction formed for announcing divine glories, although it is held as the guest of an earthly dwelling place (person), nevertheless, filled with the light of the Spirit of God, so distributes the works of prophecy, that the presence from God granting faith for believing creeps into men and the things that are done in us may demonstrate (spiritual understanding through those things which are seen cf. Rom 1:20).*

Although prophecies came from an earthly dwelling place (man), they were filled with the light of the Spirit (revealed from God). From these revelations, believing crept into man as they saw the manifestations from God. The main purpose for the Body of Christ-ekklesia-church was to show these manifestations so that people would believe on Jesus. Priscillian had seen the results of 1 Cor 14:24-25 where an unbeliever was prompted by prophesy to admit God was among them.

Because prophecy is from God, He wanted our bodies to be worthy of these mandates from God. ***Priscillian Tract 6, pp 1467 . . . the body, having been accepted from us in victory, is no longer called the territory of the world but the home of God; . . . but as the apostle says (gird up the loins of your mind, sober in all things believe in the coming complete revelation I Peter 1:13) . . . and just like cleaning a home make your flesh a habitation worthy of the mandates of God . . . you will come near completion, that is, understanding this, you will invoke the Spirit cohabitating within you in aid of the work to be completed, since, as Paul says, (it is God himself working in us both to will and to complete Philip 2:13).*** We should no longer be called the territory of the world. So gird up the loins of your mind, believe in the revelations, and make your flesh worthy of the mandates of God. How could anyone call this man a heretic?

Priscillian continued to delve deeper concerning the benefits of divine prophecy. ***Priscillian Tract 8, pp 1471-1472 . . .for this reason to reject reliance on glorying in things, which are of the flesh and to choose those of the Spirit is to turn the understanding of the heart to recognition of the truth, to investigate the secrets of heavenly precepts, to prepare the usefulness of mind, (while the time suffices cf. I Peter 4:3). . . I believe, by suiting the prophecy to the life of man and by marking out the nature of worldly evil.*** We can know the secrets of heavenly precepts and also mark out and know the nature of the worldly evil. The Gifts of the Holy Spirit are about making life here on earth easier for the Christian by making divine knowledge available for their understanding.

In this passage Priscillian showed me a deep understanding of what Apostle John was dealing with in Asia after he was released from

prison. John saw that the ekklesia-church had in some cases been replaced by the synagogues of Satan, a synagogue-like church instead of the Body of Christ with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. This was exactly what Priscillian had in mind when he compared the synagogues of Satan with the churches with the Mandates of God. ***Priscillian Tract 10, pp 1479 . . . nevertheless none of you may ignore the fact that between the two kingdoms, between the (synagogue of Satan (Apoc Rev. 2:9) and the church of the mandates of God, that is, the works of the world versus the words of God, the structure of our life is such that on this side is what is said of our God, and on that side indeed what is of the world, and therefore contrary to God, also that is found alien by us, and we renounce it, but this side we believe. And so amidst arrangements of this kind, on this side stands the promise of divine mandates, on that side the purpose of the devil's temptation, from this side the faith of Christ . . .*** There was a vast gulf between these two kinds of meetings. Priscillian wanted to be on the side with the divine mandates from God. The Arians and the Judaizers had a lot in common as neither would give Jesus His proper place in the God-head, and refused the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.

He ended his plea to the formal church by doing something that only Priscillian would do. He put down in writing an entire prophesy. This was for all to read including his detractors and the leaders of the formal church. It was a simple praise of God and a portion of the prophecy is included in this work. ***Priscillian Tract 10, pp 1482-1483 . . . the invisible fullness, which the Father owed to the Son and visibility owed to recognition which the Son owed to the Father in operation of the Holy Spirit, was made, thus placing in You the end for every defined thing and the receptacle of the infinite things, so that You might open from You alone one avenue for us coming and one approach for turning back to You. "You are to be believed as one God in all origins of virtue within and without, and standing above and internal, and surrounding and within, in all things, since You are found invisible in the Father, visible in the Son and united as Holy Spirit in the work of the two, because You for Yourself are the creator for that which You are, and You show nothing outside Yourself which may be seen more outstanding than You, and however our mind laboring at the work of inexplicable understanding within is***

closed by the error of human weakness, nevertheless it grasps the unique manner of religious understanding about You by prophetic voices, so that we recognize You one God in all, so that nothing not in You nor any place outside You we may hold either of deed and of work; and so when You hold and You are held, You are found neither outside the whole in one thing, nor not in all things."You have led out the living Spirit; which although of Itself It was not capable, nevertheless lest the Word might be empty of teaching when Your order was the beginning of those things which were not, by animation of instruction the earth offered what it did not have. And Your order was carried out in nature. Holy Father, omnipotent God who forming the temple (of your manifold grace I Peter 4:10) and the tabernacle of the church brought forth within You, extending the measures of immeasurable glory You have taught us with Christ being the author within You, so that in you also as offering a work made from nothing, first the uncomposed and the undefined might open; afterward You might divide sensibility from the insensible, sight from the dark, fragrance from dullness of sense, sound heard from the unyielding deafness. I'm sure he did this to show that prophecy was not something weird or done in ecstasy. How can you not admire a man with this kind of courage?

Priscillian also wrote the Canons of the Epistles of Paul during this time. He wrote them after the Tractates at the urging of a friend who wanted him to appear more contrite. They were included in the Vulgate but without the Tractates no one paid much attention to them. In the prologue to the Canons he addressed the concerns of the friend. *Canon Prologue, pp 1391 Having been occupied by necessities I responded to your letter rather slowly, most dear one. For you had demanded that against the cunning deceits of the heretics I might find some very firm defense in the divine Scriptures by a keen-witted snare, which might not be so much lengthy or disdainful as it might stand forth as courteous and charming.* Obviously the friend thought Priscillian's tractates might have ruffled too many feathers in the formal church, especially by including a prophesy. You can feel the biting sarcasm of Priscillian. It was hard for him too to be contrite.

He described his God and His Spirit of Wisdom. **Canon #1. God is truthful (he cannot lie), also God is Spirit and God possesses the immortality of the ages and being invisible lives in inaccessible light, also he is king and lord whose image and firstborn is Christ, in who is not found "yea and nay" but "yea" only.** **Canon #2 . . . there are two kinds of spirits, one of God, the other of the world, made for error.** **Canon #3 . . . there are two kinds of wisdom, one indeed is of God, the other to be sure is of men or of the flesh.** Obviously these were truths from Paul's writings. God is Spirit and His first-born is Christ. Wisdom was a Gift of the Holy Spirit. **Canon #9 . . . wisdom and favor and blessing are Spiritual Gifts and because of His invisible qualities, understood through these things which were made, are seen clearly.** We see God through the Spiritual Gifts and the Body of Christ was the ministry. **Canon #15 . . . the sacrament (holy mystery) once hidden from the sons of men now is manifest to the saints through the apostle and that Christ is proclaimed in wisdom which not one of the princes of this world knew.** Christ is manifested by the saints through the Gifts (Holy Mysteries). He emphasized again how the Spirit showed the deep things of God. **Canon #21 . . . the Spirit of God searches all things and also knows the deep things of God, which only the spiritual people understand and speak judging all things, they themselves are judged by no man, as they are going to meet Christ.** Only the spiritual people understand the spiritual things. He said our bodies are brought to life. **Canon #30 . . . through the Spirit of God living in us our mortal bodies are brought to life.** **Canon #31 . . . a new man is within (inward), whose image is heavenly, indeed having been formed to the image of God, and who is reformed by the grace of God and by the light of his knowledge, . . .** By the grace of God being filled with the Holy Spirit man was in the image of God. He implored them to have knowledge and faith. **Canon #43 . . . by knowledge and faith and the odor (sweet incense) of holiness those to whom he was bearing grace were filled even as the apostle was.** This sweet holiness will come whereby they will be filled with the Holy Spirit even as Paul was filled with the Spirit. Gird up the loins of your mind. He went on to say by this Holy Spirit, the Gifts are distributed to the saints. **Canon #44 . . . through the manifold grace of the Holy Spirit, in as much as it was necessary, spiritual gifts were distributed to the saints and therefore each one ought to**

remain in that to which he was called and the lower to give honor to those workings in the gospel. Each member should exercise the Gift distributed to them. This was obviously happening in the Priscillian groups and this irritated the Arians.

From his own experience, Priscillian knew the problems in Christianity had no business in the secular courts. ***Canon #46 . . . churchmen ought not on account of their own defense to go to the public but only to the ecclesiastical (saints") judgment; also they ought to judge nothing unjustly and to prove the affair by the testimony of two or three, because the saints will judge the world and angels hereafter.*** Christians should justly judge themselves. How can they judge the world if they can't judge among themselves?

Priscillian had noticed when the formal church moved away from the teachings of Paul, heresies became a real problem. ***Canon #53 . . . many vain speakers have moved away from the apostle, through them heresies arise for error.*** Paul's Body of Christ-ekklesia was right out in front of everybody, out in public places. Everyone saw and experienced the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Because of this, there was no need to discuss or debate the various issues. No vain speaker was going to change your mind. It's a wonder Christianity continues to exist with all the vain speakers who bombard the Christian mind in today's church. .

Priscillian had been set free of the Law and knew there should be no difference in the male and female in the faith. ***Canon #55 . . . not through the law but through faith in Christ and confession are believers saved and justified, with no difference made by the yoke of slavery and diversity of sexes.*** We are beginning to see a pattern here; these resurgences of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in spite of the formal church seemed always to include women. This illustrated the untapped resources for God's work that was wasted by the choking organization and hierarchy of the formal church. It was the same with the Montanists, monks, and, now the Priscillianists. It seemed when the Gifts of the Spirit happened, they always happened to both men and women.

Priscillian put in a good word for the laity especially since he had only recently been one himself. **Canon #61. *The apostle gives testimony of the good lives of some of the laity and of their faith and kindness, because they have relieved the poverty either of himself or of the saints. Canon #63 . . . certain ones have laid down (risked) their own necks for the apostle, to whom he gives thanks not only himself but also for the universal church (the whole assembly or group), which they received also in their own homes.*** He also explained how the so-called laity was the backbone of the early ekklesia-church. This was to answer the complaints from the council at Saragossa against the Priscillianists.

I'm sure the Arian bishops had serious doubts about the revelations coming from God so Priscillian pointed out how Paul received revelations through the Spirit. **Canon #71 . . . *although he blames himself for having been a persecutor of the church, and says he is the least of the apostles, nevertheless he confesses that he was caught up to the third heaven, where without doubt he was instructed in the Gospel; also he says that he was taught not by man but by Christ through the revelation of the Spirit.*** The same revelations are what Paul taught in Chapter twelve of First Corinthians. He went on about how Paul received his apostleship. **Canon #72 . . . *the same apostle says that he received grace and apostleship from God and that Christ speaks and works in him and because those who are the sons of God are moved by the Spirit of God, indeed they are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.*** He said we who are the sons of God are moved by the Spirit of God. That makes us joint heirs with Christ.

Regardless of how much we know, we continue to look through a dark glass. **Canon #80 . . . *he said that he knows in part and prophesies in part and sees what is going to be through a glass, running to the prize of the high calling of God.*** We continue to look because we know that partial knowledge is better than none at all.

Priscillian told them, those in the Body of Christ, to seek the spiritual things. **Canon #84 . . . *he says those placed in the body, who being dead to sin were restored to life by Christ, have risen again through baptism and they seek those things which are on high, not those***

things which are on earth. The things (Gifts) are from on high and not of the flesh. These Gifts are from God and are a small bit (earnest money) of what he has for us in heaven (Eph 1:13). Priscillian was very strong in his beliefs that the Spiritual Gifts were how we see God on this earth.

Priscillian wrote a total of ninety canons on the Epistles of Paul. They were written to show his beliefs and try to convince the formal church leaders he was not a heretic. He would have been a great leader in the formal church, similar in a lot of ways to the Apostle Paul, if he had only been allowed to minister his faith.

Priscillian's appeal in both the Tractates and the Canons of Paul's Epistles was similar in many ways to the writings of the Apostle John in 98 A.D. When John returned to Ephesus from prison he observed the ekklesia-church had deteriorated very much in the past fifteen to twenty years. The Holy Spirit led ekklesia-Body of Christ had digressed into a synagogue-like gathering with the accompanying levels of leadership. In order to remind the people of the importance of the Holy Spirit, he wrote the Gospel of John and the Epistles. These writings were meant to reinvigorate the Body of Christ where the works of the Holy Spirit would be manifested in the ekklesia-church meetings.

Priscillian knew because of his scriptural knowledge, his group had rediscovered the true ekklesia-church from among the unbelieving Arian influences in the formal church. He and his group had the faith to ask God for the Gifts and the Lord was faithful in providing them. The Christians should have welcomed this with open arms, for this was what Jesus wanted from His ekklesia, men and women prophesying by the revelations from God. Paul, throughout his Epistles, experienced these revelations and works of the Holy Spirit.

Because of Priscillian's social rank, vanity and his knowledge of the Word, many in the formal-church thought him to be overbearing and probably dismissed him as being too spiritual. However, it took a man with tremendous resolve to push his beliefs in the Word as far as he did when he knew the overwhelming majority of the organized formal church was against the manifestations of the Gifts.

In 383 A.D., while Priscillian was writing his tractates and canons, the political situation changed for the worse for him and his group. Emperor Gratian was killed in a revolt led by Maximus a general in the Army. At this time, the leaders of the formal church were almost equal politically to the emperors. In fact, Maximus was called the "usurper" by Ambrose because he was responsible for the beloved Gratian's death. The emperors needed the support of the church leaders. Priscillian's writings had evidently rekindled the opposition of the Arians and I'm sure they were chagrined he had escaped the charge of heresy. Ithacius, one of the original Arians, who opposed Priscillian and his beliefs, was in Trier and presented the old charges against Priscillian to the new emperor. Maximus immediately recognized in this situation a way to ingratiate himself to the leaders of the formal church. He called for a synod at Bordeaux which would be stacked with Arians against Priscillian. This way they could cancel the accomplishments of the bribery. Priscillian recognized this, and knew his chances were nil so he appealed to Maximus the emperor for justice.

Perfect Evodius heard his case in a sham trial and found Priscillian guilty of heresy but also added sorcery which could carry the death penalty. Maximus quickly sentenced them to death. In 385 A.D., Priscillian and five other supporters were beheaded in Trier.

When this became known I'm sure shock waves were sent through the religious community. The actions of this overzealous Emperor caused by the attitude of the formal church made everyone ponder "what have we done?" These people, the Priscillianist, had lost their lives because they were not orthodox to the formal church. This would really trouble someone like Ambrose who by this time knew enough about the scriptures to know the actions of the Priscillianists actually complied with the Holy Scriptures.

Martin of Tours, the highly respected spiritual monk, immediately went into action. He announced he was coming to Trier because he had heard Maximus was going to send troops to Spain to root out the remaining Priscillianists. ***NPNF2 Vol II, pp 50. The bishops who had assembled at Trier were retained in that city, and daily communicat-***

ing with Ithacius, they had made common cause with him. When it was announced to them expecting no such information, that Martin was coming, completely losing courage, they began to mutter and tremble among themselves. And it so happened that already, under their influence, the emperor had determined to send some tribunes armed with absolute power into the two Spains, to search out heretics, and when found, to deprive them of their life or goods. Sounds like the bishops who had supported Ithacius against Priscillian were getting cold feet. They asked the Emperor Maximus to prevent Martin from coming unless he would be peaceful and take communion with them. Martin evidently agreed but his main task was to stop Maximus from killing those in Spain. *NPNF2 Vol II, pp 51-52. "When this became known to Martin, he rushed to the palace, though it was now night. He pledges himself that, if these people were spared, he would communicate; only let the tribunes, who had already been sent to the Spains for the destruction of the churches, be recalled. There is no delay: Maximus grants all his requests.* Martin accomplished what he came for; however, he forever had contempt for these bishops and their actions. *NPNF2 Vol II, pp 52. Therefore, from that time forward, he carefully guarded against being mixed up in communion with the party of Ithacius. But when it happened that he cured some of the possessed more slowly and with less grace than usual, he at once confessed to us with tears that he felt a diminution of his power on account of the evil of that communion in which he had taken part for a moment, through necessity, and not with a cordial spirit. He lived sixteen years after this, but never again did he attend a synod, and kept carefully aloof from all assemblies of bishops.* After this Martin was never the same because he was completely disgusted with the formal church. He now realized the formal church with its organization was the enemy of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Martin remained in relative obscurity in the frontier areas for the rest of his life.

During the trial and tribulations of Priscillian, Ambrose the Bishop of Milan, had managed to remain aloof from the whole ordeal. Politically he was a very important person because he represented the young crown prince Valentius II and his mother and their problems with Maximus, the new Emperor. Ambrose had written a general letter to

the Council at Saragossa in 380 A.D., asking them to take back the heretics (Priscillianist) if they recanted their beliefs. And, of course, he refused Priscillian when he came to Milan to ask for support. Ambrose was probably one of the influential bishops of the formal church that Maximus was trying to impress when he executed Priscillian. After the executions, I'm sure Ambrose had to be one of those who pondered "what have we done?" Someone has lost their life because they weren't the same as the majority in the formal church. Surely Ambrose had enough Christianity to regret this turn of events.

Well it seemed Ambrose couldn't get away from the workings of the Holy Spirit. In 386 A.D., not quite a year after the executions, an incident in Ambrose's church in Milan greatly affected his regard for the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. He related this in a letter to his sister who had taken the veil some thirty-five years before in Rome. His letter number XXII told her as they were exhuming the bodies of some Christian martyrs in the vicinity of the church building, a prophetic feeling came over his heart. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 437 . . . And at once a kind of prophetic ardour seemed to enter my heart. Why should I use many words? God favoured us, for even the clergy were afraid who were bidden to clear away the earth from the spot before the chancel screen of SS. Felix and Nabor. I found the fitting signs, and on bringing in some on whom hands were to be laid, the power of the holy martyrs became so manifest, that even whilst I was still silent, one was seized and thrown prostrate at the holy burial-place.***

. . . It was as if Ambrose knew something miraculous was going to happen. Then one of the people to be prayed for suddenly fell to the ground. Here was another case of being "slain in the spirit" as the power of God was manifested at that time. Then the next day a healing took place. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 437 . . . Briefly we arranged the whole in order, and as evening was now coming on, transferred them to the basilica of Fausta, where watch was kept during the night, and some received the laying on of hands. On the following day we translated the relics to the basilica called Ambrosian. During the translation a blind man was healed. I addressed the people then as follows: when I considered the immense and unprecedented numbers of you who are here gathered together, and the gifts of divine***

grace which have shone forth in the holy martyrs, I must confess that I felt myself unequal to this task, and that I could not express in words what we can scarcely conceive in our minds or take in with our eyes . . . A man was blind and he was miraculously healed. Ambrose was mightily impressed as God softened his heart. He must have been reminded of the Elisha's bones. ***AB II Kings 13:20-21. Elisha died, and they buried him. Bands of the Moabites invaded the land in the spring the next year. As a man was being buried (on an open bier), such a band was seen coming, and the man was cast into Elisha's grave. And when the man being let down touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood on his feet.*** God always works in wondrous ways and I'm sure Ambrose needed this miracle to know the Holy Spirit was a continuing force in the world. Most everyone knew of this miracle even as Augustine related this event in his writings.

Ambrose found out how Priscillian must have felt when the leaders of the formal church rejected his experience with the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 439. And the Arians say: "these are not martyrs, and they cannot torment the devil, nor deliver any one, while the torments of the devils are proved by their own words, and the benefits of the martyrs are declared by the restoring of the healed, and the proof of those that are loosed. They deny that the blind man received sight, but he denies not that he is healed. He says: I who could not see now see. He says: I ceased to be blind, and proves it by the fact. They deny the benefit, who are unable to deny the fact. The man is known: so long as he was well he was employed in the public service; his name is Severus, a butcher by trade.*** Obviously the Arians and probably most of the leadership refused to believe the miracle. Ambrose fought back by saying, "to not believe this happened was the same as not believing in Christ". ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 439 But I ask what it is that they do not believe; is it whether any one can be aided by the martyrs? This is the same thing as not to believe Christ, for He Himself said: "Ye shall do greater things than these". . . Here I ask, do they bear a grudge against me, or against the holy martyrs? If against me, are any miracles wrought by me? By my means or in my name? Why, then, grudge me what is not mine?***

This was poetic justice because Ambrose sounded like Priscillian when he said, "why do they begrudge me, what is not mine?"

In 387 A.D., one year after the healing miracle in his church, Ambrose wrote "On the Mysteries". This treatise was for new Christians who had been baptized and told them of the benefits and meaning of their new life. I noticed a marked difference in Ambrose's countenance since the miracle. He seemed much more receptive to the Holy Spirit in his writings. He started by comparing the way God revealed Himself in old times. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 320-321. Look upon the merits of Peter also, or of Paul, who handed down to us this mystery which they had received of the Lord Jesus. To those (of old) a visible fire was sent that they might believe; for us who believe, the Lord works invisibly for them that happened for a figure, for us for warning. Believe, then, that the Lord Jesus is present at the invocation of the priest, Who said: "Where two or three are, there am I also." How much where the Church is, and where His Mysteries are, does He vouchsafe to impart His presence!*** He said God wanted to reveal himself to his disciples. He then said because we are anointed we share in the kingdom. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 321 . . . that we, too, may become a chosen race, priestly and precious, for we are all anointed with spiritual grace for a share in the kingdom of God and in the priesthood.*** He also said we share in the priesthood. This was a lot different from his proclamations about the importance of the bishops in his earlier writings. Ambrose then revealed he understood Eph 1:13 where Paul told them we have been given the authority (sealed) by the Holy Spirit. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 322. And then remember that you received the seal of the Spirit; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and godliness, and the spirit of holy fear, and preserved what you received. God the Father sealed you. Christ the Lord strengthened you, and gave the earnest of the Spirit in your heart, as you have learned in the lesson from the Apostle.*** As Paul said this was a taste of what we will receive at the end.

Ambrose showed a much deeper knowledge of the Body of Christ in discussing the sacraments that feed His church. ***NPNF2 Vol 10, pp 325. In that sacrament is Christ, because it is the Body of Christ, it***

is therefore not bodily food but spiritual. Whence the Apostle says of its type: "Our fathers ate spiritual food and drank spiritual drink," for the Body of God is a spiritual body; the Body of Christ is the Body of the Divine Spirit, for the Spirit is Christ, as we read: "the Spirit before our face is Christ the Lord." Here he said, that Jesus fed his ekklesia with spiritual food and the Spirit before our face is Christ the Lord. I don't believe Ambrose could write like this at the beginning of his ministry.

Augustine in his later writings, "Confessions", revealed that Ambrose maintained a monastery outside of Milan. ***NPNF1 Vol 1, pp 122. And there was a monastery at Milan full of good brethren, without the walls of the city, under the fostering care of Ambrose, and we were ignorant of it.*** Obviously Augustine, who was baptized in Ambrose's church, knew nothing about this monastery. Ambrose probably kept it a secret in the latter years because of the Arian members in his church. I know this is conjecture, but the monastery may have been a place where Ambrose could go and participate in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit and enjoy his newly embraced spirituality until he died in 397 A. D.

In our quest for the discovery of what happened to the ekklesia-church fostered by Jesus and taught by Paul in his Epistles, we come now to Augustine (354-430 A.D.). He probably had more to do with the formation and structure of the present day church than any other individual. Augustine is now and I suppose will always be considered the premier theologian for all time. In fact, even after the Reformation (1500 A.D.), both sides of the controversy more or less came back to Augustine's formal church.

In my opinion, his teachings were the beginning of the downward spiral of the formal church to the point where the Reformation was the logical solution; however, even with the Reformation the complex organization continued to flourish for both sides of the formal church with no apparent return to the workings of the Holy Spirit. Augustine became a Christian in 386 A.D. and began to write about religious matters in 388 A.D. At that time the formal church was going through a great deal of introspection since the Priscillianists had been executed in 385 A.D. By the execution of these proponents of the power of

the Holy Spirit, the formal church seemed to go into a defensive mode and became more rigidly opposed to the works of the Holy Spirit. Another reason for this opposition to the Spirit was the formal church had become almost equivalent in power to the emperors. With this much power and influence, the formal church had become a worldly religious system that could not possibly function by depending on something as unpredictable as the Holy Spirit.

During Augustine's time, the formal church developed into an entity that I would compare to the divided kingdoms of Israel. It was not what God had planned or desired for His people. The formal church had become a machine that was no longer fueled by God but living off of its own organization and structure. Imagine if you will what Jesus' reaction would have been to this organization. There was nothing going on to be compared with God revealing things to the babes and unlearned as he did with the returning seventy in Luke 10:21.

Augustine was baptized in Ambrose's church in Milan in 386 A.D. Prior to this he was a famous teacher of rhetoric and I'm sure was skilled at public speaking. He dabbled in Manichaeism (a bona fide heresy) which was probably restricted to the super intellectuals because they needed to be well versed in astronomy. After a time, he tired of this and began to read some of Paul's Epistles. He and his friends met a man named Pontitianus who greatly influenced him. ***NPNF1 Vol 1, pp 122. For he was both a Christian and baptized, and often prostrated himself before Thee our God in the church, in constant and daily prayers. When, then, I had told him that I bestowed much pains upon these writings, a conversation ensued on his speaking of Antony, the Egyptian monk, whose name was in high repute among Thy servants, though up to that time not familiar to us. When he came to know this, he lingered on that topic, imparting to us a knowledge of this man so eminent, and marveling at our ignorance. . . From this his conversation turned to the companies in the monasteries, and their manners so fragrant unto Thee, and of the fruitful deserts of the wilderness, of which we knew nothing. And there was a monastery at Milan full of good brethren, without the walls of the city, under the fostering care of Ambrose, and we were ignorant of it.*** Augustine was highly intrigued by Antony the spiritual monk of

years past. Pontitianus told them about the monasteries and the spirituality of the monks. Augustine wrote this in 397 A. D. and by this time he had found out about the monastery Ambrose fostered in Milan. It's interesting nothing was discussed in the formal church about the monks or the exploits of Antony. This showed the lack of spirituality in the formal church.

He struggled with his conviction to become a Christian for some time but he finally surrendered with no more doubt. ***NPNF1 Vol 1, pp 127-128. I flung myself down, how, I know not, under a certain fig tree, giving free course to my tears, and the streams of mine eyes gushed out, an acceptable sacrifice unto Thee. . . No further would I read, not did I need; for instantly, as the sentence ended, ---by a light, as it were, of security infused into my heart,---all the gloom of doubt vanished away.*** At the ripe old age of 32, Augustine became a Christian to the delight of his mother. Augustine moved to Hippo his hometown in North Africa in 389 A.D. There he was a presbyter until he became the bishop in 396 A.D.

By this time Christians, especially in Spain, considered Priscillian and his associates to be martyrs even though they were executed with the tacit approval of the formal church. This exposed a large doctrinal gulf developing between the Priscillianist and the formal church. The formal church began to battle this movement with all kinds of subterfuge without, of course, saying anything against the Holy Spirit. In 400 A.D. some 15 years after Priscillian's death, the Council of Toledo was held to put pressure on the remaining Priscillianist bishops in Spain to recant their beliefs. The formal church remained influenced by the Arians and they continued to use the Roman law against heresies for their own purposes. At this time the formal church and emperor were close enough to act as one, so when the formal church declared someone a heretic, they were punished as a heretic by the governmental officials. The question for the Priscillianist was, what to declare to the formal church about their beliefs? Both sides knew full well what the consequences would be if they told they believed like Priscillian. Priscillian partly answered this before his death. ***Tractate #3, pp 1450 . . . how do we reject divine prophecies and while we are obedient to our wishes, begrudge those who have***

prophesied God while abandoning the apostolic teachings which say: don't extinguish the spirit; don't rejecting the prophecies? (1 Thes 5:19-20) How much allegiance did the Priscillianist owe to the formal church that ignored the Word of God by rejecting the prophecies? Some of the Priscillianists showed so little respect they would recant their beliefs only to return to their churches and continue to participate in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. Both Augustine and Leo made a big to do over this in their writings; however, the larger question remained unanswered-why did the formal church not participate in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit as proclaimed in the Scriptures?

It didn't take long for Augustine to become embroiled in the Priscillian controversy. Consentius, a theologian from the south of France, wrote to Augustine and asked the great theologian to advise him on certain matters. Both parties knew it was about the Priscillianist but neither mentioned the name. ***TFC Vol II, pp 294-295 . . . I thought it better to put my request into a letter than to suffer suspense of mind. If you see fit to grant me what I ask. . . But, because it has pleased God, 'Who hath chosen the weak things of this world that He may confound the strong, by the foolishness of our preaching to save them that believe, it is not so much a question of asking a reason of God as it is of following the authority of the saints.*** Consentius wanted to know if he should just accept the directions of the formal church leaders or maybe Augustine would give him some enlightenment on the matter. Then he put Augustine on the spot. ***TFC Vol II, pp 299-300. 'A sentence of the blessed bishop Augustine,' I said, 'has been pleased to steady the tossing bark of my faith.' Then why, sir, pillar as you are of the doctrine which is in Christ, do you hesitate to give an open refutation to your son, who stands in need of correction about the rest of the question?*** This was a touch of sarcasm from Consentius. He asked for a definite refutation of the (Priscillianist) from Augustine. They accused him of idolatry by his fixation on this issue.

Augustine answered by telling Consentius it would be better if they can see each other in person and not put this on paper. ***TFC Vol II, pp 300-301. I asked you to come to us because I have found much pleasure in your natural ability as shown in your books. For that rea-***

son I wanted you here with us, not far away from us, to read certain works of mine which I thought indispensable to you, so that you could easily ask me in person about what you might have not understood completely. . . . It is not so much a question of asking a reason as it is of following the authority of the saints. See, then, according to these words whether you should not in this matter, which is the very heart of our faith, follow only the authority of the saints, and not ask me to make it intelligible to you by reason. He told Consentius to follow the leaders of the formal church and not ask him for a reason. No where did Augustine tell Consentius to go the Scriptures and find out for himself. Augustine then lectured Consentius about reasoning. *TFC Vol II, pp 304-307. I should like to say these things to rouse your faith to a love of understanding to which true reason leads the minds and for which faith prepares it . . . It is better to believe in something true but not yet seen, than to take the false things one sees for true . . . As a matter of fact, we hold things visible but past by faith alone, since there is no hope of seeing again what has slipped away with time.* . When Augustine said, "no hope of seeing again what has slipped away with time", he was probably intimating the Gifts had all passed away with the Apostles. He went on to say justice and wisdom will remain forever and said the supreme God was true justice. *TFC Vol II, pp 316-317. Indeed, that supreme God is true justice or that true God is supreme justice; meantime, our justice in this pilgrimage is to hunger and thirst for it, and our full justice in eternity will be to be filled with it hereafter . . . but in speaking of the mind we endow it with an intellectual excellence, such as justice, but which we know or wish it to be beautiful. It is with this beauty that we are re-formed to the image of God . . .* These are beautiful words; however, no where did he mention the Holy Spirit because it seemed to be a mental thing with him. This was something you could do with "intellectual excellence". Priscillian had some words for this kind of reasoning. *Priscillian Tract #1, pp 1424 . . . which the apostle well says (an unspiritual man, he says, does not perceive those things which are of the spirit of God; for he is not able; for stupidity is his and he is not able to judge; the spiritual man however can judge all things, moreover he himself is judged by no man 1 Corn 2:14-15), and as it is written: (those who are of the flesh are wise in the things of the flesh, indeed those who are of the spirit*

in the things of the spirit, and the wisdom of the flesh is death, however the wisdom of the spirit is life and peace Rom 8:5-6). For the man that thinks he can figure all this out by himself, "stupidity is truly his".

Later on Augustine wrote another letter to Consentius and this time he mentioned the Priscillianists by name. This was after the synod at Toledo (400 A.D.) where the formal church accosted several bishops and made them recant their beliefs regarding the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. Some recanted their beliefs only to go back and continue to participate in the Gifts at their own churches. This drove Augustine crazy. What he couldn't understand was their insolence toward the formal church and its leaders. These Priscillianists were a lot like their founder. Priscillian was very forthright in urging the formal-church to accept the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. In fact at the end of his Tractate #10, he included a prophecy from himself that glorified God.

In his treatise about "Lying", Augustine said what he thought about the Priscillianist telling lies about their beliefs. ***NPNF1 Vol 3, pp 484 . . . It remains, then, that what the Priscillianists think, according to the nefarious falsity of their heresy, of God, of the soul, of the body, and the rest, we hesitate not with truthful pity to condemn; but what they think of the right of telling a lie to hide the truth is to be to us and them (which God forbid!) a common dogma.*** Here he blasted them for lying about their beliefs and called them a heresy.

Evidently, the formal church was losing some people to spiritual groups similar to the Priscillianists and they had spread from Spain into North Africa. Augustine compared them to Simon Magus who wanted to buy the Holy Spirit from Peter the apostle (Acts 8) ***NPNF1 Vol 7, pp 71 . . . therefore ought we to curb all our affections from such desires. My brethren, they that seek such things are they that sell. For that Simon, too, wished to buy the Holy Ghost, just because he meant to sell the Holy Ghost; and he thought the apostles to be just such traders as they whom the Lord cast out of the temple with a scourge. For such as one he was himself, and desired to buy what he might sell; he was of those who sell doves. Now it was in a dove that the Holy Ghost appeared. Who, then, are they, brethren, that***

sell doves but who say, "We give the Holy Ghost"? . . . Aye, brethren, and they do not blush, that, by these bitter and malicious dissensions of theirs, they have made of themselves so many parties, while they assume to be what they are not, while they are lifted up, thinking themselves to be something when they are nothing . . . Augustine accused them of selling the Holy Spirit for their own benefit and then split into many parties away from the large formal church. He also thought they were self-righteous because of their affinity with the Holy Spirit.

He always contended the only place to receive the Holy Spirit was in the formal church; however, he continued to put down the Gifts of the Holy Spirit such as tongues. *NPNF1 Vol 4, pp 442-443. But those are wanting in God's love who do not care for the unity of the Church; and consequently we are right in understanding that the Holy Spirit may be said not to be received except in the Catholic Church. For the Holy Spirit is not only given by the laying on of hands amid the testimony of temporal sensible miracles, as He was given in former days to be the credentials of a rudimentary faith, and for the extension of the first beginnings of the Church. For who expects in these days that those on whom hands are laid that they may receive the Holy Spirit should forthwith begin to speak with tongues?* What was wrong with that rudimentary faith at the beginning of the Church? When Augustine referred to the beginnings of the ekklesia-church as rudimentary, he indicated it was not yet fully developed. I believe the faith was more developed then than during Augustine's time.

Tertullian, the great Christian apologist during 200 A.D., left us a very definite description and explanation of tongues. He told them tongues were a new form of prayer. *ANF Vol 3, pp 681. . . . 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 . . .* This was the new wine that required new wine skins. He went on to describe speaking in tongues beautifully. The enriched prayer was the choicest victim. *ANF Vol 3, pp 690. We are the true adorers and the true priests, who, praying in spirit, sacrifice, in spir-*

it, prayer,---a victim proper and acceptable of God, which assuredly He has required, which He has looked forward to for Himself! The victim proper is our intellect and our reasoning soul which God has required from us. Tertullian told them they should escort "speaking in tongues" with pomp and good works, because we should be proud.

In another place Augustine said tongues were for all nations at the beginning. ***NPNF1 Vol 6, pp 376. For now the power of truth began to be made known to all. For then even one man having received the Holy Ghost, spake by himself with the tongues of all nations. But now in the church oneness itself, as one man speaks in tongues of all nations. For what tongue has not the Christian religion reached? To what limits does it not extend.*** He said the church now reached all nations. This was a very flimsy excuse for not speaking in tongues. What Augustine wanted was unity and soundness of mind in the formal church and probably felt the Gifts of the Holy Spirit might cause strife especially among the Arian members.

Augustine in his instructions to the new believers taught that it was best not to emphasize the miracles in the Scriptures. ***NPNF1 Vol 3, pp 289. His thoughts, however, ought certainly to be turned away from this line of things, whether miracles or dreams, and directed to the more solid path and the surer oracles of the Scriptures . . . and assuredly it ought to be pointed out to him, that the Lord Himself would neither thus have admonished him and urged him on to become a Christian, and to be incorporated into the Church, nor have taught him by such signs or revelations, had it not been His will that, for his greater safety and security, he should enter upon a pathway already prepared in the Holy Scriptures, in which he should not seek after visible miracles . . .*** The trouble with this advice was the Holy Scriptures were full of miracles and dreams of the ekklesia-church in the early days. To tell someone not to seek after miracles but be directed by the more solid path of the Scriptures should completely confuse them. Since the beginning of the Priscillianist problem, the formal church was promoting an attitude whereby they were resigned to the non-spiritual beliefs in the formal church. In other words don't seek after visible miracles.

Priscillian in his writings showed the reason for the manifestations of the Holy Spirit. He said they caused believing to creep into men. ***Priscillian Tract #5, pp 1455. The model of prophetic instruction formed for announcing divine glories, although it is held as the guests of an earthly dwelling place (person), nevertheless, filled with the light of the spirit of God, so distributes the works of prophecy, that the presence from God granting faith for believing creeps into men and the things that are done in us may demonstrate spiritual understanding through those things which are seen cf. Rom 1:20 . . .*** Like the early ekklesia-church Priscillian saw people believe because of what they observed in the meetings. Paul in the fourteenth chapter Corinthians also described what observers saw and heard in the early ekklesia-church.

If the Apostle John had returned in 420 A.D. instead of 96 A.D., I'm sure he would have met the same fate as Priscillian. He also would have clashed with Augustine on several matters. John saw what the influence of the Judaizers had done to the ekklesia-church and was concerned about the lack of the Holy Spirit.. In his epistle, he met this problem head-on. ***AB I John 2:27a. But as for you, (the sacred appointment, the unction) the anointing which you received from Him, abides (permanently) in you; (so) then you have no need that any one should instruct you.*** Augustine discussed these verses in his narrative on the Epistle of John. In verse 27 he seemed to question Apostle John's advice. It was almost like he would like to see this part rewritten. Augustine almost said, "I would like to see the Holy Spirit teach this bunch." ***NPNF1 Vol 7, pp 481. "And we have no need that any man teach you, because His unction teacheth you concerning all things." Then to what purpose is it that "we" my brethren, teach you? If "His unction teacheth you concerning all things," it seems we labor without a cause. And what mean we, to cry out as we do? Let us leave you to His unction, and let His unction teach you. . . I, for my part, have spoken to all; but they to whom that Unction within speaketh not, they whom the Holy Ghost within teacheth not, those go back untaught. If the people didn't have the Holy Spirit they would go untaught.*** It was obvious Augustine had no idea how the Body of Christ with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit was supposed to minister to the people. Priscillian commented on this. ***Priscillian Tract 3,***

pp 1418. . . . having Christ god in a sense as a demonstrator, though whom also if otherwise we might feel also these things were revealed to us Phil 3:15) we, established to serve the justice of the Lord in sanctification Rom 6:19) . . . Priscillian said "these things were revealed to us "and that was what Jesus originally said about His ekklesia. It would operate through the revelations from the Father (Matt 16:18). The organized formal church produces procedures and programs to take the place of these spiritual happenings. In this way, these spiritual things can be avoided. We would probably be better off to suspend the meetings rather than continue these humdrum traditions. That way we would thirst for the Holy Spirit to reveal Jesus to us. Here is where faith comes in; we must ask God for these revelations and not be dependent on one man to relate to us his knowledge.

The formal church had taken on the function as the only source of Christian information for the laity. In fact, Augustine told them in his "Christian Doctrine", they didn't need the Scriptures if they only had Faith, Hope, and Love. **NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 534. And thus a man who is resting upon faith, hope and love, and who keeps a firm hold upon these, does not need the Scriptures except for the purpose of instructing others.** I wonder about this saying of Augustine. After the experience with Priscillian, were the formal church leaders discouraging the laity from studying the Word? This begged the question, where would the laity get their information? Implied here of course, they should get their information from the leaders of the formal church. When this approach was adhered to, sometimes they got the wrong information. This was illustrated in Augustine's advice about what to do with the hard to understand passages in the Word. **NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 581. For there are some passages which are not understood in their proper force, or are understood with great difficulty, at whatever length, however clearly, or with whatever eloquence the speaker may expound them; and these should never be brought before the people at all, or only on rare occasions when there is some urgent reason.** This was also from his "Christian Doctrine", and showed what someone like Augustine would do if not aided by the Holy Spirit. He will only teach what he understands by his own human resources. This is the reason we have seminaries for each denomination. They will teach only those verses that are easily understood by their partic-

ular denomination. The old axiom, "Truth divorced from experience is always open to doubt", is applicable in this case. Priscillian saw this in 384 A.D., where the formal church was leaving out the Holy Spirit even though the Scriptures were very specific about His role and place in the Body of Christ. This statement from Augustine showed his smugness about what the leadership in the formal church should allow the laity to know about the Scriptures.

In his "Christian Doctrine", Augustine exposed himself as to how he felt about the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. He used Faith, Hope and Love as a substitution for Gifts of the Holy Spirit. ***NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 534. Accordingly, many live without copies of the Scriptures, even in solitude, on the strength of these three graces. So that is their case, I think, the saying is already fulfilled: "whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." Yet by means of these instruments (as they may be called), so great an edifice of faith and love has been built up in them, that, holding to what is perfect, they do not seek for what is only in part perfect--- . . .*** By playing Faith, Hope and Love against the Gifts he created an unhealthy division that tended to negate the power of the Holy Spirit. There is not supposed to be a contest between Faith, Hope and Love and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. They are to exist together and feed off each other for God's glory.

During Augustine's time, the formal church as a whole with this organization was becoming more dependent on the leadership in Rome. Because of this the formal church felt the necessity of justifying this by the Word. Ambrose in his earlier writings had already proclaimed that the Apostle Peter was the foundation of the church. (Matt 16:18) Augustine in 400 A.D., agreed with Ambrose's interpretation in his letter to Generosus. ***NPNF1 Vol 1, pp 298. For if the lineal succession of bishops is to be taken into account, with how much more certainty and benefit to the Church do we reckon back till we reach Peter himself, to whom, as bearing in a figure the whole Church, the Lord said: "Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it!" The successor of Peter was Linus, and his successors in unbroken continuity were these: . .***

. He went on to list all the bishops of the Roman church. Supposedly, this was a direct succession to the Apostle Peter even though there was no evidence that Peter was ever the Bishop at Rome.

In 416 A.D. Augustine evidently changed his mind. His treatise "On the Trinity" stated the "Big Rock" was faith. ***NPNF1 Vol 3, pp 51. But whilst we are absent from the Lord, and walk by faith, not by sight, we ought to see the "back parts" of Christ, that is His flesh, by that very faith, that is, standing on the solid foundation of faith, which the rock signifies, and beholding it from such a safe watch-tower, namely in the Catholic Church, of which it is said, "and upon this rock I will build my Church."*** Then again in 418 A.D. Augustine said that faith was the rock in which Jesus built His church. ***NPNF1 Vol 7, pp 520. See what praises follow this faith. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." What meaneth, "Upon this rock I will build my church." Upon this faith; upon this that has been said, "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the Living God. Upon this rock," saith He, "I will build my Church."*** Augustine went on to say even the devils knew Jesus was the Son of God.

During this time Augustine must have had second thoughts about the church in Rome becoming such a powerful entity. In 420 A.D. Augustine had changed his mind once again, and decided that Jesus was the huge rock. ***NPNF1 Vol 7, pp 450 . . . "On this rock will I build my church," because Peter has said, "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God." On this rock, therefore He said, which thou hast confessed I will build my Church. For the Rock (Petra) was Christ; and on this foundation was Peter himself also built . . .for what the Church is essentially in Christ, such representatively is Peter in the rock (petra) and in this representation Christ is to be understood as the Rock, Peter as the Church.*** This was from his "On the Gospel of John". He explained his position more completely in a sermon later on in 420 A.D. ***NPNF1 Vol 6, pp 340. For before he was called Simon. Now this name of Peter was given him by the Lord and that in a figure, that he should signify the Church. For seeing that Christ is the rock (Petra), Peter is the Christian people. . . . "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the living God, will I build My Church;" that is upon Myself, the Son of the living God, "will I build My Church." I***

will build thee upon Myself, not Myself upon thee. Augustine said Jesus would build His ekklesia upon Himself.

How you interpret these verses determines how you believe "the Church ought to be". For myself, I believe the (big rock) was what happened to Peter. It was revealed to Peter by God. In other words, the huge rock was the revelation from God. This would agree with what has actually happened since that time to the ekklesia (church) of Jesus. After Pentecost, the ekklesia-church operated through the revelations of the Holy Spirit. This happened with Paul's writings when he expounded the Gifts of the Holy Spirit to the Body of Christ or ekklesia-church. These Gifts were Word of Knowledge, Word of Wisdom, Wonder Working Faith, Powers of Healing, Working Miracles, Prophetic Insight, Discerning Spirits, Unknown Tongues and Interpretation of Tongues. All these were revelations from God and when they worked as they should, the Body of Christ manifested Jesus as if He were present Himself.

In 426 A.D. a miracle happened in Augustine's church that was similar to the one in Ambrose's church in Milan in 386 A.D. Augustine related this healing miracle in his "City of God". There was a family from Cappadocia who had been cursed by their mother that was seized with hideous shaking in all their limbs. A brother and sister of this wretched lot came to Augustine's church in Hippo. ***NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 490. Now it was about fifteen days before Easter when they came, and they came daily to church, and specially to the relics of the most glorious Stephen, praying that God might now be appeased, and restore their former health . . . Easter arrived, and on the Lord's day, in the morning, when there was now a large crowd, present, and the young man was holding the bars of the holy place where the relics were, and praying, suddenly he fell down, and lay precisely as if asleep, but not trembling as he was wont to do even in sleep. All present were astonished. . .*** Here again some buried martyr's bones were involved and there was a manifestation of the Holy Spirit where a man was "slain in the Spirit". When he rose up he was healed. ***NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 490 . . . And behold! He rose up, and trembled no more, for he was healed, and stood quite well, scanning those who were scanning him. Who then refrained himself from praising God?***

The whole church was filled with the voices of those who were shouting and congratulating him . . . Augustine was not present when this happened; however, he heard their joy as the congregation filed into the building.

The next day the man's sister went to the tombs of the martyrs and the same thing happened to her. She was "slain in the Spirit": and she was healed at the tomb. Augustine seemed to be completely unmoved by this demonstration of the Holy Spirit. ***NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 491 . . . finally, some things are done in one way, others in another, and so that man cannot at all comprehend them, ---nevertheless these miracles attest this faith which preaches the resurrection of the flesh to eternal life.*** He said who's to know about these things. Maybe, just maybe, God did this to wake up Augustine to the benefits of the manifestations of the Holy Spirit like He did with Ambrose; however, after this Augustine continued to hang on to his rigidity concerning the miracles and the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. ***NPNF1 Vol 2, pp 492 . . . Which then can more readily be believed to work miracles? They who wish themselves to be reckoned gods by those on whom they work miracles, or those who sole object in working any miracle is to induce faith in God, and in Christ also as God? . . . Let us therefore believe those who both speak the truth and work wonders. For by speaking the truth they suffered, and so won the power of working wonders.*** He continued to question the motives, and then, as only he could do, came up with an explanation. He said the martyrs because they spoke the truth and suffered had therefore won the power to work wonders. If one has to suffer before receiving this Gift of the Holy Spirit, then it shouldn't be called a Gift. But it is a Gift of God and make no mistake about that!

From the very beginning Augustine championed the formal church regardless of its condition. In 388 A.D. he wrote about the formal church making excuses for its less-than-perfect members and castigating those that criticized its actions. ***NPNF1 Vol 4, pp 62. Those again, who with wicked will persist in their old vices, or even add to them others still worse, are indeed allowed to remain in the field of the Lord, and to grow along with the good seed; but the time for separating the tares will come. Or if, from their having at least the***

Christian name, they are to be placed among the chaff rather than among thistles, there will also come One to purge the floor and to separate the chaff from the wheat, and to assign to each part (according to its desert) the due reward. Augustine took up for the formal church saying it consisted of tares and good seed. He lamented, there will be a time after the chaff was separated from the wheat when each would receive his due reward. Later on in 416 A.D. he admonished people to support and stay with the formal church. **NPNF1 Vol 7, pp 77. Brethren, let every Christian among the members of Christ be eaten up with zeal of God's house. Who is eaten up with zeal of God's house? He who exerts himself to have all that he may happen to see wrong there corrected, desires it to be mended, does not rest idle: who if he cannot mend it, endures it, laments it.** "If you cannot mend it, then endure it," said Augustine. Tell this to Priscillian, who did his best to encourage the formal church to change and participate in the manifestations of the Holy Spirit as described in the Word of God. He was executed for his zeal to correct the formal church. Should Priscillian have been satisfied to allow the tares in the formal church determine its course of action? When Augustine said to "lament it", to regret or mourn the state of the formal church, he initiated a pervading attitude of resignation within Christianity. This attitude created an atmosphere of helplessness about changing the status quo of the formal church.

Augustine even in his own time was considered the foremost theologian of the formal church. However, we have seen by his writings, he was no enthusiast for the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in the formal church. Augustine wrote to Bishop Erodus in 415 A.D. concerning his views of the Priscillianists. He started by quoting where Paul was instructing the Corinthians about how to use the Gifts in Jesus' ekklesia-Body of Christ. Evidently Augustine chose to use this as a reason not to do the Gifts at all. He said these Corinthians were especially ready to cause disorder in the church. **NPNF1 Vol 1, pp 539. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him know the things which I write to you, for they are the commands of the Lord. If any man be ignorant, he shall be ignored;" intending by these words to restrain and call to order persons who were specially ready to cause disorder in the church, because they imagined themselves to excel in**

spiritual gifts, although they were disturbing everything by their presumptuous conduct. Augustine considered this activity of the Holy Spirit" to be "presumptuous conduct". Priscillian countered this conduct with his statement about prophesy. ***Priscillian Tract #5, pp 1455. The model of prophetic instruction formed for announcing divine glories, although it is held as the guest of an earthly dwelling place (person), nevertheless, filled with the light of the spirit of God, so distributes the works of prophecy, that the presence from God granting faith for believing creeps into men and the things that are done in us may demonstrate spiritual understanding through those things which are seen (cf. Rom 1:20).*** Here he said believing creeps into man because the manifestations of the Gifts are seen by man.

As a result of all his mental gymnastics, Augustine in 428 A. D. came up with a far-reaching conclusion. In his later years he wrote about "Predestination". Of all his one hundred and thirteen writings, his two treatises on predestination are more remembered than all the others. He started the first one by describing the salvation of man. ***NPNF1 Vol 5, pp 507. Moreover, that which I said, "that the salvation of this religion has never been lacking to him who was worthy of it, and that he to whom it was lacking was not worthy,"---if it be discussed and it be asked whence any man can be worthy, there are not wanting those who say---by human will. But we say, by divine grace or predestination. Further, between grace and predestination, there is only this difference, that predestination is the preparation for grace, while grace is the donation itself.*** Augustine said predestination designated those that were to receive grace. If Augustine believed this, then there were those who God did not designate to receive the grace. To me, this went against everything God wanted for mankind whom He had created in the image of God, the Son and the Holy Spirit. God's plan for mankind, after Adam's sin, was to redeem man back to Himself with the same relationship He had with Adam. God is so omniscient, so omnipresent, and so omnipotent; He knew what it would take to accomplish this feat. He had to offer His Son as a sacrifice for man's sins.

According to the Epistle to the Romans, Paul said in 8:29, which was the main verse for Augustine's predestination, "those who He foreknew,

He was aware and loved before hand." This means to me, He knew and loved everybody, not just a few. "He then destined them from the beginning to be molded into the image of His Son." God wanted all to be in the image of His Son. God in His redeeming process wanted mankind to want this grace from Him because it only works if it is a two-way relationship. You can say the same about Ephesians 1:5, the other predestination passage. Here Paul said, "It pleased God and was His kind intent." God intended for man to be like Jesus. In my opinion, Augustine took predestination too far and separated mankind into two groups, those that received the grace and those that did not receive the grace. Augustine even used predestination for those who had or didn't have the Gifts. ***NPNF1 Vol 5, pp 552. Further, they cannot deny that God has foreknown all His gifts, and the people on whom He was going to bestow them. As, therefore, other things must be preached so that he who preaches them may be heard with obedience, so predestination must be preached so that he who hear these things with obedience may glory not in man, and therefore not in himself, but in the Lord; . . . in like manner as the rest, is God's gift. And he who has not this gift, ---I shrink not from saying it, ---whatever others he has, has them in vain.*** God wants us all to have the Gifts. Augustine said he who doesn't do this, whatever Gift he has, has them in vain. He was forever questioning the motives of those who manifested the Gifts.

Augustine was probably vexed about the Priscillianist daring to intimate that he and the formal church should have the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. By his reasoning he and the formal Church were predestined not to have the Gifts. If God wanted the Gifts for them they would have them. Many Christians are like this today concerning the Holy Spirit and the Gifts. They think God will force the issue if they are to receive the Gifts. Because of the redeeming process, God wants man to reach for the benefits of His saving Grace provided by Him through the sacrifice of His Son. After we accept Jesus as our Savior, the benefits are eternal life with Him but there is more. We now have available to us the benefits of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit but we must ask for them.

One of the main reasons for writing this book was to convince people of the benefits of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit to the ekklesia-church and show what happened to those benefits down through history. It is not a matter of being saved or unsaved; it is a matter of not using what is available to us through the power of the Holy Spirit.

Sometimes churchmen tell us not to worry we have all the Spirit we are ever going to receive when we accept Jesus. Well, God had this salvation available to us all the time, but we had to accept it, ourselves. Same with the benefits of the Holy Spirit, after salvation they are available to us, but we have to accept and use them.

Augustine was probably waiting for some thunderous event from God to anoint him with these Gifts if he was meant to have them. The Holy Spirit never forces against this show-me attitude. If you want the Gifts, you have to ask for them. As a result, Augustine remained aloof and unfulfilled in regard to the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. He repeatedly said the Spirit made them shed abroad the love of God, but little else.

Why do people like me promote the Gifts to people who are obviously satisfied with their Christian walk without them? Besides the obvious, I visualize the potential for evangelizing Jesus to the world as they did in the early ekklesia-church. It is my personal belief, that something as radical as the Gifts with signs and wonders will be required to convince the Muslim world to change and believe on Jesus. Paul used the Gifts to evangelize as he wrote to the Corinthians, **AB I Cor 14:24-25. *But if all prophesy---giving inspired testimony and interpreting the divine will and purpose---and an unbeliever or untaught outsider comes in, he is told of his sin and reproved and convicted and convinced by all, and his defects and needs are examined (estimated, determined), and he is called to account by all, the secrets of his heart are laid bare; and so, falling on (his) face, he will worship God, declaring that God is among you in very truth.*** And Priscillian did the same thing three hundred and twenty years later when he observed the light of the Spirit through the works of prophesy. ***Priscillian Tract #5, pp 1455 . . . filled with the light of the spirit of God, so distributes the works of prophesy, that the presence from***

God granting faith for believing creeps into men . . . This would be a natural result of seeing the manifestations of the Holy Spirit.

In his last days, Augustine warned those that may disagree with him. ***NPNF1 Vol 5, pp 552. Let those who read this, if they understand, give God thanks, and let those who do not understand; pray that they may have the inward Teacher, from whose presence comes knowledge and understanding. But let those who think that I am in error; consider again and again carefully what is here said, lest perchance they themselves may be mistaken. And when, by means of those who read my writings, I become not only wiser, but even more perfect, I acknowledge God's favour to me; . . .*** Let there be no question how Augustine felt about his own work. Besides predestination, Augustine produced through his writings a sort of "Resignation" toward the formal church. He said the formal church shared in the fallen nature of the world. There were wheat and tares mixed together which resulted in a far from perfect group. This attitude permeated the formal church and along with predestination paved the way for an agreement among all the formal churches to let one man be the ruling force for the entire formal church. This way those perplexing problems could be answered by one man rather than depend on the revelations from God.

After Augustine, the formal church went through the most dramatic conversion in its history. The formal church organized itself in such a way where one man would be designated the head, and he would rule on all questions. Even before Augustine died (430 A.D.) most looked to the bishop of Rome as the main arbitrator to settle conflicts within the formal church.

Leo was born in 390 A.D. somewhere in the vicinity of Rome. He held various positions in the formal Church of Rome and worked under two bishops, Celestine and Sixtus. As a cleric he was determined to adhere to tradition in both doctrine and practice. I'm sure he was very familiar with both Ambrose and Augustine's writings. He was made bishop in Rome in 440 A.D.

In a letter, to Dioscorus the influential bishop of Alexandria, Leo showed agreement with Ambrose about the authority of the priest. He referred to the same Scriptures (John 20:22-23) where Jesus breathed the Holy Spirit on the Apostles. ***NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 8. On it lastly the Holy Spirit that had been promised to the Apostles by the Lord came; and so we know it to have been suggested and handed down by a kind of heavenly rule, that on that day we ought to celebrate the mysteries of the blessing of priests on which all these gracious gifts were conferred.*** He like Ambrose before him used this to say the Gifts were conferred on the Apostles and by succession were handed down through the generations by a kind of "heavenly rule" to the priests of the formal church. This elevated the priests above the laity and placed them between the laity and God.

In another letter of Leo's to Anastasius the bishop of Thessalonica he paid lip service to the unanimity of the whole body of believers. ***NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 19. The connexion of the whole body makes all alike healthy, all alike beautiful: and this connexion requires the unanimity indeed of the whole body, but it especially demands harmony among the priests. And though they have a common dignity, yet they have not uniform rank; . . . and while the election of them all was equal, yet it was given to one to take the lead of the rest.*** He said the priests especially needed to be harmonious; however, he began the process for selecting one to take the lead of the rest.

Leo, as did Ambrose, made the case for Peter being "the Rock" on which Jesus built his ekklesia-church. This interpretation was essential to justify the succession from Peter all the way forward to the present bishop at Rome.

Before embarking on this theological aberration, let's look at some facts. If we go back through the history of the church we find the Church Fathers differed in their interpretation of Matt 16:18. Leo, of course, believed Peter was the rock. Augustine began that way but through time changed and said "faith" was the rock. Then in his last writings he changed that to Jesus. Augustine said "For the Rock (Petra was Christ" (NPNF1 Vol 7, pp 450). Ambrose and Leo agreed almost

verbatim because Leo obtained a lot of his learning from Ambrose's early writings.

A letter by Jerome, a Christian writer who died in 420 A.D., also agreed with Ambrose and Leo. In 377 A.D. in a letter to Damasus, the bishop of Rome said, ". . . that is the chair of Peter. For this I know is the rock on which the church is built". (NPNF2 Vol 3, pp 18). Going further back in history, Hilary of Poitiers, a very spiritual man, said it was "faith". "This faith it is which is the foundation of the church; through this faith the gates of hell cannot prevail against her . . . whatsoever this faith is, the Fathers gift by revelation." (NPNF2 Vol 9, pp 112). Hilary died in 365 A.D. Before Hilary, Athanasius, the spiritual giant who stood with the monks and their spirituality, said in a letter written in 357 A.D., "Peter confessing it by revelation of the Father and being told, Blessed art thou Simon Barjona for flesh and blood did not reveal to thee but my Father Who is in heaven . . ." (NPNF2 Vol 4, pp 551). This indicated Athanasius had no idea of succession but rather it was simply the revelation from God that was important.

During the reign of Constantine and his sons, most of the action of Christianity was in the eastern area, consequently, there wasn't that much importance attributed to the church in Rome.

Cyprian who died in 258 A.D. was involved in trying to better organize the church. He said in explaining Matthew 16:18, "Thence through the changes of times and successions, the ordering of the bishops and plan of the church flow onwards; so that the church is founded on the bishops (ANF Vol 5, pp 305). He went on to say about Peter, "And although to all apostles after His resurrection, He gives equal power . . . Assuredly the rest of the apostles were also the same as Peter." (ANF Vol 5, pp 442) Hippolytus who died into 236 A.D. said the Holy Spirit was the rock. "By this Spirit the rock of the church is established." (ANF Vol 5, pp 237) Tertillian, the famous Christian apologist and Montanist, said, "For the church itself is properly and principally the Spirit Himself in Whom the Trinity of the one Divinity - Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (ANF Vol 3, pp 99)

Finally we come to Irenaeus who died in 202 A.D. His was a fresh and unadulterated view without any pretext of building some sort of organization. He said, "How also did the seventy preach unless they had previously known truth of what they preached? Or how could Peter have been in ignorance when the Lord gave testimony that flesh and blood had not revealed to him but the Father who is in heaven." (ANF Vol 1, pp 437) Obviously Irenaeus thought "revelation from the Father" was the big Rock in Matt 16:18.

In the early ekklesia-church the Christians were not concerned about succession from Peter the man, for they knew these revelations from God were happening in their meetings as prophesied by Jesus. **AB John 16:15. Everything that the Father has is Mine. That is what I meant when I said that He will take the things that are Mine and will reveal (declare, disclose, transmit) them to you.**

In Leo's Sermon III delivered in 443 A.D., he quoted Matthew 16:16-19 to make his point Peter was the one Jesus referred to when he said, "On this rock will I build my ekklesia." Leo maintained because of this, Peter was the head of the formal church. **NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 117. The dispensation of Truth therefore abides, and the blessed Peter persevering in the strength of the Rock, which he has received, has not abandoned the helm of the Church, which he undertook . . . his being set as the Umpire to bind and to loose, whose judgments shall retain their validity in heaven, from all these mystical titles we might know the nature of his association with Christ . . . and so if anything is rightly done and rightly decreed by us, if anything is won from the mercy of God by our daily supplications it is of his work and merits whose power lives and whose authority prevails in his See.** Leo declared it was through us, we (himself) maintain his (Peter's) authority during the present time.

Leo's statements completely by passed what actually happened after Jesus uttered these words in Caesarea-Philippi. First and foremost, there was no ingrained leader in the ekklesia. If Leo was correct, Peter should have taken over and had some exalted position such as High Priest. Secondly, Jesus told them in the upper room, the Holy Spirit would reveal to them the things of His. Thirdly, after His resurrection,

He told them to go to Jerusalem and receive power from the Holy Spirit. Fourth, after Pentecost the ekklesia met and the revelations from God were forthcoming just as Jesus had told them. They had the vehicle, the ekklesia, and they had the power, through the revelations of the Holy Spirit, to reveal God to the world. Imagine the audacity of Leo to want all this under his control.

Leo proclaimed in his Sermon III that he was honored to replace Peter. ***NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 117. And so, dearly beloved, with reasonable obedience, we celebrate to-day's festival by such methods, that in my humble person he may be recognized and honoured, in whom abides the care of all the shepherds, together with the charge of the sheep commended to him, and whose dignity is not abated even in so unworthy an heir.*** In Leo abides the care of all the shepherds (priests) and the charge of the sheep. This meant he was in charge of the whole deal. Imagine how this lines up with Jesus' statement to the disciples in Matt 23:9, "And do not call anyone (in the church) on earth father, for you have one Father, Who is in heaven." I'm sure by this time (443 A.D.) most all the bishops were agreed that Leo would be the "Pope" or supreme authority.

In a sermon in 445 A.D. Leo made sure they knew he was against the Priscillianist movement. ***NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 140. For the old enemy does not cease to "transform himself into an angel of light," and spread everywhere the snares of his deceptions, and make every effort to corrupt the faith of believers . . . Moreover he has many whom he has bound still more tightly because they are suited for his designs, that he may use their abilities and tongues to deceive others. Through them are guaranteed the healing of sicknesses, the prognosticating of future events, the appeasing of demons and the driving away of apparitions.*** He intimated that Satan himself may be behind these so-called healings and prognosticating the future (prophesies). This has always been the age-old excuse for not participating in the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.

In Leo's letter XV addressed to Turribius, a bishop in Spain, he outlined and presented the errors of the Priscillianist. He made sixteen assertions against them, some of which were, they deny the Trinity,

support the Arian heresy, say the devil not God's creation, have astrological notions, falsify and forge scripture and have immoral practices. This was so much like the Arians' tirade against Athanasius in 330 A.D. when they were trying to put down the spiritual influence of the monks. It seemed they had no shame in making false accusations.

The letter XV of Leo's was written in 447 A.D. and was distributed to the formal churches across the empire. His assertions against the Priscillianist, at first, didn't make sense to me because they can all be disproved by the writings of Priscillian. Then, I realized, this was all about "politics". Leo was campaigning for the office of "Pope" and this letter was his "policy" statement concerning the Priscillianist. The bishops needed someone to solve the Priscillian problem and Leo was probably the man. Near the end of the letter Leo outlined what should be done to the bishops who were tainted by this heresy. ***NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 26. Therefore let a council of bishops be held among you, and let the priests of neighbouring provinces meet at a place suitable to all: that, on the lines of our reply to your request for advice, a full inquiry may be made as to whether here are any of the bishops who are tainted with the contagion of this heresy: for they must without doubt be cut off from communion, if they refuse to condemn this most unrighteous sect with all its wrongful conceptions.*** I'm sure Leo wanted the bishops to know his stance on the Priscillianist and as for the sixteen assertions, we all know in politics; you don't have to tell the whole truth.

In 449 A.D., Flavian the bishop of Constantinople asked Leo for his views on the "Incarnation of Jesus". Leo wrote his "Tome", which was his position statement about his beliefs on Jesus. His "Tome" was a marvelous description of the divinity of Jesus starting with Mary conceiving from the Holy Ghost without losing her virginity. He then related the Word became flesh and dwelt with us, the Invisible made Himself visible. He obscured His immeasurable majesty and took on Him the form of a servant. He carried on the incarnation of Jesus through to His resurrection. This vivid description of Jesus completely omitted any description of the workings of the Holy Spirit. It certainly left out John 14:17 where Jesus told the disciples He and the Holy Spirit were one.

Leo prevailed on the emperor to call a synod of all the bishops to determine the "Faith" of the formal church. This was done to solidify Leo's place as successor to the Apostle Peter. The Council of Chalcedon was held in Chalcedon in September of 451 A.D. Chalcedon was immediately east of Constantinople across the Bosphorus Strait. It's interesting the important councils, like Nicaea in 325 A.D., Constantinople in 381 A.D. and Chalcedon in 451 A.D. were all located in the same small geographical area.

Because of his exalted position Leo chose not to attend but sent Paschasinus, bishop of Sicily and two others as his representatives. In accordance with Leo's request Paschasinus presided over the council. The council was attended by five hundred and twenty bishops and they started by reading Leo's "Tome". ***NPN2F Vol 14, pp 244. An important point treated in the Council of Chalcedon, that is, the establishing of the faith, and the approval of Leo's letter, is as follows: Already almost the whole West, and most of the Easterns, with Anatolius himself, Bishop of Constantinople had gone so far as to confirm by subscription that letter, before the council took place; and in the council itself the Fathers had often cried out, "We believe, as Leo: Peter hath spoken by Leo: we have all subscribed the letter: what has been set forth is sufficient for the Faith: no other exposition may be made."*** As it turned out, the "Tome" of Leo became the "Faith" of the formal church. Most of the bishops said, "Peter has spoken by Leo". The "Tome" was accepted more or less as the creed or the Faith of the formal church.

The creed was a beautiful dissertation of the Divinity of Jesus but almost nothing about the works of the Holy Spirit. A look back at the previous councils revealed how the formal church had handled the Holy Spirit. The first, the Nicæan council in 325 A.D. was mainly about the Divinity Jesus and all that was said about the Holy Spirit was a short "and we believe in the Holy Ghost". But after the Nicæan council, the Arians went after the Holy Spirit and were repulsed by Athanasius and Basil. Subsequently the Council at Constantinople had a much more complete description of their belief on the Holy Spirit. ***NPN2F Vol 14, pp 164. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, who spake in the Law, and preached in the Prophets, and descended at***

Jordan, and spake in the Apostles, and indwells the Saints. And thus we believe in him, that he is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the perfect Spirit, the Spirit the Comforter, uncreate, who proceedeth from the Father, receiving of the Son and believed on. As you can see the Holy Spirit was held in high esteem at the council of Constantinople in 381 A.D.

Now, with the Tome of Leo accepted as the creed, the formal church had, in my opinion, slipped backward in recognizing the importance of the Holy Spirit. It seemed the five hundred and twenty bishops were seeking a way to avoid all controversy. Most of the bishops probably agreed with the emperor's proclamation. ***NPNF2 Vol 14, pp 246. They conceived no other way of removing all doubt; for, after the conclusion of the synod, the Emperor thus proclaims: "Let then all profane contentions cease, for he is indeed impious and sacrilegious, who after the sentence of so many priests, leaves anything for his own opinion to consider." He then prohibits all discussion concerning religion; for, says he, "he does an injury to the judgment of the most religious council, who endeavours to open afresh, and publicly discuss, what has been once judged, and rightly ordered."*** This was meant to end all discussions and arguments for all time. Leo was the ultimate authority of the formal church.

There were several canons approved by the synod and most were intended to close off anything relating to the Holy Spirit. Remember at this time the formal church and Emperor acted as one, so these canons were considered the laws of the land.

Canon IV stated ***NPNF2 Vol 14, pp 270 . . . it is decreed that no one anywhere build or found a monastery or oratory contrary to the will of the bishop of the city; and that the monks in every city and district shall be subject to the bishop, and embrace a quiet course of life, and give themselves only to fasting and prayer, remaining permanently in the places in which they were set apart; and they shall meddle neither in ecclesiastical nor in secular affairs, . . .*** The formal church ended the independence of the monks. From now on they were subject to the closest bishop. Another Antony, or Martin of Tours, could not develop under these conditions. Canon XVIII ***NPNF2 Vol 14, pp***

281. The crime of conspiracy or banding together is utterly prohibited even by the secular law, and much more ought it to be forbidden in the Church of God. Therefore, if any, whether clergymen or monks, should be detected in conspiring or banding together, or hatching plots against their bishops or fellow-clergy, they shall be all means be deposed from their own rank. This would certainly stop anything like the Priscillianist movement within the formal church. It would stop anything of a religious nature outside the formal church.

In 453 A.D., in a letter to Maximus, bishop at Antioch, Leo directed that no one could preach or teach except the priest. ***NPNF2 Vol 12, pp 87. This too it behoves you, beloved, to guard against, that no one except those who are the LORD'S priests dare to claim the right of teaching or preaching, be he monk or layman, who boasts himself of some knowledge.*** Since this was after the council at Chalcedon directives from Pope Leo were the law. From this there would be no more Priscillians or monks like Antony, either in or outside the formal church. Compare this to Paul's description of the ekklesia-church when he was instructing the disciples on the decorum of the Gifts in a public place. ***AB I Cor 14:29-31. So, let two or three prophets speak---those inspired to preach or teach---while the rest pay attention and weigh and discern what is said. But if an inspired revelation comes to another who is sitting by, then let the first one be silent. For in this way you can give testimony---prophesying and thus interpreting the divine will and purpose---one by one, so that all may be instructed and all may be stimulated and encouraged;*** If an inspired revelation comes to one who's sitting by then let them speak. Leo's rules were a far cry from the instructions of Paul in the canonized Word of God.

After the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., the formal church reached a milestone that I'm sure would have flabbergasted Paul, Peter, John, and most of the Church Fathers. The formal church leaders said the formal church was built upon Peter and declared him the first Bishop of Rome. By succession down through the generations, they made Leo the Pope, the head and foundation of the formal church. The council passed canons that were essentially laws meant to curb anything of a spiritual nature. By these vain imaginations they

attempted to harness the Holy Spirit to their specifications and essentially destroyed the idea and freedom of the ekklesia.

Let us stop and look at the history of the Roman Empire and its relationship to Jesus' ekklesia. Jesus was born or the Incarnation took place twenty-one years after the Roman Empire named its first Emperor, Augustus. After the democracy from the Greeks, the Romans were responsible for the roads and uniform laws which created a very civilized society. All of this was in line for God to present His Son for the redemption of man. God also presented to man His ekklesia for man's benefit and to spread the Gospel for the redemption of man. Jesus' ekklesia was protected from the Jews by the Roman's regard for the democratic ekklesia. These roads and uniform laws enabled Paul and others like him to spread the Gospel to all corners of the empire and the ekklesia enabled them to bring the message and show God manifesting Himself through His Gifts in the public places.

By 451 A.D. Jesus' ekklesia had reached the ultimate in its battle with the "Gates of Hades". Those "in charge" were personified by the deadly combination of one-man rule (the pope) of the formal church and the cooperation of the Emperor. This combination effectively quashed the legal avenues for Jesus' ekklesia and its manifestations of God through the Holy Spirit. For those theorists who speculate about the demise of the Roman Empire, all this happened after the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. and the city of Rome was sacked and overrun by the barbarians in 476 A.D. It seemed God was finished with the Roman Empire.

My detailed study of the ekklesia, synagogue-like meetings, and the formal church ended with the death of Leo in 461 A.D. By this time, the overwhelming evidence showed the Holy Spirit and the organized formal church were not compatible. The rest of Church history only serves to emphasize this point; however, I will attempt a very brief discussion of Church history and meaningful events as they related to the manifestations of the Holy Spirit and the Body of Christ.