LOOKING ANEW AT THE NEW PROPHECY: TERTULLIAN'S MONTANISM AND PENTECOSTALISM AS NEO-MONTANISM

YOUJIN CHUNG

Thesis presented for the Degree of Master of Theology

At the University of Stellenbosch

Promoter: Dr. Mary-Anne Plaatjies Van Huffel

December 2013

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby solemnly declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and that I have not previously submitted in its entirety or in part submitted at any academic institution or university.

Signature_____   Date_____

ABSTRACT

Through the eyes of the Catholic Church, one usually looks at Montanism as a second-century heretical sect. This prevailed orthodox view has devalued the Catholic Tertullian as a schismatic when he had accepted Montanism as his theological verification. The recent scholarship, however, has challenged that Tertullian's transition to Montanism had not necessarily resulted from his theological conclusion. Rather this suggests that Tertullian, from the very beginning, was much more sympathetic to the new prophets than to the Catholic priests; the Montanist Tertullian had always taken precedence over the Catholic Tertullian. Given this new perspective, the thesis is developed as follows;

Chapter 1, the topic and title are introduced with four critical research questions;

  (1) Why were the original Montanists condemned?

  (2) Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?

  (3) Why does Montanism exclude the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?

  (4) Why does Montanism include   the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?

Here particular interest is Tertullian's intermediate position; as a point of contact, Tertullian stands not only between the Montanists and the Catholics, but also between the original Montanists and the present day Pentecostals as Neo-Montanism.

Chapter 2 seeks to find an answer to the first research question of "Why were the original Montanists condemned?" Then, the researcher focuses on the root cause of the original condemnation of Montanism in three aspects. (1) Montanism was condemned as the victim of the institutionalization of the church, (2) Montanism was condemned as the pagan inspiration including controversial manifestations, such as ecstatic prophecy (and speaking in tongues), fanatical millenarianism, and strict puritanism, and (3) Montanism was condemned as the power struggle between the urban and rural church leadership. The point is that these three reasons are interrelated as a whole and, not as a separate entity. Yet, the conflict in the church regarding church government had taken the lead in the original condemnation of Montanism. The victory of urban church leadership had justified the victimization of the Montanists, the

representative of the rural leadership.

Chapter 3, the thesis has dealt with the second question; "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?" The researcher acknowledges of the uneasy connection between the apologist Tertullian and the Montanist Tertullian. Yet, if Montanism was accused of its political conflict, not of its theological deviances, the relationship of Tertullian with Montanism needs to be reconsidered. Then, the researcher tries to vindicate Tertullian's position through two methodological approaches. First, the researcher reconstructs the new image of Tertullian as the lay leader born into Montanism by deconstructing the conventional portrayal of Tertullian; (1) as the son of an officer of the Roman army, (2) as the professional Jurist, (3) as the Catholic priest at Carthage, and (4) as the schismatic. Second, the researcher also takes into account of Tertullian's identity in the concept of the transitional correlation. By applying Tertullian's transitional period as the Pagan-Catholic-Montanist to the concentric circles of concern, the previous view of Tertullian can be transformed into the new formula of Pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-Montanist as butterfly. This three-fold structure then opens the way for a newborn image of Tertullian.

Chapter 4 is dealing with the relationship between Montanism, the Montanist Tertullian, and the present-day Pentecostalism in order to answer the final question; "Why does Montanism include/exclude the present-day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?" Tertullian's Montanism, like a hinge, closely interconnects the present-day Pentecostalism to the original Montanism in historical, theological   and ecclesiological sense of the word. First, the first generation of Pentecostals, regardless of whether they are the proponents of the Azusa Street or Topeka revival, they find their historical identity in the first generation of the apostolic church and this includes the second-century Montanists and the Montanist Tertullian. Second, from the theological point of view, the Montanist distinctive theological fashions, such as ecstatic prophecy, speaking in tongues, and the impending eschatological hope, has clearly re-echoed in the diadem of the current Pentecostal theology.. Third, the original Montanists and the present-day Pentecostals are both ecclesiologically the strong advocates of the pneumatological theocracy. For both, the priority is to return to the apostolic primitive church.. So, the current Pentecostals is convinced that they trace their root from the second-century spirit-filled Montanists.

Chapter 5 summarizes the relationship between Montanism, the Montanist Tertullian, and the present day Pentecostalism by answering to the following four   research questions;

(1) "Why were the original Montanists condemned?"

The answer is the ecclesiastical power struggle between the urban and rural leadership made the Montanist crisis a highly politically charged affair rather than a theologically controversial issue.

(2) "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?"

The answer is Tertullian, as natural born Montanist, is determined to be a self-sacrificing mediator in order to bring reconciliation between the two rivals, namely, the city-priest and the countryside prophets.

(3) "Why does Montanism include/exclude the present-day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?"

The answer is Montanism is the antecedent of the present-day Pentecostalism.

SAMEVATTING

In die oë van die Rooms Katolieke Kerk is Montanisme niks anders nie as 'n tweede-eeuse ketterse sekte. Hierdie ortodokse seining het die Katolieke Tertullianus as skismatikus gedevalueer, in besonders toe hy Montanisme as sy teologiese standpuntname aanvaar het. Deesdae is geleerdes van mening dat Tertullianus se oorgang na Montanisme is nie noodwendig die gevolg van sy teologiese stellingname nie. Dit suggereer eerder dat Tertullianus van die begin af, meer simpatiekgesind teenoor die nuwe profete as teenoor die Katolieke priesters was. Dit blyk dat die Montanus Tertullianus altyd voorkeur bo die Katolieke Tertullianus gekry het. Gegewe hierdie perspektief, het die tesis soos volg ontwikkel:

Hoofstuk 1, die onderwerp en titel word ingelei met vier kritiese navorsing vrae;

(1) Hoekom was die oorspronklike Montanisme veroordeel ?

(2) Hoekom het Tertullianus 'n Montanus geword?

(3) Hoekom sluit Montanisme die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme Neo -Montanisme uit?

(4) Hoekom sluit Montanisme die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme Neo -Montanisme in?

Hier is veral van belang Tertullianus se intermediêre posisie as 'n punt van kontak. Tertullianus staan nie net tussen die Montanisme en die Katolieke nie, maar staan ook tussen die oorspronklike Montanisme en die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme as Neo -Montanisme.

Hoofstuk 2 beoog om 'n antwoord op die eerste navorsingsvraag te vind: "Hoekom is die oorspronklike Montanisme veroordeel?" Die navorser het vervolgens drie aspekte wat betrekking het op die oorsaak van die oorspronklike veroordeling van Montanisme gefokus. (1) Montanisme was veroordeel as die slagoffer van die institusionalisering van die kerk, (2) die Montanisme was veroordeel as 'n heidense inspirasie, byvoorbeeld die omstrede manifestasies: soos in ekstase, profesie (spreek in tale), fanatiese millennialisme, en streng Puritanisme, en (3) Montanisme was veroordeel as die stryd tussen leierskap in die stedelike en plattelandse kerk. Hierdie drie redes is interafhanklik van mekaar as 'n geheel en is dus nie 'n aparte entiteit nie. Die oorwinning van die stedelike kerk leierskap die veroordeling van die Montanisme, wat die landelike leierskap verteenwoordig het, geregverdig.

Hoofstuk 3 handel oor die tweede vraag, "Hoekom het Tertullianus 'n Montanus geword? " Die navorser erken die ongemaklike verband tussen die apologeet Tertullianus en die Montanus Tertullianus. Tog, as Montanisme daarvan beskuldig word van politieke konflik en nie van

teologiese afwykings nie, dan behoort die verhouding van Tertullianus met Montanisme in heroorweging geneem te word. Die navorser het Tertullianus se posisie deur middel van twee metodologiese benaderings probeer verdedig. Eerstens, het die navorser die nuwe beeld van Tertullianus gerekonstrueer as leke leier wat in die tydperk van Montanisme gebore deur die konvensionele uitbeelding van Tertullianus te dekonstrueer; (1) as die seun van die Romeinse offisier, (2) as die professionele regsgeleerde, (3) as die Katolieke priester van Kartago, en (4) as die skismatikus. Tweedens, die navorser het ook Tertullianus se identiteit insake die konsep van die oorgang korrelasie in ag geneem. Deur Tertullianus se oorgang as die Heiden – Katolieke – Montanus in konsentriese sirkels aan te dui, kan die vorige siening van Tertullianus omskep word in die nuwe formule van die ruspe Katoliek – kokon – Montanus na vlinder. Hierdie drieledige struktuur baan die weg vir 'n nuwe beeld van Tertullianus.

Hoofstuk 4 hanteer die verhouding tussen die Montanisme, die Montanus Tertullianus en die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme om sodoende die laaste twee vrae te beantwoord: "Hoekom is Montanisme in/uit gesluit in die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme as Neo- Montanisme ? " Tertullianus se Montanisme, soos 'n skarnier, verbind die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme aan die oorspronklike Montanisme in historiese, teologiese en ekklesiologiese sin van die woord met mekaar. Eerstens, die eerste generasie van Pentekostalisme, ongeag of hulle voorstanders van die Azusa Straat herlewing of die Topeka herlewing is, vind hulle hul historiese identiteit in die eerste generasie van die apostoliese kerk en dit sluit in die tweede-eeuse Montanisme asook die Montanus Tertullianus. Tweedens, uit 'n teologiese vertrekpunt, die Montanus se eiesoortige teologiese modes: soos in ekstase, profesie, spreek in tale, en die eskatologiese hoop, eggo duidelik die hedendaagse Pinkster teologie. Derdens, die oorspronklike montanisme en hedendaagse Pentekostalisme is beide ekklesiologies sterk voorstanders van die Pneumatologiese teokrasie. Vir beide van hulle is dit die prioriteit om na die primitiewe apostoliese kerk terug te keer. So, is die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme   is daarvan oortuig dat hul,   hul   ontstaan kan terugspoor   van die tweede-eeuse geesvervulde Montaniste.

Hoofstuk 5 som die verhouding tussen die Montanisme, die Montanus Tertullianus en die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme op en beantwoord die volgende vier navorsingsvrae;
(1) Hoekom was die oorspronklike Montaniste veroordeel ?
Die antwoord lê daarin opgesluit dat die kerklike magstryd tussen die stedelike en landelike leierskap het Montanisme 'n hoogs polities gelaaide aangeleentheid gemaak eerder as 'n

teologies omstrede kwessie.

(2) Hoekom het Tertullianus 'n Montanus geword?

Tertullianus, as gebore Montanus, was vasbeslote om 'n selfopofferende bemiddelaar te wees om sodoende versoening te bring tussen die twee opponerende groepe, naamlik, die stedelike − priester en die plattelandse profete.

(3) Hoekom sluit Montanisme die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme Neo -Montanisme uit?

(4) Hoekom sluit Montanisme die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme Neo -Montanisme in?

Montanisme is die voorloper van die hedendaagse Pentekostalisme

⊠

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH

Tertullian, known as "the first theologian of the West"[1], has severe critics as well as strong defenders. There is, on the one sense, clearly a great deal of respect for him as a vigorous defender of the Catholic Church. Yet, the main target for criticism is, on the other hand, his adherence to Montanism, a notorious second-century heretical sect. Although the entirety of Tertullian's lapsing into Montanism is still open to scholarly debates, the majority of scholarship barely honors him as the good shepherd who was faithful to his flock. Rather many criticizes Tertullian as a runaway shepherd, who left the bosom of the Catholic Church and joined the fanatical band of the 'New Prophecy.'[2] The name of Tertullian, the famous apologist for the Catholic Church, has become a thorn in the flesh for orthodox circles and the person of Tertullian has become a tragic figure who, after brilliant services to the Church, died outside her fold (Campbell 2011:341). The Orthodox Church has pejoratively devalued this African theologian as a failed Catholic. Then, Tertullian's honor comes with his shame, reminding a bitter lament, "*Corruptio optimi passima*"; "the worst corruption is the corruption of what is best" (Laurentin 1977:190). Tertullian's Montanism is made to wear a scarlet letter on him, despite his undeniable influence on the Catholic Church, particularly on Latin Christianity.

1.2. RESEARCH PROBLEM

In spite of such harsh criticisms against Tertullian, the stimulation that continually radiated from this African genius –even after his lapsing from the orthodox Catholicism –has been an interesting subject for many scholars. In general, they regard Tertullian's Montanism a theological mutation of his strict asceticism by simply detaching himself from the Catholic stage. For them, the Catholic Tertullian can no longer coexist with the Montanist Tertullian. Such a view makes Tertullian as 'Dr. Jekyll/Catholic and Mr. Hyde/Montanist' and this

---

[1] The term comes from the same title of Eric Osborn's book (Cambridge, 1997).

[2] The term 'New Prophecy' was coined both in the anonymous source and the testimony of Serapion, bishop of Antioch (192-202) (Eusebius, *HE*, 5.16.4; 5.19.2, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 2, vol. 1, 1996; hereafter NPNF 2). It was often used as the Montanist self-chosen sobriquet, while its opponent, the church, often referred to Montanism as the Phrygian or Cataphrygian Heresy by pejoratively adding adjective new.

implicitly recognizes the Montanist Tertullian as a mutant of the Catholic Tertullian, just as Mr. Hyde is that of Dr. Jekyll. This may explain the reason for the majority scholarly opinion that Tertullian's Montanism resulted from his biased aversion to the Catholic Church and its inevitable corollary was his official break with the Orthodox (Frend 1965:366; Quasten 1953:247; Baus 1965:203).

This may hold some truth, but provide a dim reflection on Tertullian's theological paradigm shift. "What did Tertullian do as a Montanist/Mr Hyde?" may overlook "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist from a Catholic/Dr. Jekyll?" More attention thus is given to be in connection with why rather than the what question. It is because the centrifugal nature of why is better than the centripetal nature of what for properly defining the interesting character of Tertullian. The question, 'Why' suggests that Tertullian's changeover did not necessarily result from his theological conclusion, but rather it came from his theological commencement. This implies that Tertullian's Catholicism is pregnant with Tertullian's Montanism as a seed, not as a fruit. Such a new perspective calls for reconsideration of the previous verdict on Tertullian, which dichotomically separates the Montanist Tertullian from the Catholic Tertullian in either-or category. This pleads Tertullian's cold case to the court of appeal.

In addition, such a new outlook, from why to what, asks for the root cause of the original condemnation of Montanism as Tertullian's theological anchor. In this sense, the question, "Why were the original Montanists condemned?" is closely interconnected with the question, "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?" If Tertullian had started his Catholicism with Montanism and developed his theology through the Montanist believers within the Catholic Church, Tertullian's Montanism needs reconsideration, not as a divisive, but as a distinctive action; not as an exclusive, but as an inclusive participation. This implies that Tertullian might have stood between the Montanist and Catholic believers as a point of contact and his Montanism might have functioned as a catalyst for the reconciliation between two groups.

Also, such vindication of Tertullian and his Montanism is thought provoking to the growing concern regarding the connection between the original Montanism and the present day Pentecostalism. This suggests that the veneration of Tertullian's Montanism sheds new light on the relationship between these two historical movements in a fresh and relevant way. To put it in a different way, Tertullian's Montanism can be a key to find an answer to the question, "Why

12

does Montanism include/exclude the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?" Indeed, such three Why questions may indicate that all three are closely interconnected with each other as both question and answer by giving a new perspective to the relationship between Montanism, the Montanist Tertullian, and the present day Pentecostalism.

1.3. PRIOR STUDY

The recent scholarship has undertaken some significant researches to such thorny Why questions. For the first question, "Why were the original Montanists condemned?," the scholarship has particularly focused on three conflicting aspects. (1) Montanism was condemned as the victim of the institutionalizing Catholic Church (Hill 1979:331-51), (2) Montanism was condemned as the pagan inspiration including controversial manifestations, such as ecstatic prophecy, fanatical millenarianism, strict asceticism (Daunton-Fear 1982:648-651), and (3) Montanism was condemned as the power struggle between the urban and rural church leadership (Frend 1979:25-42). Each approach has a degree of truth, but the whole picture is far more complicated and interrelated as a whole (Stewart-Sykes 1999:1-22).

Many studies have also been on the second question "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?" and there seems to be a general scholarly consensus that Montanism was attractive to Tertullian as confirming his strict asceticism on church discipline against the contemporary Catholic Church, which had walked in a different path from his vigorous Puritanism (Osborn 1997:210). Yet, the more recent studies suggest that Tertullian's adoption to Montanism had much rested on from within rather than from without the Carthaginian Christian Community (Osborn 1997:163-182). Such a new notion that Tertullian's Montanism was as distinctive, not as divisive from the Catholic Church (Tabbernee 2007:137) may give new light on the role of the Montanist Tertullian not as a schismatic, but as a mediator between the Montanist and Catholic believers. Tertullian, like a retrospective prophet, wished to revive the spiritual vitality of the institutionalizing Church and in this sense, he saw Montanism as the holy-club within the Catholic Church, which could bring a new momentum.

As for the third question, "Why Montanism does include/exclude the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?", there has been growing scholarly concern to link the original Montanism with the current Pentecostalism (Bruner 1970:35-55; Clark 1987:7-10).

Especially many Pentecostal scholars have argued that the sheer nature of Montanism has long been distorted by its bitter opponents. The uncritical opposition to the New Prophecy, according to them, has unfortunately led to have an abortion of an enthusiastic embryo for the charismatic renewal of the Church until today. Therefore, some Pentecostals have even insisted that the distinct characteristics of Montanism, namely, ecstatic prophecy, speaking in tongues, and eschatological fervor, should be vindicated as verification for the continuing work of the Holy Spirit in the Church and Montanism, in this sense, needs to be reevaluated as a Pentecostal antecedent (Kim 2009:113-124). This newly scholarly climate makes the relationship of Tertullian with Montanism as an interesting study case to further critical involvement. This provides a springboard for the new perspective of the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism.

1.4. AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

It is interesting to note that Tertullian's Montanism is more sympathetic to why questions than what questions. The gleam of why sheds fascinating insights on the peculiar relationship between Tertullian and the New Prophecy by lending a fresh perspective to Tertullian's eager embrace of Montanism; this indicates that Tertullian's Montanism is to be understood as his theological/ecclesiological commencement rather than as his theological/ecclesiological conclusion.[3] In this rubric, it can be said that Tertullian, from the very beginning, was much more sympathetic to the new prophets than to the Catholic priests. He, from his early stage, vigorously detached himself from the dead Orthodoxy, which replaced the spiritual freedom by the closed hierarchy. This implies that there needs to be a reconsideration for Tertullian's Montanism; the Montanist Tertullian had always taken precedence over the catholic Tertullian and his Montanism was distinctive, inclusive, and complementary with the Catholic Church. From its inception, Tertullian was with Montanism as the very heart of his theology as well as ecclesiology and he was willing to incarnate himself into the realm of the Catholic Church as a natural born Montanist for bringing reconciliation between the Montanist and Catholic believers.

---

[3] Osborn, by contrast, has understood Montanism as the result, not the cause, of Tertullian's theology, especially of his concern for Trinity (Osborn 1997:10).

14

This newly characterized portrayal of Tertullian as the natural born Montanist pales the previous heavy penalties for him. This may vindicate not only Tertullian's shame as a schismatic, but also his honor as the forerunner of the spiritual new prophet. Tertullian's Montanism may no longer become a tragic example of "Icarus' wings,"[4] its melting wax finally caused him to fall into the sea where he drowned, but rather it may venerate him as a mediator who stood between the original Montanist and the Catholic believers in order to bring the reconciliation. The particular importance of the role of Tertullian's Montanism is two-fold. Tertullian's Montanism, like a hinge, closely interconnects not only the second-century Montanists to the Catholic believers, but also the original Montanism to the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism. Figuratively speaking, Tertullian has the keys of the kingdom of old and new Montanism; whatever Tertullian binds on old/new Montanism can be bound in the second-century Catholic Church/the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism, and whatever he loose on old/new Montanism can be loosed in the second-century Catholic Church/the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism. Yet, significantly enough, this requires a careful and critical process of examination to reach a valuable outcome.

Yet, it is significant enough that Tertullian's Montanism was not a tragic feature, which led the believers to a division, but rather a point of contact, which brought the reconciliation into the Church. The implication of this approach is quite reminiscent. From this point of view, Tertullian's Montanism becomes a significant reminder of the current spiritual déjà vu. Then Tertullian' lapsing into the New Prophecy is both a bridge to be crossed and a base to be occupied for the restatement of sheer relationship between the second-century Montanist and the Catholic believers; between the original Montanism and the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism.

1.5. DELIMITATION

The first delimitation concerns the lack of historical texts for the research. The history of Montanism, especially, suffers from the loss of its own writings and the surviving works are also mainly preserved by the opponents. Tertullian's several treatises in his Montanist period

---

[4] In Greek mythology, Icarus is the son of the master craftsman Daedalus. The main story told about 'Icarus' is his attempt to escape from Crete by means of wings that his father constructed from feathers and wax.

are strictly limited value, and his major books (*On Ecstasy*) in defense of Montanism are even lost. It is also frustrating to apply a biographical approach to the leading figures of the new prophets and Tertullian because of the same reason. Also, as for the modern Pentecostal movement, despite its great expansion, there has been relatively less evaluative study conducted regarding the movement's history and origins. With this paucity of the textual evidences, the researcher conducts a historical-systematic literary review not only to minimize the disadvantage, but also to maximize the advantage of the research.

The second delimitation concerns the insufficiency of library books. The researcher's University rarely maintains a collection of reference books about the research topics – especially the original Montanism and the Montanist Tertullian and this as a result hinders the researcher's full extension of the primary and secondary source materials and historical treatises. Therefore, the researcher is less sympathetic to the materials from within than to from without, such as, the inter-library loan or on-line journals. Acknowledging such vantage point, the research has been done mainly with the sources which are available for outside the library channels.

1.6. METHODOLOGY

The thesis is a church historical-systematic literature review on the distinctiveness of the origins of original Montanism, Tertullian, and the present day Pentecostalism. First, many references to the original Montanism are from the recent scholarship, such as Stewart-Sykes, Frend, Trevett, and Tabbernee, as well as from fourth-century works including Eusebius'[5] *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Epiphanius' *Adversus Haereses*. Others are mostly indebted to Nicene and Post-Nicene Series (NPNF 1 and 2). Similarly, most of Tertullian's works owe to the Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF) in English translation and the secondary resources. Third, Bruner, Hollenweger, Menzies, Dayton, and Clark's books attest to define the characteristics of the modern Pentecostal movement in relation to its historical, systematic-theological, and ecclesiastical ethos. Many monographs, essays, journal articles and dissertations also have made this thorough research more balanced and beneficial.

---

[5] Eusebius, who was an eyewitness to some of the events described in his book and had access to archival documents for other sections, described the emergence of the Christian church, its teachers, leaders, heresies, persecutions and eventual dominance under the Byzantine emperor Constantine.

16

The research consists of three Why question and develops to find the relevant answer to each question. For the first question, "Why were the original Montanists condemned?", even if there are a variety of scholarly studies to the root-cause of original condemnation of Montanism, the research has focused on three conflicts. (1) the conflict with the institutionalizing Church (Hill 1979:331-51), (2) the conflict with pagan inspiration (Daunton-Fear 1982:648-651), and (3) the conflict with the urban and rural church leadership (Frend 1979:25-42). The point is that these three reasons are interrelated as a whole, not as a separate entity. In other words, the confrontation of the city priests and the countryside prophets had deteriorated as the church became more institutionalized and the urban church leadership began to look down at the rural-based Montanist, the new prophets, as the old leadership, which should be replaced and superseded by the new leadership. For the urban leadership, the Montanist radical manifestations, that is, their ecstatic prophecy with speaking in tongues, their eager expectation of the New Jerusalem and their strict Christian life, were self-evidence, which proved the rural leadership's theological inferiority as well as their political intrigue. This suggests that the conflict of the church government had taken the lead of the original condemnation of Montanism; the victory of urban church leadership had justified the victimization of the Montanists, the representative of the rural leadership.

Then the research has dealt with the second question; "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?" The thesis acknowledges the uneasy connection between the apologist Tertullian and the Montanist Tertullian. Tertullian's honor as the Church Father turned into his shame when he lapsed into Montanism, the controversial sect. From that moment, for the Catholic Church, Tertullian became a prodigal son, who never returned to the bosom of the Father. Yet, if Montanism was accused of its political conflict, not of its theological deviances, the relationship of Tertullian with Montanism needs to be reconsidered; Tertullian's entanglement with Montanism does not necessarily mean that he cut himself off from the bond of the Catholic Church both theologically and ecclesiologically. So, the thesis tries to vindicate Tertullian's position through the two methodological approaches. First, on the basis of the recent scholarship (T. Barnes, E. Osborn, and D.I. Rankin), the researcher deconstructs the conventional portrayal of Tertullian (1) as the son of the Roman army, (2) as the professional Jurist, (3) as the Catholic priest at Carthage, and (4) as the schismatic who brought a great schism into the Catholic Church. Second, the researcher takes into account Tertullian's

17

identification with the concept of the transitional correlation. By applying Tertullian's transitional period as the Pagan-Catholic-Montanist to the concentric circles of concern, the previous view of Tertullian transforms into the pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-Montanist as butterfly. In doing so, the researcher tries to reconstruct Tertullian's new identity through a dynamic and complementary process, not as a separate and contradictory unit. Here every stage forms a coherent whole; the innermost circle is the incarnated Montanist Tertullian. One has access to this circle only through a second circle formed by the Catholic Tertullian. This witness is mediated by the action of the Pagan Tertullian, the third outer circle. This three-fold structure then opens the way for a new-born image of Tertullian, who was preparing for a great transformation as a point of contact between the Montanist and the Catholic Christians.

.

This new perspective sheds new light on Tertullian's Montanism. Tertullian, as the bearer of the transitional correlation, started his Christianity with Montanism and developed his theology through the Montanist holy-club within the Catholic Church, and committed his life to the reconciliation between the Montanists and the Catholic believers. Also, as a lay leader of the Cathaginian Christian community, Tertullian recognized that the original Montanists were condemned not as the theological radicals, but as the political rivals of the Catholic priests. Therefore, for this African Montanist, the sheer problem was not the appearance of African Montanism, but its disappearance in the Catholic Church for the political reasons. This led Tertullian's Montanism to a very different stage. As a natural born Montanist, Tertullian was quite retrospective of prophetic ministry and wished to revive its spiritual vitality within the institutionalizing Catholic Church. This sense of urgency impelled him to lead the Montanist holy-club within the church and even urged him to stand against the clerical Hierarchy, who was already engaged in the process of church institution. Yet, Tertullian's Montanism is not exclusive, but rather inclusive. It is because Tertullian wished to bring the reconciliation between the Montanists and the Catholic believers, between the new prophets and the new priests. So, the Montanist Tertullian is no longer a synonym of schismatic Tertullian. Rather, Tertullian's Montanism is to be understood as the self-sacrificing effort for the reconciliation of the two ecclesiastical rivals, namely, the urban priests and the rural prophets.

Furthermore, Tertullian's Montanism is important to understand the relationship between the original Montanism and the present-day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism. Then, the research has devoted much space to the relationship between Montanism, the Montanist Tertullian, and

the present-day Pentecostalism in order to answer the final question. "Why does Montanism include/exclude the present-day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?" Tertullian's Montanism plays a decisive role in finding the significant nexus of these two historical movements. Like a hinge, it closely interconnects the present-day Pentecostalism to the original Montanism in historical, theological, and ecclesiological perspective. First, the first generation of Pentecostals, regardless of whether they are the proponents of the Azusa Street or Topeka revival, they find their historical identity in the first generation of the apostolic church and this includes the second-century Montanists and the Montanist Tertullian as well. Second, from the theological point of view, the present-day Pentecostalism shows the striking similarities with the original Montanism. The Montanist distinctive theological fashions, such as ecstatic prophecy, speaking in tongues, and the impending eschatological hope, has clearly re-echoed in the diadem of the current Pentecostal theology, namely, Jesus as Saviour, Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer, Jesus as Healer, and Jesus as the Coming King. Third, the original Montanists and the present-day Pentecostals are both ecclesiologically the strong advocates of the pneumatological theocracy, which emphasizes the Spirit and His guidance as the unifying principle of the one holy church. For both of them, the priority is to return to the apostolic primitive church, which allows a continuance of the gifts of the Spirit in the Church as the main power and authority. Significantly enough, the elements of the primitive Church, such as speaking in tongues, ecstatic prophecy, millenarianism and eschatological hope still remain in the present-day Pentecostalism, so that Pentecostals claim to trace their root from the second-century spirit-filled Montanists.

In this connection, of particular interest is Tertullian's role as the point of contact between the original (Old) and present day (New) Montanism as well as the Phrygian (Asia Minor) and Carthaginian (Africa) New Prophecy. If Tertullian was the natural born Montanist as a lay leader, and if he voluntarily lapsed into the Catholic Church for the sake of ecclesiastical reconciliation, his self-sacrificing decision may provide the pilot study to read two-New Prophecy with new eyes. The Montanist Tertullian is the gateway to sheer relationship between Asia/Old and Africa/New Montanism; it is Tertullian's significant role removing myopic eyes from Asia/Old Montanism and thus seeing Africa/New Montanism, the present day Pentecostalism, in a fresh and relevant outlook.

1.7. RESEARCH STRUCTURE

The thesis is structured in five sections. In **Chapter 1**, the topic and title are introduced with the research problem, research question and methodology. The heart of this chapter is three Why questions to ask arriving at a new answer to the relationship of the original Montanism, Tertullian, and the present day Pentecostalism. **Chapters 2** focuses on the original condemnation of Montanism under the critical question, "Why were the original Montanists condemned?" The chapter finds its reasons in three aspects; (1) Montanism was condemned as the victim of the institutionalizing church, (2) Montanism was condemned as the pagan inspiration including controversial manifestations, such as ecstatic prophecy (and speaking in tongues), fanatical millenarianism, strict Puritanism, and (3) Montanism was condemned as the power struggle between the urban and rural church leadership. **Chapter 3** is devoted to the relationship between Montanism and Tertullian with the question, "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?" The chapter reconsiders the new identity of Tertullian as natural born Montanist and lay leader through two methodological approaches; (1) the deconstruction of the conventional portrayal of Tertullian and (2) the reconstruction of the concept of the transitional correlation as a process of Pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-Montanist as butterfly. **Chapter 4** deals with the final question, "Why does Montanism include/exclude the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?" This chapter provides the importance of Tertullian's Montanism to understand the relationship of the original Montanism and the present day Pentecostalism. It, like a hinge, closely interconnects the latter to the former in historical, theological, and ecclesiological perspective. Lastly, **Chapter 5** draws a conclusion from the previous three Why questions. This will bring a new perspective to the relationship between Montanism, the Montanist Tertullian, and the present day Pentecostalism in a consistent historical, theological, and ecclesiological correlation.

1.8. POTENTIALIMPACT

The impetus for this research lies in uncovering specific gap (problem) in the current knowledge on both the original Montanism and the Montanist Tertullian, which both has long been considered as bad examples in the church history. The potential contribution of the research thus is two-fold; the one is to serve to dispel some of curved shadows, currently overshadowing the historical truth. The other is to make sense of this interpretation as a healthy reminder of the contemporary spiritual déjà vu, which calls for a practical and positive

interpretation of the church history as the living voice, still speaking in the current situations, beyond the border of the past that has no relevance to today. From this viewpoint, this research may serve the significant body of academic research as a springboard for further critical involvement.

CHAPTER 2 THE CONDEMNATION OF THE ORIGINAL MONTANISM

2.1. THE ORIGINS OF MONTANISM

Is it a coincident that Montanism[6] can be dated to the time when Tertullian was born about?[7] Montanism, also known as the New Prophesy, started from upper Phrygia in Asia Minor about 156 CE[8] (Bruce1988:168) and was originally the enthusiastic undertaking by a Christian prophet Montanus,[9] the founder of this movement (Harnack 1961:95). The modus operandi of such an indigenous Christian prophet became a highly controversial issue among the churches. Dissatisfied with the worldliness of the Church, and the laxity of discipline, in the year 157, Montanus, a converted priest of Phrygia, commenced a crusade, preaching against the prevailing licentiousness, and calling for a return to the vigorous faith and simple life of the early days of Christianity. Montanus claimed to be the incarnation of the Paraclete, and that his utterances and decisions should be received as the divinely inspired revelation of God's will. He called on his followers to break entirely with the world, to give up marriage and earthly ties, to live in a state of frequent ecstasy and vision, to court martyrdom. He preached severest asceticism, and austere living. Even he claimed the supremacy of the individual conscience acting under direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and denied the rights of the community or Church to order men's lives. Consequently, the bishops of Asia Minor condemned Montanus and his teaching, and excommunicated him and his followers. Forbidden to reform the Church from within, Montanus seceded and claimed orthodoxy for himself alone.

The message of the New Prophecy was subversive but attractive; the Montanist new prophets challenged the authority of the Catholic bishops as the sole purveyors of the charismata by

---

[6] The word Montanism was found first in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catecheses*, 16.8, NPNF 2, vol. 7).

[7] Many scholars have suggested that Tertullian's date of birth may fall into the decade 150 to 160CE, for example, Quasten 155CE; Harnack 150-155CE; Stuiber 160CE; *Patrologie;* Evans 160CE; but Barnes recently has proposed a later date around 170CE.

[8] For the rise of Montanism, there have long been scholarly debates. Some (Frend, Aland, and, Burghardt) see its beginning in the late of the second century or shortly after 200CE, while others (Trevett, Barnes, and Evans) assume not later than 160CE or not far from the year 170CE. However, Eusebius' date (172CE) was generally accepted by the majority of the scholars.

[9] The term Montanism is derived from his name as the founder of the movement.

claiming that "the prophetic prerogatives legitimately belonged with them (the Montanist prophets)" (Robeck 2010:418). Such radical visionary prophets inculcated a sense of spiritual desires in the contemporary Christian believers in terms of a strong spiritual nostalgia and the impending eschatological hope. The new prophets had contented the good old days when the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit was naturally performed, while at the same time promising the establishment of the New Jerusalem near Pepuza with the glorious second coming of Christ (Bruce 1982:218).[10] Since the parousia and the last judgment were regarded as so imminent, the Montanist followers were willing to live an austere life and also to be the martyrs for the eschatological cause.[11] Not surprisingly, "Prophecy, asceticism, and martyrdom became the hallmarks of Montanism." (Frend 1984:254)

No policy of containment or deterrence from the Orthodox Church would prove effective. Rather the adherents of Montanism had spread widely far beyond its native Phrygia and by the end of the second century, its followers had even reached to the province of Africa and there it won a powerful convert, the esteemed theologian Tertullian (Latourette 1997:129). Yet, as the influence of Montanism had expanded, it had split Christian believers in Asia and in Phrygia (177CE) and the Church, through the Synod of Iconium (230CE), had officially rejected the Montanist baptism[12] and had excommunicated the new prophets and their followers (Snyder 1989:22) from the Catholic Church.[13] Nonetheless, the remnants of Montanism had continued to survive in Phrygia, the birthplace of the New Prophecy, until the Emperor Justinian had finally crushed them in the six century (Burgess 1984:56).

---

[10] Epiphanius, *Pan*. 49. 1.

[11] F. Klawiter has especially argued that the extreme position of voluntary martyrdom distinguishes the New Prophecy from its ecclesiastical opponents. The movement, according to her, was rejected by the opponents to be subversive and problematic to the authority of bishop-presbyter as well as irrational and insane because confessor-martyrs in the New Prophecy had ranks or titles equal to that of ordained ministers by way of 'the power of martyrdom' which had been traditionally in the hand of the priesthood (251-61). However, it is worth noting that voluntary martyrdom, recently well articulated by W. Tabbernee, is not the essential defining characteristic of Montanism; the adherents of the New Prophecy were no more prone to voluntary martyrdom than the Catholics (2007:201-42); see also C. Trevett's work whose basic perspective is on the same page with Tabbernee (1996:157).

[12] In this sense, it is interesting to note that what is important for Ash is that why the heresy was rejected (1976:237).

[13] Also see, Eusebius, *HE* 5.16. 3; 10.

2.2. THE CONFLICT BETWEEN MONTANISTS AND ANTI-MONTANISTS

The church history tells that the central stream of Christianity in the second century had suffered from two outstanding deviations: Gnosticism and Montanism. Both looked alike superficially, but differed significantly. Gnostics had concentrated on the intellectual side of Christianity in a biased way, whereas the Montanists had emphasized its inspirational aspect excessively (Bruce 1982:214). Although Gnostic exaggeration had considerably undermined the authority of the Catholic authority, a far more severe offense had been given to the new prophets partly because of their solidarity with many grass-root Christians. For the institutionalizing Church, a massive savage vigor of the new prophets and their followers came with more a splitting headache than the individual pseudo-Christian intellectuals. For them, the old prophets' unbending spree was too fatal so as to institute the first council, since the Jerusalem council had been convened, in order to deal with the Montanist crisis in more systematic and intelligent ways (McDonnell 1991:108).

Such a scandal of the new prophet has intrigued the scholarly interest in connection with the root cause of the original condemnation of the New Prophecy. In addition, in the default of the Montanist own writings –indeed none of treatises has survived from Montanus and his immediate followers, it seems not fair for many church historians that the new prophets alone expect to shoulder all the blames for negative suspicions and charges, which was mostly done by their ecclesiastical opponents (Wright 1976:15). A certain groups of scholars, knowing such a problem, have paid special attention to the nature of accusations against the New Prophecy and three scholarly concerns in particular stand out. Each finds the root-cause of the original condemnation of Montanism from; (1) the conflict with the institutionalizing Catholic Church (Hill 1979:331-51); (2) the conflict with the pagan inspiration including its controversial characteristics, namely, ecstatic prophecy, fanatical millenarianism, and strict asceticism (Daunton-Fear 1982:648-651); and (3) the conflict seen in the power struggle between the urban and rural church leadership (Frend 1979:25-42). These three approaches thus merit closer inspection.

2.2.1. The Conflict with the Institutionalizing Catholic Church

First, the most widespread scholarly opinion is that Montanism was condemned as the victim

of the institutionalizing Catholic Church (Hill 1979:331-51). In the eyes of the institutionalizing Church, which had already engaged in a process of institution, the Montanist fervent desire for the freedom of the Spirit seemed anachronistic and even futile. For the Catholic authorities, the rampant challenge of heresies insinuated that it was a time of crisis and the Church needed a new form of leadership, which could rescue the Christians from "the valley of the shadow of death." The situation had clearly reminded of the fact that "no one pours new wine into old wineskins" (Lk. 5:37 NIV) unless he/she ignored the burst of wineskins. In this sense, "[the bishops] must become greater; [the prophets] must become less." (Jn. 3:30)

By the second century, a series of challenges, especially posed by Gnosticism and Marcion, had compelled the orthodox to build a strong tower protecting the doctrinal and ecclesiastical citadel (Greenslade 1964:109-10) and it was inevitably accompanied with the concentration of power and authority centered on church authorities, such as bishops, who could distinguish the real from the fake teaching. The Catholic bishops then began to prescribe the formal doctrines and practices of the Church, which proved their superiority over other competing ecclesiastical rivals (Kyrtatis 1987:91); indeed, the priority of the bishops was to build their own tower with "one language and common speech" (Gen. 11:1). In this climate, the different voice of Montanists, accompanying with speaking in other tongues, was none other than a serious challenge, which might ruin their dream of one strong Church by confounding the common language within the Catholic Church (Kyrtatis 1987:95).

The Catholic authorities, however, were careful to show their public hostility to these tongue speakers partly because of the orthodox characters of the New Prophecy. The new prophets, from the first, found their root in a prophetic movement in line with the Apocalypse of John (Heine 1987-8:1-19) and thus attached themselves to the same branch of Ammia, the prophetess of Philadelphia (Calder, 1923:329-330).[14] This may explain the apparent leniency of the earliest church fathers toward Montanism, the controversial sect.[15] Perhaps even many

---

[14] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.16, 7.

[15] Irenaeus, *Haer.*, II, 32, V, 6, I.

orthodox fathers were in confusion as to the real nature of the New Prophecy.[16] Yet, the Catholic Church's wait-and-see stance was soon ended when the Montanist prophets had touched the forbidden tree, namely, their consecrating the lay believers as bishops, including women.[17] This had provoked the Catholic authorities to anger. They saw it as a direct threat, which could do serious harm to their well-organized clerical hierarchy.

For the Catholic Hierarchy, there were certain reasons that the bishops, not prophets, were to be new wines for new wineskins. It was generally recognized that in the wake of St. Paul's missionary journey, each Christian community had developed two-type of ministry; the residential and traveling (Harnack 1884:88-153). Where the former usually operated administrative and liturgical tasks in the local church, sitting at the seat of the officials, namely, bishops, elders and deacons, the latter mostly served many churches as Spirit-filled itinerants, under the title of apostles, prophets, and teachers (Gillespie 1994: 3). The early church, at first, drew no sharp distinction between two positions. Rather both, as catholic and charismatic, were considered part of the integrated church ministry. By the end of the century, the influence of the pedestrian-ministry had been gradually declining and the Christian community had begun to largely "evolve into a three-part hierarchy of bishop, presbyter/priest, and deacon" (Snyder 1989:18). Under this situation, the Montanist new prophets, who emphasized a liberty in the presence of the Spirit, were the unwelcome guests of the local church authorities, who had already celebrated the development of the new concept of office in the Church (Barnett 1953:118). For the Catholic Hierarchy, the role of the prophets, the traveling minister, was to be superseded by the bishops, the residential new office.

For the Catholic Hierarchy, the process of the church institution was inevitable. They insisted that the church organization was to be understood in the emerging situation where the immediate problem was defense against the heretical –Gnostic and Marcionite –challenges (Greenslade 1964:109). The emerging situation had clearly appeared that the Church was in crisis both theologically and ecclesiologically and it was desperate for the Church to have "a stiffer framework of law and order, a fixed canon of scripture, and authoritative hierarchy, an

---

[16] Hippolytus had recognized the dogmatic orthodoxy of the system in Montanism (*Philosophoumena*, VIII, 19 trans. by F. Legge, 1921) and Origen had been in struggle to define the Kataphrygians between heretics and schismatics (*In Titum*, IV, 696, ANF, vol. 4).

[17] Epiphanius, *Adversus Haereses* [*Panarion*], 49.2.5.

aspiration after uniformity, a retrospective eye, a respect for tradition" (Greenslade 1964:109). In a word, the Body of Christ had desperately called for a newly well-organized church institution. Relying on such *Sitz im Leben,* the Catholic authorities then explained why they were far more intolerant to the Montanist new prophets than to Gnostics.[18] For the Catholic Hierarchy, the rise of Montanist new prophets had thrown them into more panic; the Gnostics were more or less like the reclusive figures behind the scene, while the Montanist new prophets were the public propagandists, publicly demonstrating their theatrical performance. When the bishops began to check Gnosticism through the formation of a defined canon, the danger of Montanism was unmasked; they put their first allegiance on the Paraclete and New Law rather than on Christ and the Gospel (Gwatkin 1909:81).[19]

Yet, the seed of the church institution had been also grown from inside as well. As such, the impulse of change and development could easily be found in an insistence from within the Catholic Church (Countryman 261); the initial impetus was stemmed from within. In addition, the historical evidences have yielded that the character of the second-century church at large had been internally in transition from an oral prophetic community to a textual hermeneutic community (Smith 1997:56-7). With respect to this adaptation, no sooner had the bishops started transforming the church than the contemporary prophecies were subject to the canon of Scripture. A new *regula fidei* had quickly set in the Catholic Church that "prophecy [was] particular, temporal and subjective, whereas Scripture [was] universal, eternal and objective" (Smith 1997:59). Indeed, "textuality became a new typology" and Christianity became a "religion of the Book" (Smith 1997:56).

Then, the canonical thinking had gradually crept up on "the epoch of revelation (Harnack 1896:224) and began fossilizing the prophetic revelation into a relic of the past age (McArthur

---

[18] Montanism, in principle, is the exact reverse of Gnosticism; for instance, Gnostics refers everything to human reason, while the New Prophecy refers everything to the Paraclete. Cf. Labriolle sees Gnosticism as the intellectual crisis and Montanism as the moral crisis (1924:146).

[19] Also Eusebius, *HE*, vi, 20. 3; see also Hippolytus *Haer*. 8. 19; Epiphanius, *Pan*. 48. 7; it was however interesting to note that the New Prophecy possessed its own inspired writings –such as *Book of Revelation, Shepherd of Hermes* and *Apocalypse of Peter,* as argued by C. Trevett (1996:132) –and Eusebius charged them with having created 'new scripture' (*HE*, 6.20.3); see also, 5.18.5 which reported that the Montanist Themiso composed a new catholic epistle. With regard to this, N. Denzey, went so far as to suggest that there has been the possibility of Montanist reception of Gnostic texts (2001:427-48). For the relationship between Montanism and Gnosticism, see also; K. Froehlich, "Montanism and Gnosis", 1973.

1992:73); prophetic inspiration had fallen under hierarchical institution. In this climate, the Montanist claim of new revelation was repugnant to the new Church Hierarchy. For the new church leadership, zipping the Montanist mouth up was an impending task before the new prophets attempted to turn the clock back to the age of disorder (Greenslade 1964:110); for the Catholic Hierarchy, it was merely a retrograde step to cut off the new cluster of grapes in the newly organized church.

Such two reasons –both external and internal –explained the growing hostility of the new Catholic authority over the Montanist new prophets. From the Catholic Hierarchy's perspective, there was a clear sign that the Church was in transition from desert to town, and from inspiration to institution (Frend 1980:29). Facing with such a time of crisis, the Catholic leadership was convinced that a new situation would bring a new challenge and thus called for a new leadership, which could see the whole picture in a new light. Yet, for the bishops, the Montanist prophets were just yesterday's heroes whose power was not effective and suitable for the present situation (Ash 1976:227-52). In the eyes of the new Catholic powers, the Montanist new prophets were poorly rehearsed in the "myth of Sisyphus."[20]

Indeed, there was no room for the Montanist prophets in the Catholic bishops' house (Wright 1976:22). In a figurative term, this newly institutionalizing Catholic Church software was not compatible with the Montanist old version of operation system; it was clear for the Catholic Hierarchy that "the old has gone, the new has come" (2 Cor. 5:17 NIV). With its new format, the Catholic Church must be controlled by the established order and to this purpose, a priori was to amend the troublesome and spontaneous prophet/prophecy into a friendly well-organized version. Yet, the church programmers also had provided for the worst case that they would completely delete all the buffering data for the successful reformat of the Church directory. The Catholic Hierarchy was convinced that now was the time for a new beginning and the Church was required to pay the price for it; a new birth of Catholic institution paid for the death of the old inspiration (Ash 1976:227-52).

Here the Catholic Hierarchy had decided to sacrifice the Montanist new prophets for the new

---

[20] Greek legend; each time the boulder neared the top it rolled back down and Sisyphus was forced to start again.

church institution. From the new prophets' uncompromising ecstatic fervor, the Catholic bishops found no hope for the merger of two groups. Then the only way was to denude such untamed troublemakers as spiritual eunuchs (silent prophets) or spiritual exiles (isolated prophets) so that the new prophets had naturally faded into the background of the Catholic priests (Ash 1976:252). In order to locate the Montanist charismata in a bygone apostolic era (Kydd 1984:57),[21] the institutionalizing Catholic Church then began to hasten a series of killing the new prophets; the Catholic authorities gave a speculative look at the Montanist direct inspiration and their hope for the immanent Parousia (Latourette 1953:347). The purpose of such attacks was not necessarily to reveal the new prophets' theological default, but rather was to highlight their political inferiority as the lapsed prophets. Indeed, the bishops attack on the Montanist new prophets mainly served to celebrate and strengthen the new Catholic Hierarchy's victory in connection with the transfer of the church government (Kyrtatis 1987:95).

This suggests that the original condemnation of Montanism was due in large measure to the development of the church institution, especially, the transition of the church government from the inspirational prophets to the institutional priests (Bonner 1991:222). In fact, it did not take long that this new church leadership, saturated with pragmatism, had demonstrated their comparative superiority over the old Seers, the apocalyptic visionaries. The situation faced with was particularly advantageous to the new Catholic priests; outside was busy with the theological battle with heresy (Bruce 1982:214), while inside went through the development of creeds and practices as the constructive theology (Livingstone 1978:934). The institutionalizing Catholic Church soon had realized that this was the time of all times to attack its ecclesiastical rival. Scarcely had the new prophets been condemned when the new Catholic Hierarchy had become the sole champion of the church leadership; indeed, the institutionalizing Catholic priest had driven the final nail in the new prophet's coffin.[22]

Although the Catholic priests had continually propagated that the Montanist new prophets were not condemned, but just institutionalized (Burghardt1979:347), neither the Catholic priests nor

---

[21] Ash, however, has denied such an interpretation based on 'canonical theology'; he does not see the charisma of prophecy and canon as antithetical concepts by both orthodox and Montanist believers (1976:227-52).

[22] In this sense, Ash has concluded that "Montanism was rejected because of developments more sociological than theological" (1976:249).

the Montanist prophets were satisfied to remain the uncrowned king. From this angle, the original condemnation of Montanism was derived from the conflict between the institutional Catholic priests and the inspirational Montanist prophets, namely, the new and old church leadership (Frend 1989:29). The struggle, in the long run, was over the victory of the Catholic priest and from that moment, the ecclesiastical center of gravity was changed from inspiration to institution. Indeed, the Montanist new prophets, as the advocates of the voice of the spontaneous prophecy, had been taken over by the Catholic priests, as the defenders of the voice of the organized authorities (Campenhausen1969:163-172). It was therefore, the victory of the Catholic priests, which made the Montanist new prophets, the victim of the church government.

To sum up, the transitional church had preferred the Catholic new priests' will to centralization to the Montanist new prophets' will to decentralization. From here onwards, under the centripetal forces of the institutionalizing Catholic Church, the bishops' salient collection of the New Canon had slowly but surely erased the Montanist oracle of the New Jerusalem from the memory of believers. Under the new leadership of the Catholic Hierarchy, the dogma and doctrine had absolute primacy over revelation and prophecy. Indeed, it was the Catholic new priests, who posed a serious threat to the Montanist new prophets. Then, the inspirational Montanist new prophet had finally become the victim of the institutional Catholic new priests. In a nutshell, the Montanist new prophets were superseded by "the canonical prophets" (Williams 1981:3).

2.2.2. The Conflict with Controversial Characteristics

2.2.2.1. The Ecstatic Prophecy

Second, many see the Montanist crisis from its controversial characteristics in line with the pagan inspiration. Most of all, the manner of the Montanist manifestations, such as their fanatical and ecstatic prophecy, caused great offense seen in the light of the suspicion of pagan superstition. Although in the second-century Christian context, especially in Asia Minor, such peculiar manifestations were not completely new, it was repugnant to the eyes of the Catholic Church, which had already engaged in the process of institution (Bruce 1982:214). Not surprisingly, the Catholic bishops had delivered their veto to the Montanist prophecy, judging

it as a sort of the yeast of the Pharisee, which could spoil the whole Church order (Tabbernee 2007:403-4).

Among the offensive pagan smells, what bothered the Catholic Hierarchy most was the Montanist ecstatic prophecy. The emerging Catholic leaders at first had merely undercut the Montanist prophecy as a kind of frenzy, irregular, and spurious ecstasy,[23] but later they had cruelly satirized the new prophets as energumen who spoke pagan magical incantation (Swete 1912:68). Indeed, for the institutional Catholic priests, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy was counter-evidence to justify their authority. For the Catholic new leaders, it was necessary to prove their superiority over the Montanist new prophets, the old leadership and the Montanist ecstatic prophecy, accompanying with wild dancing, unintelligible speech, and frenzied fits, highlighted the dominant position of the well-organized Catholic priests by comparison. That was why the Catholic bishops made every effort to blame the Montanist ecstatic prophecy on pagan inspiration, contrary to the tradition and succession of the Orthodox Church (Knox 1950:34-7; Skewart-Sykes 1999:17).

Here, the Catholic priests' strategy was clever; they were careful enough not to dig up the contents, but to lick up the manners of the Montanist ecstatic prophecy. For the Catholic Hierarchy merely shadow boxing was good enough, instead of tackling the details behind the Montanist ecstatic prophecy. Then, the Catholic bishops drew water to their mill, by claiming that whenever the divine revelation was associated with the ecstatic prophecy, it was always inspired by an evil spirit (Tabbernee 2007:88). At a premium of the church tradition, the Catholic authorities simply judged the Montanist ecstatic prophecy no other than pagan inspiration, which had often been found in heretical conduct and magical operations (Swete 1912:68-60).[24] For them, the Montanist irrational, ecstatic, and glossolalic form of utterances were false and useless attempts to resist the rational, stable, and intelligent criteria of church institution (Latourette 1953:347).

There was no hesitance for the Catholic Hierarchy to sarcastically mock the Montanist new

---

[23] Eusebius 5.16.7, 9; interestingly enough, Tertullian also spoke of Montanist ecstasy as resembling madness; see, Tertullian, *De anima*, 45, 3.

[24] Eusebius *HE*, 5.16.7.

prophets as the pseudo prophets (Chadwick 1993:52-3), calling them; "Hail, king of the Church!" (Mk. 15:17-8) By degrading the Montanist ecstatic prophecy as pagan inspiration, the Catholic priests wished to remove their religious –also their political –stigma as the number two at the church leadership. The benefit from it was two-fold; it would help the Catholic priests removing their unworthy title as the second next to the prophets, while at the same time it may prevent the Montanist new prophets, the descendents from the old prophets, from coming back to power (Butler 2006:31-38). To this end, the Catholic priests had continued to assassinate the Montanist ecstatic prophecy (Gwatkin 1909:93).

Also, the Catholic priest had taken advantage of the Pauline tradition, which seemed to emphasize the prophetic control (1 Cor. 14:32) (Tabbernee 2007:94). The Pauline text, for the Catholic Hierarchy, had insisted on the intelligibility of genuine prophecy (1 Cor. 14). The Montanist ecstatic prophecy, in this sense, was the complete opposite in terms of their babble and strange speaking, which made no sense to hearers. In the eyes of the Catholic bishops, there was no better evidence to prove the Montanist guilt of unorthodoxy than their non-intelligible ecstatic prophecy (Tabbernee 2007:407-8).[25] By paying attention to structural affinities with the pagan inspiration, the Catholic priests had devalued the Montanist ecstatic prophecy as the pagan revelatory chant, even if glossolalia was not rare in the early prophetic discourse in Asian Minor (Trevett 1996:86-91).

For the Catholic priests, matters were getting clearer and clearer when they had begun to find prominent similarities between the Montanist and pagan ecstasies. Yet, the Catholic Hierarchy was not in a hurry and they went into the final verification process. The Catholic authorities needed to relocate the nature of glossolalia, which was popular in the Montanist new prophets. The following result was to distinguish it from the genuine prophecy (Knox 34-7); then, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy in a state of trance was branded as false and fake. To this end, the best way seemed to detach a glossolalia from a genuine prophecy. Indeed, the Catholic bishops had torn the curtains between the unintelligible glossolalia and clear wits of prophecy as a separate and contradictory occasion (Tabbernee 2007:96).

---

[25] The church leaders, especially anti-Montanist, actually referred Montanist speech as frenzied and strange babbles (Eusebius, *HE*, 5.16.7). Besides, Christopher Forbes has interestingly argued that the Montanist prophecy may not take a glossolalia form (1995:160-2).

As such, the Catholic priests were well aware of the power of the Montanist ecstatic prophecy and speaking in tongues (Swete 1912:70-1). They recognized that their unintelligible utterances were, like a "song of Sirens,"[26] irresistibly attractive, so that none could even escape from its power and strength; once someone heard about it, they must obey it. Moreover, for the Catholic priests, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy sounded like their will to survive (Greenslade 1964:109-10); in their fanatical passion, the Montanist new prophets seemed to pass some of their generic characteristics to the next generations. From the Catholic Hierarchy's perspective, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy came as their desperate desires, which signed a future deposition, namely, the attempt to smuggling their egg into the existing nest; it prophesized as if the Montanist new prophets laid their ambitions (eggs) in the Catholic Church (nest) for a better tomorrow. Without a doubt, such egg-dumping behavior had greatly disturbed the Catholic priests because this included a potential rebel to their leadership (Wright 1976:21). If it was the case, the priority on the Catholic priests was to toss the Montanist stealthy-eggs out of their communal clutch for the safety of their own eggs. Indeed, for the Catholic Hierarchy, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy was no other than *voces magicae*,[27] namely, magic words, which implied the ulterior motive of the Montanist new prophets and their deposition of the institutionalizing Catholic Church.

2.2.2.2. The Fanatical Millenarianism

Yet, the Catholic priests were not always easy to defend themselves. The new church champions had to deal with the emerging complaints on their new leadership; "Are the new priests children of Isaac or the children of Ishmael?"; "Is their victory over the prophets thoroughly deserving for the Church?" What was worse, there were suspicions on the new leadership, seeing its allergic reaction to the Montanist ecstatic prophecy as a kind of an inferiority complex, and it questioned whether or not the new priests rejection of the ecstatic glossolalia was because they were not as good as the Montanist new prophets (William 1981:3). In addition, the current situation seemed not favorable to the Catholic priests. Facing with the

---

[26] In Greek mythology, Sirens were described as dangerous and beautiful features, who lured the sailors with their enchanting music and voices to shipwreck.

[27] Eusebius, *HE*, v.16.7.

vacuum of prophetic gifts, many contemporary Christian believers, not necessarily all, had raised doubt if the Church really became healthier than before at the expense of the charismata as the new leadership promised (Kydd 1984:57). The result of its assessment was negative. In contrast to the new leadership's promise, the Church still needed the old wineskins; it was hardly deniable that the Church became institutionally sophisticated, but spiritually exhausted. This, in return, was a warning sign that the Catholic leadership's tactic must be changed; they needed to elaborate their justification for expelling the Montanist new prophets except for their ecstatic manners. This meant the Montanist hilarious manifestations and their unintelligible glossolalia no longer served as a litmus test to prove their theological deviance and their political illegitimacy (Kydd 1984:35-6).

Impelled by a sense of urgency, the Catholic priests began to change their attack on the rival party from the manner to the content (Tabbernee 2007: 407-8); complains and distrusts against the current leadership were crouching at their door, so the Catholic Hierarchy must master it to firmly maintain their position. For the Catholic priests, this was so complicated and difficult task to integrate their changed tactic into their previous line of argument; it actually required a drastic switch in the display of their policy. In this new process, the Catholic priests had focused their concern from the rivals' non-intelligible glossolalia to their intelligible oracles. In a figurative term, the Catholic priests had to re-open the grave of ecstasy, once buried with contempt, and collect every piece of dry bones to make them fit together in order to prove its deformation and monstrosity.

Then, the sharp knife of the Catholic priests began to dissect the corpses of the Montanist oracles. Before long, the Catholic leadership had pointed out that the oracles of New Prophecy had held erroneous and blasphemous contents; the oracles had not only equated the Montanist new prophets with the Paraclete, but also, more seriously, declared that even God the Father came to Montanus, the boss of the new prophets, to guide believers into all truth;[28]

---

[28] Heine, however, questioned the authenticity of this oracle in terms of its appearing in late document and inconsistent contents of oracle; he suggested all of these reflected the post-date the Trinitarian debates of the fourth –century (1987-8:17-9). cf. See, Eusebius, *HE*, v. 14.1; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, XL VIII, 2; Didymus, *De Trinitate*, III, 41; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Kataoheseis,* XVI, 8. Acknowledging this argument, Hippolytus later reported that some Montanists were heretics because they attached themselves to the heresy of Noetians, who claimed that "the Father is himself the Son…and that this one underwent generation and suffering and death," *Philosopoumena*, VIII, 12 (NPNF 2).

> I am the Father and I am the Son and I am the Paraclete
>
> I am the Father, and the Son, and the Paraclete
>
> I the Lord, the Almighty God, remain among men
>
> Neither angel, nor ambassador, but I, the Lord God the Father, have come
>
> (Montanus, fragment oracle, 1-4)

The Catholic priests had also paid special attention to the fact that the Montanist prophecy begun with a self-disclosure in the 'I' form (Powell 1975:51; Wright 1976:19). Even if such I am sayings formula was not necessarily novel, rather was familiar with the Old Testament prophetic form (Froehlich 1973:99), the Catholic Hierarchy had pejoratively characterized it as an sacrilegious expression by implying that the Paraclete in the new prophets had spoken better and greater than the Spirit in the Catholic priests (Thomas 2003:155-65; Tabbernee 2007:110). They regarded the self-identification of the Montanist new prophets no other than the self-proud, or the self-deception, which had asserted their superiority over the canonical prophets, the representatives of the Catholic priests (Grant 2003:51). For the Catholic leadership, the matter became clear and clearer. There was a tactical combination between the Montanist anti-intelligible glossolaia and their anti-organizational oracle as a coherent whole. In a nutshell, the ecstatic form of the Montanist prophecy was inseparably connected with the rebellious content of the Montanist oracles.

Furthermore, the eyes of the institutional Catholic priests were tailing the oracle of the Montanist eschatology with a deep suspicion. The oracles of two Montanist female prophets, Maximila and Priscilla, had boldly proclaimed the impending End (Greenslade 1964:223) and it was greeted by boos and jeers from the Catholic leadership. The antipathy toward the Montanist new prophets had deepened when the Montanist oracle had insinuated themselves into the remnant of the last times. The oracle of Maximilla, for example, had openly boasted of her specialty as a chosen prophetess;[29] "after me there will be no longer a prophet, but the consummation" (Aune 1983:315). The oracle of Priscilla, another leading figure of new prophets, had made matters worse. This female prophet had boldly, but badly, prophesized the

---

[29] Epiphanius, *Pan.* 48. 2. 4.

coming of the Montanist Kingdom; the New Jerusalem would come down at the town of Pepuza,[30] "a most insignificant hamlet" in Phrygia (Latourette 1953:128);

> In the form of a woman arrayed in shining garments
>
> came Christ to me and set wisdom upon me
>
> and revealed to me that this place [Pepuza] is holy
>
> and that Jerusalem will come down hither from heaven (Priscilla, fragment oracle, 12)

For the Catholic leadership, the Montanist eager expectation of the parousia was not a trivial problem. This was not purely a religious matter, but practically a political issue. In a sense, the Catholic Hierarchy had recognized the seriousness of the Montanist eschatology; their fanatic millenarianism had fed off apocalyptic visions and fantasies (Burghardt 1979:343), and as a result, it had sparked off a wave of nostalgia for the venerable past and thus of the hope for the better future. In this sense, the Montanist new prophets were great admirers of the past and the future, but grievous dodgers of the present. For the Catholic priests, the goal of the Montanist eschatology was two-fold: their political as well as religious/spiritual restoration. The Catholic Hierarchy then regarded the Montanist oracle of the New Jerusalem as their manifesto, expressing their long-awaited ambition to revive the past glory both spiritually and politically (Williams 1989:331-51).

Not surprisingly, the Catholic priests had showed no mercy for such asylum-seekers. The Montanist eschatological hope was accounted guilty of political subversion and it thereby must be banished. Then, the Montanist new prophets were sentenced as guilty. Under control of the male Catholic priests, the Montnanist two female prophets, especially Maxilla and Priscilla, had stood accused of failing their prophecy [31] as runaway brides [32] (McGinn-Mohrer 1989:276-329). From the verdict of the Catholic judges, such disobedient women, being obsessed with self-fulfillment, had even lured many believers to a desert (Tabbernee 2007:408).

---

[30] Epiphanius, *Pan*. 49. 1; see also 48.14; "These people [the Montanist believers] reverence a desert place in Phrygia, what was once a city called Pepuza, now leveled to the ground. To that place, they say, the Jerusalem above is to come down. Consequently they go there to celebrate certain mysteries and to sanctify themselves, in line with their understanding."

[31] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.16,18; 5.17,4; also, Epiphanius, *Haer*, xlviii, 2.

[32] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.18.3.

Therefore, in the Catholic priests' judgment, the Montanist glorification of Pepuza was none other than the millenarian fantasy, which has no real ground (Williams 1989:331-51).

The Catholic Hierarchy found that the Montanist eschatology had a double-faced head; each, like Janus,[33] looked in opposite direction, namely, the future and the past. This explains why the Catholic priests had concentrated their condemnation on the Montanist futuristic aspect of the New Jerusalem. The Catholic Hierarchy had already recognized that the collapse of the future Kingdom would lead a successive fall of the past glory of the Montanist new prophets; by blocking the future-face of the Montanist eschaton, the Catholic leadership could also eclipse the Montanist past-face. In doing so, the Catholic priests had denuded not only the Montanist apocalyptic chiliasm as a foolish rush, but also their past glory as an empty hope (Butler 2006:17). This, in the end, made the Montanist eschatology a self-fulfilling prophesy against the Montanists, themselves; indeed, the Catholic priests had cleverly used the Montanist radical eschatology as a Trojan horse, which ultimately destroyed the Montanist new prophets from inside (Butler 2006:35-8; Pelikan 1971:98-9).

Before the Catholic priests' careful scheme, the Montanist eschatology just could prove suicidal for themselves; the Montanist hope for the New Jerusalem became its own worst enemy. Then, the Catholic leadership did strike a fatal blow to such shocked visionaries. Without hesitation, the Catholic priests had put a "Cain's mark" (Gen. 4:15), as a sign of renegade, on the forehead of the Montanist new prophets, so that they had to go out from the Catholic Church's presence and lived in the land of Nod,[34] bearing an unbearable punishment as restless wanderers (Pelikan 1971:107).

2.2.2.3. The Strict Asceticism

The Catholic priests' sharp sword, once drawn for fake visionaries, would not be returned until it had found and despised another false omen, namely, the Montanist strict asceticism. The Catholic leadership was fully aware of an inextricable connection between the Montanist

---

[33] Janus is the god of the ancient Roman religion, with a double-faced head because he looks to the future and the past.

[34] Here 'nod' means 'wandering.'

fanatical millenarianism and the excessive Puritanism (Schaff 1992:417); an eager voice of the imminent parousia had an almost hypnotic effect and it enticed the new prophets and their followers to take a hard-line stance on their Christian lifestyles (Trevett 1998:16-8). In the eyes of the Catholic priests, it was no surprise then that these lunatic fringes were hopelessly self-addictive to a relationship of millenarian-Puritanism; they had ceaselessly brainwashed themselves into believing that the Paraclete had led Christians into a more ascetic and a more rigorous type of holy life in this last times (Gwatkin 1909:74-5). Yet, such a double-trouble, that is, the uneasy combination between the Montanist eschatology and their asceticism, was not necessarily a double-burden for the Catholic leadership. Rather, on the opposite sense, it might save the trouble of getting blood on its hands again. The Catholic priests' sword, already sharpened for great slaughter of the Montanist millenarians, could be also laid on the necks of Montanist puritans without extra effort.

In their observation, the Catholic priests had found that the Montanist new prophets were especially addicted to a stricter life in four specific areas, that is, (1) fasting, (2) forgiveness of sin, (3) marriage, and (4) martyrdom (Burghardt 1979:343). For the Catholic Hierarchy, the first three were less embarrassing to deal with, rather all had in the palm of their hand. It was because the Catholic Hierarchy could easily strip the Montanist holiness naked under the charge of unwarranted novelty (Tabbernee 2007:105). Firstly, the Montanist fasting unquestionably went beyond the traditional Christian teachings; they had imposed its severity on the adherents, including the fasts for half a day, and 'xerophagy', namely, dry diets for two weeks.[35] Secondly, the stringent exercise of the power of the keys –the power to forgive the lapsed –had simply represented the Montanist new prophets' stingy grace; they had refused to give forgiveness to the Christian sinners as much as the Catholic bishops did.[36] Thirdly, the Montanist high self-esteem for celibacy and continence had proved their self-contradiction only; they had openly accorded a great honorary title virgin even to the runaway women.[37] For the Catholic new priests, all evidences had clearly supported then that the Montanist sanctity of Christian lifestyle was half-truth; for the Catholic Hierarchy, all of the Montanist puritanical

---

[35] Eusebius, *HE,* 5.18.2. Especially, Hippolytus, in this connection, made derogatory comment about the character of Montanists calling them as 'radish-eaters', *Refut. Omn, Haer*. viii. 19, 1, x. 25 (ANF vol. 5).

[36] Tertullian has expressed the similar opinion in his treatise, the *De pudicitia* 21. 7 (ANF, vol. 3).

[37] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.18.3.

children were mere mutants, derived from the impure Mother, namely, the Montanist false eschatology (Greenslade 1964:109-10).

Yet, for the Catholic Hierarchy, the last point, the Montanist new prophets' extreme position of martyrdom, was not easy; it actually came with a hot potato to the Catholic priests. In contrast to the Catholic leadership's desire, the Montanists' colorful speech had stirred many ordinary believers to take action impulsively to this cause. The Montanist new prophets had forced their adherents to confess the name publicly and offered a reward for any voluntary martyrdom in the midst of persecution (Klawiter 1980:253-4), which, in the eyes of the Catholic Hierarchy, made them a mere death-squad (Croix 2006:198). For the Catholic priests, the Montanist faith in martyrdom was made for tragedy; their rush for the baptism in the blood was the inevitable corollary resulting from their ecstatic prophecy and their fanatical eschatology. As such, for the Catholic leadership, the Montanist new prophets were repelled by their voluntary martyrdom (Barnes 1971:177-8; Cohn 1970:25-7; Knox 1950:49); the Montanist blood-baptism was basically insane and irrational, contrary to the decent and traditional teaching of the Catholic priests (Klawiter 1980:254, no. 12).

Yet, there was another important reason to make the Catholic priests disturbing. The Catholic Hierarchy had harshly criticized the Montanist martyrdom due in large measure to their fear of replacement; the Catholic leadership saw the Montanist subversive attempt behind their suicidal pilgrimage. For the Catholic priests, the Montanist new prophets had strategically seemed to produce their fellow martyrs, including women, for the sake of their ecclesiastical coup d'état (Klawiter 1980:253-4); facing with such a voluntary-martyrdom-rush, the Catholic priests had first shuddered with horror and then, they were distraught with fear of replacement (Campenhausen 1957; quoted by Klawiter). In fact, the potential power of the Montanist martyrs, who were obsessed with vain hope, was enough to threaten the existing position of the Catholic Hierarchy (Klawiter 1980:254). Both, the new prophets and Catholic priests, were well aware that the Church accorded the power of the keys –or, the power to forgive the wavering saints –to martyrs, who were especially awaiting death (Klawiter 1980:254). This explained that the Catholic leadership was quite reluctant to transfer such extraordinary power to the Montanists new prophets through their fellow voluntary martyrs (Klawiter 1980:254). From this viewpoint, the Catholic leadership regarded the Montanists mass exodus from life as none other than the counter-attack of the ecclesiastical exiles. By forcefully exercising the

39

power of the keys, the Montanist new prophets had manipulated their faithful believers for their political restoration. For the Catholic priests, it was the toughest ultimatum of the Montanist new prophets; to this end, they were irrationally crying out for either power or death![38] (Klawiter 1980:260).

As far as the Catholic priests' concern, the Montanist new prophets were using their adherents' life-or-death action for impure purpose. To maximize their political retaliation, the Montanist new prophets had deliberately drawn a thin line between confessors and martyrs. While the Catholic leadership had never identified a martyr with a confessor until the latter would seal his/her confession with death,[39] the Montanist new prophets used to impose the same power and authority not only on the imprisoned confessor-martyrs, but also even on the released confessors (Klawiter 1980:256). For the Montanist prophets, the benefit of such compromise was phenomenal; in so doing, they could get their strong religious/political advocates whose rank or title was equal to that of ordained ministers in the church leadership. Scarcely had the Montanist confessor-martyrs rubbed their shoulder with them when the Catholic priests begun to find themselves snared in a web of intrigue.

From the Catholic priests' view, the Montanist great misuse of the power of the keys had reached its climax when they had begun to transplant this priestly power into their female confessors.[40] To the Catholic Hierarchy's surprise, the Montanist new prophets, from its very birth, had very successfully manipulated their female believers. Giving them a ministry title,[41] the Montanist new prophets had made use of women believers as their practical bodyguards from a hail of arrows, while at the same time hiding themselves as the secret power behind the throne. What was worse was that such female confessors, who were deceived by the Montanist new prophets, had retained their credential as martyrs, even after releasing from the

---

[38] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.16.12-13; 20-21; 5.17.2-3.

[39] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.2.2-3.

[40] In spite of paucity of historical evidence, Klawiter persuasively argues its plausibility. According to him, *The Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas* infers that for the New Prophecy, the power of the keys is given to both male and female imprisoned confessors. The fact the New Prophecy, from its inception, has accepted the prominent role of the female prophet significantly suggests that this priestly power can be back to a very origin of a movement (1980:251-61).

[41] Epiphanius, *Pan*. 49.2.1-5.

imprisonment, and thereby revisited their rivals as a contending power group in a "revised hierarchy of clergy" (Trevett 1998:12;18). Not surprisingly, the Catholic leadership did not take such ascension of female role, regardless of its sheerness, as good news. This explained why the Catholic priests took a close look at Pauline prohibition of women's active role in the church as their best defense; "we do not reject women prophets…but we do not permit them to speak in the church, not to have authority over men" (Labrriolle 1913:105).[42] Therefore, such was the Catholic leadership's firm response to the Montanist female confessor-martyrs; for them, there was only one option; either death as they wished, or retreat to the former subordinate female.

In such a bitter struggle, the issue at stake was whether the Catholic leadership could unmask the distortion of Montanist asceticism. Impelled by a sense of urgency for the coming of the New Jerusalem, the Montanist new prophets, *ex*-ecclesiastical leaders, had tried to propagate their extreme holy lifestyle as another circumcision, pertaining to the new millennium. In addition, such radical puritans even had systematically embellished their severe and rigorous attitude to fasting, forgiveness of sin, marriage, and martyrdom, as no more than ecomium to the coming of the Montanist Kingdom. The Catholic priests began to look at the Montanist cultic attempt as a shrewd plot to supersede their ecclesiastical position. For them, the Montanist voluntary martyrdom, in this connection, was the epitome of their cunning intrigue. To this end, the Montanist new prophets not only had mechanically produced the ready-made martyrs, but also had maliciously corrupted the confessor-martyrs relationship, by sacrificing female volunteers for their political sake. In all cases, the Montanist austere life, in the eyes of the Catholic priests, was nothing but a hotbed of anti-rational, anti-clerical and anti-institutional conspiracy.

2.2.3. The Conflict with the Urban Church Leadership

Thirdly, the Montanist new prophets became more condemnable as their message became more powerful. The Catholic leadership's fear of replacement needed its immediate escape and such a desperate impulse led them into the power struggle with the retired but dangerous

---

[42] It is, however, reminiscent that Paul has allowed women prophets in Christian community (1 Cor. 11:5).

ecclesiastical rivals, namely, the Montanist rural prophets.[43] Of particular interest came from their different –or almost opposite –background. When both –old and new –leadership were against each other, such a conflict began to take on a new aspect: the power encounter between city and countryside Christianity (Frend 1980:25-42). The Catholic priests, as highly organized urban leadership, had strengthened their solidarity with the institutionalizing Church where the Montanist new prophets, as spontaneous rural leadership, had gotten together under the flag of the New Jerusalem.

The fate of such collision between such heterogeneous groups had already been decided when the Church put forth all its power to open the way for the institution. Indeed, the Catholic leadership, from its very inception, had expected that the church constitution by nature was not secure against the polarization of the church government as pro-and-anti organization (Braudel, 1974:373), but nonetheless, the Catholic priests had decided to accept such risks. It was because the Catholic leaders, filled with their own pride, were convinced that they could control such a new circumstance successfully by separating the ecclesiastical haves from have-nots. The more the Catholic leadership was prone to the development of the institution, the more the Church was overshadowed by the principle of competition; then the centrality of the city-church leadership had begun to eclipse the marginality of the countryside-church leadership (Kyrtatis 1987:17, 95). It was an inevitable corollary then that the development of urban Christianity came by elbowing rural Christianity off en masse (Stewart-Sykes 1999:21-2); the champion of the privileged urbanized church –its hierarchical and Episcopal authority –had come chiefly at the expense of the underprivileged rural churches (Frend 1980:29).

This suggested that there was a close inter-relationship between the church institution and its urbanization. Indeed, the advance of church went hand in hand with that of city (Fox 1986:265); as the church began its organization based on the urban area, the city had become a new town for the church constitution. In this friendly combination, the Christian groups as a result were strong in cities and the new church leaders too were settled down in the city rather than countryside (Frend 1965:291-294). In this context, the territory of the city became the rising political unit for the new church leadership (Sohm 1921:47). Here, significant was the fact that

---

[43] There found a similar opinion from Frend, Williams, Kyrtatis, Trevett, and Stewart-Sykes .

the Catholic priests were the children of the city. Not surprisingly, the urban church leadership had chosen for themselves the city as the Garden of the Eden and planted their flag on it, while the Montanist new prophets had still pitched their tents in the land of wilderness (Kyrtatis 1987:17). In consequence, it was the new city leaders, who first had parted themselves of their own volition from the countryside old leaders.

The result of these different decisions was immediate. Soon two parties went their own separate ways with their own company and the dissimilarities between urban and rural Christianity manifested; each represented its own paradigmatic boundaries as institutional versus inspirational; practical versus apocalyptic; and old versus new. Yet, greater benefit and power were mainly concentrated on the urban priests, who first had selected the city, "a brave new world", than the rural prophets. Taking advantage of church institutions, the city leadership, by and large, had overwhelmed the countryside churches socially, culturally, and theologically (Kyrtatis 1987:93); as a result "a land flowing with milk and honey" was almost exclusively accessible to the city-based hierarchical churches. Then, the situation had predisposed the urban church leadership to be a patron of the rural leadership, not to be a partner with it.

The conflict between the two parties became intensified. On the one sense, the city-church leaders had regarded the Montanist new prophets as the headquarters of countryside-church leadership. From the urban leadership's view, the problem was clear; such the rural prophets were externally anachronistic and internally anarchic. Yet, for the rural prophets, the self-preservation of local church was their first allegiance and thereby the merger into the city-church came a poor second. As the Montanist new prophets' pride was their duty as local church-keepers, their pity was the corruption from the entanglement with a new environment, namely, the advance of the institutionalized and even secularized city-church. In this sense, the Montanist prophets were the staunch advocates for the rural conservatives (Stewart-Sykes 1999:21-2; Klawiter 1975:20). They were convinced that the countryside was the last redoubt of the primitive church (Klawiter 1975:1), which had not defiled her body with the city spirit, a cesspit of corruption. This gave the rural leadership a deep conviction that the city-based church institution was nothing but a symptom of inner compromise; it liquefied their rigid discipline and duty as the heirs of the old prophets.

The city-countryside conflict did not become the talk of the church overnight. In the earliest

phrase, the Montanist crisis seemed nothing more than a petty commotion solely for the local Phrygian consumption; the peripheral Montanist new prophets were still minor players in the church leadership, being dwarfed by the centralized Catholic priests. It was thus the local Phrygian bishops, who had first responded to the outbreak of Phrygian revolt as an indigenous matter. They, as the shepherds of the flock, might feel a sense of obligation to deal with such a local problem with pastoral concerns (Tabbernee 2007:404-5). The Phrygian trouble was, however, much more complex and complicated; the simple dualistic judgment of friend-and-foe gave no clear-cut conclusion that the Montanist new prophets were theologically unorthodoxy. The more the local bishops had kept their eye on the ball, the more they could not take their eye off the ball. In irony, what challenged the local shepherds most was that they felt ambivalent about the new prophets' ambiguity; the Phrygian prophets' character, at times, seemed legitimate, but at other times, seemed novel and strange. This vagueness gave the local bishops a lack of confidence to judge the New Prophecy condemnable and called for the immediate intervention from the upper–and thereby city –church to take the lead (Tabbernee 2007:42). From then onwards, the Phrygian disturbance soon had snowballed into an ecclesiastical crisis to convene regional/city synods.

At first, the local bishops had expected that the commitment of the city leadership would quickly quell the Phrygian disturbance. Yet, with the urban leadership being sent in, the situation had rather deteriorated rapidly. From the first, the city leaders, as the Catholic Hierarchy, were careful to Phrygian rural prophets as their political rivals (Frend 1980:25-42). For the city-church leaders, the outburst of Phrygian Seers was a bad luck for their fortune; therefore, the Catholic leadership had watched them as a critical local revolt to usurp the central power. Be that as it may, for the urban Catholic priests, there was no middle ground to negotiate with the countryside-church leaders to protect their vested interest (Braudel, 1974:373). Indeed, the urban leadership had a premonition that letting the rural prophets stand by them became a recipe for disaster. That was why the urban Catholic leaders burnt their bridge behind them when they first had received an SOS message from the local bishops; in the eyes of the city leadership, it was no longer a matter of the local problem, but of the church government (Ash 1976:227-52). This meant, for the city hegemony, the rural prophets must be purged out not because of their theological unorthodoxy, but because of their political un-orthopraxy.

The urbanized Catholic Church priests had characterized the Phrygian crisis as an

ecclesiastical-political coup and thus were trying to woo regional synods away from their political/ecclesiastical competitors. To this end, the city leadership at first had to shed their stuffy image of worldliness. As a reaction to the rapid process of church institution, the Montanist rural prophets' catchphrase, "back to the primitive spiritual church", was widely gaining support from both urban and rural believers and this had made the urban church hierarchy looked poor by comparison. In order to change the situation, the city leadership had claimed that Christianity was, by nature, an urban –not a rural –religion, mostly developed in cities (Fox 1986: 265). In addition, they had argued that Christian prophecy, the heart of the Montanist rural prophet, was actually the urban phenomenon rather than rural (Trevett 1996:49). In doing so, the city priests had tried to emphasize the fact that the city was, contrary to popular belief, not a tombstone, but a birthplace of the Christian prophet and prophecy.

Such praise for the city as the home of prophecy had turned the scale. Once the city hierarchy had begun to popularize the prophecy as the city heritage, the strength of the countryside-church began to ebb away; the prophetic power of the Montanist rural prophets had become powerless when the Catholic city priests had taken the birthright of prophecy. The kidnapping of prophecy had subsequently left the Montanist prophets with injured pride. The city priests had taken not only the sole ownership of prophecy, but also its solid power from the rural prophets. By nailing down the prophecy to urban phenomena (Trevett 1996:49), the city hierarchy had tried to neutralize the Montanist prophets and their ecstatic prophecy. In this sense, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy was nothing but the Montanist rural prophets' bitter crying. From the urban leadership's view, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy and their strange utterances were an uneasy mix of lamentation and revelation: their wailing/weeping for friends and cursing/mocking against foes. Inasmuch as the Catholic priests had observed, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy had been secretly encoded and it could only be decoded by their fellow tongue-speakers who could carry out the unintelligible glossolalia in a state of ecstasy (Kapelle 1984:87-111; Gillespie 1994:133, 157). Then the urban priests had suspected that the Montanist rural prophets might have hidden their political ambitions behind their ecstatic prophecies in the form of unintelligible utterances. The Montanist glossolalia, in this sense, was the secret code, which could successfully conceal their political/religious retaliation against the Catholic Hierarchy.

The urban leadership's fear of replacement was not a mere exaggeration. The Catholic city

leaders were mortified to realize that the Montanist rural prophets might be the best brains as well as the crying fists; half of them had drawn a very schematic plot, while the other half were equipped with aggressive arsenals. Against all expectations, the Montanist rural leadership was certainly assiduous in the fight against the urbanized Catholic hegemony. The city hierarchy even had realized that the Montanist new prophets' lack of facility in speech –such as its short and unadorned oracle –might have been a token gesture to grant the Montanist lower self-discipline (Stewart-Sykes 1999:16-7) in order to hide their ulterior objective.

Yet, the Montanist rural prophets' plot was discovered before it was carried out. The Catholic city leadership had found that the Phrygian rivals had begun to receive offerings from the rural community in compensation for their spiritual services (Wypustek 1997:279).[44] On the one sense, the urbanized Catholic Hierarchy had criticized that such a behavior –to ask for money while prophesying –was the very antithesis of what the post-Pauline Christian community oriented and thus should be banned from both city and countryside churches (Tabbernee 2007:388).[45] Yet, on the other sense, the city leadership had been in constant fear lest their rival could use it as the exercise of power of the weak (Nasrallah 2003:174). For the urban leadership, the brains of the Montanist new prophets might have realized that the receipt of a salary was the first-and-foremost step, which could promote their low status in the church. It was actually an open secret that the Catholic city leadership had already been involved in this uneasy connection between power and money; indeed, the city church had consisted of a number of hired city priests (Stevenson 1987:133-6, 140). Since Catholic Hierarchy was the defending champion of the church government, the city leadership had already been enjoyed such a hidden manna through a well-organized internal mechanism, which had been exclusively available for the inner-circle of the city church (Kyrtatis 1987:142). The fixed salaries and organized charities had served not only to strengthen a rigid hierarchy, but also to create patronage, which enabled the city leaders to enhance their political power within the church.

Given this situation, the emergence of the waged Montanist new prophets came to the Catholic Hierarchy not as mere a copycat crime, but as a serious encroachment on their privileges. For

---

[44] Eusebius, *HE*, 5.18.2, 5-6 and 11.

[45] Also, see, *Didache*, 11, 8 (*The Didache: A Commentary,* 1998).

the city leadership, the Montanist rural prophets must have some ulterior motives; they might have a secret design to shake the monopoly of the established church aristocracy, in one sense, by popularizing the democratized leadership within the church and, in other sense, by promoting authority of the underprivileged as an alternative power group (Stewart-Sykes 1999:20). This suffered the urban priests in two ways; first, the city leaders had to turn a blind eye to the traffic between the Montanist rural prophets and countryside churches lest their scandal come to the light. Second, the Catholic city leadership was soon fed up with this conspiracy of silence because it was a traitor's peace, just adding to the fear of another betrayal. Indeed, the Montanist rural prophets had often proclaimed that the city priests must come third after pneumatics and *koinonos* (Butler 2006:31; Trevett 1996:210).[46] For the city priests, there was no quid pro quo for this silence except for Montanist' kiss, namely, a signal of betrayal; it consequently turned out to be good for the Montanist rural prophets, not for themselves. The Montanist rural prophets had cleverly used the city priests' Achilles heel for their political/religious restoration.

Soon, the reappearance of the religion of Phrygia was the urban leadership's worst nightmare. For the city-church hierarchy, the Montanist ecstatic prophecy had encouraged their adherents to participate in the Phrygian crusade and glossolalia was none other than an oath of allegiance, which had showed their fanatical-but-faithful commitment to the Montanist Holy War against the city-church leadership. Furthermore, the Montanist rural leadership never ignored of producing the salaried prophets as their practical sponsors to prepare for such a long and high-cost combat. In this climate, the public pledge of the urban priests –to develop the city church as a decent, ordered and tidy society –was seriously threatened by the Montanist rural prophets (Frend 1980:37). Indeed, the initial cacophony between city priests and countryside prophets was the prelude to the severe conflict between urban and rural Christianity. In this respect, the Montanist crisis was a gritty description of the city-countryside confrontation as the privileged-underprivileged; institutional-inspirational; priestly-prophetic leadership. In the end, the city priests had finished this Armageddon by crucifying the Montanist rural prophets on the cross and put the written notice of charge against it: *noblesse oblige* –great power comes with great responsibility.

2.3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

---

[46] Jerome, *Epist*. 41, 3.

The entirety of the original condemnation of Montanism was not simple; its ground was far beyond what one single aspect thought possible. Behind the usual accusation of the movement, there was rather the complex interrelationship between the institutionalizing church, the controversial manifestations -ecstatic prophecy, fanatical millenarianism, and strict asceticism –and the power struggle of urban and rural Christianity. Yet the confrontation of the city-countryside church leadership had played the most decisive role in cutting Montanism off from the bond of the Catholic Church. In the eyes of the urbanized Catholic Hierarchy, the rise of the rural origin of Montanism was like opening up a Pandora's Box, which had long been a taboo since the church aristocracy had been established. Then, the urban ruling party had attributed every smell of suspects to the lower social status of the Montanist new prophets as their political/religious rival. For the Catholic Hierarchy, the prerogative and duty of the church institution was not to preserve old shelters for the countryside troublemakers, but to prepare new headquarters for the city troubleshooters; indeed the city leadership has no sharing place for the countryside prophets.

Before long, the lot had singled out the Montanist new prophets. The palm of supreme power had solely belonged to the urbanized Catholic priests. This had decided the fate of two rivals; the rural leadership had fallen victim to the power-struggle, rather the urban leadership had been held in high esteem as victors. In consequence, the Montanists rural prophets were completely at the mercy of the Catholic urban priests. Yet, the victors were not magnanimous in their victory; the new conquerors had banished their old rival from the Land of Promise by ridiculing them in a pejorative sense; "Can anything good come from Phrygia?" (Jn. 1:46).

CHAPTER 3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TERTULLIAN AND MONTANISM

After a lost war, the sum of all ecclesiastical powers had been united in the Catholic city leadership as in a centre. It is no coincidence then that, in the wake of triumph of the Catholic priests, fortune no longer smiles on the Montanist rural prophets as the crushing defeatists of the battle. Rather the Catholic Hierarchy had vilified them as the Cataphrygian mutiny who had continued to resist against the institutional church order (Tabbernne 2007: 406). Even if they were trampled underfoot by the Catholic priests, flames of resistance were not completely quenched. Even if the new had come and the old had passed away, the inner-spirit of the New Prophecy had hardly die out and it rather rapidly gained more followers outside Asia Minor in general and Africa in particular (Barnes 1971:131). To be sure, the blood of the Montanist new prophets was seed to persevere in their attempt to challenge against the Catholic Hierarchy. From this point on, historical questions had arisen when the Apologist Tertullian had voluntarily welcomed the remnants of Phrygian seers with open arms; here his close-knit fraternity with the involuntarily dethroned soothsayers had tantalizingly scouted certain solutions to answer the question; "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?"

3.1. THE ACCEPTED PORTRAYAL OF TERTULLIAN

3.1.1. The Conventional Outlines of Tertullian as the Pagan-Catholic-Montanist

Unlike a man with Tertullian's famous –or notorious –reputation, the dearth of evidence on his biography hinders the full portrait of this African genius. It is ironic that except for Tertullian's self-revelation, Jerome's writing is almost the only data to offer on his tortuous life. The modern scholarship nonetheless has endeavored to establish a general picture of such a vigorous-but-tempestuous African Apologist in a relevant way. This demands researchers to take look at the so-called accepted portrayal of Tertullian, although much of this image is now open to scholarly debates. The conventional outlines of Tertullian, in spite of some drawbacks, has definitely served to loom large in shadowy figures of a man of paradox (Osborn 1997:50), as both the author of the *Apologeticum,* the masterpiece of Catholic Apology, and of the *On Ecstasy,* the defense of Montanism,[47] and also as both the heresy-hunter and heresy-holder

---

[47] Yet, it is unfortunate that this treatise (consists of total six books) has been disappeared now.

49

(Eller 1957:6).

Following is the popular conjecture that has introduced the domain of Tertullian's resume. Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus,[48] a native of Carthage, was born in 155 CE[49] as the son of a centurion in the Roman Army.[50] He was educated in the excellent schools of that flourishing capital of Roman North Africa. Both at Carthage and Rome, he had studied rhetoric and philosophy, as well as law. His parents were both pagans (Quasten 1953:246) and this background, together with his confession, had rendered that he was a sinner who frequented the public shows[51]; committed adultery[52] as a married man,[53] and instigated the cult of Mithra[54] (Labriolle 1924:61). Besides, the expert in law added to Tertullian's specialty as the professional Jurist, who had especially a good reputation in Rome (Quasten 1953:246). Favorite was his philosophy of both Seneca and Plato (Norris 1967:99) but evident was his preference for Stoics to Platonists in connection with a corporate view of the soul.[55] Christianity became Tertullian's religion after witnessing the fortitude of Christian martyrs at Rome about 193CE (Arbesmann 1950:viii). Tertullian's nickname, a merciless Apologist, had well showed his zeal for this new conversion and from then, his honor roll of the Catholic priest was added to him (Labriolle 1924:61-2). Tertullian has been converted to Christianity before 195 CE. Not long after his conversion, he published his famous treatise, the *Apologeticum,* in the year 197 CE.

Despite his influential position at Carthaginian and other African churches, Tertullian's

---

[48] Tertullian in his treatises calls himself Tertullianus (*de Bapt.*, 20; *de Exhort. cast.*, 13) and Septimius Tertullianus (*de Virg. Vel.*, 17). Lactantius, an advisor of the first Christian Roman emperor, Constantine I. also calls him Septimius Tertullianus (*Inst. Div.*, 5,1,23, ANF, vol. 7). In fact, Quintus and Florens are a subsequent tradition, gathered in the 15th century by J. Trithemius and Politanus (Labriolle 1924:56, note 3).

[49] There are diverse opinions about Tertullian's date of birth, yet.

[50] Jerome, *De VirisIllustribus.*

[51] Tertullian, *De Spect.*, XIX.

[52] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis.*, LIX.

[53] Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem.*

[54] Tertullian, *De Praescr.*, XL, 4.

[55] Tertullian, *De Anima*, 5. 2.

orthodox career had collapsed under his transition to Montanism about 207 CE.[56] During the reign of Septimius Severus, a wave of persecution had swept over the whole North African church and Tertullian had become acquainted with the Montanists (Le Tourneau 1987:88). Their asceticism attracted him (Ferguson 2009:319). Between the years 202 CE and 213 CE, his views had underwent a momentous change (Nasrallah 2003:100-1; Tabbernee 2007:131). Tertullian felt that the claims of Christ had been weakened and watered down by the lax tone of society, and the absence of a high moral standard of life (Gonzales 1974:24-5). He longed for more austerity, a stricter and more literal obedience to Christ's commands (Bethune-Baker 1951:373). In this frame of mind, Tertullian was attracted by the teaching of Montanus and his fellow new prophets (Frend 1965:93).

By 206-208 CE, Tertullian had attached himself to the Montanism wholly and had broken with the old Catholic church, which from now onward he condemned (Smith 1943:127-39; Quasten 1953:247; Grant 1970:217; Chadwick 1993:92). By the year 213 CE, he joined the Montanists and ranked as a heretic by the Orthodox Church. His later writings had shown him as a convinced Montanist (Frend 1965:371); but he separated in old age from even these associates and founded a little sect of his own (Power 1971:37). Tertullianists were to be found in Carthage nearly two centuries subsequent to his death, which took place not long after the year 222 CE.[57] Tertullian had stood this test. He became a better Montanist than Montanus himself. He died between 220 CE and 240 CE (Arbesmann 1950: viii; Frend 1965:380).[58] In all cases, the conventional view has described this African genius as a tragic hero whose last days were grievous in the circles of rebirth as a Pagan-Catholic-Montanist (Barnes 1971:136).

3.2. THE RECONSTRUCTED PORTRAYAL OF TERTULLIAN

3.2.1. The Newborn Outlines of Tertullian in the Concentric Circles of the Pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-Montanist as butterfly

---

[56] Yet, no agreement has been reached on the exact date of his becoming a Montanist; (Montaue 1991:112; Evans 1964: i-xl).

[57] Augustine, *Haer*, 86.

[58] Yet, the dating of his death was in dispute. Barnes, for example, suggests as late as 230CE or 240CE, but Quasten after 220CE, and Frend about 240CE.

In general, a conventional view sees Tertullian's high profile in the shame-and-honor category and it connects his transitional period to his distinctive identification in terms of; (1) the son of Roman centurion, (2) the professional Jurist, (3) the Catholic priest of Carthage (Barnes 1971:11-23), and (4) the schismatic Montanist (Duchesne 1914:202; Labriolle 1924:64-5; Baus 1965:203). This regards Tertullian as an African prodigal son who had completely spent father's property (Catholicism) for his own sake (Montanism). Therefore, in his transitional period, Tertullian seemed to be regressing; every phase of transition was wasteful and each new stage was primarily designed to remove the previous phase without any significant interconnection. Rather every new identity of Tertullian was none other than a result of struggle against his old identity. Indeed, in every time of transition, Tertullian had no interconnection with the previous stage and being interrupted by the force of progress, the old Tertullian was swallowed up by the new Tertullian, so as to the Catholic Tertullian over a Pagan Tertullian, and the Montansit Tertullian over the Catholic (Frend 1965:366).

Against such a mechanical way of anatomy, the recent scholarship has begun to suggest the new paradigm of Tertullian. Giving a sympathetic ear to the concept of transitional correlation, this seldom sees Tertullian's period of transition as a Pagan-Catholic-Montanist a separate "one plus one plus one," but rather as an organic three-dimensional unity (Heron 1983:175), preparing a metamorphosis. To this end, it first begins to deconstructs the previous identification of Tertullian as the son of Roman centurion; the professional Jurist; the Catholic priest of Carthage; and the schismatic Montanist, and then this brings the newborn image of Tertullian through a concentric circle of new formula, namely, Pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-butterfly as Montanist. Here every stage forms a coherent whole; the innermost circle is the incarnated Montanist Tertullian. One has access to this circle only through a second circle formed by the witness of Catholic Apologist Tertullian. This witness, in turn, is mediated by the action of the Pagan Tertullian, the third outer circle. Indeed, this threefold structure opens the way for newborn images of Tertullian not only envisaging an old identity, which is revitalized, renewed, and regenerated from its own roots, but also creating a new identity as the point of contact, which brings the reconciliation between the Catholic and Montanist believers.

3.2.2. In the Period of Pagan as Caterpillar: Beyond the Identification as the Son of a

Roman Centurion

The public transitional period of Tertullian starts with his Pagan identity and this is related to his genealogy as the son of a Roman centurion. The validity of his Pagan identity has almost rested on Jerome's text. In it, Jerome has definitely described Tertullian father as *centurio proconsularis* –a centurion of the proconsularis cohort.[59] In addition, the historical references suggest that Tertullian's father must have been one of the Roman officials,[60] who had actively involved in a search-and-destroy mission to the notorious cult of Saturn at Carthage in connection with the sacrifice of children, during the middle of the second century (Frend 1965:345, 361-2, 383; Barnes 1971:14, 16).

Yet, Tertullian's sonship as the Roman centurion has been challenged and one charge against it comes from the lack of historicity. The recent studies have found out that historical accounts rarely give cross-references to such a claim, which means, neither any centurion had simply been born with that title in the Roman army nor had openly displayed any substitutionary human immolation at Carthage in Tertullian's day (Barnes 1971:11-2, 21).[61] In this historical silence, the textual tradition of the *Apologeticum,* a masterpiece of the Apologist Tertullian, may offer a clue to this cacophony. Some scholars take a close look at the significant variances between two readings of the *Apologeticum,* from the Vulgate and from the Fuldensis.

Here at issue is that the different reading of two texts. For the cult of Saturn, the former, the Vulgate, has informed of the charge of infant sacrifice at Carthage in the reign of Tiberius with the word of *patriaenostrae,* while the latter, the Fuldensis, has dated this event back to the time of Tertullian's father with the word of *patrisnostri* (Barnes 1971:19)*.* From this variation, it is presumed then that Jerome perhaps read *patrisnostri* -version of the text and thus deduced the father of this African Apologist as a *centurio proconsularis* (Barnes 1971:19). From this viewpoint, one can draw the reason for its mistake of Tertullian's sonship; Tertullian's identity as the son of a Roman Army official comes from Jerome's false reading of the text (Ferguson

---

[59] Jerome, *De VirisIllustribus.*

[60] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 9.2.

[61] The decline of infant sacrifice in Carthage; L. Poinssot-R.Lantier, *Rev. hist. rel*. LXXXVII (1923), 32, 66; P. Cintas, *Revue africanine* XCII (1947), I; L. Foucher, *Hadrummetum* (1964), 33; J. Carcopino, *Aspects mystiques de la Rome paienne* (1942), 39 –all are quoted from Barnes (1971).

2009:313). Here the claim Tertullian as the son of a Roman centurion falls short of a half-truth.

Yet this is not to say that the denial of Tertullian's sonship as a Roman Army official overlooks Tertullian's transitional period of Pagan as caterpillar. Rather Tertullian's father, regardless of whether he was a Roman official or not, must have played an important role in empowering and disempowering the Pagan Tertullian. Under the umbrella of a Pagan father, young Tertullian could be held in great esteem as the direct beneficiary of the Roman culture and education (Arbesmann 1950: viii); indeed young Tertullian had grown up in a Pagan culture, inherited from his Pagan father. It is easily noted then that Tertullian, through his works, was very knowledgeable of rhetoric, literature, law, and philosophy with all in a high degree (Osborn 1999:361); also he was bilingual in Latin and Greek (Roth 2009:434), so many of his treatises were composed in both languages. The present education of Carthage alone did not stretch Tertullian, so this enthusiastic student had extended his seat of learning to even Rome, the imperial capital.[62] It is no accident then that Tertullian, a thirsty-learner, was soon fully acquainted with "the greater part of the great system of Greco-Roman philosophy,' especially, Stoicism (Labriolle 1924:57). Yet, Tertullian's great passion for the knowledge also might have driven him to study of Scripture – and the biblical literatures.

Soon, the amplitude of the breadth of his intellect made Tertullian becoming the new elite of the North Africa (Power 1971:37). Since the power of Romanization was so pervasive and persuasive, Tertullian, as like any other Roman citizens of his time, had often defended the permanent success of Rome,[63] the mother of his knowledge,[64] but denounced barbarian invasion of the empire. Indeed, the Pagan Tertullian, as the citizen of Roman civilization, had continued to appreciate all the benefits, spring from this "City of God."

Yet, the more Tertullian had taken himself captive by the spirit of the World, the more he sensed his spirit had become pale and powerless; "for with much wisdom comes much sorrow; the more knowledge, the more grief" (Eccl. 1:18). In the recognition that the only knowledge perfectly acquire was the knowledge of limitation, Tertullian felt suffocated not by its lack or

---

[62] Tertullian, *De Cultu Feminarum,* 1.7.

[63] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 30. 3-4.

[64] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 32. 1; *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, 24. 18.

emptiness, but by its richness of knowledge. Yet this subversion of the world-knowledge had not left him a painful trauma alone. Filling the gap of "the spirit of the age" with the place of experience, Tertullian had have turned his attention to Christianity as the reversal of the world-truth (Ellul 1986:3). A saturation of the Pagan philosophy had ultimately led the Pagan Tertullian into a new encounter with Christianity; indeed, the spiritlessness had opened the Pagan Tertullian's eyes and heart in order to see the Spirit in a fresh way (Kierkegaard 1944:84-5).

For the Pagan Tertullian, as a new elite in Rome (Ferguson 2009:314), Christianity then came with an alternative to this worldly knowledge and this led his rapid breakaway from "the spirit of the age." As this Pagan intelligentsia moved in the history of the Son of Man, this acted as a magnet for him as a major breakthrough in his intellectual vacuum. Then Tertullian was drawn into a "brave new world" until it even invited comparison with the Pagan and Christian world (Labriolle 1924:58).[65] The journey of the two different worlds had ultimately made Tertullian an ugly duckling; the experience of both dissimilation and assimilation. For the Pagan Tertullian, this tension seem so intimidating that any effort was unfruitful in conciliating between the two worlds (Labriolle 1924:59). If one world was increased, then the other world must be decreased and yet, he soon recognized that there was a power behind this opposition. Beyond a mere dichotomization, two worlds were in a state of flux and it was a paradox, which took hold of them together and thereby gave them shape and coherence; it provided them a cosmos rather than a chaos (Migliore 2004:105).

Although Tertullian's turnaround from the pagan worldview was phenomenal, the scales still remained in his eyes and this required the second awakening of paradox: the paradox between Christian philosophers and Christian martyrs. Significant was that this new experience brought the Pagan Tertullian to a great turning point becoming the Catholic Tertullian (Arbesmann 1950: viii; Ferguson 2009:313). His recognition of paradox from the outside Pagan world had induced the Pagan Tertullian to turn his attention to the inside Christian world as an alternative

---

[65] It is well known that Tertullian in his treatises not only had quoted the great number of texts from scripture, but also had interpreted and paraphrased them for the purpose of persuading and triumphing the opponents. Tertullian, according to Labriolle, had possessed both the Old (Alexandrian Canon) and New Testament, which was consisted of the twenty seven books; Tertullian, however, omitted his quotations from the 2nd Epistle of Peter, the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of John, and the Epistle of James; he had attributed the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas (ibid, 58, note 3).

shelter. Yet it was not long before Tertullian found himself in paradox within the contemporary Christian world. To his great surprise, the Christian world was not the Garden of Eden, far distanced from the Pagan world. What was worse, these two worlds were intermingled and fused together under the name of pre-and-post Christianity (Simon 1973:385). [66] This ambiguity added fuel to the fire of Tertullian's inner struggling of the old Pagan with the new Christian belief[67] and thus filled him with repugnance. Soon a question followed him; "Can the Christian world really call itself as the better world?", or "Can a farewell to paganism really guarantee a warm greeting to Christians who go hand in hand with such a corrupted world?" [68]

This unbearable weight of self-question had reached its climax when the Pagan Tertullian witnessed the Christian martyrs whose majority belonged to the illiterate plebs, "the mass of simple believers" (Croix 2006:157).[69] The historical accounts have evidently stated that the milieu facing this African thinker bore the sobriety of the Pagan persecution over the whole churches in Carthage, his native city (Warfield 1930:4).[70] Then, this life-and-death situation turned the life and faith of all believers upside down as well. What mostly astounded such an African intelligentsia was the dubious practice of Christian thinkers/philosophers. While a number of ordinary Christians had voluntarily thrown in their lot with their crucified master, the most high-class Christian thinkers/philosophers, whose main slogans were Christianity is the true philosophy, had rather thrown in the towel out of fear of persecution.[71]

The absurdity of the situation made Tertullian speechless. For him, any hesitancy or reluctance of Christian philosophers, which endorsed a certain form of martyrdom, was none other than

---

[66] Especially this compatibility of Christianity and pagan philosophy is well preserved in Justin Martyr's works as positive, not negative, element (*Apol*. 5.4, ANF vol. 1)

[67] Tertullian explicitly rejected philosophy as the vain curiosity, but implicitly was proud of his cultural strengths (*De Anima* 21. 5); such conflict, of course, was not unique to him as a Christian writer.

[68] Tertullian, *De Pallio*. 6. 2.

[69] The recent studies, however, have also suggested that there is the strong evidence for wealthy Christians in the church at Carthage, while finding in few traces of low classes there. The general social composition of Carthaginian church, however, is unclear.

[70] For better circumstances on persecution, especially see in Tertullian's treatise, *Ad. Scap.,* 5.

[71] Justin was an outstanding exception, so when Tertullian called him as 'philosopher and martyr', it should be considered not antithetical but complimentary (Osborn 1997:33).

the subterfuge, rooted in love of life. Tertullian saw it merely as the cloak of guilt with a view to justifying their flight from persecution.[72] In the eyes of Pagan Tertullian, Christian philosophers dug their own graves. These philosophically inclined educated Christians were now intent on making Christianity philosophically respectable and thus such philosophically learned Christians easily made themselves the followers of the Christian Gnostics who had often brought doubt or controversy into the Church (Kaufman 1991:170). In their self-contradiction, Christian philosophers had expected more than the teaching of Scripture, and thereby they had run away from the Bible more reasonably and arrogantly (Kaufman 1991:170).

Such an observation had provided the Pagan Tertullian a perspective, which could see him, surrounded by the same philosophical trap and thus helped him escaping from the mire of the perverted logic. Indeed, it had led Pagan Tertullian's rendezvous with the Catholic Tertullian. Yet, this is not to say this had brought a complete rupture between the Pagan and Catholic Tertullian. Instead, both had shown a productive tension as a coherent whole, just as a caterpillar went to cocoon as a continuing process. Furthermore, such a transitional correlation may give a significant clue to his famous-but-intriguing question; "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"[73] It is generally recognized that this bold question represents Tertullian's belief in the negative relationship of Christianity and Pagan philosophy (Simon 1973:385). Yet, Tertullian's caterpillar-cocoon correlation has made the tune of this rhetoric completely different. Here the Pagan-Catholic Tertullian did not merely deplore the world-philosophy relation as the source of the errors,[74] so Athens after all could teach nothing to Jerusalem (Gonzales 1974:22-3). Rather the crux of Pagan-Catholic Tertullian's argument was the strange seduction of confluence, which had persistently attempted to link the static Athens with the dynamic Jerusalem in a wild dream of Christian thinkers/philosophers (Gonzales 1974:23).

For the Pagan-Catholic Tertullian, the problem was a panegyric of confluence, namely, a superficial attempt at arbitrarily reconciling Christianity and Pagan philosophy under the aegis of "Logos-Christology" (Thyssen 2006:137). Then, it was Tertullian's Pagan-

---

[72] Clement, *Stromata*, iv.10.76; It is often reported that Clement of Alexandria, Christian philosopher, had fled Severan persecution in Alexandria in 202(Eusebius, *HE*, 6.11.6; 6.14.9); Tertullian, by contrast, refuted it regarding flight from persecution as apostasy (*Ad Uxorem,*1.3.4)

[73] Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum,* 7.9.

[74] Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum,* 7.3.

Catholic/caterpillar-cocoon correlation, which had precisely detected the arsenal of sophism and thereby had given him a warning signal. In other words, the transitional correlation had made it possible for the Pagan-Catholic Tertullian to remain in balance with the Pagan-Catholic perspective, and this perspective had placed him in an aura of clear discernment. In fact, as the bearer of Pagan-Catholic, Tertullian was able to shed light on the dark side of confluence. Indeed, Tertullian's transitional correlation reminded of the fact that the premature marriage between Christianity and Pagan philosophy would end in miscarriage (Thyssen 2006:146) and this perception gave Tertullian a sense of urgency to preserve s Jerusalem from the intrigue of Athens (Kaufman 1991:172).

Here Tertullian's overriding aim was to disclose the acid of confluence, not of conflict, between Athens and Jerusalem, which had shrewdly been conspired by Christian thinkers/philosophers (Kaufman 1991:171-2). Their cheap conciliation, for Tertullian as the bearer of transitional correlation, was in danger as well as in vain. For him, the arguments of Christian thinkers/philosophers did rather savour of hypocrisy. They had just contrived to get their own tranquility. On the basis of their comfortable life, these Christian intelligentsias, on the one hand, had relentlessly propagated that the confluence of Athens-Jerusalem may bring a new shelter for the believers. Yet, on the other hand, they were quick to flee from the martyrdom,[75] persecution,[76] and repentance[77] to the cause of this shelter (Labriolle 1924:77). What was clear for Tertullian was that Christian thinkers/philosophers had intentionally tortured truth[78] and, in doing so, devalued fellow believers from hearer of the Word to hearer of the World.

Tertullian's transitional correlation, then, had dramatically changed the tune of the question. In it, the question, "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" could be heard as a song of rebuke, but also as a song of lament. As the bearer of the transitional correlation, Tertullian took to pity Athens, the headquarter of Christian thinkers/philosophers, which had continued to misuse her broken mirror with a view to justifying her self-deception as an identical twin with Jerusalem, the home of Christian martyrs. Yet, Tertullian's transitional correlation made his lamentation

---

[75] Tertullian, *Scorp.*, i.

[76] Tertullian, *De Fuga.*, 5-8, 10.

[77] Tertullian, *De Paen.*, 5, 10-12.

[78] Tertullian, *De Anima*, 18. 7.

progressive, not retrogressive; it gave Tertullian a sort of immunity against the risk of the second infection from Christian thinkers/philosophers and thereby made it possible for him to be part of the Christian martyrs. Anchoring himself to the transitional correlation, Tertullian could have penetrated a fallacy of the Christian narcissists. For him, Christian thinkers/philosophers had made the fatal mistake of justifying the current brokenness of Athens as the precondition to the future perfectness of Jerusalem. They had relentlessly provided a distorted picture that the confluence of Jerusalem-Athens could establish a new mode of faith (Barnes 1971:211-232). In this false belief, Christian thinkers/philosophers had even acted like new leaders of the Church, overemphasizing their ability to blend Old Jerusalem with New Athens (Gonzales 1974:17-25).

The increase of intellectual self-indulgence called for Tertullian's immediate engagement. Relying on his transitional correlation, Tertullian could discover the deceit of the advocates for Athens-Jerusalem confluence. For the bearer of transitional correlation, they were none other than parasites upon Christian martyrs; they simply sapped Jerusalem's glory, which had basically been built on the baptism in the blood (Birley 1993:47). As if a parasite, in the first stage, was just relying on a host for its survival, but later it was gradually taking over the host by killing its life, Christian thinkers/philosophers were intelligently boasting about their fabricated prowess. Facing with a conspiracy of Athens, Tertullian's transitional correlation had begun to activate with great sensitivity; this gave him considerable alarm that the troops of Athens had moved into the city of Jerusalem in order to sack the treasure of Christian martyrs (Countryman 1979:261-2).

Then, Tertullian sent an SOS message to paradox for a remedy against this contagion of Athens (Powell 1975:33); the transitional correlation led him to impose paradox on Athens paradoxically. Tertullian's transitional correlation convinced him that paradox alone would make straight paradox again (Kierkegaard 1944:84-5). Yet, a hasty generalization was not his way. Here of particular interest was sheer subtlety of Tertullian's paradox based on his transitional correlation. In fact, Tertullian's paradox was pregnant with a double-deconstruction (Marshall 2012:479-93); first, on the basis of the Pagan-Catholic experience, Tertullian had vigorously deconstructed the confluence of Athens with Jerusalem. Then, from this vantage point of the relation between Athens and Jerusalem as a broken mirror, he had finally destroyed it again to construct the new identity of Jerusalem, entirely apart from the

first shallow confluence between the two.

Significant was that Tertullian's transitional correlation, its paradoxical connection of the Pagan-Catholic/caterpillar-cocoon, had ushered him into a new phase of disconnection. By the way of this paradoxical correlation, he could have been alienated from the band of Christian thinkers/philosophers. This rupture was decisive. Here, Tertullian did not perform a neat trick like a lizard, just amputating its own tail to save its life. Rather he had to pay the penalty with his head for cutting his tail, which might lead him into the Christian thinkers/philosophers. For Tertullian, this was not a burden, but a joy because he was convinced that the blood of Christian martyrs would save life but, that of Christian thinkers/philosopher would kill soul (Thomassen 2004:242-3).

This, in a sense, may also explain the reason why Tertullian is often called a paranoid puritan. Before the increasing attempts to substitute the blood of Christian martyrs for that of Christian thinkers/philosophers, Tertullian might feel a sense of responsibility to remain as the bearer of the martyrs (Evans 1976:32-3). As a parable of parasite indicated, tears of Christian thinkers/philosophers were no little than a veneer of repentance and such crocodile tears, like a virus, could spread out quickly to the believers and thus dilute secretly the nature of the blood of Christian martyrs. Symptoms were already evident. The intellectual role of the bishops was strongly emphasized and doctrinal sophistications were undisputedly justified; the educated bishops ranked a distinctive leadership based on their intellectual pre-eminence (Countryman 1979:261). This had rapidly enhanced the rate of virus, which had already infected the blood of Christian martyrs within the Church. In this time of crisis, Tertullian might have found a puritanical needle as the best safeguard against the second infection of the Church. Impelled by a sense of urgency, Tertullian had to take puritan as a preventive action for those who were not immune to the blood-shifting of Christian thinkers/philosophers.

In addition, Tertullian's puritanical character may also indicate that the cycle of his transition had been entering upon a new period from caterpillar to cocoon. When a caterpillar has eaten enough leaves, it must go into a process of cocoon to grow its wings from inside. In the similar way, in his transitional correlation, the saturation of Catholic Tertullian naturally called for the Puritan Tertullian as a next state. Casting a speculative look at the intellectual indulgence of Christian thinkers/philosophers, Tertullian, at the same time, had apologetically characterized

the seriousness of heresy as a scar face of intelligence.[79] For him, Christian heretics were actually in cahoots with philosophy (Osborn 1997:42). The heresies, like a praying mantis (meaning prophet as Greek), had camouflaged their threats and harms in intellectual curiosities. Then, when the time was ripe, they stood tall and spread their forelegs in an attempt to pinch or bite; in spite of their prayer-like posture, praying mantis (heresies) were exclusively predatory to eat their prey alive. Their sexual cannibalism had clearly showed their destructive nature. The female praying mantis had begun feeding by biting off a head of a male one to enhance her fertilization. After finishing this grotesque mating, they gave birth to a deformed baby, who was crying out, "in the beginning was Reason." (Thyssen 2006:159). This rampant of intellectual challenge made Tertullian's apology essentially puritanical in order to put the church in quarantine.

To be sure, Tertullian transitional correlation had characterized his new identity. As the bearer of Pagan-Catholic/caterpillar-cocoon correlation, Tertullian had experienced twofold conversion in connection with the relationship between Christian thinkers/philosophers and Christian martyrs. First, he had converted from the argument of Pagan philosophy, focusing on conflict between Pagan and Christian world, and then he had lapsed from the argument of Christian philosophy, emphasizing the confluence between Athens and Jerusalem. The first conversion helped him removing intellectual scales from his eyes, while the second conversion ushered him into a new identity of the Puritan Apologist. In his transitional correlation, the Pagan-Catholic Tertullian became capable of experiencing, expressing, and communicating with his each stage as a coherent whole.

3.2.3. In the Period of Catholic as cocoon: Beyond the Identification as the Jurist

The accepted view regards the Jurist as a typical character of Catholic Tertullian. From this viewpoint, the Jurist and Catholic Tertullian were identical (Barnes 1971:23). Four reasons are suggested to support this assumption, namely, (1) a homonym, (2) professionalism, (3) contemporariness; and (4) historicity (Barnes 1971:23-4). First, the homonymic name has been often presented as the best evidence to consider. Depending on a small chance of the different

---

[79] In Osborn's observation, such an objection of Tertullian was, however, in direct with philosophers rather than philosophy however (1997:42).

person of the same name, this almost ensures that two African elites are the same person.[80] Second, the professionalism also suggests both are one and the same. Admittedly, the Catholic Tertullian is very good at Roman law and this quality positively renders that both are identical. Third, the historical account also offers that the Jurist is more or less contemporary with the Catholic Tertullian and thus they could be the same person. Lastly, Eusebius's writing bears witness to the same identification of both (Barnes 1971:22-4).[81]

While it is widely accepted that the Jurist are the Catholic Tertullian –and vice versa, there also are many other opinions that refute this view. First, this may overlook a fact that a homonym does not preclude the possibility of the cognomen –indeed, it is possible to think that there might exist two different Tertullians with the same name at the same period (Barnes 1971:24). Archeological discoveries also support this conjecture; numerous inscriptions show that there are considerable bearers of the same name down through the history of the Roman Empire.[82] All suggest then that a homonym alone is not enough to prove the same identity between the Jurist and the Catholic Tertullian (Barnes 1971:24).

Second, for the professionalism, the frequency of legal language in Tertullian's works is not necessarily a guarantee of his identity as the Jurist. Rather, the historical context alludes that the knowledge of law is a prerequisite to the educated men in Roman society and the Catholic Tertullian, as a beneficiary of the Roman culture, might have learned a good knowledge of the legal terminology as compulsory (Bonner 1949:84). This indicates two possibilities; his expertise in Roman legal principle as the professional Jurist and as the non-professional Jurist. Therefore, the question still remains obscure; the extent of the congruence is high, but, the same token, its reverse also is great.

Third, the assumption that contemporariness may offer the same identification is too naïve. It just relies on a historical co-incidence. On the one hand, the Jurist is already well known as a pupil of Sextus Pomponius and this presumes that his birth was no later than 155 CE (Barnes

---

[80] Labriolle, 'Tertullienjurisconsulte', *Nouv. Rev. d'hist. de droit fr. Et etr.* XXX, 1906, 8 (quoted from Barnes ,1971).

[81] Eusebius, *HE,* 2.2.4.

[82] W. Kunkel, *Herkunft und soziale Stellung der romischen Juristen,* 1952, 236 (quoted from Barnes, 1971).

1971:23).[83] On the other hand, the Catholic Tertullian was born between the years 150-160 CE considering his main literary activity during the middle of his age (Labriolle 1925:71, Barnes 1971:58). Yet, recent studies suggest that the Catholic Tertullian is not a pioneer of Christian apology and thereby his masterful work, the *Apologeticum*, can also be considered as a branch of Greek apologists' works, which was already established and widely enjoyed before him (Barnes 1971:58, 108). This may pale the direct correlation between the maturity of his literary work and the advance of his age. Rather this may imply that perhaps he is well aware of this literary tradition and soon surpasses his predecessors in his great genius (Burrow 1988:209). Therefore, it cannot be ignored both of the possibility that the Catholic Tertullian might have been born around 170 CE and thus might not be identical to the professional Jurist.

Lastly, as for the historical evidence, it is mostly indebted to Eusebius' testimony and is barely reliable. It is well known that Eusebius was little interested in the Latin Christian literatures; actually he is almost silent to most famous Latin writers, such as Minucius Felix, Victorinus of Poetovio, and even Cyprian. This lack of attention to the Latin tongues is no exception to the Catholic Tertullian. Perhaps, the *Apologeticum* is the only source that Eusebius refers to as the master of Latin Christian writings. This raises an immediate question if one can expect a careful comparison of the Catholic Tertullian with the Jurist from this passionless researcher. Furthermore, Eusebius' poor Greek translation makes the reading of Tertullian irrelevant and mistrustful (Barnes 1971:5-6, 25-6). In all cases, it is inappropriate to call Eusebius as a witness for the defense of sheer identity of the two Tertullians.

Yet, from the reconstructed perspective of Tertullian, the denial of the same identification does not necessarily represent a complete rupture between two-Tertullian (Morgan 1908:3-10). Rather Tertullian's transitional correlation drives him to a new identity in his caterpillar-cocoon interplay. In fact, such a new perspective never overlooks the positive cohabitation of the Jurist and Catholic Tertullian. Tertullian's transitional correlation may open the way for the possibility of a new identity as the Catholic Tertullian with the Jurist-eye; the Pagan Tertullian had internalized the judicial aspect into the Catholic Tertullian and he even extended it to the level of divine justice. As the bearer of transitional correlation, Tertullian's concern was once again its confluence, not its conflict. For him, the conflict was solvable in anticipation of divine

---

[83] According to Barnes, the Ulpian's citation (Dig. XXXIX. 2.30) gives a hint to this assumption.

justice, but a real vexing problem was the uncritical confluence, which blinded the reality of conflict and thereby attempted to replace the divine justice with the intellectual indulgence. The real enemy was the overuse and abuse of intellectual jurisdiction, which had inflicted on the Church.

As the Catholic Tertullian with the Jurist-eye, he first raised a question to the course of the Roman justice. In his judicial view, the innocent Christians were persecuted in the Roman justice system, which had no logic (Osborn 1997:66); "if [Christians] confess, [they] are tortured; if [Christians] persevere, [they] are punished; if [Christians] deny, [they] are acquitted, because it is an attack on a name, [Christian]."[84] Herein Tertullian had brought a countersuit against the Roman accusation against Christians. For him, the Roman justice was following the perverted logic; the Roman justice became illegal and illogical because it took a process of confluence between good and evil. Tertullian's transitional correlation, then, called for *retorsion*, a forensic defense, against this false charge; indeed, his *retorsion* was sent from the Catholic Tertullian through the Jurist. Tertullian had boldly posted his theses on the door of Roman justice, by saying that, "Roman injustice confirms Christian innocence"; "in dying, Christians conquer[85] as the blood of Christians seed."[86] Here, Tertullian's *retorsion,* went beyond a mere plea of the survival of the Christians. Rather it was a typically robust manifesto for their ultimate hope of victory (Burrows 1988:211) because his *retorsion* was deeply rooted in the divine justice.

Yet, this is not to say that Tertullian's justice was in speculative metaphysics. As the Jurist-eyed Catholic, Tertullian's *retorsion* had rather touched the tangible reality of persecution and sought a retributive –but also, restorative –justice. To this end, Tertullian had realigned the stuffed Roman justice as an antiseptic agent against the bacterial infection of heresy. In his technical argument of the prescription, or a juridical objection, Tertullian had asserted a complete rejection of heretics' use of Scripture[87] (Quasten 1953:270); they have no right to appeal to Scripture. Here at issue was once again the reappraisal of confluence; heretics were

---

[84] Tertullian, *Apologeticum,* 2.20.

[85] Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 50. 3.

[86] Tertullian, *Apologeticum,* 50.13.
[87] Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum,* 15.

asserting their authority as the sharers of Scripture. Against it, Tertullian's response was simple and clear; "Be still! You are not in the same league as ours!" For him, any attempt to confound wheat with weeds was unjust and had to be rooted out.[88] Therefore, in his *retorsion* (Burrow 1988:211-2, 247), the parable of the weeds (Matt. 13:24-30) was not enough; the divine retribution allowed both –wheat and weeds –grew together until the harvest, but Tertullian's retribution had forced the Roman justice to go and pull them up before they sprouted and formed heads.

Yet, Tertullian's transitional correlation had never let his *retorsion* remain retributive. As a caterpillar continued to eat (destroys) leaves and spin (constructs) a cocoon for the next stage, Tertullian's legal retribution to heretics had also invited ethical restoration of Christians as a protective covering for the future transformation. Here Tertullian viewed retributions as a process of cocoon that prepared Christians for a new phase of faith. Therefore, for Tertullian, the process of cocoon was never inactive and defenseless. Rather this may include a series of dynamic and vibrant movements; it would require both a voluntary self-withdrawal into a cocoon and a proactive self-construction for future transformation. This may also explain that Tertullian's *retorsion,* or his retributive justice, was always pregnant with restoration. The price was, however, costly; Tertullian had to run the risk of taking both a refuge and a catacomb; both a resting and a burial place. Yet, this was not to say that he acted self-destructing. Rather Tertullian's *retorsion* was self-renewing and even self-transforming in terms of retribution-restoration interplay.

Again, this resulted in the advance of his holiness. In fact, the aim of Tertullian's *retorsion* was to integrate a process of cocoon both externally and internally; Tertullian had devoted himself to reconcile the external persecution and internal preservation. At the end of this process, Tertullian had found a nexus of relations, namely, holiness, as the core of Christian purity. As his transitional correlation indicated, Tertullian's holiness was holistic; it represented a complete preservation from within as well as from without (Bryant 1998:49-77). Indeed, a process of external cocoon had led Christians to the alienation from the world and it acted as a mirror of a process of internal cocoon, namely, the Christian holy life; for Tertullian, the

---

[88] Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum,* 3.

internal process of holiness had always preceded the external process of holiness. In other words, Tertullian was well aware that the disintegration always started from within, not from without.

Tertullian's holiness, on the one hand, made him extremely vigorous against wavering Christians in general and post-baptismal sinners in particular. For him, such an internal crackdown was closely related to an external collapse. It is God's will that Christians must be holy (1Th 4:3); "Be holy because I, the Lord your God, am holy" (Lev. 19:2). In Tertullian's holiness, wavering believers were the usual suspects of post-baptismal sinners (Bryant 1998:50). As the exodus-Israelites in a wilderness had always wished to go back to the exiled-Israelites, wavering believers were remained discontent to the Christian holy life. For Tertullian's holiness, they were the double-betrayers; first, they had canceled the conversion promise of a new life in the Spirit, and second, they had taken out every opportunity not only for transforming themselves, but also for serving the fellow believers as a member of the sanctified community. Therefore, Tertullian saw the act of backsliding as willful and thereby unforgivable; "You have abandoned me; therefore, I now abandon you" (2 Chr. 12:5).
.

Even if Tertullian's holiness had verified that he was a devout believer, it on the other hand, did not limit him in an exclusive summary justice (Bryant 1998:76). Tertullian's transitional correlation had prevented his holiness from being private and subjective. Rather the Catholic Tertullian with Jurist-eye made his holiness as both retributive and restorative; in his transitional correlation, Tertullian could see any subsequent return of God's elect to sin's dominion as an opportunity to inclusively reconcile the believers, not to exclusive repel them from the Church. Yet, for him, this opportunity of special cleansing must be granted only for those who had sinned to sin no more. Tertullian had clarified that the second remission of sins should be final and it would be restricted to the genuinely repentant in order for it not to be taken as a pretext for continued sinning. For him, the grant of perpetual penitence and restoration for the baptismal sin was out of the question. As the baptismal sin had ultimately led the faithful to be spiritually dead to Christ and thereby dead to salvation, God alone could grant his fallen saints a special Jubilee, the second, but final divine remission.[89]

---

[89] Tertullian, *De Baptismo*. 10. 3; *De Pudicitia*, 2, 3, 13, 18, 19, 21, and 22.

Yet, a critical question stands out; "Is Tertullian's holiness code in relation to the second remission actually consistent from the very beginning?" A seemingly very different tone of his arguments on this issue had added fuel to the fire of such curiosity. Some have argued that they found definite discrepancies in Tertullian's penitential attitude between his earlier and later treatises, especially between the *De Paenitentia* and *De Pudicitia*. From this vantage point, they have criticized Tertullian's duplicity in his dealing with the baptismal sinners. In this assessment, Tertullian had played a double game; in his early treatise, the *De Paenitentia,* the Catholic Tertullian had contended that divine pardon refuses to no category of sin if the sinner might follow the process of penance; so, no sin was actually irremissible by God. Yet, in his later work, the *De Pudicitia,* he had suddenly shifted his position and restricted the scope of remission only to the venial sins. Here, Tertullian had ruled out the serious offenses –such as sins of adultery and fornication –from the previous category of remission. Many have assumed Tertullian's acceptance to Montanism as the reason of such change; the Montanist vigor of asceticism might have forced him to reword his Catholic belief in a stricter sense. In order for justifying his re-conversion, the Montanist Tertullian had to contradict everything the Catholic Tertullian had said.

Again, Tertullian's transitional correlation may give a new vista of this criticism. This dynamic correlation refused to place its bearer in a static position. Indeed, the nature of Tertullian's transitional correlation was centrifugal, rather than centripetal. In this sense, the separation of the Catholic Tertullian from the Montanist was as nonsensical as that of a caterpillar from a cocoon; this never admitted that the Montanist Tertullian was the very antithesis of the Catholic Tertullian. Rather, Tertullian's transitional correlation may suggest a new mode of progressive integration of the Catholic and Montanist Tertullian as a coherent whole. Both looked at the same direction with two eyes and the issue was a parasite confluence, his ongoing struggle. Then, Tertullian's transitional correlation had begun to reveal the hidden sin behind the debate of the doctrine of second repentance, namely, the creeping in penitential laxity of the contemporary Catholic Church. For the bearer of transitional correlation, the real problem was that Catholic leadership had exceeded its authority to impose the bishops to distinguish of sins remissible from sins of irremissible. It was none other than the second ambition of confluence, which put the Episcopal control on a par with the divine sovereignty. Here Tertullian's transitional correlation had accused the clerical order of being a self-claimed Judge (Evans 1971:141).

This implied that Tertullian negation of the second penance was not a novelty of his Montanism. Rather, Tertullian, from the first, had opposed adultery, idolatry, and murder as the grave sins, already prescribed in the New Testament tradition (Osborn 1997:172).[90] The teaching of 1 John (5:16-17) had especially been influential for the Catholic Tertullian as the significant reminder of sins, "not lead to death" and of sins, "lead to death." (Daly 1993:97-141)[91] Indeed, Tertullian had actually been consistent in the way he had treated the issue of sin and, from this viewpoint, he had constantly delivered his veto to the overstepping of Episcopal authority over the second repentance. As a catholic, Tertullian had already acknowledged the danger that the Catholic Church was far more vulnerable to the overdose of Episcopal antidote to the second penance, than to the overflow of poisons of post-baptismal sins.[92] Tertullian felt that a wider deployment of sacramental means of grace and absolution was a symptom of Episcopal intervention that was affecting the Church. In this light, Tertullian, as a natural warrior of confluence, regarded the bishops' pardon of grave sins as a secret conspiracy to replace the divine authority by the routinized administration of the Episcopal order (Countryman 1979:268).

From his Catholic period, Tertullian was well aware of a danger of parasitic confluence. For Tertullian, the Catholic Church must have been blind not to realize the danger that she was in; the real danger was that the Episcopal pardon became too cozy for the believers. Yet, it was Tertullian's transitional correlation, as the Pagan-Christian and caterpillar-cocoon interplay, which would not assimilate himself into the Episcopal community and thus could see the true colors of confluence. The Catholic bishops, by contrast, had begun to mix a certain portion of penitential authority into the vessel of divine sovereignty. Neutralized by the power of confluence, they called themselves as the sole ownership of the Urim and the Thummim (Ryrie 1986:63-4)[93]; then, the authority of the Catholic priest had begun to supersede the divine Priest; they had claimed the ecclesiastical supremacy over the divine authority in relation to the second

---

[90] For example, the Decalogue; Matt. 10:32-33; Matt. 15:19; Mark 7:21; 1 Cor. 6:9-10; 1 Cor. 5:11.

[91] Besides, in his later treatises, Tertullian, with all parallel passages, tirelessly repeated that grave sins were irremissible in the sight of God; *De Pudicitia* 2, 19; *Adversus Marcionem* 4, 28; *De Corona Militis* 2; *Adversus Praxean* 26; *De Fuga in Persecutione* 7.

[92] Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* ,7.
[93] See also, Exodus, 28:29-30.

remission. For Tertullian, the situation was desperate. Disregarding the divine light and perfection, the Episcopal system had simply granted sinners via 'cleromancy,' namely, casting of lots. This made-in-bishop jubilee offer had mechanically produced the recycled penitents through the ready-made process of church sacrament under the bishops' signature. Tertullian saw it as a pseudo rectification, resulting from the instigation of confluence.

This resulted in Tertullian's bitter denunciation of the *Shepherd of Hermas* (Bryant 1998:77). In Tertullian's time, the *Shepherd* had widely been considered as a sacred text[94] and thus had often been cited as divinely inspired prophecy among many contemporary Christians. Yet, Tertullian did not hesitate to denigrate it as the shepherd of adulterers.[95] He had especially made biting remarks about the main teaching of the text, a reckless promise of the second remission for the post-baptismal sinners. Here, the Catholic Tertullian had thundered against the *Shepherd* not because it dealt with the doctrine of the second repentance, but because it defended the doctrine of the second confluence. Tertullian found the same danger of confluence in the text and this made him suspicious of the motives of the *Shepherd*.

All indicated the subtlety of Tertullian's transitional correlation and this had run through his previous two treatises, the *De Paenitentia and De Pudicitia,* as well. Both had dealt with his greater emphasis on the separate-but-subsequent challenges with different-but-distinct purposes. The nature of his dynamic correlation, as both the Pagan-Catholic and caterpillar-cocoon interplay, had chimed in with these two treatises. One side was the Pagan-Catholic Tertullian, who was invoked by the fallen saints, so his central concern in the *De Paenitentia,* was on the renewal of the holiness of the Christian believers, and thereby his purpose was basically pastoral and personal. The other was as the bearer of caterpillar-cocoon correlation, who was angered by the self-indulgent bishops, so his aim in the *De Pudicitia* was to restore the holiness of God, and thus his goal was chiefly theological and communal (Barnes 1971:247, Daly 1993:109-115).

Tertullian's transitional correlation, then, maintained a good balance in his argument of two

---

[94] It has been generally remarked that the text was one of the most influential of early Church writings, see, Eusebius, *HE*, 3.3.6.

[95] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia,*10 and 20.

treatises. Here Tertullian had constituted double punishment for the Episcopal order in particular and the fellow Christians in particular; they were both guilty and not guilty; they were both plaintiff and defendant. To this end, in one sense, Tertullian acted like a staunch judge, who was quite unsympathetic to the Roman persecutors and heretics as plaintiff. Yet, at the same time, he, like a lawyer, presented a great favor to the persecuted Christians as innocent defendants. Then, Tertullian had suddenly changed his previous attitude to the same Christian believers and tried to take them to court again. For Tertullian, these vindicated Christians were in jeopardy as a result of sympathy to the Episcopal pardon; they were becoming recidivists on the question of second remission with the connivance of the Catholic bishops. This suggested the reason why the Pagan-Catholic Tertullian had consistently written these two treatises in a separate-but-subsequent way, as like two sides of a verdict. One (*De Paenitentia)* was for the persecuted Christians in a view of a defense lawyer and the other (*De Pudicitia)* was for the perverted believers under control of the Catholic bishops in a view of a prosecuting attorney (Burrow 1988:209-35). Once again, at issue here was not temporal retribution, but continual restoration of Christian believers. Tertullian's argument, formed by his transitional correlation, was not against them, but for them. Both advocacy for and accusation against them actually acted as a springboard for the edification of wavering believers; this double punishment rather had served an instrument of change that would ultimately connect both extremes; between plaintiff and defendant; between advocate and prosecution, in order for bringing restitution, not retribution.

3.2.4. In the Period of Catholic as cocoon: Beyond the Identification as the Priest of Carthage

From the conventional perspective, Tertullian's apparent Catholic radiances had cemented his position as a priest of Carthage. This view has often been quoted in Jerome's text as verification. Jerome, in his book, had plainly described Tertullian as Tertullianus presbyter,[96] who "fought the good fight of faith" against the baleful Roman Catholic clerics (Barnes 1971:11). Also, Tertullian seemed to have affiliated himself with a priestly group, who could preach the sermon in a church on the Lord's day.[97] His several treatises, written in the form of sermons, lent

---

[96] Jerome, *De VirisIllustribus.*

[97] Tertullian, *De Anima*, 9.4.

support to this assumption (Barnes 1971:117)[98]. After all, Tertullian's considerable influences over the Church seldom agreed that he was a mere layperson. Tertullian was already a force to be reckoned with in the whole African Church and this characterized his priestly position most undeniably (Quasten 1953:247).

Yet, the question still remains. First, Tertullian's priesthood at Carthage tends to contradict his own testimony. In some writings, Tertullian had often preferred his position as the laity to that of priest; "For are not we lay people also priest?,"[99] and "But when we are called upon to be the peers of priests in discipline, we lay aside our fillets and pair off!"[100] Furthermore, Tertullian' confession of the state of matrimony –it would be almost certain that Tertullian was married to a Christian wife [101] –had raised the question about his priesthood. [102] By acknowledging all, recent scholarship has suggested Tertullian's new position as one of the leading members of the "council of lay elders" in the Carthaginian Christian community (Kärkkäinen 2002:41; Tabbernee 2007:137).

Tertullian's laity has gained more support in the perspective of transitional correlation. As the bearer of the caterpillar-cocoon correlation, Tertullian perhaps wished to act as a point of contact between the priests and laity. For him, the Church, as a big cocoon, must be a closely knit-community, which was not only able to nurture each caterpillar (each believer) in it, but also to encourage every one of them to undergone a complete transformation. Yet, as the Church went into the process of institution, its original ability to serve the members would decline; rather the thread of cocoon had just spun off a tight-knit inner sanctum, namely, the royal priesthood. This was the birth of the monarchical episcopate, which had indelibly

---

[98] For more details in Tertullian's writings as a form of sermon, see his treatise, the *De Spectaculis*, and *De Cultu Feminarum* II.

[99] Tertullian, *De Exhortatione Castitatis* 7.3.

[100] Tertullian, *De Monogamia,* 12.2.

[101] Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem* I, 1. 1 and II, 1. 1.

[102] Many apostolic fathers, however, have seen the married state as the normal way of life for all Christians, clergy as well as laity; Clement of Rome*, Epistle to the Corinthians*, 38. 2 (ANF); Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to Polycarp*, 5. 2 (ANF); see also Harnack (1908:212-3). It was not until the fourth century that church authority took a strict stance over the sexual life of church ministers; (Frazee 1972:149-67).

imprinted on Tertullian's mind as an absurdity (Brent 1995:427-57, 537-40). Such a process of church institution, by nature, was incompatible with Tertullian's transitional correlation and this made it hard to assimilate himself into the priestly inner-circle in the Church.

Yet, this is not to say yet that Tertullian's transitional correlation had blindly forced him to turn his back to the Catholic Church (Dunn 2004:557). What really annoyed him was the elite power group, who was too busy with the establishment of its own basilica under the guise of church institution. Therefore, for Tertullian, as the bearer of dynamic transitional correlation, becoming a priest was nothing less than becoming a puppet for the Catholic Hierarchy. Indeed, Tertullian saw a priestly ordination not as an incentive, but as a disincentive to the Church in terms of the elevation of church hierarchy. The priesthood, unwittingly, had instigated the classification of believers' status within the Church (Krytatis 1987:91). For the ecclesiastical power elite, the priesthood was just the privilege to effectively manipulate or control the laity by justifying the dominant-subordinate relationship between clergy and laity. Indeed, Tertullian regarded the priesthood going astray as a symptom of schism. Tertullian, led by the transitional correlation, could find a potential danger of church division from the priestly addition to church institution. It was not a coincident then that Tertullian was determined to find his genuine identity in the identifiable leadership, "who was simply part of the whole people of God" (Fee 1991:122), rather than in the priestly office, exercising its authority over the congregation for its own sake. Apart from the clerical hierarchy, Tertullian wished to become an inspirational 'hungry' lay-leader. In other words, Tertullian's dynamic transitional correlation had encouraged him to choose the position of a lay leader rather than that of an ordained priest under the aegis of the ecclesiastical power elite.[103]

Here Tertullian's avowal of lay leadership as a catholic (Tabbernee 2007:137) gives a significant clue to the nature of the Montaist Tertullian. At the heart of his transitional correlation was the process of its continuity, not its discontinuity. Tertullian's laity-glorification as a catholic sheds new light on his New Prophecy-glorification as a Montanist. Put it in another way, the caterpillar-cocoon process can be understood as a preliminary step to

---

[103] It is, however, interesting to note that Tertullian seemed not to come from poor family, but from an affluent one; his education and general manner, as shown before, clearly supported this explanation. See his treatise the *Ad Uxorem*, I. 1. 2.

the new construction of cocoon-butterfly process in a dynamic and consistent correlation. In this sense, Tertullian's transitional correlation may imply that the Catholic Tertullian, from the first, was pregnant with the Montanist Tertullian, just as a process of cocoon, from the beginning, was a preparation for a new and complete transformation to a butterfly. This also suggests that Tertullian's appeal to the laity, thus, was both a forth telling and foretelling to verify his past and future identification (Swete 1912:83). To be sure, in his transitional circle of caterpillar-cocoon-butterfly correlation, Tertullian had consistently anticipated identifying himself with this dynamic and coherent process. Indeed, the relation of the Pagan-Catholic and the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian had played a decisive role in fulfilling separate-but-complementary needs as a coherent whole, as the caterpillar-cocoon process was followed by the cocoon-butterfly stage without any contradiction.

Yet, a doubt is still permissible. This new perspective actually may betray the existing view of Tertullian in a critical way. From the accepted framework, a portrayal of the Montanist Tertullian was presented in chronological order; Tertullian's honor as a Catholic Apologist was interrupted by his later acceptance to Montanism and hereafter he had lived the rest of his life as captain of the African New Prophecy.[104] From this viewpoint, Tertullian's anti-priesthood belief was considered as mere propaganda to justify his loyalty to Montanism and its egalitarian teaching. According to this line of argument, the deeds of the pro-Montanist Tertullian had exactly corresponded with that of anti-Catholic Tertullian. His later writings were nothing but the Montanist manifesto, just satisfying itching ears of the adherents (Barnes 1971:135).

From this viewpoint, the later writings of the pro-Montanist Tertullian were mere downright propagandas filled with his Montanist fantasy and respect; this then devalued Tertullian's later writings as a deformation from his earlier ones. In this fashion, the pro-Montanist Tertullian had made the error of a blanket denial of his previous Catholic belief. In fact, according to this view, there can easily be found a portrayal of the Catholic Apologist, conforming to the Catholic belief in Tertullian's early treatises; he had apparently represented himself as an apostle for the Hierarchy, not for the laity. (Tabbernee 2007:66) To this end, the Catholic Tertullian not only had castigated heretics due to their lack of proper hierarchical organization

---

[104] Jerome, *De Vir. Ill*. 53.

(*De Raescriptionibus Haereticorum,* 41), but also had condemned them as outcasts against the hierarchical order. It came as no surprise then that Tertullian had even publicly exalted the monarchical episcopate as the foundation of apostolic succession (Ibid 20-21; 32-36), having the sole authority over the Christian baptism (*De Baptismo,* 17).

For the accepted perspective, the matter is clear. After turning to a pro-Montanist, Tertullian wished to remove his previous mistake, namely, the praise of priesthood in his catholic days (Barnes 1971:83). Then the conspiracy with the laity seemed the best way for the Montanist Tertullian to make clear his loyalty to anti-Catholicism to both the Catholics and Montanists (Tabbernee 2007:65). The goal of this public announcement was two-fold; it had declared his disconnection with the Catholic Church and also had promised his connection with the New Prophecy. The allegation that the Montanist Tertullian was the product of his anti-Catholicism was getting clearer and clearer; his anti-clerical statements had readily echoed in his late works, especially, the *De Exhortatione Castitatis* and *De Monogamia,*[105], already recognizing him as a fervent Montanist (between 208-211 CE).

Interestingly enough, it is a dialectical approach, which can put a strain on this well-organized chronological viewpoint. The way of juxtaposition of the Catholic and Montanist Tertullian will be losing its ground before the dynamic correlation of the Catholic-Tertullian continuum; the Catholic Tertullian, from the first, had broached the subject of anti-clergy with the Montanist Tertullian. In a nutshell, the Catholic Tertullian, from his pre-Montanist period, had written the pro-Montanist works inexorably. Indeed, a free and dynamic transitional correlation had replaced the relation of the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian from immanent confrontation to transcendent conciliation. To this end, Tertullian's early writings merit closer inspection and two treatises, namely, the *De Cultu Feminarum* II and *De Oratorie*, are especially drawing attention. Both were known as Tertullian's first literary works, written by 196-197 and 198-203 CE respectively (Barnes 1971:30-56), freed from the New Prophecy's influence. In presenting the relevant themes, between these two treatises found the common ground whose aim was to address virtue of Christian women's modesty in general[106] and the necessity of their wearing a veil in a church in particular.[107] In both treatises, it is important to find the

---

[105] This chronological order follows Barnes' suggestion (1971:30-56).
[106] Tertullian, *Cult. Fem.* II. 1. 2.

nature of Tertullian's transitional correlation, which integrated his anti-clerical attitude with a touch of sarcasm.

First, the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian, in his *De Cultu Feminarum* II, had appealed that Christian women should absent themselves from ostentatious bodily adornments, including fancy hair-style, which encouraged their lustfulness.[108] For him, the cultivating beauty of Christian women would be acceptable to none but their husband (Barnes 1971:101). Yet, Tertullian' transitional correlation demands readers to approach this treatise with more subtlety. It refused to listen to a voice of the Catholic Tertullian alone in connection with a virtue of Christian women's modesty. Rather his transitional correlation needed someone who had also a sympathetic ear to the Montanist Tertullian. Herein Tertullian's transitional correlation opened a new vista for this early treatise; it reminded of the fact that the author of this treatise was the bearer of the dynamic transitional correlation. Like a Möbius strip, the character of Catholic-Montanist Tertullian was merged into the text both separately and corporately; in this book, there was both tensions and integrations; both parallels and contrasts, stemming from two-Tertullians.

Riding on his transitional correlation, Tertullian, in this treatise, had deftly weaved a special theme and it was beyond the virtue of self-control in Christian life. For greater emphasis, Tertullian had intentionally hidden a pearl inside the shell of female Christian's integrity. Here the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian may become a forerunner of a "framed narrative," a subtle literary technique (Witzel 1987:380-414). In this story within a story, the Christian woman with modesty issues was an introductory part for a more emphasized second narrative, the sheer contestation. In particular, such a second story within the main narrative began to pale as a stereotype of the Catholic Tertullian as an anti-feminist. Rather it revealed his Montanist character as an anti-clericalist. In this frame story, what Tertullian was actually unfolding was a hidden vice of Catholic Hierarchy, referring to a cardinal virtue of Christian women; indeed his treatise was a biting satire on the hypocrisy of the Catholic Hierarchy in the church of Carthage.

---

[107] Tertullian, *Orat*. 21. 1.

[108] Tertullian, *Cult. Fem*. II. 3. 1.

Tertullian's use of a frame story also implied that he was trying to project his transitional correlation into this treatise by swapping a virtue for a vice, namely, by replacing the Christian women with the Catholic hierarchy. In other words, Tertullian's vitriol came with the proviso that he had described Christian women as a broken symbol for the high-ranking Catholic clergy. Then, the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian had deftly substituted the virtue of Christian self-control for the vice of Catholic clerical self-corruption. This subtle overlap at first acted as a camouflage for the Catholic hierarchy, but later it actually exposed the tawdry side of the ecclesiastical inner circles, who were covered with worldly ornaments (Tabbernee 2007:388); there was a good deal of hypocrisy, which made the ecclesiastical narrowness as a necessary evil for the good of the Church institution. Here, Tertullian had temporarily hidden the hypocrisy of the Catholic Hierarchy in order to open it in public.

Tertullian's use of framed narrative made the *De Cultu Feminarum* II a new version of black comedy. In his short drama, Tertullian attempted a deliberate cover-up. In it, the ecclesiastical duplicity, his main theme, was not openly revealed, but secretly hidden in the form of Christian admonition. For the author of framed narrative, the direct evacuation of tragedy would not be efficacious even if it could bring catharsis; he knew that it just left the reader complacent. Rather Tertullian had expected that the absence of cathartic resolution, or so-called "alienation effect" (Brecht quoted by Brooker 1994:191, 193), encouraged readers to take political action in the real world, in order to fill the gap they had experienced vicariously. Bearing a constant interplay of internal transition, Tertullian had outwardly created the dual-character in a virtue-vice relation, namely, the Catholic Hierarchy, wearing Christian women's clothing. Here the beam of Tertullian's satire had penetrated the veil of Christian women, covered by the cloak of the clerical nobility;

> As for those who dye their hair, do they desire to turn themselves into Gauls or Germans? Shame on them: may the daughters of wisdom leave such foolishness![109]

---

[109] Tertullian, *Cult. Fem*. II. 3. 1.

Second, Tertullian's anti-clerical voice had become more elaborate in the *De Oratorie,* one of his earliest works. Once again, the text shows sublime paradox; paradox against a strong defense of the Catholic tradition from the pro-Montanist perspective in a free and dynamic relation of Catholic-Montanist Tertullian. Here, Tertullian had reinforced the previous theme of two-faces of Catholic Hierarchy as an extension of the *De Cultu Feminarum* II. Therefore, for the method, the framed story had been revisited with more creative and critical manners. Here appeared the Christian women, especially virgins, as a virtual character and they acted for the existing Hierocracy. The role of such surrogate virgins was manifest in a subsequent character-transfer from unveiling virgins to uncompromised clergies. In this pattern of twist, Tertullian called the attention of an intricate web of relation between the uncovered head and uncircumcised heart. Here the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian once again had presented a hidden caricature of Catholic priesthood, mixed with unveiling virgins in the Church.

In such a bizarre convolution of the character, Tertullian on the one hand had acted as a vigorous catholic; he at first had tackled the local custom of the Church at Carthage, granting virgins to attend services without a veil.[110] For the Catholic Tertullian, the tolerance of unveiling virgins in a church was a serious erosion of the Catholic tradition, already well preserved in the apostle Paul's instruction (1 Cor. 11:5). In his eyes, the attendance of virgins without veils not only dishonored themselves, but also disavowed the validity of the Church tradition. Yet, on the other hand, Tertullian here had showed another character as a Montanist and anti-clericalist. The Montanist Tertullian saw unveiling-virgin syndrome in the Carthaginian church[111] as a constant onslaught of confluence, namely, a will to parasite on truth. Therefore, for him, at issue here was not only the unveiling heads of virgins, but also the unveiling hearts of clergies.

That was why Tertullian, in this treatise, had skillfully drawn together the different threads of all aspect in a fresh way; he had put his intrinsic interest of anti-priesthood on unveiling virgins so that they undertook their secret mission to the Catholic clergies. In doing so, Tertullian had dramatically changed the status of virgins without veil; the virgins, at first, were sacked to

---

[110] Tertullian, *Orat*. 21. 1.

[111] Tertullian, *De Viginibus* ,1.11.

propitiate the Catholic Tertullian, but now these virtual characters were held in high regard by the Montanist Tertullian because they had successfully unraveled the unfaithfulness of the Carthaginian clergies. Through the lens of the female double agent, the Montanist Tertullian had exhibited ugly faces of the monarchical episcopate, full of its own pride. Indeed, in his metaphorical war on scar faced priesthood, Tertullian had contrived unveiling virgins as a virtual character against clerical sordidness, namely, a dangerous and provocative display of confluence (Daniel-Hughes 2010:191).

Yet, complicating the issue was the hiddenness of the Montanist Tertullian. Despite Tertullian's imparting his flavor of anti-clericalism to unveiling virgins, his real purpose through this virtual character was actually hidden, not open in this text. Tertullian' intended concealment primarily resulted from the nature of his transitional correlation. Here, Tertullian's concern was two-fold. On the one hand, facing with spiritual unveiling, he, as a faithful catholic had anticipated the immediate vindication of veiling in the church not only for "the sanction of tradition," but also for "a return to apostolic practice and precept" (Barnes 1971:140). Yet, on the other hand, the Montanist Tertullian recognized that a parasitic confluence from within was far more harmful than conflict from without. Thus, for him, it was better to make believers' ears dull and close their eyes before reaching a quick and instant solution.

This is not to say that the Montanist Tertullian was imprisoned in his own world. Rather his hiddenness was a significant mode of communication to express both his resistance to and reconciliation with the Catholic Hierarchy. Tertullian's hiddenness, in this sense, was related to 'sensus plenoir', a fuller sense. Tertullian saw that this additional and deeper meaning existed in the form of a spiritual layer on top of the literal (Brown 1955:92). From Tertullian's view, the truth thus was to be revealed, not to be taught, and every revelation needed a certain period of latency for a successful rendezvous between the original intent and 'sensus plenoir'; in this regard, he was also aware that this dormancy often involved a time of silence and even a time of shame. This vantage point sheds new light on Tertullian's hiddenness. Indeed the riddle of his concealment was now laid bare; to heal their blindness, the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian, had painfully, but purposefully, spit on the ground and made some mud with the saliva, and put, or veiled, it on the blind eyes of the episcopate, not merely touched, or unveiled, them. By granting them a temporal shame, or blinding their blindness, Tertullian wished to encourage the Catholic Hierarchy to go and wash the blind eyes in the Pool of Revelation for

the complete healing.

Tertullian's hiddenness in this light acted as a springboard for the development of his transitional correlation. In his free and dynamic correlation, the Montanist Tertullian was part of his Christian life, relating to the Catholic Tertullian and in the same vein, his anti-clericalism rested on his adherence of laity as well as priesthood. In this light, Tertullian, in this treatise, wished to demonstrate such an energetic tension by analogy with hiddenness, namely, another vibrant combination of unveiling virgins with unveiling Catholic Hierarchy. As the long-dormant period of cocoon is needed for the dynamic life of a butterfly as the next transformative stage, the hiddenness of Montanist Tertullian in the unveiling virgins was necessary for the new perspective of Catholic Tertullian in the unveiling Catholic Hierarchy; for Tertullian, the blind of the Catholic Hierarchy was temporarily designed to give them new sight.

Tertullian's hiddenness, as self-replicating living organisms grew, had manifested again in his later twin treatises, the *De Virginibus Velandis* (208-9 CE) and the *Passion of Perpetua*. Of particular interest in the first treatise was the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian's mirror reading, a reading of uncircumcised Catholic Hierarchy through the unveiling virgins. Just like his past two works, Tertullian, in this later writing, once again created his special method of virtual character of unveiling virgins as the unveiling clergies in the Church. Insinuating an uncovered head as an indicator of spiritual depravity, Tertullian had closely connected the act of virgins/clergies' unveiling to his anti-priesthood perspective. Again, Tertullian's willingness to laity had reechoed in this links of the uncovered Christian virgins with the uncircumcised Catholic clergies. Transmitting his distaste for the priesthood to uncovered virgins, as the virtual character of the Catholic Hierarchy, Tertullian had implicitly revealed his reluctance to the hierarchical control;

> Wear the armor of your (*virgins/clergies*) shame; surround yourself with a rampart of your; construct a dam for your sex that neither lets out your eyes nor admits the eyes of a stranger. Drape yourself in a woman's clothing so that you (*virgins/clergies*) might protect your virginal (*clerical*) status[112] (*italics* are the researcher's emphasis)

---

[112] Tertullian, the *De Virginibus Velandis,*16. 5.

Besides, a particular interest lies in Tertullian's attitude to female Christians, especially virgins, in relation to his anti-priesthood. From the Catholic-Montanist perspective, his adherence to laity had shone through female Christians in general and virgins in particular. With that in mind, Tertullian, in this treatise, had given virgins, his virtual characters, challenging assignments: the disclosure about hypocrisy of the Catholic Hierarchy. It was important to note that Tertullian gave these female Christians special missions not because he disparaged them, but because he appreciated their ability and value; as much as his anti-clericalism dishonored duality of the powerful Catholic Hierarchy, his enthusiasm for the laity raised a special salute to courage of the powerless female Christians. This sheds new light on Tertullian's view on Christian women. Against existing suspicions on him, Tertullian's transitional correlation may neutralize his previous façade of misogynist (Church 1975:83-101; Carnelley 1989:31-5; Finlay 2003:503-25) and the father of male ecclesiology (Torjesen 1995; Angelo 1995). Rather Tertullian might have known the fact that the Montanist female prophets, such as Priscilla and Maximilla, were accorded the honorable title as virgin among adherents[113] and it would be a constant reminder of his respect for the female Christians.

This outstanding respect for the female Christians may attribute the authorship of the *Passion of Perpetua* to Tertullian, the bearer of Catholic-Montanist correlation. In general, the book was known as the prison diary of Vibia Perpetua, a young African Christian matron. It was often said that the text was authored by a member of Montansim and Perpetua, the main character of the narrative, was a female martyr of the same sect (Musurillo 1972; Robinson 1891). Although there have been scholarly dissentions,[114] many agree that the Montanist Tertullian was the final redactor of such a noble and moving testimony of a Carthaginian woman (Quasten 1950:181) in terms of undeniable stylistic and theological similarities with his other writings.[115] Indeed, Tertullian's great admiration for the laity, both male and female believer, was deeply embedded in this tale of a tragic heroine. In this book, Tertullian, as the contemporary of Perpetua, had showed the quintessence of his laity-mania in a melody of deep

---

[113] Eusebius, *HE*, 5. 18. 3.

[114] Its authorship is still debatable; some assert Tertullian (Beek, Quasten), others the deacon Pomponius (Braun, Campos), and few to Pseudo Tertullian. For more details, see Barnes (1971, 263-266).

[115] In particular, the resemblance in phrase and syntax and in words and ideas is offered between Tertullian's works, the *Ad Martyres* and *De Patientia.*

compassion.

In fact, the *Passion* had well preserved the character of Tertullian's laity in a vivid way; the text had audaciously described the privileged upper clergy as a peripheral and minor image. In Perpetua's dream, for example, the bishop and presbyter, whose name were Optatus and Aspasius, had thrown themselves at the feet of Perpetua, the female lay-martyr and even begged her for their reconciliation (Barnes 1971:75-78). Such a humorous caricature towards the clerical nobility had reflected Tertullian's anti-clericalism. Also, this, on the flipside of the coin, paled the assumption of Tertullian as a priest, who could ridicule his contemporary clergies. Rather the narration of the *Passion* implied that Tertullian, as the lay leader, was reluctant to assimilate himself into the high-class clerical group. Tertullian found a sort of shrewd intrigue from the ordination of Catholic Hierarchy, which was constantly increasing its benefits at the cost of lay believers; for him, the current consecration had merely served as a license to intensify the monopoly of church oligarchy. Yet, the *Passion* suggests that Tertullian's adoption of laity, or his abortion of clericalism, was not mere antagonism against the privileged clergies. Indeed, neither was Tertullian's aim at all cost the triumph over the church hierarchy, nor was his salvific joy the ecclesiastical *Pax Laymana,* namely, the renaissance of the laity in the Church. Rather in his transitional correlation, Tertullian's laity no longer was in conflict with the clerical authority, but was perceived as a major breakthrough in tension of both. In *Passion*, Tertullian had developed this new relationship through the passion of Perpetua, as his fraternal twin (Barnes 1971:79).

The narrative went on to say that upon the clerical group's asking for reconciliation, Perpetua was interrupted by angels and the petition of high-class hierarchy was laughed out of court. Significant was Perpetua's response; she was not displeased when these two officials came to her for a resolution. Rather this African heroine was very moved and was about to embrace begging petitioners in sincerity. For Perpetua –and also Tertullian, the opposition to the church offices did not necessarily mean the opposition to the Church; rather, for them –both Perpetua and Tertullian, anti-clericalism was not entirely the synonym of anti-Catholicism (Barnes 1971:85). Thus, the text had underlined the great depth of Tertullian's laity through Perpetua as a proof of his/her unique, compassionate, and intense love and ambition for the Church's reconciliation and rejuvenation.

This energetic lay-clerical relation resulted from Tertullian's free and dynamic transitional correlation, which was heading for the future transformation. The *Passion* in particular had shown a sublime combination through Perpetua's action. This made the *Passion* another version of the Book of Acts, transforming the period of incubation into the power of life. Here, Tertullian, the author of the book, had described Perpeuta as his female disciple, who was chosen to preach the power of his transitional correlation. In the *Passion*, Tertullian, had imparted of his transitional power to Perpetua and that impartation enabled her to take on greater responsibility to witness this gospel of correlation to other people, regardless of believers and non-believers; the ordained and non-ordained. In this light, Perpetua's action, bestowed by Tertullian, was by nature more dynamic than static; more sympathetic than unsympathetic; more inspirational than institutional (Barnes 1971:83).

The great dynamic power of Perpetua illuminated that Tertullian, her master, had reached the maturity of his transitional period; the correlation of the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian began to turn its direction into the phase of Montanist, the last transitional correlation. That was why the *Passion* was full of Montanist light. In text, Tertullian had described the vision, prophecy, sacrament, and the power of the martyrs with great emphasis (Wypustek 1997:276-297). Furthermore, Perpetua's heroic action as a female lay-Christian had evidently advocated restoring egalitarianism, a main catchphrase of the original Montanism. For the Montanists, they not only had admitted converts of every age, rank, background, but even had encouraged any female member to take the lead in the field of ministry (Schaff 1992:424). In fact, two of the three prophets, as the center of Montanism, were women, namely, Priscilla and Maximilla and they, like Montanus, were the indispensable female figures in Montanism history (Trevett 1998:12).

In this sense, the central role of Perpetua in the text had the remarkable parallels in a deep veneration for the Montanist female prophets. With a great support of Tertullian, Perpeuta, a laywoman, acted as a reincarnation of the original new prophetess who had already enjoyed high esteem within the sect (Barnes 1971:79). Yet, more remarkable was Perpetua's double-incarnation: the first was incarnation of lay Perpetua from Tertullian's anti-clericalism and the

second was incarnation of female Perpetua from the Montanists' anti-elitism.[116] In the *Passion*, Tertullian with intent had deftly weaved the image of Perpetua and that of the precedent female legends together in order to redeem the glory of lay leadership in the Church. Figuratively speaking, Tertullian, in this text, wished to draw water from the Montanists' well with Perpetua's basket, which had long been buried by ecclesiastical opponents and thereby its effect as well as existence forgotten.

Yet Tertullian's Perpetua was not a mere retrospective of the Montanist female prophets; rather this vision of double-incarnation had encouraged her to participate in a process of concentric circle of concern. Indeed, Tertullian's Perpetua acted as the center of circles, embracing two different –but having the same center –size of circles, namely, the original and African Montanism. Indeed, both were the two aspects of the same reality and what held them together was Perpetua's double-incarnation, which maintained the same distance from the center. Yet, in the eyes of Perpetua –and also Tertullian, the Catholic Church was infatuated with the monarchical episcopate and this rigid hierarchy threatened the state of dynamic equilibrium.

Soon, Tertullian's Perpetua was challenged by the Catholic Hierarchy. At first glance, Perpetua, a female laity, seemed to be engaged in a losing battle against a great power of the priests, forcefully encroaching on her circle. The organizational episcopate had attempted to snatch the central point from Perpetua, the common center, and then they drew a circle of the clerical hierarchy as its new center. Tertullian's Perpetua regarded it as an act of provocation from the Kingdom of elite and took an action to bringing the Power of Keys back to the temple of the laity. Yet, for her, the best way of recapture was not in retaliation against the Catholic priests, but in repentance of them. Here was the real purpose of Tertullian's Perpetua. The action of Perpetua was aimed at drawing the Catholic priests to the true voice of lay Christians, so that they tore their robes and wept for their own funeral. Then all the desecrated clergies, from the least to the greatest, once again would pledge themselves to the teaching of Montanist egalitarianism, by granting each one of them equal rights and privileges to serve the Body of

---

[116] For Tertullian's admission of female prophets and teachers, see; *De Ieiuniis* 1; *Adversus Praxean* 1; *De Resurrectione Carnis* 2; *De Anima* 9; but for his repudiation of female pretensions to the ministry, also see; *De Baptismo* 1, 17.

Christ.[117] This made up the central message of Tertullian's Perpetua repentance and renewal, not rebuke and revenge. Thus, the text served as an eloquent reminder of the restoration of the broken relationship between clergy and laity. To this end, Tertullian was determined to give Perpetua, his female doppelganger, out to Catholic authorities as a propitiatory offering. Then, Perpetua built an altar and presented fellowship offerings under the aegis of Tertullian. Yet, this is not to say that Perpetua knelt down herself in self-abasement. Rather she was committing herself to bring reconciliation to the church.

In this sense, Perpetua's double-incarnation resembled the divine incarnation, a willing sacrifice as the promise of reconciliation in the form of absurdity. Against the Catholic priests' challenge, Tertullian's Perpetua had volunteered to return to death penalty as the place of womb –the origin of incarnation –where both pain and joy coexisted as a whole. She came to realize that the pain of incarnation culminated in crucifixion and it was mysteriously intertwined with joy of reconciliation. Indeed, Perpetua's painful step of incarnation ultimately opened the door of joyful rejuvenation. This was the real power of Perpetua' double-incarnation. Here this female lay-Christian, without unfurling a large banner of retaliation, could embrace the pain of self-incarnation for the encouragement of reconciliation in the institutionalizing, systematizing, and legitimizing Catholic Hierarchy.

Then, in the *Passion,* Tertullian's Perpetua elevated the lay-clerical relationship as a convergent, not divergent, point to be reconciled. For Tertullian's Perpetua, this relationship was to be considered as two strong pillars of the Christian oikos as soul mates, not as antagonists. So, the impact of Perpetua's reconciliation was two-fold. On the one hand, this led Perpetua to the place of ransom for the reconciliation of two separated pillars in the Church; between the privileged clergies and the underprivileged laities; between pro-catholic inner circles and pro-Montanist outer circles. On the other hand, Perpetua's self-offering paved the way for the veneration of African Montanism; indeed, Perpetua's heroic sacrifice had inaugurated a new era of African New Prophecy. This vulnerable female lay believer, like Samson, stood between the cracked two pillars, and leaned against them –her right hand on the laity and her left hand

---

[117] Nonetheless, as has been noted earlier, it is quite reminiscent that the Montanist ministry shared with other churches a threefold structure; for more details, see; Tabbernee (2007:422); Vokes (1966:307-15); and Osborn (1997:177).

on the clergy. Then such a Christian woman embraced two pillars with all her might, lest the wall fell on both groups. Indeed, Perpetua, as a restitutor, not as an institutor, was willing to sacrifice herself for the reconciliation of broken pillars.

To be sure Tertullian's transitional correlation could not –and should not –pass his Catholic period without any new wave of transformation. In essence, this free and energetic internal pulse was in direct contact with the external propulsion in its ripple effect. In the wake of his dynamic correlation, Tertullian was determined to be ordained as a lay leader, not as a priest (Barnes 1971:11-23; Tabbernee 2007:137). This made the stereotypical image of the priest Tertullian obsolete. Rather it gave an alternative view of the African lay leader in a dynamic relation of Catholic and Montansit Tertullian. As a cocoon-butterfly interplay was inseparably associated with each other, so was the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian in his transitional correlation (Rankin 1986:73-9). Moreover, this close interconnection characterized Tertullian's paradoxical lay-clerical relation as soul mates, not as antagonists. Tertullian, in both his early and late treatises, had consistently phased in new subtle methods, such as creating a virtual character, and inserting the framed story, in order to maximize his sheer intention: repentance, renewal and reconciliation with the duality of the Catholic Hierarchy. In particular, the *Passion* was the quintessence of his manifestation of dual-character. Here, Tertullian as the author of the text, had imparted his anti-clericalism to Perpetua and she had served as the mediator, who was not only embracing both anti-priesthood and pro-laity, but also connecting both the original and African Montanism. Then Perpetua's double incarnation became a powerful reminder that the Tertullian, through Perpetua, had acted as a catalytic restitutor to bring the reconciliation between the Catholic Hierarchy and Montanist lay believers in his/her free and dynamic transitional correlation (Tabbernee 2007:157) .

3.2.5. In the Period of Montanist as Butterfly: Beyond the Identification as the Schismatic

Tertullian's apologia for the laity was deeply interconnected with his Catholic-Montanist correlation. Simply speaking, his laity had passed into transitional correlation by osmosis. Yet, Tertullian's investiture of the lay was fairly iconoclastic in his days: the heyday of Catholicism. In fact, the Catholic Hierarchy was unhappy when this lay leader had relentlessly preached the power of the laity and had often questioned about the nature of the "kingdom of priest" (Merrill 2008). Even, the Catholic Hierarchy was in fear that this laity-syndrome might spread widely,

even to the extent of being involved in the protest of laity against the Episcopal basilica. Soon, the Catholic priest took up a defensive position; then, Tertullian's loyalty to the Catholic Church was seriously questioned and challenged. For the clerical elites, this office-resistant lay leader seemed to have more confidence in his voices than in the high-ranking priesthood. This was partly the explanation of the condemnation of the Catholic Tertullian as the unrewarded prophet sympathizer (Gilmour 1996:60-68).

From this viewpoint, it had long been taken for granted that Tertullian's acceptance to Montanism had precipitated another Montanist-crisis in Carthaginian community and his complete submission to the doctrine of the Phrygian prophets had finally ruptured the delicate peace with the Catholic Church (Labriolle 1924:64; 91). Then, this view had simply judged the Montanist Tertullian as sheep-stealer or separatist who spoiled his career and relationship with the Catholic Church. Such a negative view often found its support in the fact that Tertullian did not satisfy his own personal conversion and rather had actively persuaded others to make them ardent adherents to his new religion. St Augustine's witness was often quoted to prove Tertullian's guilty; after leaving the bosom of the Catholic Church, Tertullian even build a clandestine structure of a splinter group, the Tertullianists.[118]

Yet, there has been different opinions as well. Even in the so-called Montanist treatises, mostly written after 207,[119] this African prodigal son had seldom spoken that he had defiantly divided the inherited property and went out his father's house without looking back (Powell 1975:34). Rather it was Tertullian's coolness toward the Catholic Hierarchy, which caused deep ripples in the heart of the Catholic authorities and they in return had organized themselves to defend their religious privileges (Baus 1965:205). Despite Tertullian's laity as part of his effort to raise a protective wall "to keep off the wolves, but not a fence to divide the sheep" (Schaff 1885:181), the result was bad enough. The Catholic Hierarchy, who was hurt by Tertullian as a prodigal son, devalued him as a self-anointed king of a questionable sect and as a chief antagonist against the church order. This mutual disrespect became a growing hindrance to détente of the two opponents; for Tertullian, the Catholic Hierarchy had become a tyrant, while, at the same

---

[118] Augustine, *Heresies*, 86.

[119] This follows the view that Tertullian opened his adherent to Montanism in 207 and thus Montanist treatises are attributed to his works in/after 207; for more details, see, (Barnes 1971:55).

time, for the Catholic priests, Tertullian had become a puppet of Montanism (Walker 1968 11-16).

Such tensions had heightened and reached even an impasse, as neither side would compromise on three aspects in particular: ecstatic prophecy, martyrdom, and asceticism. On the one sense, this seemed a reappearance of the Montanist crisis at Phrygia, the ecclesiastical conflict between the rural prophets and urban priests (Kyrtatis and Croix 1987:91). Yet, on the other sense, the difference was Tertullian's readiness to cope with such a déjà view with new eyes, namely, his transitional correlation. The clerical hierarchy had continued to brand Tertullian's later works as the Montanist monologue at best, and a collection of pulp fiction at worst (Williams 2013:130). Yet, it was Tertullian's transitional correlation, which had emancipated his later works from the thralldom of the theme of African prodigal son. Interesting was that Tertullian, through his transitional correlation, had returned to the very same place where the Phrygian seers were defeated; in doing so, he wished to celebrate their rebirth, not to lament their burial, as if a phoenix rose from the ashes.

For the first celebration of Tertullian was the resurrection of ecstasy. Tertullian had recognized that the clerical hierarchy had held fast to its belief that genuine prophets should not speak in ecstasy (Frend 1982:81). With a single-minded desire to strengthen the church institution, the Catholic Hierarchy had begun to justify a false dualism where it divided the church government between the priests and prophets; while the Catholic priest refused the possibility of both/and, they rather drove to an either/or for the sake of their sole leadership. Then, they had just built up the priestly landmark at the expense of the prophets' inspiration. For Tertullian, as the bearer of transitional correlation, this autocratic type of leadership was too stiff and narrow. The Catholic priests had continued to maintain their intransient position under the aegis of Hierarchical shell. Tertullian perceived the Catholic priests' ecclesiastical intolerance might ultimately lead them to the condition of cataract so that they would go blind to the spiritual need.

Here Tertullian was determined to be a retrospective prophet (Childs 2009:362-77), who called for the manifestation of spiritual ecstasy. For Tertullian, the suppression of old-but good spiritual gifts was a vain attempt to hide the 'Empty Tomb.' No matter what seal the Catholic priests had deliberately put on the tomb of the Montanist ecstasy stone, the stone was already

rolled away from the entrance of the tomb, so nobody could deny the resurrection of the crucified Montanist ecstasy. Since Tertullian, like Mary Magdalene, was an eyewitness to see the risen ecstasy,[120] the Catholic claim that ecstasy was still dead was meaningless and useless. Rather Tertullian was confirmed in his belief and he continued to take his apologetic attitude of the Montanist ecstasy against the heavy opposition of the Catholic Hierarchy (Ferguson 2009:318). For Tertullian, both as externally the witness of the Montanist risen ecstasy and internally the bearer of transitional correlation, his main task was to go and tell the good news, namely, the resurrection of Montansit ecstasy, to the Catholic remnant who were still keeping the empty tomb. As an eyewitness to the empty tomb, Tertullian, afraid but filled with joy, could have audaciously proclaimed the resurrection of Montanist ecstasy; "Received [the ecstasy] not as a tradition, but as truth[121]!" Even if the Catholic Hierarchy had willfully ignored its resurrection from the dead, Tertullian's eyewitness bore testimony to the rebirth of Montanist ecstasy, not as an invisible phantom, but as a tangible body (Montague 1991:97-101). Yet, Tertullian's celebration of Montanist ecstasy was bombarded with heavy suspicions. The Catholic Hierarchy had conducted a witch-hunt against Tertullian and devalued him as a schismatic who brought confusion and division within the Church.

Ironically, the miraculous truth made the Catholic priests' heart even harder. Upon seeing the empty tomb, the majority of Catholic Hierarchy gathered together and devised a plot. Then, the Catholic priests had intentionally begun to circulate the rumor that the Montanists had come during the night and stolen the body of ecstasy away while they were asleep. Tertullian's response to this Catholic report was phenomenal; not only did he historically affirmed his witness to the resurrection of Montansit ecstasy, but also theologically refuted the official report. Tertullian had claimed that the Catholic priests could have experience the Montanist ecstasy while they were asleep (Nasrallah 2003:132-40).[122] Here, Tertullian's goal was twofold; one was his strong conviction that the Montanist ecstasy should go back to the Church even if it

---

[120] Tertullian, in his treatise (*De Anima*, 9.4), had vividly described the frequency of ecstatic possession through an episode of Christian woman, who used to become ecstatic and converse with angels, sometimes even with God, in his church at Carthage.

[121] Tertullian, *De Virginibus Velandis*. 1.1.

[122] She adds that the same word *ecstasis* is used by the Septuagiant for Adam's "deep sleep" (Gen 2:21); for Abraham's "trance" (Gen 15:2); for "derangement of mind" (Deut 28:28) and by the New Testament for Peter and Paul's state of mind when they received visions (Acts 10:10; 22:17)

seemed to be beyond reason and mind.[123] The other was his correction of the Catholic report, manipulated by the clerical hierarchy. Then, Tertullian had elaborated on his argument. In fact, in contrast to the Catholic Hierarchy's claim, sleeping was not a sufficient excuse to prove the missing body of Montanist ecstasy. If the Catholic priests really fell asleep before the tomb, they rather must have recognized the resurrection of Montanist ecstasy even in their deep sleep (Frend 1984:256). The reason was that the state of sleeping, or trance, was a great channel to experience ecstasy as the result of power of the Spirit (Tabbernee 2007:134). In the same way as Adam (Gen. 2:21), the first prophet, had experienced ecstasy in his deep sleep in the Garden of Eden, the Montanist ecstasy by nature preserved the memory of what it had seen and heard even if its faculties of sense were suspended as a positive gift from God (William 1948:277-85). Therefore, in this sense, the Catholic report was no longer defensive to justify the claim that the body of Montanist ecstasy was stolen by the followers during the sleep of the Catholic Hierarchy.

Yet, Tertullian was careful enough not to round off the scriptural sharp point by slavishly swapping ecstasy for charismata; he saw ecstasy a necessary condition for the manifestation of charismata, but he did not regard the former as a direct cause of the latter. Rather for Tertullian, every mode of ecstasy was not always indispensable for charismata, but no sheer ecstasy was revealed without charismata. Such distinction made it possible for Tertullian to be set apart from the band of fanatical extremists. For him, the state of ecstasy was the particular moment when humans, especially Christian believers, regardless of whether they were the clergy or not, were able to enter into direct relation with God under divine sovereignty (Ford 1971:3-29). Yet, the Catholic Hierarchy were busy with a lucid dreaming, a dream that the dreamer consciously knew that they were dreaming.

In this light, for Tertullian, the Montanist prophets had many scores to pay off. Indeed, his witness to the Montanist ecstasy was a critical moment when he overcame the hurdles of the Catholic Hierarchy and thereby devoted himself to the restoration of the universal prophet-hood. It was no surprise then that Tertullian celebrated the resurgence of Montanist ecstasy and decided to become an ardent defender of the Montanist new prophets (Barnes 1971:43). Yet, from Tertullian's identity as a retrospective prophet, the question was raised that Tertullian was

---

[123] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 4. 22.5.

definitely charismatic, but also schismatic against the ecclesiastical status quo.

Second, Tertullian's celebration of martyrdom had really added fuel to the fire of the Catholic suspicion. In general, the Catholic Hierarchy had distrusted such celebration of the baptism in the blood as an illegitimate offshoot, derived from the Phrygian soothsayers (Croix 2006:130). For the clerical hierarchy, this was a real hemorrhage of a qualified ex-Catholic Apologist (Croix 2006:198). The Catholic priests began to believe that Tertullian's commitment to martyrdom was just a mask behind which the Montanist prophets worked. They found that the blood issue was actually not so much a matter of concern to the Catholic Tertullian. In his pre-Montanist day, Tertullian had actually taken no scandal at assuming the propriety of flight from persecution. But, scarcely had he plugged himself in the code of Montanism when the celebration of martyrdom had begun to come into play (Tabbernee 2007:131). The Catholic Hierarchy had argued that Tertullian, in his time of Catholic Apologist, had also considered the blood-baptism as an important Christian virtue, but he was much more careful to impose it on the faithful as the absolute duty. [124] In fact, for the Catholic Tertullian, the flight from persecution was both permissible and prudent as clearly instructed on Jesus' command (Barnes 1971:183); "when you persecuted in one place, flee to another" (Mt. 10:23 NIV). The Catholic priests, then, urged that Tertullian's completely changed attitude to martyrdom was nothing but his subordination to the doctrine of Montanism. In this regard, the church hierarchy was convinced that Tertullian's celebration of martyrdom was a mere propagation, rushed in to win cheers at the Montanist believers.

Yet, this claim had met with counterargument. In particular, the nature of Tertullian's transitional correlation had softened a direct contradiction between the Catholic and Montanist Tertullian. For both the Catholic and Montanist Tertullian, martyrdom was "the mark of Jesus."[125] In his dynamic transitional correlation, Tertullian, from the first, had met the risen Christ through the Christian martyrs. In a considerable way, Tertullian's martyrdom-inspired experience, just as St. Paul's experience on a road-to-Damascus, had kept his eyes wide open

---

[124] Tertullian in his treatises, seemed to held this moderate position; see, especially, his treatises, *Ad Uxorem*, I, 3; *De Patientia*, 8; Scorp. 1.11.

[125] It is noteworthy then that Tertullian exhorted the martyrs from one of his earliest extant works, the *Ad Martyras* in 197CE.

to the baptism in the blood in connection with the complete transition of suffering into glory; "the Christians wins a victory when he is executed, a victory whose prize is eternal life"[126] (Barnes 1971:166). Indeed, it was the experience of martyrdom, which had ushered the Pagan Tertullian into a new phase of Catholic Tertullian.

This implied that the origin of Tertullian's Christianity could be traced from his martyrdom-experience. Then, Tertullian's eyewitness of martyrdom played a decisive role in understanding of the relationship between the Catholic and Montanist Tertullian. In fact, martyrdom was an incubator, which allowed a newborn Tertullian to develop until he broke out of the Catholic-Montanist shell; martyrdom had actually led Tertullian not only to Catholic water-baptism, but also to Montanism blood-baptism. For him, with regard to baptism, regardless of water or blood baptism, any negotiation was not allowed (Tabbernee 207:259). That was the reason why the baptism issue, as God's ordained truth,[127] had continued to reecho in his treatises from the *Apologeticum* (197 CE) to the *Ad Scapulam* (212 CE). Indeed, for Tertullian, martyrdom was Alpha and Omega to experience Christianity. Yet, what made Tertullian deeply disappointed was the modesty of the clerical hierarchy. Contrary to the apostolic teachings, the Catholic priests, when persecution struck, were so quickly deserting the gospel of martyrdom and even turning to a different gospel, the gospel of flight from persecution; "Blessed are those who [run away rather than] persecute because of righteousness."[128] Considering this teaching as false, Tertullian did not hesitate to rebuke such an attempt to pervert a gospel of the crucified martyr. From Tertullian's eyes, what was staggering was the scale and speed, the accelerating momentum and the encompassing intrusiveness of this corrupted gospel for the martyrdom dodgers (Chadwick 1993:92). Therefore, for Tertullian, this was unforgivable as well as unacceptable.

Against the Catholic syndrome of flight from persecution,[129] Tertullian's attitude was firm.

---

[126] Tertullian, *Apologeticum,* 50.1.

[127] Tertullian, *Scorp*. 2. 1.

[128] Matthew, 5:10.

[129] Tertullian, *Cor. Mil.* 1. 4; apart from Tertullian's witness, it has been often recognized that the Church was less questionable the propriety of flight from persecution, so that even church authorities, when martyrdom offered, had fled. Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, for example, had taken a refuge in a small house in the country and Clement of Alexandria left to Alexandria to avoid the impending persecution.

For him, there was no prospect of this martyrdom-free gospel. Rather Tertullian found a hope in the primitive witness-martyr interplay, which radically dissociated from the contemporary popular and comfort belief. This rampant inflation of the blood-free baptism in the Catholic Hierarchy had made Tertullian introspective about his previous writings. Yet, the goal of his self-assessment was prospective rather than retrospective; Tertullian was determined to look back on his early writings in order to look forward to his later treatises. This is not to say that the Montanist Tertullian had attempted a break with the Catholic Tertullian by defining his past as soft and irresolute (Baus 1965:203). Rather Tertullian saw his previous writings left areas of blind spot and wished to minimize them, if not completely removed them, through the retro-prospective combination; in this formula, retrospective was open to inspiration while, at the same time, prospective was bound with institution.

This shed new light on the accounts of Tertullian's celebration of martyrdom; this paled the previous fertile areas, resulting from the conflicting perspective between the Catholic and Montanist Tertullian. In this retro-prospective formula, there was a very thin-line between his Catholic believability and Montanist unbelievability to deal with the issue of flight from persecution. From this perspective, the conflicting reading of Tertullian transformed into "meta-narratives" (Lyotard 1984); all had one consistent direction, not just a collection of random story, without exhaustive exclusion of its own independent voices. In this sense, Tertullian's later work, the *De Fuga in Persecutione*, his well-known Montanist text, became part of one big story; for the sake of martyrdom, this Montanist treatise fitted into a grand story in general and particularly connected with other two writings: the *De Patientia* and *Ad Uxorem.* Indeed, under the unifying theme of martyrdom, Tertullian had written meta-narrative, namely, the *De Fuga, De Patientia* and the *Ad Uxorem,* as a coherent whole.

In his meta-narrative, taking the *De Fuga* as the central point, Tertullian had emphasized the Montanist exhortation of martyrdom through the *De Patientia* and the *Ad Uxorem.* To this end, the *De Patientia* was juxtaposed with the *Ad Uxorem*; the juxtaposition of the admonition of flight from persecution with Paul's dictum of marriage. First, Tertullian, through the *De Patientia*, had praised the virtue of patience, which encouraged the persecuted Christians to overcome the current temptations and thus to take the baptism in the blood for their own

volition. [130] Then, he had overlapped the narrative with his adoption of runaway from persecution in the *Ad Uxorem*. This might be designed with a significant caveat in his mind. In this treatise, Tertullian seemed to permit the avoidance of persecution rather than falling into apostasy. Yet, the axiom here was not to choose either flight from persecution, or falling into apostasy, but to avoid both as evil.[131] For Tertullian, St Paul's concession of marriage issue (1 Cor. 7) set a precedent in principle. This great Apostle in advance suggested that better was neither to marry nor to burn with lust; here St. Paul had never admonished Christians for accepting the superiority of marriage over lack of self-control. Rather Paul was trying to reminded that "if it be only called 'good' in comparison with an evil, it is not so much 'good' as a species of lesser evil" (Osborn 1997:169).[132] In the same vein, for Tertullian, neither better nor good was to flee from persecution in comparison with falling into apostasy. Therefore, here Tertullian's argument had nothing to do with a defense of the flight from persecution. Indeed, his point was not relative good, but absolute evil for both runaway from persecution and rush into apostasy.

Here was Tertullian's elaborate intention. Tertullian wished that each of his treatise was understood as a coherent whole in his meta-narrative. Such a reading of Tertullian through meta-narrative made deep inroads into martyrdom in the *De Fuga* as its main theme*;* "flight is wrong, flight is in vain, flight is against the will of God"[133] (Barnes 1971:186)*.* Once again, a central thread run through the oracle of the Montanist as a compendium of his whole concern; "Desire not to die in bed, in childbirth or from fever, but in martyrdom, to glorify him who suffered for us."[134] Therefore, in the frame of meta-narrative, Tertullian's trilogy, namely, the *De Patientia,* the *Ad Uxorem,* and the *De Fuga,* made a particular contribution to his celebration of martyrdom. This may open the way to deftly spin and weave a cacophony of his voices into a coherent vessel: in his mega-narrative framework, there existed a nature of retrospective-prospective; institutional-inspirational; the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian.

---

[130] Tertullian, *De Patientia*, 15. 2.
[131] Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem*, 1. 3. 4.

[132] See also, Tertullian, *De exhortation castitatis*. 3. 7.

[133] Tertullian, *De Fuga*, 5. 3.

[134] Tertullian, *De Fuga*, 9. 4.

Finally, the last celebration was the Tertullian's asceticism (Church 1975:91-2). The name of Tertullian was put on the clerical hierarchy's most wanted black lists when he jumped on the Montanist bandwagon. Then, Tertullian's eagerness for Christian holy life was perfected with Montanist asceticism. Soon, the Apologist Tertullian was called the Montanist puritan. Yet, the Puritan Tertullian was an unwelcome guest for the clerical hierarchy (Gonzales 1974:17). The Catholic Hierarchy was not happy with him who emphasized stricter Christian life. Followed by disbelief, the Catholic Hierarchy began to direct its complaint against him about his rigorous fervor. The Catholic authorities led a witch-hunt against this ascetic, suspected of being a Montanist. Then, Tertullian was accused of a heretic, and thereby a schismatic. Tertullian's seemingly staggering steps on the marriage issue gave the Catholic Hierarchy a conviction that his asceticism was novel and thereby condemnable. The clerical hierarchy had denigrated Tertullian double-tongues on re-marriage (Ferguson, 2009:320); they complained that Tertullian said yes in his early Catholic days, but said no in his later Montanist days. Then, Tertullian's three treatises, the *Ad Uxorem I, II, De Exhortatione Castitatis*, and *De Monogamia,* were presented as evidence to prove him guilty of inconsistency. For the Catholic Hierarchy, Tertullian's duplicity, his denigration and exaltation of marriage, effectively proved himself as guilty.

This evidence seemed to rule in favor of the plaintiff, the Catholic Hierarchy, rather than of the defendant, the Montanist Tertullian. Having presented the *Ad Uxorem* as the first evidence, the clerical hierarchy argued that what defendant Tertullian said in his early days, was consistent with the teaching of the Catholic Church. In this treatise, without any official connection with Montanism, Tertullian, at first, had showed his appreciation of the Christian marriage. Then, he had expressed his viewpoint on the second marriage as conditional acceptance; Christians could not remarry except but Christians. [135] With this premise, the Catholic Hierarchy maintained that there had been a direct correlation between Tertullian's change of attitude to marriage and his entanglement with Montanism (Ferguson 2009:320). That was the reason why the plaintiff adopted another defendant's treatise, the *De Exhortatione Castitatis* as the second evidence. The Catholic Hierarchy was convinced that this treatise was the physical evidence to demonstrate Tertullian's brain washing by the Phrygian Seers (Tabbernee 2007:131).

---

[135] Tertullian, *Ux* II. 1. 2.

According to the Catholic plaintiff, Tertullian, in this treatise, introduced a new thesis on the Christian second marriage, contrary to his previous argument. Here, his new dissertation was overly didactic under the title of: "the critical evaluation about the negative effect of Christian re-marriage on the spiritual value of continence and virginity." For the Catholic plaintiff, what was truly striking was that the defendant Tertullian now made a quick U-turn on the same issue; in it, he completely denied the Christian second marriage and even branded it as "species of fornication."[136] Therefore, it was clear for the Catholic plaintiff that Tertullian's radical rupture must have to do with his radical embarking upon Montanism (Tabbernee 2007:408). Then, there needed an urgent official sanction. For the Catholic Hierarchy, nothing was more condemnable than a catholic writer who had plagiarized the doctrine of Kataphrygian Heresy in his thesis. Be that as it may, the plagiarized Tertullian must be expelled from the school. The punishment was two-fold. One was the Catholic Tertullian's derailing of research direction; it led him to his disconnection with the Catholics, and the other was his involvement in a plagiarism scandal; it led him to his connection with Montanism. To be sure, for the Catholic plaintiff, the defendant Tertullian's decision was a change for the worse; the Catholic Tertullian had plagiarized the taboo subject to make himself a Montanist doctor.

Yet, this was not the final accusation against Tertullian. Highlighting the contrast between two opposite evidences, the Catholic plaintiff added the third evidence, the *De Monogamia,* as a fatal blow. For the Catholic Hierarchy, this treatise was nothing but a veritable propagandist pamphlet for the sake of Montanist; from beginning to end, this dealt with the doctrine of marriage-remarriage relationship *of* the Montanist, *by* the Montanist, and *for* the Montanist. Defining Catholics as psychic –or non-spiritual, Tertullian had inexorably propagated that the Montanists alone were the genuine bearers of one marriage, guided by the Paraclete, the sustainer of the truth.[137] From the Catholic plaintiff's perspective, Tertullian became his own enemy when he derogated Christian re-marriage. The Catholic Hierarchy criticized that Tertullian's puritanical teaching was the sign of deceiving spirits in later times, contrary to the apostolic teachings; "[hypocritical liars] forbid people to marry and order them to abstain from certain foods, which God created to be received with thanksgiving…" (1 Tim. 4:3 NIV).

---

[136] Tertullian, *Exhort. Cast*. 9. 1.

[137] Tertullian, *Mon*. 1. 2.

Therefore, it was clear for the Catholic plaintiff that the Montanist Tertullian was found guilty; he must be charged as a false teacher, conspiring with the Phrygian Seers (Smith 1943:127-39); for the Catholic plaintiff, the Montanist Tertullian' sin was a crime beyond an extenuation. For the Catholic Hierarchy, all evidences clearly indicated that Tertullian had committed an impeachable offense. What the Catholic plaintiff expected was then that the defendant Tertullian admitted his own guilt and paid for his wrongful deed. Yet, to their surprise, Tertullian rather pleaded the right of silence; while Tertullian refused to admit his sin, he did not deny it either. Instead, Tertullian simply gave his final testimony before the jury; "all evidences being offered by the plaintiff alone could be simply unfair. Every justice had a flip-side, just as a plagiarism was often a two-way relationship, so the point was who and which was the original."

This merits a reinvestigation of Tertullian's case. If Tertullian's intentional subtlety considered, the conflicting reading of his treatises should not be taken at face value; he must have written his literary works, fulfilling separate but complementary purposes. This would pave the way for a reversal of the case; the Catholic plaintiff's evidences, in this sense, could also be chosen as evidences to prove Tertullian's innocence. In this light, the first counter-evidence came from the motif of asceticism. Actually Tertullian's Puritanism, unlike the Catholic plaintiff's argument, was not intended to propagate his spiritual superiority over the psychic Catholics. Rather it encouraged every believer to live by the Spirit, not gratify the desires of the sinful nature; here Tertullian's main aim was moral renovation, rather than religious/political revolution (Church 1975:91). It was rather the clerical megalomaniacs, who blew up things out of all proportion. The Catholic Hierarchy had focused all their energy to ensure the current position and thus they were always nervous of any potential challenges against their regime. In this line of concern, the Catholic plaintiff suspected Tertullian had an ulterior motive in his asceticism.

The second counter-evidence was related to meta-narrative. From this point of view, Tertullian's three treatises were to be understood as a process of continuum toward a point, not as a separate entity without any consistent interconnection. This perspective also had to do with the sensus plenoir, a fuller revelation. The line of Tertullian's argument in this sense was coherent. Tertullian was convinced that Christianity by nature was a revealed religion (Barnes

96

1971: 129, 132) and Montanism was a belief in "the mission of the *Paraclete*" as a progressive revelation (Labriolle 1924:64). For him, it was non-sense to say about the silence of the Spirit much the same as the separateness of God in the OT from the NT; "Who can dare to say that the Paraclete and his revelation has ceased to speak to men?" For Tertullian, his asceticism, together with Christian marriage issue, was deeply rooted in the teaching of the *Paraclete* and it was the progressive and supplementary revelation, primarily in line with the message of Christ.

This paled the Catholic plaintiff's accusations against Tertullian's teaching as novel and pseudo. Rather as the concept of meta-narrative implied, Tertullian's three treatises could be understood as a constant process of development. Just as ancient rhetorical handbooks had divided a speech into certain sections, such as, exordium, narration, proposition, confirmation, and reprehension, each one of the parts was incumbent on Tertullian's asceticism in order to recapitulate and reopen his peroration. Indeed, for Tertullian, every one of his treatises was developed in response to a gradual revelation and thereby all parts fitted together in a relevant way as to the sensus plenoir. This explained Tertullian's asceticism was direct contact with his submission to the Paraclete and his progressive revelation, rather than to his resistance against the Catholic Hierarchy and its traditional teachings. Moreover, in such a frame of meta-narrative-sensus plenoir interplay, one great missing-point was that the Catholic plaintiff was often overconfident of his ability. The clerical hierarchy tended to think that they were the only agent capable of welding divergent revelations into a single doctrine. Of course, this ecclesiastical pride seldom allowed the perspective of fuller revelation with meta-narrative, epitomized by Tertullian's asceticism as an on-going consistent process.

From this point, Tertullian's vindication entered upon a new phase. Taken the sensus plenoir as central, the meta-narrative perspective no longer saw the Montanist Tertullian as a schismatic, but as a point of contact between the Montanists and Catholic believers within the Catholic Church (Robeck 1992:128-34). In contrast to the Catholic plaintiff's accusation, Tertullian was actually a peacemaker, not a troublemaker, between the Montanist prophets and the Catholic priests. Even if Tertullian once claimed that "only a Montanist can be a true Christian"[138] (Barnes 1971:83), he never dreamed of a break with the Catholic Church. Rather

---

[138] Tertullian, *De Fuga in Persecutione* 14.3.

for him, the Montanists were not the secret agents, but the holy-club members within the Catholic Church (Powell 1975:33-54); not the divisive dissents, but the distinctive assents for the unity of the Church (O'Mally 1967:120-3; Bray 110, 131). Indeed, Tertullian regarded both of them as a separate but complementary entity.

Viewing Montanism as a sort of the holy-club within the Catholic Church was critical. It played a decisive role in redirecting the flow of the trial on Tertullian's accusation. It first relegated Tertullian's stigma as a schismatic and thus helped him to clear his name. Then it elevated that his rendezvous with Montanism was not the source of his defection. Rather for Tertullian, Montanism, from the first, coexisted with the Catholicism as the common goal of the Christian Tertullian. This suggested that Tertullian considered the Church as an organic whole, inseparably interconnected of the Montanists with the Catholic believers like a Möbius strip. Yet, from Tertullian's eyes, the problem was that the Church was having difficulty keeping her balance between two groups and for him, one of the main reasons was the emergence of the Catholic Hierarchy in the process of church institution. Tertullian perceived that the institutionalizing Church Hierarchy would eventually lead the church into spiritual hibernation. As the Church was busy with its organization, tension grew from within. In the one sense, both of them, the Montanist and Catholic believers, agreed that the Montanists might hold the casting vote. Yet, both, in the other sense, might have different expectation for the Montanist role; the Catholic Hierarchy considered them as inhibitors against their sole leadership, while the Montanist saw themselves as catalysts for the spiritual rejuvenation of the Catholic Church.

Rather than easily assimilating himself into the Catholic Hierarchy, Tertullian was dissimilating enough to suggest that Montanism must be a church inside of the Church. In the figurative sense, Tertullian realized that the Catholic Church was deeply dependent for its mission on the well-organized control tower and this institutionalizing mechanism as a result had produced the GIGO (Garbage In, Garbage Out) principle at work in the process of selection and election on their ministry. The Catholic decision-makers had begun to enjoy the systematic information and analyses more than their spiritual discernment; in short, the force of church institution became a solely credible reference despite its potential danger of the incoming of poor and garbage database. No sooner had Tertullian accessed the system than he found the faulty and incomplete construction and application of data. From there onwards, his concern was to exhort every individual believer, who blindly accepted what the system said, and thus

to improve the quality of data, which went through the corrupted system.

Of particular interest was Tertullian's solution. In order to activate a new network interface, which allowed Catholic believers to get to another data program, Tertullian opened a new access code, whose number was M-O-N-T-A-N-I-S-M. For Tertullian, the operation of Montanism into the Church database was not chance, but a choice to determine its destiny. Even if he had tried to launch a new interface, having connected with a particularistic Montanist power supply, this was not to say he had an ulterior motive. Rather, here his purpose was not the establishment of Montanism but, that of church universal (Labriolle 1913:60;136). To this end, Tertullian first had endeavored to distribute freely his initial software patch into the whole Carthaginian Christian community (Tabbernee 2007:66). Then he devoted himself to continue to upgrade his program to make it a user-friendly interface; indeed, Tertullian's Montanist software had been adapted and contextualized with the African vernacular language.

The notion that Tertullian's Montanism had been widely used in the Catholic community was critical. Figuratively, this may reflect that the Montanist software was comparatively easy to install and thus popular among the software users who were under the Catholic system. Yet, this was not to say that there were no competitors and no complaints to this new program. Indeed, the response scales varied from the aggressively resistant Catholics, the moderately receptive Catholics and to the radically fanatic Montanists. There had been on-going pros and cons for such a new patch program. Yet, Tertullian viewed such tensions as a kind of growing pains, derived from the conflict between a concern for apostolic doctrine and a concern for apostolic discipline (Osborn 1997:180). Indeed, the church would grow out of them as the church grew older. Therefore, for Tertullian, the real problem was not the existence of pains, but the non-existence of remedy. Tertullian was convinced that the existence of the Montanist holy-club within the Catholic Church represented the coexistence of pain and remedy from within.

Tertullian's Montanism as a positive cohabitation with Catholicism had reached its peak in his later writing, the *Passion of Perpetua*. Despite its definite Montanist DNA, the Carthaginian Christian community had venerated Perpetua as a Catholic martyr, not a Montanist (Barnes 1971:79). St. Augustine had confessed that such African female saint was popular in his

sermon.[139] He also had reported that some bishops even put the *Passion of Perpetua* on a par with other canonical scriptures (Barnes 1971:54). Yet, Augustine was unfriendly to Tertullian, the author of the *Passion*, insinuating him as the champion of his own independent Montanist group.[140] Nonetheless, little wonder then that Perpetua was held in great esteem in the Catholic Church. In this sense, it seems contradictory to hail Tertullian as a ringleader of the church schism while at the same time venerating Perpetua, the avatar of Tertullian, as the Daughter of God (Barnes 1971:83). At any rate, not everyone was happy with Tertullian's Montanism. Indeed, there was a certain dislike of change in the ecclesiastical status quo; in particular, for the clerical hierarchy, the advance of Montanist holy-club within the Church was uncomfortable; from the Catholic authorities' view, this new attempt looked as if the Tertullian's Montanist holy-club had thrown down the gauntlet to them. The reason the Catholic Hierarchy overreacted was because they had already encountered a similar case. Indeed, there was a historical precedent in Asia Minor; the original Montanists had been trying to rub their shoulders with the clerical hierarchy. Yet, the case was decided against them (Labriolle1913:59-60, 136; Duchesne 1914:197, 201) and in favor of the Catholic plaintiff, the clerical hierarchy. This meant, for the defendant Tertullian, more evidence was needed to break the judicial precedent in order to win the case.

This urged Tertullian to call a third person and Praxeas was asked to appear in court as a new witness. According to Tertullian's testimony, it was Praxeas, or "busy body"[141] (Evans 1948:184; Bethune-Baker 1951:431; Brent 1995:525-9), who had falsified the record of the Montanist holy-club members to be scandalized. Indeed, no sooner had Praxeas secretly consulted with the Catholic Hierarchy (the bishop of Rome) than it had begun treating the Montanist believers unfairly. For his religious vindication, this diplomatic figure used a twin strategy, namely, hyperbole and hypercriticism; Praxeas had overestimated the authority of the Catholic Hierarchy while at the same time underestimating the full potential of Montanism. The ill effect of his instigation was immediate. Soon the Montanist holy-club members were persecuted by the clerical hierarchy and ousted from the Catholic Church. For Tertullian, it was

---

[139] Augustine, *Serm*. 280-2.

[140] Augustine, *Heresies*, 86.

[141] The text provides no clear identification about this person.

no other than the spiritual holocaust "by expelling prophecy through introducing heresy and by sending away the *Paraclete* through crucifying the Father"[142] (Gonzales 1974:25). Then, Tertullian took his case to the Court of Appeal. It was because the Montanists suffered heavily from Praxeas' trick and not Tertullian himself, but the clerical hierarchy actually caused a schism within the Church. Quite contrary to the allegations, the main culprit of church schism was Praxeas and the Catholic Hierarchy who was entrapped by his deception. Thus, every charge against Tertullian and his Montanism must return to them. This constituted Praxeas and his sympathizers to double punishment; they were no more than *pneumatomachi* (combaters against the Spirit)[143] and schismatic (members of religious schism).

Embarrassed by the double punishment, the Catholic authorities had begun to find out their salvation by themselves. Ironically enough, a strong negation against the Montanist holy-club by the same token, was aiding and abetting them to organize the demi-Montanist holy-club within the Church. At first, theses Praxeas' priests narrowed down the spiritual exercise to the Catholic inner-circle. Then they indoctrinated that the bishop alone possessed the prophetic charismata, so "do nothing apart from the bishop."[144] Yet, for Tertullian, such was the establishment of another spiritual tyranny at the expense of the original Montanist holy-club (Baur 1879:53). A fatal mistake was that the priestly conspirators had continued to rhapsodize, but their rhapsody was rather a retrograde step for the nature of the Church; "the church is not a conclave of bishops, but the manifestation of the Holy Spirit"[145] (Barnes 1971:84). From Tertullian's perspective, what was actually vital and permanent in Christianity was not the history of hierarchical institution, but the history of Christian spirit (Frend 1965:93-4).

Then, Tertullian appealed that he, and the Montanist holy-club members, had to defend themselves against the Catholic Hierarchy's spiritual monopoly; indeed he claimed he acted in self-defense to save the Spirit and the Montanist holy-club" under the spiritual elitism of the Catholic Hierarchy. Yet, interesting was Tertullian's way of resistance; he was not just acting

---

[142] *Pneumatomachi* denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, hence the Greek name *Pneumatomachi* or 'Combaters against the Spirit'; Tertullian, *Against Praxeas*, 1.5.

[143] Tertullian, *De Jejunio* 1.3.

[144] Ignatius, *Epistle to the Philadelphians*, 7, 1.

[145] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia,* 21.17.

in self-defense, but rather was participating in self-sacrifice. Embracing the current heavy challenges with his compassion, Tertullian was patient with suffering. Just as Perpetua did, Tertullian was also holding out an olive branch to the opposite Catholic Hierarchy. Even if they were self-indulgent and stubborn, Tertullian never gave up hope of finding a conciliatory message. Paradoxically enough, the oppositions he encountered had led him to become a merciful warrior; to this end, Tertullian was striving to empty himself to bring about a reconciliation between the two conflicting groups and here his transitional correlation once again played an important role. Indeed, it was the nature of his dynamic correlation, which encouraged him to make such an impossible mission possible.

As his transitional correlation intrinsically suggested, for Tertullian, the true church must be genetic. This implied that the church must be involved in the organic relation of the past-present-future interplay as a coherent whole. In other words, in the church, such transitional correlation came with an endless chain of processes, or organic activity, consistent with the entire body. Here the crux was seamless transition; the church, in its dynamic and energetic transitional process, was not static, but in a constant state of flux and change. Then, this change was never something optional. Rather, the injunctions of each form of this process were, from the very outset, volitional. New ways always disturbed and threatened the current status quo; old ways of doing things were often turned upside down. The sense of safety and security touched by each wave of expansion became altered and remolded. In short, change included growing pains for ultimate transformation.

From this perspective, as the bearer of the transitional correlation, Tertullian looked at the Montanist holy-club within the church as part of a developing continuum rather than as an antithesis of the Catholic authority (Powell 1975:33-54; Barnes 1971:42-7); he actually regarded the Montanist holy-club members as substantial contributors to the church's reconstruction. To this end, he had launched a peace appeal to all the church hierarchy, putting forward Perpetua's double-incarnation as an ideal vehicle to increase cooperation between the two. Yet, unfortunately, the Catholic Hierarchy considered it as an act of vandalism against their control. Noteworthy was that even if Tertullian was a lay leader of the holy-club, he never dreamed of the advent of New Jerusalem, or Phryginian kingdom at the cost of the clerical hierarchy. Rather he tried to set a successful example to the Montanist holy-club members; how they could realistically cooperate with the Catholic authorities without loss of dignity,

while, at the same time, resisting unjust legislations or actions despite such resistance rarely bringing about the desired results.

Yet, Tertullian's response was never passive, nor pessimistic. Rather his way of self-sacrifice, as his transitional correlation indicated, was action, participation and transformation; just as a new process required new growing pains, this vibrant power enabled Tertullian to offer himself for the reconciliation between two conflicting groups (Barnes 1971:142). Tertullian's self-sacrificing effort thus was two-fold. On the one hand, it was a dynamic, multifaceted process of transformation from without. Yet, on the other hand, it was a willing and volitional process of choice from within. This helped founding his new identity in a reconciling role between the Montanist and Catholic believers. It was no surprise then that Tertullian, with his self-sacrificial purpose, went into the womb of the clerical hierarchy. For Tertullian, no greater love than to lay down his life for reconciliation, the heart of his transitional correlation as the final transformation; as the lay leader of the Montanist holy-club, he had a strong desire even to the extent of shedding his own blood for rapprochement between the conflicting parties.

In a sense, Tertullian, as a peacemaker, may find the role of the Montanist holy-club in Jonah complex. He saw the current state of the Montanist holy-club as being in the belly of a great fish in order to save the descendants of Jonah, the runaway clerical hierarchy from the face of the Paraclete. Therefore, it was necessary for Tertullian that the great fish swallowed Jonah's priests so that they were inside the fish until the Paraclete commanded the fish to vomit them again onto dry land, as a sign of new birth. In retrospect, Tertullian recognized that he perhaps could not help acting like a complaining Jonah who was displeased and angry at God's compassion upon his opponents without experiencing transitional correlation; apart from it, he might also act in self-defense against his accusers, but may not participate in self-sacrifice for them. It was Tertullian's transitional correlation, which illuminated his significant role, not as merely an angry prophet, but as a point of contact between the Montanist and Catholic Christians. In fact, the dynamic transitional correlation made this African new Jonah enthusiastic to bear his own cross. Yet, he definitely knew that his yoke was not easy and light, but worthwhile. It might also necessarily lead both groups –the Montanist and Catholic holy-club members –to the precarious and painstaking position; Tertullian, and the Montanist holy-club members, should be swallowed up by the great fish as well as they swallowed their rivals. For Tertullian, the self-defense may explain that swallowing could protect them from drowning,

but it was only self-sacrifice, which was able to open a new perspective that swallowing also could be a prelude for the transformation of a new creation; from an angry prophet to a joyful midwife who had experienced the birth of a new life.

Then, Tertullian's statement had reached a conclusion. In a sense, as the Catholic plaintiff insisted, he perhaps was a schismatic with a view to separating himself from old Jonah. Yet, Tertullian's transitional correlation sheds new light on his alienation; it was rather no other than a precondition for his transformation as a new creation. Here Tertullian became the new African Jonah, the spirit-filled prophet as well as the lay leader of the Montanist holy-club. Important was that this transformed Tertullian was not a new kid in town, but an old midwife who was proactively involved in the process of a new life within the community.[146] In his transitional correlation, all periods of dynamics were viewed as transitional stages to improved conditions and trying to reach a higher realization of the truth. The Montanist holy-club in this sense was inherent in the church as a process, which was readily responsive to new stimuli, an organic force. Then, this perspective enabled him to participate in a dynamic process; therefore, Tertullian no longer remained as an angry-prophet, rather transformed into a weeping-prophet; he now mourned together with the Montanist holy-club members within the Catholic Church and thereby became a joyful mid-wife helping delivery of a new spirit between the Montanist and Catholic Christian believers.[147]

3.3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The appraisals of Tertullian's transition vary from the guardian of the Catholic Church to the ringleader of Montanism, a heretical sect. This mostly comes from the different perspectives on his multiple characters. Some have found Tertullian's identification in a traditional framework, which has separated him in four areas as: (1) the son of Roman centurion, (2) the professional Jurist, (3) the Catholic priest of Carthage, and (4) the schismatic Montanist. Others try to approach him with a new perspective, focusing on his separate but consistent transitional correlation. From this perspective, Tertullian's identification can be reconstructed as a coherent

---

[146] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* 7; *De Paententia* 8.

[147] The motif of Tertullian as a mourner and midwife came from Juliana M. Claassen's book, *Mourner, Mother, Midwife; Reimagining God's Liberating Presence in the Old Testament* (2012).

whole, namely, the Pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-Montanist as butterfly. This characterizes him as an organic unity where each transitional period is closely interconnected with the other. The result is a Tertullian who differs from the Tertullian defined by the precedent.

Tertullian's transitional correlation safeguards the existence of each stage at different times in his life and verifies his role as a bearer, who can master every category. First, in the period of Pagan as caterpillar, Tertullian had penetrated the danger of confluence between Christian philosophers and Christian martyrs. Second, in the period of Catholic as cocoon, his first concern centered on the problem of Athens-Jerusalem confluence and then elaborated on the potential for lay-clerical relation through Perpetua's double incarnation. Finally, in the period of Montanist as butterfly, Tertullian focused on the coexistence of Montanist holy-club within the Catholic Church through his self-sacrificial anticipation. In his transitional correlation, the sphere of previous stage came together as the next phase while, at the same time, interacting with each other in a separate but coherent way. Here the different –and even seemingly opposing –characters were not entirely negative. Rather this tension and conflict were necessary in his vibrant, creative, and energetic future transformation. Indeed, Tertullian's transitional correlation shed new light on the Montanist holy-club as inclusion, not exclusion, and as cooperation, not as confrontation within the Catholic Church.

Yet, the question still remain; "Was not Tertullian a schismatic?" The answer also can be found in his transitional correlation in particular in connection with the phase of the Montanist as butterfly. In this period of transition, the prospect of Praxeas' instigation and the self-indulgence of prodigal bishops in the church had galvanized him into action. Tertullian, as the lay leader of Montanist holy-club, had spoken about his new peace treaty with missionary zeal by transforming himself from self-defense to self-sacrifice for the Catholic Hierarchy, the bitter opponents. As the bearer of this dynamic transitional power, Tertullian was determined to be a voluntary mediator in order to bring the reconciliation between the Montanist and Catholic believers. Indeed, Tertullian's transitional correlation was always action, participation and transformation.

CHAPTER 4 MONTANISM, TERTULLIAN AND PENTECOSTALISM

4.1. THE IDENTIFICATION OF PENTECOSTALISM AS NEO-MONTANIS

It cannot be overestimated that Tertullian was the only defender of the holy-club within the Catholic Church in his time. Still there have been contemporary sympathizers who sided with him against the Praxea's priests[148] (Rankin 1995:49). Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that the Montanist holy-club members cast their lot with Tertullian; their voices have disappeared in the midst of history with the end of their spokesman (Baus 1965:203). From there onwards, the mainline Catholic Church has decided to put aside the genealogy of the New Prophecy in Asian Minor and its ardent witnesses in Africa and in response, the church hierarchy has played a big role in consolidating clerical domination through the institutionalized church (Baus 1965:205). This prevalence of clerical institution as a result inaugurates the era of spiritual hibernation; the modesty and silence of spiritual ecstasy has become the strict code of conduct of every Christian soldier. In this context, subsequent attempts to awake such dormancy have been decried as heretical and thereby schismatic.

Yet the seed of the New Prophecy was not destroyed; it grew out of the epitaph of the holy-club. The long forgotten history of the new prophets once again came to the fore together with the rise of the modern day new generations: Pentecostals. They do not hesitate to call themselves the present day holy-club members and began to pay their special attention to the ancient holy-club members in terms of historical, theological, and ecclesiological relationship. Some of them especially see the original Montanism as an instructive prototype of their movement (Bruner 1970:36) and even try to vindicate this ancient charismatic movement as their antecedent, not as a heretical sect (Kim 2009:113-124). To put it in a nutshell, by calling themselves as Neo-Montanism, this group of Pentecostals help the army of dry bones to come to life and stand up on their feet (Ezekiel 37:1-10).

Nonetheless, the question, "Who are the Pentecostals?" never expects an easy answer when it especially is related to the original Montanism. The reason is, even if the present day Pentecostals are really the genuine followers of the new prophets, their characters are far more

---

[148] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, II: 32. 4.

complicated and even, in many ways, controversial just as those of their precedents. In this sense, the stereotyped answer is no longer sufficient for this question. The view that Pentecostals are members of Holiness groups who consider tongue speaking as the evidence of the baptism of the Spirit (Synan 1971) pales its dynamic and divergent DNA, which are unique to them. Rather it demands to "speak of Pentecostalism-*s*, rather than Pentecostalism" (Robeck 1993:45), encompassing its historical, theological and ecclesiological perspective.

The point is that one-sided emphases are not appropriate to render a full image of Pentecostalism. Rather the definition of Pentecostalism is actually in a way kaleidoscopic; it needs a polyphonic, but holistic approach including historical, theological, and ecclesiological characteristics, rather than just a single dimension. Furthermore, such dynamism is helpful not only to characterize its identification as Neo-Montanism, but also to examine its relationship with original Montanism. Indeed the genuine character of the present day Pentecostalism calls for the necessity of rediscovering the nucleus of the original Montanism inherently stored in the cells of the new prophets and Tertullian. It is thus no accidence that such vista provides a sort of stepping-stone to cross over the following question, "Why does Montanism/Tertullian include/exclude the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?"

4.1.1. Pentecostalism as Historical Movement

Led by the new spiritual environment, the first generation of Pentecostalism was generally convinced of their new identity even to the extent that they cut themselves off from the past; indeed they "[viewed] Pentecostalism's arrival as providentially generated, end-time religious revival fundamentally discontinuous with 1,900 years of Christian history" (Cerillo 1999:229). Nonetheless, such a belief in the spontaneous origin of Pentecostalism[149] can trace its root in a past event, namely, the first Pentecost. In fact, the first Pentecostal generation based its role in that of the first generation apostolic church in the Bible, especially in the book of Acts. Considering themselves as members that represent a renaissance of Apostolic Christianity, such enthusiasts are striving to bring a new Pentecostal history not only by restoring the doctrine and practice of the first century church, but also by reawakening the traditional religious teaching between the close of the apostolic age and 1900 (Irvin 2005:37).

---

[149] See, especially, Brumback (1961).

The first generation of modern Pentecostals then takes a close look at sources and origins behind this new Reformation and seeks explanations for their movement's beginnings within the historical process. From this point on, some have been content to locate its origin in the Wesleyan Holiness Movement (Synan 1971:75, 115; Kendrick 1961; Nichol 1966). Others have found the close relation in the Keswick movement (Menzies 1975:81-98; Anderson 1979:111-2; 166-171), or in the Black oral root of the slaves of America (Tinney 1976; Lovett 1973; Hollenweger 1997:18-400; MacRobert 1988:9; Irvin 1995). Taking into consideration of this vast diversity, the recent scholarship then passionately suggests a new perspective, which can synthesize all elements as a whole, rather than as a separate unit (Cerillo 1997:29-80). Recognizing all such approaches, the best comes to being in the nineteenth century Holiness revival movement especially in connection with the Foursquare Church, which has its unique character of four-fold Gospel, emphasizing Jesus as Savior, Spirit-Baptizer, Healer, and the Coming King (Dayton 1987:15-28). Here it is interesting to note that the free dynamic mode of Pentecostal movement has a particularly Wesleyan anchor, a systematic higher and holier state of being (Laurentin 1977:133).

Yet, such a Pentecostal bond with the historical revivalism has unfortunately been shattered when a distinctive branch of Oneness Pentecostalism emerges with a new issue. This Oneness Pentecostals tends to replace the orthodox practice of baptizing in the name of Father, Son and the Holy Spirit with that of "Jesus only" presenting the apostles' baptizing in the book of Acts as a proof text (Acts 2:38; 8:16;10:48; 19:5). Since Oneness teaching had theologically rejected the doctrine of Trinity, the Oneness Pentecostals were not accepted by the other Trinitarian branches of orthodox Christianity as well as by Trinitarian Pentecostals[150] (Irvin 2205:38). Before long, the wind of discontinuity had rocked the Trinitarian Pentecostals as well. The rapid growth of Pentecostalism urges its adherents to venerate the father of the movement and two rivalries are especially open to a sharp dispute.

One group of Pentecostals advocates Charles Fox Parham, a Holiness evangelist, as the prime nominee who deserves credit for being the father of modern Pentecostalism.[151] They have

---

[150] Now only one percent of Pentecostals and charismatics follow Oneness doctrine (Kay 2004: xxvii).

[151] Among the leading proponents of this view are Kendrick (1961); Goff (1988); and Blumhofer (1993).

argued that Parham is the first who formulated speaking in tongues as the biblical evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Hollenweger 1972:22) and Sister Agnes N. Ozman, one of students of his Bible college, is the first to have the specific Pentecostal experience, namely, speaking in strange tongue[152] when the Topeka outpouring broke out in 1901. From there onwards, Parham and his followers, impelled by a sense of urgency, have held large meetings in many towns accompanied by various Pentecostal-like experiences. Taking speaking in foreign language as *xenosolalia* at face value, Parham personally had taught that the baptism of the Spirit would remove the burden of missionaries to study foreign language to preach in the mission field (Parham 19_:31-32; Synan 1971:102-3). Parham's leadership was, however, beginning to wane when he upheld a sectarian belief, namely, British-Israelism, and the following generation barely mentioned his primacy in Pentecostal history. The proponents of Parham, nonetheless, have maintained that his great contribution, that is, speaking in tongues is a necessary concomitant of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, continued to enthroned him as the father of modern Pentecostalism (Nichol 1966:28).

Yet, others have disputed that it is not Parham of Topeka, but William Seymour of Azusa who has the birthright as the father of modern Pentecostalism (Robeck 1993:166-80) and in this sense, it is not the Topeka outpouring, but Azusa Street revival to be championed as the birth of present day Pentecostalism. In the wake of the Topeka outpouring, the one-eyed Black preacher William Seymour, one of Parham's pupils, has preached the new Pentecostal experiences, including the baptism of the Holy Spirit, in which he learned from Parham.[153] As his preaching had got wider attentions, the fire came down at a prayer meeting in Bonnie Brae Street on April 1906 and peoples received the Holy Spirit with glossolalia (Bond 1958:158). After moving from Bonnie Brae Street to Azusa Street, the meetings had continued for three years without interruption and the message rapidly became noticed worldwide through the

---

[152] "Ozman asked that hands might be laid upon her to receive the Holy Spirit as she hoped to go to foreign fields, at first [Parham] refused not having the experience [himself]," but when he placed his hands upon her head and prayed "[he] had scarcely repeated three dozen sentences when a glory fell upon her, a halo seemed to surround her head and face, and she began speaking in the Chinese language, and was unable to speak English for three days… Seeing this marvelous manifestation of the restoration of Pentecostal power, …we continued as a school to wait upon God. We felt that God was no respecter of persons and what He had so graciously poured out upon one, He would upon all" (Parham, "The Latter Rain," *Apostolic Faith* December 1950-January 1951:3-15).

[153] It is interesting to note that Seymour himself had allegedly not experienced 'speaking in tongues' at that time (Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, 1972, 22).

medium of the *Apostolic Faith,* which was published by Seymour and his colleagues.

Yet its large and fast growth brought severe persecutions as well. Many religious soreheads began to degrade the Azusa Street mission as half-revival which is limited in the black communities only and as a result discriminately separated the black church from the whites. The unfavorable press even ridiculed the movement as the second-class fanaticism led by the social outcasts (Hollenweger 1972:23).[154] In this context, unfortunately, the spirit of Azusa began to bog down with bickering and lost its original power, which used to wash away the color line in the blood (Bartleman 1925:54).[155] Surprisingly enough, Parham, the mentor of Seymour, joined such persecution by harshly criticizing the interracial mingling at Azusa.[156] Nonetheless, the Azusa Street mission became a watershed to upgrade modern Pentecostalism as a global phenomenon (Wills 1991:60) and this made William Seymour, the leading figure of the movement, as the father of such Spirit-filled frontier movement.

Although the matter is still open to question, the scholarly consensus, partly due to its global impact, tends to take the Azusa Street as the birthplace of American Jerusalem[157] and with regard to this, some, especially Negro Pentecostals, regard the modern Pentecostalism as being essentially African spirituality whose pioneer is William Seymour, an African-American Holiness preacher (Cox 1995:101). The Pentecostal movement, according to this view, is to be seen as the black supremacy, which first began as a Negro phenomenon, and then later accepted by whites (Fidler 1963:3-4).

Of inescapable significance is that this outlook, seeing the Azusa Street as primarily a black church phenomenon, never underestimates the interracial character of the Azusa Street Revival from the very first. Even if it does not set aside the influence of the black Pentecostals and their

---

[154] The Los Angeles Times especially described Seymour as "an old colored exhorter" who acted as "major-domo of the company" to hypnotize unbelievers. Old "colored mammys" were seen to "gurgle wordless talk" in a "frenzy of religious zeal" (Los Angeles Times, April 198, 1906 quoted from Synan 1971:107).

[155] It is arguable that Azusa Street revival, at the beginning, was the interracial characteristics, which showed no racial prejudice in the service. "Negroes, whites, Chinese and even Jews attended side by side to here Seymour preach." (Synan 1971:109)

[156] Hollenweger especially indicates that Parham disappeared from the official letterhead on the Azusa Street Revival from November 1907 and so did the whites in 1908 (*The Pentecostals*, 1972, 23).

[157] Bartleman, in his book, wrote that "Pentecost has come to Los Angeles, the American Jerusalem." (1925:63)

distinctive contributions, the Azusa revival, and William Seymour, from its inception, had laid its foundation on racial unity, not on its segregation. In the American Jerusalem, race-mixing congregation was "the rule rather than the exception" in the midst of the growing racial tension everywhere else (Synan 1971:182). In this sense, the Azusa Street Mission was no other than a resurgence of the interracial revival, recorded in the first Pentecost in the Book of Acts; "they were all together in one place…from every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:1-5).

Such complete interracial unity indicates that the American Jerusalem is to be understood as an open-end rather than dead-end. More specifically, the glorification of Azusa, together with William Seymour, does not necessarily attribute the embryo of Pentecostal movement to the singular origin of 'Men in Black', but rather to the multiple colors beyond the pan-Africanism (Irvin 2005:42). To put it in a figurative way, what one-eyed Black preacher of Azusa had really sowed was a seed of the modern Pentecostalism in the field of a global perspective. Therefore, a greater momentum is gained through "the global character of Pentecostalism as movement" than through a local history of a black church event (Irvin 2005:44); in essence, "Azusa Street was a *local* with global *designs* (Irvin 2005:45).

In this category of local-global relationship, such the "double-consciousness" of Pentecostalism paves the way for a new perspective of the Pentecostal identification (Du Bois 1969:45). From this viewpoint, the Azusa Street revival –and William Seymour as well, begins to take off its wasteful disputes to narrow down the Pentecostal origins as a specific paradigmatic model. Rather it gives Pentecostal history a new impetus to embrace it as local and global phenomena. This firmly excludes any attempt to use such "double-consciousness" as a bargaining chip in local-global talks. Rather it proves Pentecostalism as movement with multiple causes and origins, where both local and global forces are converging (Irvin 2005:45). Better thus to recapitulate the Azusa Street as one of the monumental signs with two arrows, signifying both blacks and whites as the mixed-race congregation; both local history and global character; both adoption of the past and adaptation for the future.

This even suggests that it is not appropriate to define the Azusa Street Movement as the one determining factor for Pentecostal origins because, in a big picture, the American Jerusalem revival is a nexus of Pentecostalism as a local stream riding on the global tides. In this respect, it is noteworthy that the Azusa Street revival can be considered, not essentially but

provisionally, as the so-called fractured genesis of the present day Pentecostal movement. Put in another way, the Azusa can be seen as the harbinger of New Jerusalem, which is in fuse both foretelling and forth-telling prophecy. To be sure, from the post-Azusa onwards, the Azusa Street revival comes with the precedent of Pentecostalism, but similarly, from the perspective of the pre-Azusa, the American Jerusalem also becomes the direct descendant of the movement. This reminds then that the current veneration of the Azusa Street as the birthplace of Pentecostalism requires a significant caveat; without it, this brings a great missing link by overlooking the existence of its historical ancestor who goes beyond the timetable of post-Azusa period.

Nonetheless, the aftermath of the post-Azusa perspective is quite persistent. From this viewpoint, seeing the Azusa as the center of new Pentecostal wave, the subsequent Pentecostal-like movements can be even called the second and the third wave, which is strongly reminiscent of the Azusa Pentecostals as the first wave. As the fire of Azusa Street (1906-9) spread to the rest of the North America and Asia across the Pacific Ocean, there were the early pioneers who had to struggle to keep the torch of Pentecostal spirit in their own local place. The names can be listed as John G. Lake in South America and South Africa, T.B. Baratt, in Norway, Alexander Boddy in Britain, and Geritt Polman in Germany and Netherlands (Kay 2004: xxi). Indeed, the first-generation of Pentecostals were convinced that they were radically new and free from the historical precedents of Christendom, who had the first-time experience as the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Irvin 2005:39). Led by such intense apocalyptic eschatology and spontaneous speaking in tongues, the first Pentecostals committed themselves to the last command of Jesus Christ, namely, the rapid evangelization of the world.

The advent of the second wave came as the first Pentecostals were in confrontation with the established church over the issue of Pentecostal-like experiences; the churches outside of Pentecostals wished to set the constitutional guidelines to such flexibility and Pentecostals saw it as echoes of ecclesiastical dictatorship. Yet it was in the 1960s when the mainline churches and denominations, including Roman Catholics, had experienced the so-called Neo-Pentecostalism, or charismatic movement, which brought a new dimension of spiritual refreshment in their comfort zone (Kay 2004:xxii). At first, the first wave Pentecostals were astonished that the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out on their contenders just as they had experienced. Yet the early Pentecostals soon came to realized that it was no other than a

déjà-vu of a biblical event: Peter's experience at Cornelius house. The only difference from the original was that the present day new converts, by contrast, did not leave their house; rather they had concentrated such new Pentecostal experiences on their own spiritual renewal without restructuring of the vested structures. For those who received the outpouring of the Spirit under the mezzanine were called, Neo-Pentecostals –or charismatics, distinguished from the classical Pentecostals. In this sense, both show clear distinction; the second wave Pentecostals turned their spiritual experiences into inward and personal renewal while the first-generation Pentecostals equipped themselves with Pentecostal emphasis for outward and evangelistic purpose (Kay 2004:xxiii). In some degree, the Neo-Pentecostals had tamed their precedent's apocalyptic spiritual gifts into pragmatic *charismata* for internal innovation.

In 1980s, the third wave Pentecostals came into being from the delicate tension between classical Pentecostals and Neo-Pentecostals –or between the apocalyptic first wave and the pragmatic second wave. Such newcomers were reluctant to bind themselves with both traditional denominations and even classical Pentecostalism. Rather they had alternatively declared themselves to be the members of the New Churches in which charismatic theology and Pentecostal experience ideally fused together under the leadership of an apostolic figure (Kay 2004: xxiii). This distinct characteristic made them call themselves Neo-Charismatics who had Pentecostal-like experiences through personal relationship, but no traditional Pentecostal or charismatic connections (Kay 2004: xxxii). Neo-Charismatics soon enlarged their territory by merging those who were within mainline denominations with independent groups, setting aside their own members who were already hungry for the manifestation of the Spirit. The impact of such third wave Pentecostals is unique; they brought a completely new dimension into Christian bodies by unfurling the breadth of Pentecostal-like experiences – speaking in tongues, prophecy, and healing, to such an extent that they enjoyed a second renaissance, even if they originally came from both the first and second wave Pentecostals.

Although the post-Azusa perspective explains the continuity of Pentecostal-charismatic movement in a sense analogous to a series of waves and in light of this, the Azusa Street revival is at the very heart of this vista, the recent outlook rather shows growing concerns to the pre-Azusa viewpoint particularly in relation to the complexity of the historical precedent of Pentecostalism. Here of particular pinpoint is that Pentecostal origins can be found in the indigenous roots –especially in case of Latin America, Africa and Asia –rather than in the

America Jerusalem.[158] This has unflinchingly claimed that the rivalry perspective, arranging the movement in the wake of three waves, is in some degree, a lame-duck approach, which is only satisfied within western churches (Yung 2003:63-82). For the pre-Azusa view, the post-Azusa approach is clearly in a dilemma over a claim that "in Pentecostalism every generation is the first generation" (Mignolo 2000: ix).

Those who see the Azusa Street with the pre-Azusa framework have great interest in the outbreak of glossolalia as occasional punctuation of Christian history and they interpret it in very distinctive way. The prospect of the pre-Azusa adherents, like that of the post-Azusa, provides that speaking in tongues is a necessary evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but they, unlike their rivalry view, single out the dawn of the Azusa Street revival as another physical evidence of the baptism within the church history. Rather for them, the spiritual outpouring upon American Jerusalem with speaking in tongues is one of historic Pentecostal-like experiences. From their aspect, the particular significance of Azusa Street was that it again gave Pentecostals a theological verification that tongue speaking would be the only initial evidence of the reception of the Holy Spirit (Synan 1971:121-2). No wonder such a doctrinal inception should be distinguished from a historical birthplace. Therefore, this is clear for the pre-Azusa proponents that the Azusa Street can be the doctrinal origin of the baptism of the Spirit, but cannot be the historical genesis of the baptism of the Christian church.

This unfolds the hidden genealogy of Pentecostal movement; the pre-Azusa advocates, standing on the shoulders of the post-Azusa adherents, can see further behind a wall of the American Jerusalem and then find their historical precedents who are not bound with circles of Wesleyan holiness groups. They, in so doing, discover a great reservoir of the baptism of the Spirit that continues through Christian history. It is particularly epitomized by the occurrence of the first Pentecost as a great reversal of the Tower of Babel. To put it briefly, it is the pre-Azusa perspective, which can serve Pentecostal believers to look back on their origins in the history of the spiritual blessings, including spirit-baptism, in order to look forward to their future as a consistent continuum. In this heritage, they wish to put themselves in the lists of spiritual lineage as one piece with the preceding pneumatic tradition. Namely; from the

---

[158] Many see Pentecostalism as the culturally adapted forms of religiosity; of European Pietism (Macchia 1993; 65-84); of African indigenous form (Kalu 1998:229-55); and of Latin America or Asian origin (Wilson 1999:109)

Wesleyan holiness-movement in 1867; the Irvingites movement in 1830's; the Keswick Convention in 1875 England; the Mormons and the Shakers in eighteenth and nineteenth century America; the radical Reformers in sixteenth century; Walensians in thirteenth century; the Albigenses in twelfth century; Montanists in the second century; the enthusiastic Corinthians in the first century; the apostles of the first Pentecost and the Old Testament prophets, the first men of the Spirit and His gifts (Synan 1971:119; Bruner 1970:35, 54).

Of particular importance with regard to this connection is that, the pre-Azusa-bearers, by defining the Azusa revival as a movement, not as an outbreak, are willing to join the group of the historical Spirit-bearers in the Christian community. In this sense, their identification has particularly a spiritual anchor in the first-century primitive church (Clark 1987:7) and thereby has a close connection with later day charismatic revival movement down through the church history (Nichol 1966:19). This connection is two-fold; on the macro level, it poses Pentecostals to engage in the Christian tension between the major and the minor traditions in the Church; between the spirit of order and the spirit of prophecy (Burgess 1984). On the micro level, in so doing, it gives them a new membership to stand alongside with Montanism and the Montanist Tertullian, their charismatic antecedents, who were in continuity with the line of enthusiasm as the holy-club within the Church (Clark 1987:7-10).
.

To be sure, in its historical approach, Pentecostals disagree that their historical root is limited to the Topeka outpouring in 1901 or Azusa Street in 1906. Rather, beyond such local boundary, Pentecostals, particularly the pre-Azusa bearers, are eager to go back to the origin of Spirit-baptism. This passion enables them to be able to find their identification in the first-century church and the following revival movement, which is closely linked with the spiritual charismata (Synan 1971:119; Bruner 1970:35); in this vein, the first generation of modern Pentecostals finds their role in that of the first generation apostolic church. Therefore, the antecedent of Pentecostalism can be traced back from the pneumatic movement, including Montanism and the Montanist Tertullian, which is outlined down through the church history (Clark 1989:7). Indeed, Pentecostals, like the original new prophets and Tertullian as the African prophet, are the heirs of the frontier, enthusiastic type of Christianity.

4.1.2. Pentecostalism as Theological Movement

In their emphasis on the so-called Pentecostal-like experiences, Pentecostals tend to follow the lead of the Spirit rather than any set of theological traditions; they rely on spoken rather than written guidance (Schwartz, 1970:166). In this light, they have often been accused of exegeting their own experience (Fee 1991:107) and this induces many Pentecostals to have their tenets in a close affinity with evangelical-fundamentalism (Brumback 1947:30). Such a similarity simply considers Pentecostals as evangelicals-plus (Kärkkäinen 2002: xiv); "regarding salvation through justification by faith, [they] are Lutherans. In water baptism formula, [they] are Baptists. With regard to sanctification, [they] are Methodists. In aggressive evangelism, [they] are as the Salvation Army. But regard to the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, [they] are Pentecostals!" (Brumback1947:119)

It is, however, worthwhile that despite such considerable parallels, there exist non-negotiable nuclei which are only unique to Pentecostals and this can be characterized by four distinctive dimensions, namely, experience; baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healing and eschatological hope. At issue, here is the interesting interconnection of each aspect with fourfold gospel; Jesus as Savior, Spirit-Baptizer, Healer, and the Coming King[159] as a whole. In other words, there are intimate correlation between experience-Jesus as Savior; baptism in the Holy Spirit-Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer; divine healing-Jesus as Healer; eschatological hope-Jesus as the Coming King and this creates a microcosm of the Pentecostal theology in a relevant way.

First, many find their sheer identity as Pentecostals in strong desire of spiritual experience. For them, "experience comes first; theology followed" (Kärkkäinen 2002:6); "[t]o be Pentecostal primarily presupposes that one partakes of the common Pentecostal experience" (Clark 1989:17). In their belief of Jesus as Savior, such experience-hungry Christians especially consider their experience not as experience per se, but as experience of the power of God in Jesus (Clark 1987:47); to put briefly, Pentecostal experience of the Spirit is none other than the experience of the Spirit of Jesus. Indeed, for Pentecostals, such experience of the power of God in Jesus is not mere confession, but sheer conviction, which verifies their life and thought as Pentecostals. In particular such verification characterizes its genuine level into six criteria; namely, first, biblically evangelical; second, spiritually charismatic/prophetic; third,

---

[159] Donald W. Dayton concluded that a fourfold Gospel is a heritage of Holiness Movement in the nineteenth century and only the practice of speaking in tongues set Pentecostalism apart from the earlier Holiness Movement (*Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1987).

vocationally Jesus-committed; fourth, individually life-transformative; fifth, communally missiological; and finally sixth, existentially emotional (Clark 1987:51-63). This suggests that Pentecostal experience can be found in its holism as well as its dynamics, which reshape Spirit-filled believers into a completely new dimension.

Yet the special emphasis on experience in Pentecostal theology is vulnerable to the criticism that Pentecostals are simply anti-intellectuals (Nichol 1966:77). This in some degree has some truth; some of the early Pentecostal leaders actually attributed everything to the leading of the Spirit, so that "those who were filled with the Spirit needed no one to instruct them"[160] (Campbell 1951:204). Here the problem is that such antipathy toward education seems to justify spiritual pomposity and even spiritual aristocracy by separating themselves from the established churches (Gee 1949:18). Such old tradition dies hard and there still are echoes of the past; "in the beginning there was an experience and a testimony, then came an explanation in the form of a theological construct" (Plüss 1993:191). In this light Pentecostal experiences precede their hermeneutics; "Pentecostals did not look to the text for the origination of a theology, but for the biblical/theological verification of their experience" (Fee 1976:87).

Yet there are some reasons that Pentecostals has been in the main anti-intellectuas. On the one hand, there was a strong eschatological expectation in the early Pentecostal theology, which seemed to be little benefit and time for systemizing for their belief. Coupled with supernatural and charismatic ethos, this intense and imminent *eschaton* made any intellectual pursuits useless; they even saw it none other than worldly ornamentation against new spiritual dispensation (Moore 1992:3). On the other hand, "dealing with the living God in experience is no easy task" (Kelsey 1976:240). When experience of God came into being as the center of Pentecostal theology, Pentecostals in a sense became a kind of living contradiction (Fee 1991:108); it "demands more than *belief* in an experience; it rather demands the *experience* of the experience itself (Clark 1987:40);

> It is not that [Pentecostals] are fundamentally anti-theological but that they fear the elevating of theology or doctrine to the first place. With the traditional definition of

---

[160] C. Perham showed an anti-intellectual attitude when he derided Scientists, infidels, and higher critics as "a trinity of the same species" (*A Voice crying in the Wilderness*, 39)

theology as 'faith seeking understanding', the Pentecostals would largely agree; however, they would want to be sure that the faith was not merely formal or intellectual, and that it be profoundly experiential. Pentecostals are people who have had a certain experience; so they find little use for theology or doctrine that does not recognize and, even more, participate in it. (Williams 1974:181)

Second, in their belief of Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer, the distinctive teaching of the Pentecostal movement concerns the power of what Pentecostals call the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals place this doctrine of Spirit-baptism before all other considerations as a citadel of their theology (Bruner 1970:38). In Pentecostalism, the baptism in the Holy Spirit is understood as an experience subsequent to or discrete from the new birth (Macchia 2006:110; Bruner 1970:69), accompanying speaking in tongues (Conn 1956:96; Williams 1955:55), and it significantly is related to spiritual power rather than salvation (Bruner 1970:73). For Pentecostals, this distinctive experience is scriptural. The experience of Spirit-baptism was foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament, especially the prophecies of Joel (Joel 2:28-32), and also found in many New Testament statements (Acts 2:1-4; 2:38; 8:4-25; 9:1-19; 10-11; 19:1-7 and Mark 1:9-11) (Nichol 1966:8-9). In this regard, the Day of Pentecost was a fulfillment of all these prophecies and promises (Acts 2:1-4). Indeed, Pentecostals were convinced that the first Pentecost was not only a significant reminder for the birth of the Church, but also for the evidence to prove Spirit-baptism as a recurring phenomenon in all ages (Menzies 1971:9).

In addition, the emphasis that in any case of Spirit-baptism there is speaking in tongues even makes Pentecostal theology far more distinctive. In Pentecostalism, a glossolalia, an ecstatic speaking in a language, is the initial evidence of the baptism in the Spirit (Bruner 1970:77). They are convinced that biblical accounts of tongue speaking' can evidently justify their belief. The Scripture describes that speaking in tongues is the physical evidence of the receiving the Holy Spirit through the event of; (1) Pentecost (Acts 2:4); (2) the households of Cornelius (Acts 10:46); (3) the believers at Ephesus (Acts 19:1-7); and (4) St. Paul's gift of tongues (1Cor. 14:18) (Nichol 1966:10). Here Pentecostals are more confident to say that there is the paradigmatic relationship between Spirit-baptism and speaking in tongues and this is available today for every believer because "the New Testament is not a record of what happened in one generation, but it is a blue-print of what should happen in every generation until Jesus comes

(Du Pless 1977:6). For Pentecostals, such is the tiara of their theological conviction that the supernatural, extraordinary, and visible work of the Holy Spirit are a commonplace of Church History that have occurred again and again as in the days of the apostles (Gee 1949: 9; Bruner 1970:20).

Yet this may raise a certain amount of skepticism as well. In particular, if the practice of glossolalia is actually a common religious phenomenon even today[161] (Bunn 1973:46), what is the precise nature of speaking in tongues? Is Pentecostal glossolalia something essentially different from other "hollow imitations of the first springtime of the Spirit?" (Behn 1964:726) Especially the fact that there exist a number of non-speaking in tongues-Pentecostals in the Pentecostal church today may add fuel to the fire of this suspect. In this sense, it is necessary to remind that there is a clear demarcation between Pentecostal distinct and Pentecostal essence; "even though the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in other t ongues is the distinctive doctrine of Pentecostalism, it is not the central essence of Pe ntecostalism" (Archer 1996:63). For the Pentecostals, contrary to the popular opinion, speaking in tongues are actually not the final goal, but a commencement of new Christian life empowered by the Spirit (Nichol 1966:15).

It is also reminiscent that there were early Pentecostal leaders who did seldom agree to the close relationship between Spirit-baptism and speaking in tongues;

> Yet, we never sought tongues nor fought tongues, and never tell others to seek tongues, as some falsely claim we do. Seek Jesus Christ to baptize you with the Spirit, and the result will be that you will be 'filled with the Holy Ghost and begin to speak with tongues', for God is no respecter of persons (*Word and Witness* 1912:4)

It cannot be ignore that even William Seymour, the American Pentecostal pioneer, had advised his congregation not to be mere tongue-chasers; "[N]ow, do not go from this meeting and talk about tongues, but try to get people saved" (Zimmerman 1986:60). Rather, for him, a clear evidence of receiving Spirit baptism was; "Divine love, which is charity, Charity is the spirit

---

[161] For more views, see; George H. Williams and Edith Waldvogel, "A History of Speaking in Tongues and Related Gifts," in Michael Hamilton, ed., *The Charismatic Movement* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975).

of Jesus" (McGee 1991:81). Such an infusion of Spirit baptism with divine love supports that Spirit-baptism as the power of God should not underestimate Spirit-baptism as the love of God; the baptism in the Spirit rather is to embrace both "God's saving work and his role as Spirit-Baptizer" (Macchia 2006:119-120).

In this relationship of Spirit-baptism and speaking in tongues reminds of some similarities between the modern Pentecostals and the ancient prophets, including Montanist prophets. First, both have claimed to a fuller revelation of the divine will in virtue of their inspiration by the Spirit. Second, both have convinced that they were genuine mouthpiece of the Spirit, having a gift of tongues, including ecstasy and trance. Third, both have regarded glossolalia as enthusiastic and direct manifestations of the Spirit; and finally, both have argued Spirit-baptism with speaking in tongue as distinctive, not essential, of their belief.

Third, in regard with Jesus as Healer, divine healing plays an important role in constituting a Pentecostal theology. In Pentecostalism, a burning passion is found for receiving the supernatural gifts, especially the gift of healing (Cox 1995:101) and this is actually developed from the biblical promise that the redemption of Christ brings a remedy for all manner of illness (Nichol 1966:16). Pentecostals, from the very beginning, have a strong sense of expectation and appreciation to the miraculous, including divine healing (Williams 1981:164-5). To take away the supernatural from Pentecostalism, there will be no theology for Pentecostals (Jeffreys 1931:50); "Miracles are to [Pentecostalism] what movement is to the body. That is, if the body no longer moves, if it is incapable of moving, it is nothing but a dead shell, a corpse" (Parizet 1961:3, 26 quoted in Hollenweger 1972:368).

In Pentecostalism, a deep allegiance to miracle can be also found in its view of healing as atonement for human sins. By assuming sin as the cause of sickness, Pentecostals interpret divine healing as a verification of the forgiveness of sin (Dayton 1987:121):

> Redemption finds its center in the Cross-of our Lord Jesus Christ and there we must look for the fundamental principle of Divine Healing, which rests on the atoning sacrifice…If sickness be the result of the Fall, it must be included in the atonement of Christ, which reaches as "far as the cures is found." (Simpson 1915:34)

120

There is also a close interrelation between the Pentecostal healing of the sick through prayer and their understanding of Scripture (Hollenweger 1972:368); "[believers] will place their hands on the sick people, and they will recover" (Mark 16:18). Yet, such experience-hungry Christians prefer to experience it personally rather than to preach merely the doctrine of divine healing (Hollenweger 1972:368); it is because, in their view, neither doctrine, or theology, nor church order could replace the experience of the Holy Spirit (Williams 1981:197).

Here the Pentecostals stress that they are ardent defenders for the Back-to-the Bible movement (Hollenweger 1972:291). For Pentecostals, Scripture should be interpreted literally; the Bible gives them a clear instruction that in case of illness, the elders, (not the bishops!), ought to be called to pray for the sick person; anoint him with oil; and encourage him/her to confess if he/she is guilty of any sins (James 5:14-18). Furthermore, it is also the biblical teaching that the gifts of the Spirit are the supernatural gifts; the afflicted person are delivered from illness through the touch of handkerchiefs or aprons! (Acts 19:12) (Nichol 1966:15-7). The Pentecostals, therefore, boldly argue that Scripture to be Spirit-Word in a dynamic correlation of text and the Spirit (Kärkkäinen 2002:9).

Yet, such a sense of self-confidence must overcome the challenge of self-criticism; "the apostles practiced divine healing without making a special point of preaching it, whereas [Pentecostals] preach it, but fail to practice it" (Steiner 1960 quoted in Hollenweger 1972:357). Among the Pentecostal healing evangelists, it is a common mistake that they no longer consider themselves as God's servant, but make God as their servant (Hollenweger 1972:357). For Pentecostals, the prayer of healing as 'Thy will be done' is not even appropriate because "that wasn't the way David prayed…in Psalms 6.2-9…there were no ifs or buts in that prayer" (Yeomans 1926:22). In addition, the Pentecostals are often in a dilemma over how to tackle the crisis of delaying or silence of the healing. In this case, a typical response is to shift the blame for not being healed onto patients by condemning their unrepentant sin or lack of faith. Both rather may provoke opposition and even leave deep scars for the justification of Pentecostal healing.

Yet, on the other hand, this presents Pentecostals a new opportunity to stretch their horizon. In this process of failure, the Pentecostals can experience self-healing; they are able to diagnose their own wounds and thus heal by themselves. In so doing, the healed Pentecostals begin to

rediscover earlier doctrine of the healing as an atonement in the healing as God's special favor; the former leads the Pentecostals to its immediate result of NOW and ALL, whereas the latter leaves them room to wait and see (Carter 1884:167). This enables the Pentecostals to see the healing, of themselves and others, in the realm of divine wisdom or divine purpose under God's sovereignty. Then they rather realize that God does not;

> always heal now, but sometimes reaches His ends with His children in the way of bodily weakness and even sickness, as can be seen in the apostle Paul himself and some of his co-workers…These examples are reminders that all healing in the end is a gift of God's sovereign mercy and compassion (Steiner 1959:5-6, 13)

This is not a theological wavering, but an affirming which is distinct in Pentecostal theology. By clinging to the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit, Pentecostals do not simply stay in classical dogmatic convictions. They rather offer a fresh view on Jesus as Healer by permitting its inscrutability as proof of divinity; the Spirit's working is passionate and spontaneous on the one hand, but slow and gradual on the other hand (Hollenweger 1972:362-373). Here the doctrine of healing through prayer plays an important role in sustaining the core identity of the Pentecostal theology. If Pentecostals avoid such a unique DNA, or set it aside, Pentecostalism, as a whole, may lose its distinctiveness without an opportunity of healing the sick and society.

It is unfortunate that there exists a missing link between the present day Pentecostal healing and the ancient new prophet's –and the Montanist Tertullian's. On the one hand, it is not practical to exclude the possibility that the original new prophet and African new prophet had not been involved in healing both individually and cooperatively. Montanism, most of all, was the fountainhead of all the enthusiastic revival movements in Christian history and in this sense; it is hardly likely that they ruled out healing the sick from their spiritual ministries. Yet on the other hand, it may be true to say that for them, individual healing might come with less interest or importance than other essential characteristics, such as ecstatic prophecy, immanent parousia and strict moral requirement; indeed, they were prophets, millenarians and puritans, but were not necessary exorcists/healers. Impelled by a sense of strong urgency, the new prophets had expected an immediate change/judgment, rather than a progressive healing/compassion for the body of Christ.

Further, in their apocalyptic perspective, they seemed to have inclined even to the so-called WOW effects: the enthusiastic prophecy, the imminent Lord's return, a calling for the lay priesthood, and high-level of asceticism. In contrast to the initial expectation, such a demand of NOW and ALL[162] unfortunately created a wrong impression as them being self-righteous and even self-deceptive. The new prophets and Tertullian might have been, in a way, theologically orthodox, but relationally cold with neighboring Christians; perhaps they were in a hurry to chase the wind of Spirit rather than to take care of the ordinary believers. Ironically, there was less chance for them to embrace the Spirit as the empowerment with the Spirit as the divine love (Macchia2006:117-125); sadly enough, in their eyes, both spirit-filled enthusiasts might have been less compelling to integrate Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer with Jesus as Healer.

Lastly, the Pentecostal theology lays its foundation on a fervent expectation of the second coming of Jesus. The Pentecostals agree that the effusion of the Holy Spirit is intimately linked with the Last Days (Dayton 1987:144). They in particular read Joel's prophecy and Paul's writings as the prelude to the close association between pneumatology and eschatology (Hamilton 1957:33). Apart from naïve optimism of post-millennialism, Pentecostals do not hesitate to identify themselves with pre-millenarians because "it is Scriptural that Christ will come first. He must come before his reign of a thousand years." (Moody 1910:163)

The distinct character of the Pentecostal eschatology is found in the notion that Pentecostals take into account a subtle balance between prophetic and apocalyptic reality. Then such observation predisposes Pentecostals to bridge the gap between the millennial hope and actual historical experience (Dayton 1987:158-160). This significantly involves the transformation of Pentecostal eschatology into the theology of Hope;[163] "just as the Old Testament people of God was travelling towards the land where milk and honey flow, so the New Testament people of God is travelling towards the new earth and the new heaven" (Hollenweger 1972:420). The Pentecostal eschatology thus no longer remains passive as the doctrine of the End, but rather actively rearranges the reality by participating in the service of God's mission with hope of Jesus as Coming King.

---

[162] This motif, NOW and ALL, is borrowed from Robert Kelso Carter, *The Atonement of Sin and Sickness: or, a Full Salvation for Soul and Body* (Boston: Willard Tract Repository, 1884), 167.
[163] J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope.*

No wonder eschatology occupied a central place for both the new prophets and Tertullian, the African new prophet. With an eager anticipation of the imminent return of Christ on earth, the Montanist prophets had claimed the glorification of Pepuza, the New Jerusalem, as described in the Book of Revelation and Tertullian, in his eschatological earnestness, had also held a more spiritual and a more ascetic type of Christian life as a preparation for the impending parousia (Greenslade 1964:223). Furthermore, both were radical pre-millenarians who had sympathetic ear toward Armageddon; "the approaching End was signaled, not by progress, but by decline" (Dayton 1987:163). From their perspective, it must be the spotless Bride of Christ who could meet the Bridegroom on the last day[164] (Osborn 1997:178). Accordingly both the Montanist and the Montanist Tertullian were fascinated by prophetic and apocalyptic themes and for them; the amalgamation of eschatology into pneumatology was an inevitable corollary under the current pessimistic climate (Dayton 1987:144). Significant is that such eschatological fascination was neither novel nor strange in the history of Christendom;

> …something like a law, that the more vitally hope is present in the *Ekklesia,* that is, the more powerfully life in the Spirit of God is present in it, the more urgent is its expectation of the Coming of Jesus Christ; so that the fullness of the possession of the Spirit and the urgency of expectation are always found together, as they were in the primitive community (Bruner 1962)

Even though both were, in a sense, the fanatic millenarians, the heart of their eschatological zeal should not be neglected. In them, there was a burning desire for a speedy return of Christ who could establish His Kingdom on earth. What is striking is that their eschatological expectation is available in the Christian church today with a hope of the second coming of the Messiah. This reflects that the stream of their eschatological vision does not stop there, but still flows in present day Pentecostalism as the counter-evidence, which represents its spiritual-eschatological continuum in a relevant way.

In short, the Pentecostals theology has a particular and dramatic correlation between (1) experience-Jesus as Savior, (2) baptism in the Holy Spirit-Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer, (3) divine

---

[164] Tertullian draws an image of church as the bride of Church in many places, such as *Mon*. 5.7 and 11.2.

healing-Jesus as Healer, and (4) eschatological hope-Jesus as the Coming King. Indeed, each aspect characterizes the diadem of the Pentecostal theology as an experience of the power of God in Jesus (Clark 1989:17); Spirit baptism with speaking in tongues (Macchia 2006:110); divine healing in supernatural worldview (Hollenweger 1972:368); and eschatological fascination with spirituality (Dayton 1987:144). This creates a new significant link between the present day Pentecostals and the original new prophets and Tertullian, the African new prophet. Indeed there is the striking similarity at almost every point between the doctrinal and experiential emphases of Montanism and those of present day Pentecostalism, namely, belief in the present work of the Holy Spirit in the individual, enthusiastic prophecy and its accompanying glossolalia under the immediate inspiration, and imminent second coming of the Lord with the millennial reign of Christ. In case of healing, there exists a missing link between the Pentecostals and new prophets and it may reflect that the Montanists were having difficulty integrating the character of Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer into that of Jesus as Healer.

4.1.3. Pentecostalism as Ecclesiological Movement

The particular nature of the Pentecostal ecclesiology rests on the freedom and sovereignty of the Holy Spirit. The Pentecostals regard the Church as "a group of people who are individually empowered by the Holy Spirit for service within the community and in external witness" (Clark 1989:67). For them, the church is to be "a pneumatological theocracy" consists of charisma, revelation and ministry. This represents not only their emphasis on the Holy Spirit, but also their enthusiasm for the reappraisal of True Church of the New Testament: the church filled with and guided by the Spirit through the apostles (Williams 1981:156). Indeed, their deep spiritual hunger for the early ideal church comes with their deep dissatisfaction with the church today (Fee 1991:108). Pentecostals feel the absence of power in the contemporary church (Bruner 1970:21). In their view, the secret of church power is the Spirit. What characterizes Pentecostals particularly is the insistence that the church must return to the first-century charismatic church and it is only possible for the church in which the Spirit is an experience, not for the church in which the Spirit is a doctrine. (Bruner 1970:20-1).

Such an awareness of new fullness of spiritual power has made deep inroads into an ecclesiastical bureaucracy of the established church. The Pentecostals, as "a new invasion of the Spirit" (Williams 1981:112), argue, "It is the Upper Room and not the Temple that has the

power of Pentecost." (Horton 1960:226) From this belief, for the Pentecostals, the True Church should definitely be distinguished from greater and lesser Babylon, that is, both the established and free church (Hollenweger 1972:430). Yet this is not to say that the Pentecostals aimed at fostering anti-establishment and becoming sectarians. They instead actually were consistently trying to separate themselves from the dangers of ecclesiasticism and sectarianism:

> [Pentecostals] are not fighting men or churches, but seeking to displace dead forms and creeds and wild fanaticisms with living, practical Christianity. 'Love, Faith, Unity' are [their] watchwords, and 'Victory through the Atoning Blood' [their] battle cry. God's promises are true. He said: "Be thou faithful over a few things, and I will make thee ruler over many." From the little handful of Christians who stood by the cross when the testing and discouragements came, God has raised a mighty host (*Apostolic Faith* 1906)

It is also interesting to note that the Pentecostals do not overlook the ecclesiological pluralism in the New Testament. Rather the Pentecostals recognize that there is a different-yet-balancing view of the church in the New Testament. One is the Johannine type of church, which was allergic to hierarchical structure, but enthusiastic to informal groups and the other is the church, having its root in the Pastoral Epistles, which gave more weight to a structured church ministry than the freedom of the Spirit (Hollenweger 1972:427). Despite St. Paul, having in his epistles, had functionally differentiated charisma from ministry (Hollenweger 1972:429), to the Pentecostals the implication is clear: both, at the same time, must be taken seriously. As there is no contradiction between office and Spirit, so must be no separation of freedom from structure (Clark 1987:68). Indeed, charismatic freedom must go hand in hand with realized ministries even if the Spirit is indispensable for motivating the Pentecostal ecclesiology (Clark 1987:66-69). This clearly represents that the validity of the Pentecostal ecclesiology is to be neither office-less, nor Spirit-less (Clark 1987:69). Rather the quintessence of the Pentecostal ecclesiology is to be found in the freedom of the Spirit within the church order, which is created by the apostles, in order to continue to carry out the task of edifying the Church (Schweizer 1961:7).

As such, the Pentecostals never consider themselves as a separate entity, but a unifying movement within the Christian Church as a spiritual catalyst (Nichol 1966:55). That is why the

Pentecostals see the prevalent religious inertia as a serious warning that the Church is losing much of its initial impetus. There were, however, the antecedents who felt the same burden before them, namely, the Montanist prophets and Tertullian as the African new prophet. Both were surprised that the church was so quickly compromising herself with the spirit of the world rather than the Spirit of the Church; in their eyes, Church had suffered from charismatic amnesia, moral lethargy, and theological fossilization. What was worse for them was that the spontaneous prophetic ministry seemed to be superseded by a regular official ministry, which simply minimized supernatural works and the direction of the Holy Spirit (Lawson 1961:66). Given the unfavorable climate, the Montanist new prophets were first confronted with a rapidly institutionalizing Catholic Church, but they were defeated. Then the same baton was handed over to the Montanist Tertullian for the same purpose. In one sense, this helps explain why both were broadly inimical to the established church of their day. In another sense, however, both confessed the church to be one, catholic, and apostolic unity without division (Rankin 1995:111-6).

The Montanist prophets did not deny the role and power of the hierarchy in the church, even if they put their focus on prerogatives of spiritual men who acted as an inspired instrument of the Paraclete (Daly 1993:15). Now it is recognized that there had been a sophisticated ministerial organization in the Montanist circle: a centralized administration, collectors of money, and salaried officials including women clergy (Tabbernee 2007:422; Vokes 1966:307-15; Osborn 1997:177). This is reflected in that the new prophets were accused of organizing their novel ministry rather than of abandoning Catholic Church's institution, despite they had definitely intended to restore the charismatic form of the first-century church ministry (Tabbernee 2007:388). At any rate, the New Prophecy regarded prophetic/charismatic ministry not as a competitor, but as a collaborator with the clerical ministry and that the Montanist spiritual church should remain within the Catholic Church not as an antithesis, but as a synthesis.

There was no substantial change in Tertullian's view of the church. In his appreciation of the martyr church, which owned the tradition of Perpetua, Tertullian rather went much further than the Montanist prophets had gone. Tertullian had argued that the unity of the church had to be empirical; anyone who brought a schism in the church is not a Christian or he was apostate (Osborn 1997:179). For Tertullian, the one church as the single bride of Christ was a metaphor for a monogamous marriage in Christianity. Tertullian considered the unity of church as a

127

matter of tradition. Never did Tertullian deny the Christian belief that there would be one God, one baptism, and one church (Rankin 1995:91-110). The holy-club within the Catholic Church was the clear evidence that he tried to act as a peacemaker, not as a troublemaker. As the body of Christ, the church must be peaceful one; the unity of the church must embrace both psychic catholic and spiritual new prophet as a whole. Tertullian, as a self-sacrificial volunteer for reconciliation, had maintained that the co-existence between office and Spirit was not only valid, but also essential for the church universal. Indeed Tertullian, in his ecclesiastical view, was both Catholic and Montanist who brought a correlation in the office-Spirit interplay.

In their ecclesiastical perspective, all three groups, the Montanist prophets, Tertullian, and Pentecostals, have agreed that the church never come apart from the Holy Spirit; they are convinced that the church has to leave room for the sovereign work of the Holy Spirit. Nonetheless, as the primitive church in the New Testament alludes (Hollenweger 1972:427), the direct impulse of the Spirit does not deny the whole principle of order and authority, which the existing church has developed: charismatic freedom is continued alongside a structured ecclesiastical order. All three pneumatics have also recognized that such a profound unity does not allow a free riding. If the church wants to remain a dynamic church governed by the Holy Spirit, then they have to no choice but to walk the pathway of risk.

To summarize, the Pentecostals, in their ecclesiology, look forward to returning to the church in the New Testament; the church guided by the apostles who are filled with the Holy Spirit. For the Pentecostals, the church must be a pneumatological theocracy, which includes productive tensions between Spirit and office, and between freedom and structure. Pentecostals regard the church without Spirit as empty, but the church without offices as unhealthy as well. Indeed the Pentecostal ecclesiology is an epitome of the church in the New Testament, which shows a harmonious combination between Spirit and offices and between charisma and hierarchy (Clark 1987:66-69). In this understanding of the church, the Montanist prophets and the Montanist Tertullian are not exceptional. Both come to believe that the Spirit is the unifying principle of God's holy Church. Their defense of the Paraclete, in this sense, does not expel the hierarchical constitution of the church. For them, the church of the Spirit is not invisible, nor illusory, rather visible and externally tangible body within the Christian community. In essence, it is radical, but not revolutionary; it is distinct, but not divisive. In principle, both are vigorous defenders of one Christian Church as the body of Christ; the unity of the church must not be

compromised, but rather must remain as the sole spouse of one holy Christ.

4.2. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As considered so far, the identification of the present day Pentecostalism varies considerably; its dynamic and complex character calls for a careful approach in holistic ways. In particular, this merits closer inspection at least of three aspects, namely historical, theological and ecclesiological viewpoints. First, the view that considers the Pentecostalism as historical movement finds its antecedent in the early primitive charismatic movement including Montanism. Second, the fourfold theological correlation, such as experience-Jesus as Savior: baptism in the Holy Spirit-Jesus as Spirit-Baptizer: divine healing-Jesus as Healer: and eschatological hope-Jesus as the Coming King, implies that the Pentecostals are descendents who inherited their spirit of theology from the new prophets and Tertullian, the African new prophet. Third, the present day Pentecostals consider the church as a pneumatological theocracy in the intimate link of office with Spirit and this is none other than a constant reminder of their precedent, the new prophets. In all fashions it reflects that the emergence of the present day Pentecostal movement is in continuity with the New Prophecy and Tertullian as the African new prophet. Pentecostalism shows a high degree of similarity with the original Montanism and its African advocate in historical, theological, and ecclesiastical characteristics. All of them point to all three having a common and coherent nature, which is in conformity with the belief of the church in the Apostolic Christianity. All three are historically enthusiasm-centric, theologically experience-centric, and ecclesiologically Spirit-centric. Indeed, this dynamic correlation, as did Tertullian, renews and empowers the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

The researcher attends in this thesis to the following research question: "Why were the original Montanists condemned?" **Chapter 2** therefore focuses on the origin of Montanism and its root-cause for their condemnation as reflected within the recent scholarly views. Even if the entirety of Montanism shows the complex interrelationship between the institutionalizing church, the controversial characteristics, including ecstatic prophecy, fanatical millenarianism, strict asceticism, and the conflict of urban and rural Christianity, the ecclesiastical power struggle made the Montanist crisis a highly politically charged affair.

Secondly, the researcher pays attention to the following question: "Why did Tertullian become a Montanist?" Consequently, **Chapter 3** focuses on the relationship between Montanism and Tertullian. A new perspective in transitional correlation reduces the traditional portrayal of Tertullian and rather induces the reconstructed portrayal in concentric circles of the Pagan as caterpillar-Catholic as cocoon-Montanist as butterfly. In this shifting-perspective, a schismatic Montanist Tertullian has transformed into a self-empting mediator who brings the reconciliation between two rivals, namely, the new prophets and new priests. Here the Catholic-Montanist Tertullian was trying to restore the Church from the transubstantiation of priests' institution into the consubstantiation of prophet's inspiration; the Montanist holy-club within the Catholic Church substantiated his self-sacrifice.

Lastly, the researcher pays attention to the following question: "Why does Montanism include/exclude the present day Pentecostalism as Neo-Montanism?" Subsequently, in **Chapter 4,** the researcher concentrates on the precise nature of the relationship between Tertullian, Montanism, and Pentecostalism. There are significant overlap between them; all are historically enthusiasm-centric, theologically experience-centric, and ecclesiologically Spirit-centric. Indeed, all act interactively and intimately as a coherent whole as if the trio plays a symphony of Neo-Montaism with the new prophets under the direction of the conductor Tertullian, the African new prophet.

The way of Tertullian's voluntary and purposeful reverse Exodus into the place of *limbo* –from Montanism to the Catholic Church –is strongly reminiscent. Tertullian's Montanism, as a point of contact between Montanism and Neo-Montanism, opens with a *communio* outlook, which

shows how the Spirit without the Church can/must interrelate with the Church without the Spirit; it functions as a hinge between Old and New Montanism. Then this dynamic nexus brings a new hope and new challenge to the present day Neo-Montanism whose distinctive task is in line with the go-between as enthusiastic born-again pneumatics. Indeed, Tertullian's Montanism is painstaking but breathtaking stigma, which tells anew the story of Old and New Prophecy today.

This study brings a new perspective to the relationship between Montanism, Tertullian, and Pentecostalism in a consistent historical, theological and ecclesiological correlation. It also sets new links by the inversion of what has been disconnected before: the result is to draw a new identity as Montanism-Montanist Tertullian-Neo-Montanism as a whole. All three are interconnected with each other for a renewal of orientation and a change of direction within the Church. Such striking affinities with all three do serve to shed new light upon one another. It, however, must be admitted that the nature of the argument presented here is suggestive rather than prescriptive, and open to further creative and critical development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander Roberts, A C C, James Donaldson (ed) 1994. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1-10. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Alexander Roberts, J D, Philip Schaff, and Henry Wace (ed) 1996. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series*. *The Early Church Fathers*, 1-14: Hendrickson Publishers.

Alexander Roberts, P S, and James Donaldson (ed) 1994. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Series*. *The Early Church Fathers*, 1-14: Hendrickson Publishers.

Anderson, A 2004. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, R M 1979. *Vision of the Disinherited* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Angelo, M R D 1995. Veils, Virgins, and the Tongues of Men and Angels, in W, E-S H a D (ed), *Off with Her Head: the Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture*, 131-64. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Arbesmann, R 1950. *Tertullian and Minucius Felix, Apologetical Works*. *Fathers of the Church Series*. 10. New York.

Archer, K J 1996. Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 9.

Ash, J L 1976. Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church *Theological Studies* 37:227-52.

Attridge, K N a H W 1998. The Didache: A Commentary. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Aune, D E 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____, 2006. *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Bamett, M 1953. *The Living Flame: Being a Study of the Gift of the Spirit in the New Testament*. London: The Epworth Press.

Baney, S M M 1948. *Some Reflections of Life in North Africa in the Writings of Tertullian. Patristic Studies*. 79-80. Washington, D.C.

Barnes, T D 1968. Legislation against the Christians *JRS* LVIII.

_____, 1969. Tertullian's *Scorpiace JTS* NS, XX.

_____, 1970. The Chronology of Montanism *JTS* N.S. XXI.

_____, 1971. *Tertullian:A historical and literary study*. Oxford.

Barnett, M 1953. *The Living Flame: Being a Study of the Gift of the Spirit in the New Testament With Special Reference to Prophecy, Glossolalia, Montanism and Perfection*. London: Epworth.

Barret, D (ed) 1982. *World Christian Encyclopedia: A Comprehensive Survey of Churches and Religions in the Modern World A.D. 1900-2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bartleman, F 1925. *How Pentecostal Came to Los Angeles: As It Was in the Beginning*. Los Angeles: Privately Printed.

Baur, F C 1879. *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*, 2. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

Bauer, W 1971. *Orthodox and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Baus, K 1965. From the Apostolic Community to Constantine, in Dolan, H J a J (ed), *History of Church*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Becker, C 1961. *Tertullian: Apologeticum*. Munchen: Kosel-Verlag.

Behn, J 1964. s v 'glossa'. *TDNT 1*.

Bethune-Baker, J F 1951. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian doctrine*. London.

Birley, A 1993. Persecutors and Martyrs in Tertullian's Africa, in Clark, D (ed), *The Later Roman Empire Today*. London: Institute of Archaeology.

Blumhofer, E L 1993. *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Bond, G 1958. *The Life Story of the Rev. O. H. Bond*. Oakgrove: Ark.

Bonner, G 1991. *Schism and Church Unity. Early Christianity: Origins and Evolution to AD 600*: SPCK.

Boring, M E 1979. The Influence of Christian Prophecy on theJohanninePortrayal of the Paraclete and Jesus *NTS* 25:113-23.

Bowden, H W 1971. *Church History in the Age of Science: Historiographical Patterns in the United States 1876-1918*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.

Braudel, F 1974. *Capitalism and Material Life 1400-1800*. London: Fontana.

Bray, G L 1979. *Holiness and the will of God: Perspectives on the Theology of Tertullian*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.

Brent, A 1995. *Hippolytus and the Roman church in the third century*. Leiden Brill.

Brooker, P 1994. Key Words in Brecht's Theory and Practice of Theatre, in Thomson, P a G S

(ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Brecht*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce, F F 1982. *The Spreading Flame*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____, 1988. *The Canon of Scripture*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.

Brumback, C 1947. *What Meaneth This?* Springfield, Mo: Gospel Publishing House.

_____, 1961. *Suddenly . . . From Heaven*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.

Bruner, E 1962. *The Christian Doctrine of the Church, Faith and the Consummation, Dogmatics*. London: Lutterworth.

Bruner, F D 1970. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bryant, J M 1998. Wavering saints, mass religiosity, and the crisis of post-baptismal sin in early Christianity: a Weberian reading of The Shepherd of Hermas *European Journal of Sociology* 39/1:49-77.

Bultmann, R 1963. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burgess, S M 1984. *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

_____, 1986. Montanist & Patristic Perfectionism, *Reaching Beyond: Chapters in the History of Perfectionism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pubhshers.

_____, 2002. s v 'Montanism'. *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*.

Burghardt, W J 1979. Primitive Montanism: Why Condemned? From Faith to Faith: Essays in Honor of Donald G. Miller on his Seventieth Birthday *Pittsburgh Theological*

Monograph Series 31:339-356.

Butler, R D 2006. *The New Prophecy & "New Visions": Evidence of Montanism in the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Calder, W M 1923. Philadelphia and Montanism *BJRL* 7:309-54.

Campbell, J 1951. *The Pentecostal Holiness Church*. Franklin Springs, Ga: The Publishing House of the Pentecostal Holiness Church.

Campenhausen, H v 1969. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Carnelley, E 1989. Tertullian and Feminism *Theology* 92:31-35.

Carter, R K 1884. *The Atonement of Sin and Sickness: or , a Full Salvation for Soul and Body* Boston: Willard Tract Repository.

Cerillo, A, Jr. 1997. Interpretive Approaches to the History of American Pentecostal Origins *Pneuma* 10/1:29-80.

Chadwick, H 1993. *The Early Church*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Childs, B S 2009. Retrospective Reading of the Old Testament Prophets *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108/3:362-77.

Christenson, L 1969. *Speaking in Tongues...a Gift* London: Fountain Trust.

Church, F F 1975. Sex and Salvation in Tertullian *Harvard Theological Review* 68.

Claassen, J M 2012. *Mourner, Mother, Midwife: Reimagining God's Liberating Presence in the Old Testament*: Westminster John Knox.

Clark, E T 1955. Holiness Churches, in Loetscher, L A (ed), *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 520. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Clark, M S 1989. *What is distinctive about Pentecostal Theology?* Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Cohn, N 1970. *The Pursuit of Millennium: Revolutionary Millennarians and Mystical Aanrchristis of the Middle Ages* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Comby, J 1985-1989. *How to Read Church History*, 1-2. London: SCM Press.

Conn, C W 1956. *Pillars of Pentecost*. Cleveland, TN: The Pathway Press.

Countryman, L W 1979. The Intellectual Role of the Early Catholic Episcopate *Church History* 48/3:261-68.

_____, 1982. Tertullian and the Regula Fidei *The Second Century 2*:208-27.

Cox, H 1995. *Fire from Heaven*: Da Capo Press.

Croix, D K a G E M D S 1987. *The Social Structure of Early Christian Communities* Verso Books

_____, 2006. Voluntary Martyrdom in the Early Church, in G.E.M de, S C, Michael Whitby, Joseph Streeter (ed), *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*. New York: Oxford.

Cross, a E A L 1978. s v 'The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church'.

Currie, S D 1965. 'Speaking in Tongues': Early Evidence Outside the New Testament Bearing on 'Glossais Lalein' *Int* 19.

Dafydd, G D 1955. Some Aspects of Christian Prophecy up to and including Montanism with

Special Reference to the Patristic Text.

Daly, C B 1993. *Tertullian: The Puritan and His Influence: An Essay in Historical Theology*: Four Courts Press.

Danielou, J 1977. *The Origins of Latin Christianity*. Baker, London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd.

Daunton-Fear, A 1982. The ecstasies of Montanus *StPatr* 17/2:648-51.

Davis, J G 1955. Tertullian: De Resurrectione Carnis LXIII: A Note on the Origins of Montanism *JTS* NS 6:90-94.

Dayton, D W 1987. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson.

Deferrari, R J 1959. *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, 40. Washington 17, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press.

Deuchesne, L 1950. *Early History of the Christian Church: From its Foundations to End of Third century*, I. London: John Murray.

Dewar, L 1959. *The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought*. NY: Harper & Brothers.

Dunn, G D, 1970. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. London: SCM Press LTD.

_____, 2004. Heresy and Schism according to Cyprian of Carthage *Journal of Theological Studies* 55:551-574.

_____, 2004. *Tertullian*. London: Routledge.

Ellul, J 1986. *The Subversion of Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans

Publishing Company.

Enslin, M S 1947. Puritan of Carthage *JR* 27:197-212.

Epiphanius 1987. The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, in Williams, F (ed), *Book 1*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Eusebius 1953. Ecclesiastical History, in Deferrari, R J (ed), *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*. Washington 17, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press.

_____, 1998. *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Hendrickson Publishers.

Evans, E 1948. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*.

_____, 1964. *Tertullian's Homily on Baptism*. London: SPCK.

_____, 1972. *Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford.

Evans, R F 1976. On the Problem of Church and Empire in Tertullian's Apologeticum, in Livingstone, E A (ed), *Studia Patristia*. Berlin.

Faupel, D W 1996. *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplemental series 10*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Fee, G D 1976. Hermeneutics and Historical Precedent: A Major Problem in Pentecostal Hermeneutics *Spittler*:118-132.

_____, 1991. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Ferguson, E 2009. Tertullian *Expository Times* 120.

Fidler, R L 1963. Historical Review of the Pentecostal Outpouring in Los Angeles at the Azusa

Steet Mission in 1906 *The International Outlook*:3-14.

Finlay, B 2003. Was Tertullian a Misogynist: A Reconsideration *Journal of the Historical Society* 3:503-525.

Forbes, C 1995. *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment*. Tubingen: J. C. M. Mohr.

Ford, J M 1966. Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy? *JEH* 17.2:145-58.

_____, 1971. Toward a Theology of "Speaking in Tongues" *Theological Studies*:3-29.

Frazee, C A 1972. The Origins of Clerical Celibacy in the Western Church *Church History*:149-67.

Frend, W H C 1961. The Seniores Laici and the Origins of the Church in North Africa *JTS* NS, xii.2.

_____, 1964. A Note on the Chronology of the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the Outbreak of Montanism *Oikoumene: Studi paleocristiani pubblicati in onore del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II*:499-506.

_____, 1965. *Martytrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

_____, 1980. Town and Countryside in Early Christianity, *Town and Countryside in Early Christian Centuries*, 25-42. London: Variourum Reprints.

_____, 1982. *The Early Church: Fom the Beginnings to 461*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

_____, 1988. Montanism: A Movement of Prophecy and Regional Identity in the Early Church *BJRL* 70:25-34.

Froehlich, K 1973. Montanism and Gnosis *OrChrAn* 195:94.

Fuller, J M Tertuallianus, Quintus Septimius Florens *DCB* 4.

Gee, D 1929. Why is 'Penteocst' Oppresed? *The Pentecostal estimony* X.

_____, 1949. *The Pentecostal Movement*. London: Elim Publishing House Ltd.

Gillespie, T W 1994. *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

Gilmour, D 1996. The Unregarded Prophet: Lord Curzon and the Palestine Question *Journal of Palestine Studies* 25/3:60-8.

Goff, J R 1988. *Fields White unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

Gonzales, J L 1974. Athens and Jerusalem Revisited: Reason and Authority in Tertullian *Church History* 43:17-25.

Goodman, F D 1972. *Speaking in Tongues: A Cross-cultural Study of Glossolalia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goree, B W 1980. The Cultural Bases of Montanism, Baylor University.

Grant, R M 1970. *Augustus to Constantine: The Thrust of the Christian Movement into the Roman World*. New York.

_____, 2003. *Second-Century Christianity: A Collection of Fragments*. Westminster: John Knox Press.

Greenslade, S L 1932-3. Tertullien of Carthage *ExpT* 44.

_____, 1956. *Early Latin Theology: Selections from Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose and*

Jerome Library of Christian Classics: Westminster Press.

_____, 1964. *Schism in the Early Church*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

Groh, D E 1985. *Utterance and Exegesis: Biblical Interpretation in the Montanist Crisis*. *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. NY: University Press of America.

Gwatkin, H M 1909. *Early Church History*, 2. London: Macmillan and co., Limited.

Hamilton, N Q 1957. *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*, no. 6. *Scotish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers*. Edinburge: Oliver and Boyd.

Hanson, R P C 1961. Notes on Tertullian's Interpretation of Scripture *JTS* NS, xii.

Harnack, A 1896. *History of Dogma 2*. London.

_____, 1961. *History of Dogma*, 1. NY: Dover Publications Inc.

Hart, L D 1978. A Critique of American Pentecosal Theology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Hauerwas, W H W a S 1989. *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony* Nashiville: Abingdon.

Heath, G L 2008. *Doing Church History: A User-Friendly Introduction to Researching the History of Christianity*. Toronto: Clements Publisher.

Heine, R E 1987-1988. The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy *SCent* 6:1-19.

_____, 1989. *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*. Macon, GA: University Press.

Heron, A I C 1983. *The Holy Spirit*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Hennecke, E *New Testament Apocrypha*, 2. PA: The Westminster Press.

Hill, C 1992. *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Future Hope in Early Christianity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hippolytus 1886. Philosophoumena, in Alexander Roberts, J D, and A. Cleveland Coxe (ed), *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Grand Rapids, Mich. Hippolytus 1921.

Hollenweger, W J 1972. *The Pentecostals*: SCM Press Ltd.

_____, 1997. *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide* Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Hopkins, M K 1965. *Population Studies*, XVIII.

Hopwood, P G S 1936. *The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Horton, H 1960. *The Gifts of the Spirit*. London: AoG Publishing House.

Hultgren, S A H a A J (ed) 1996. *The Earliest Christian Heresies Readings from their Opponents*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Irvin, D T 1995. Drawing All Together in One Bond of Love: The Ecumenical Vision of William J. Seymour and Azusa Street *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 6/1.

Jeffreys, G 1931. The Gospel of the Miraculous, in Gee, D (ed), *The Pheonmena of Pentecost*, 33-50.

Jensen, A 1993. Prisca-Maximilla-Montanus: Who was the Founder of Montanism *StPatr* 26.

Kalu, O U 1998. The Practice of Victorious Life: Pentecostal Political Theology and Practice in Nigeria, 1970-1996 *Missions* 52:229-55.

Kapelle, R P V 1984. Prophets and mantics, in Lounibo, R S a J (ed), *Pagan and Christian anxiety*, 87-111. Lanham: MD.

Kärkkäinen, V-M 2002. *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perpective*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Kaufman, P I 1991. Tertullian on Heresy, History, and the Reappropriation of Revelation *Church History* 60.

Kelsey, M T 1976. Courage, unity and theology *Spittler*:232-244.

Kendrick, K 1961. *The Promise Fulfilled: A History of the Modern Pentecostal Movement*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.

_____, 1963. The Pentecostal Movement: Hopes and Hazards *Christian Century*/80.

Kierkegaard, S 1944. *The Concept of Dread*: Princeton University Press.

_____, 1967. Entry, in Hong, H V H a E H (ed), *Journals and Papers*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kim, L J 2009. Is Montanism a heretical sect or Pentecostal antecedent? *AJPS* 12:1.

Klawiter, F W 1975. The New Prophecy in Early Christianity: The Origin, Nature, and Development of Montanism AD 165-220, University of Chicago III Divinity School.

Knox, R A 1950. *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Kreidler, M J 1989. Montanism and Monasticism: Charism and Authority in the Early Church

StPatr 18.

Kydd, R A N 1984. *Charismatic Gifts in the Early Church: An Exploration into the Gifs of the Spirit During the First Three Centuries of the Christian Church*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publisher.

Kyrtatis, D J 1987. *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities*. London: Verso

Labriolle, P d 1924. *History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.

_____, P d 1924. *Latin Christianity*. London.

Lampe, G W H 1977. *God as Spirit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Laurentin, R 1977. *Catholic Pentecostalism*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.

Latourette, K S 1953. *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, 1. New York: Harper & Brothers.

_____, 1997. *A History of Christianity*. Peabody, MA: Prince Press.

Lawson, J 1961. *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers*. NY: The Macmillan Company.

LeTourneau, M S 1987. General and Special Topics in the De Baptismo of Tertullian *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 5/1:87-105.

Lewis, D M (ed) 2004. *Christianity Reborn: The Globla Expansion of Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Livingstone, F L C a E A 1978. s v 'The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church'.
MacArthur, J F 1992. *Charismatic Chaos* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Macchia, F D 1993. *Spirituality and Social Liberation: The Message of the Blumhardts in the Light of Wuerttemberg Pietism*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

_____, 2006. The Kingdom and the Power: Spirit Baptism in Pentecostal and Ecumenical Perspective, in Welker, M (ed), *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatlogy and Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Mackie, A 1921. *The Gift of Tongues*. NY: George H. Doran Co.

MacRobert, I 1988. *The Black Roots and White Racism of Ealry Pentecostalism in the USA*. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Martin, I J 1960. *Glossolalia in the Apostolic Church*. Berea, KY: Berea College Press.

Marshall, G 2012. The Problem of Religious Language 'Look at it this way' [Wittgenstein] *Sophia* 51/4:479-93.

McDonnell, G T M a K 1991. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit* Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

McGee, G B (ed) 1991. *William J. Seymour and the 'Bible Evidenc'. Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson.

McGinn-Mohrer, S E 1989. The New Prophecy of Asia Minor and the Rise of Ecclesiastical Patriarchy in Second Century Pauline Traditions, Northwestern University.

McGrath, A 2009. *Heresy:A History of Defending the Truth*. London: SPCK.

McRoberts, I 1988. *The Black Roots and White Racism of Ealry Pentecostalism in the USA*. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Menzies, W M 1971. *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God* Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.

_____, 1975. The Non-Wesleyan Origins of the Pentecostal Movement, in Synan, V (ed), *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*. Plainsfield, N.J.: Logos International.

Migliore, D L 2004. *Faith Seeking Understanding: An Introduction to Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Mignolo, W D 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowleges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univeristy Press.

Mitchell, S 1993. *Anatolia : land, men and gods in Asia Minor*: Oxford.

Moltmann, J 1967. *The Theology of Hope*. London: SCM Press.

_____, 1974. *The Crucified God*. New York: Harper & Row.

Montague, K M a G T 1991. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.

Moody, D L 1910. *at Home*. London: Morgan and Scott.

Moore Rickie D., J C T a S J L 1992. Editorial *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1.

Morgan, J 1908. *The Importance of Tertullian in the Development of Christian Dogma*. London.

Mueller-Fahrenholz, G 1995. *God's Spirit: Transforming a World in Crisis*. New York: Continuum.

Muller, J E B a R A 1995. *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works and Methods*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Musurillo, H 1972. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. Oxford.

Muzzey, D S 1908. Were the Spiritual Franciscans Montanist Heretics? *The American Journal of Theology* 12/No. 4:588-608.

Nasrallah, L 2003. "*An Ecstasy of Folly": Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nichol, J T 1966. *Pentecostalism*. NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

O'Malley, T P 1967. *Tertullian and the Bible*. Nijmegen-Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt N.V.

Osborn, E 1997. *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West*: Cambridge University Press.

_____, 1999. The Subtlety of Tertullian *Vigiliae Christianae*/52:361-70.

Parham, C F 19_. *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness*. Baxter Springs, Kansas: Apostolic Faith Bible College.

_____, 1951. The Latter Rain *The Apostolic Faith* XXVIII.

Parks, E P 1945. *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts under the Early Empire*: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Pelikan, J 1971. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Plessis, D D 1977. *A Man called Mr. Pentecost*. Planinfield, NJ: Logos.

Plüss, J-D 1993. Azusa and Other Myths: The Long and Winding Road from Experience to Stated Belief and Back Again *Pneuma* 15/2:191.

Poirier, J C 1999. Montanist Pepuza-Jerusalem and the Dwelling Place of Wisdom *JECS*

7:491-507.

Powell, D 1975. Tertullianists and Cataphrygians *Vigihae Christianae* 29:33-54.

Power, V 1971. Tertullian: Father of Clerical Animosity toward the Theatre *Educational Theatre Journal* 23/1:36-50.

Quasten, J 1950. *Patrology* I. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press.

_____, 1953. *Patrology*, II. Utrecht Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers.

Rankin, D I 1986. Was Tertullian a Schismatic? *Prudentia* 18:73-9.

_____, 1995. *Tertullian and the Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reeves, M 1976. *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*. London: SPCK.

Robeck, C M 1992. *Prophecy in Carthage: Perpetua, Tertullian, and Cyprian*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Pilgrim Press.

_____, 1993. Stock of Pentecostalism: The Personal Reflections of a Retiring Editor *Pneuma* 15/no. 1:35-60.

_____, 2010. Montanism and Present day 'Prophets' *Pneuma 32*.

Robinson, J A 1891. *The Passion of S. Perpetua*. Cambridge.

Roth, D T 2008. Matthean Texts and Tertulliano Accusations in Adversus Marcionem *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 59.

_____, 2009. Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel *Vigiliae Christianae* 63:429-67.

Ryrie, C C 1986. *Basic Theology: A Popular Systematic Guide to Understanding Biblical Truth*

Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.

Sandidge, J L 1987. *Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue (1977-1982): A Study in Developing Ecumenism, vol 1*, 44. *Studies in the Intercultural History of Christianity*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Schaff, P 1992. *History of the Christian Church: Apostolic Period, 1* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____, (ed) 1994. *The Early Church Fathers-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Series*. *The Early Church Fathers*, 1-14: Hendrickson Publishers.

_____, 1996. *History of the Christian Church: Ante-Nicene Christianity A.D. 100-325*, 2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Schwartz, G 1970. *Sect Ideologies and Social Status*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schweizer, E 1961. *Church Order in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press.

Shaw, P E 1946. *The Catholic Apostolic Church*. NY: King's Crown Press.

Sider, R D 1971. *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simon, M 1973. Early Christianity and Pagan Thought: Confluences and Conflicts *Religious Studies* 9/4:385-99.

Simpson, A B 1915. *The Gospel of Healing*. NY: Christian Alliance Publishing.

Smith, J K A The Closing of the Book: Pentecostals, Evangelicals, and the Sacred Writings *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*/11:49-71.
.

Smith, R G 1943. Tertullian and Montanism *Theology* 46:127-139.

Snyder, H A 1989. *Signs of the Spirit: How God Reshapes the Church?* . Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Sohm, R 1921. *Outlines of Church History*. London: Macmillan.

Soyres, J D 1965. *Montanism and the Primitive Church: A Study in the Ecclesiastical History of the Second Century*. Lexington: KY: American Theological Library Association.

Steiner, L 1959. Divine Healing in God's Plan of Redemption *Pentecostal Evangelical* XLVII.

Stevenson, W H C F a J 1987. *A New Eusebius:Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to Ad 337*. London: SPCK.

Stewart-Sykes, A 1997. The Asian Context of the New Prophecy and of Epistola Apostolorum *Vig Chr* 51.

_____, 1999. The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50.

Streeter, B H (ed) 1919. *The Spirit*. NY: The Macmillan Company.

Stuiber, B A a A 1966. *Patrologie*. Fribourg-Basel-Vienna.

Swete, H B 1912. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers*. London: Mcmillan.

Synan, V 1971. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.

Tabbernee, W (ed) 1978. *Christian Inscriptions from Phrygia*. Grands Rapids, MIch.: Eerdmans.

_____, 1978. The Opposition to Montanism from Church and State, University of
     Melbourne.

_____, 1985. Early Montanism and Voluntary Martyrdom *The Australian Theological Review*
     17/2:33-44.

_____, 1989. Revelation 21 and the Montanist New Jerusalem *AustBR* 37:52-60.

_____, 1997. *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press..

_____, 2007. *Fake Prophecy and Polluted Sacraments: Ecclesiastical and Imperial
     Reactions to Montanism*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

_____, 2009. *Prophets and Gravestones: An Imaginative History of Montanists and
     Other Early Christians*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Tabbernee W., a P L 2008. *Pepouza and Tymion: The Discovery and Archaeological
     Exploration of a Lost Ancient City and an Imperial Estate*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Thelwell, P H a S 1995. *Latin Christianity:Its Founder, Tertullian, Ante-Nicene Christian
     Library*, 3-4. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Thomas, C M 2003. The Scriptures and the New Prophecy: Montanism as Exegetical Crisis,
     in D. Warren, E B, et al (ed), *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions, and
     Symbols* 155-65. Leiden: Brill.

Thomassen, E 2004. Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome *Harvard Theological
     Review* 97/3:241-56.

Thyssen, H P 2006. Philosophical Christology in the New Testament *Koiunklijke Brill NV*
     53:133-76.

Tinney, J S 1976. William Seymour: Father of Modern-Day Pentecostalism *Jouranl of the Interdenominational Theological Center* 4/1:34-44.

Torjesen, K 1995. *When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of Their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Trevett, C 1983. Prophecy and Anti-Episcopal Activity : A Third Error Combatted by Ignatius? *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34:1-18.

_____, 1989. Apocalypse, Ignatius, Montanism: seeking the seeds *VigChr* 43:313-338.

_____, 1989. The Other Letters to the Churches of Asia: Apocalypse and Ignatius of Antioch *JSNT* 37:17-35.

_____, 1995. Fingers up Noses and Pricking with Needles: Possible Reminiscences of the Revelation in Later Montanism *Vigiliae Christianae* 46:258-69.

_____, 1996. Eschatological Timetabling and the Montanist Prophet Maximilla, in Livingstone, E (ed), *Studia Patristica xxxi*, 218-24. Leuven: Peeters Press.

_____, 1996. *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____, 1998. Gender, Authority and Church History: A Case Study of Montanism *Feminist Theology*:9-24.

Turner, M 2010. James Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit :Appreciation and Response *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 19:25-31.

Vokes, F E 1966. Montanism and the ministry *StPatr* 9:306-15.

Waldvogel, G W a E 1975. History of Speaking in Tongues and Related Gifts, in Hamilton, M

(ed), *The Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans.

Walker, D 1906. *The Gift of Tongues*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Walker, G S M 1968. *The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian*. Richmond: John Knox Press.

Warfield, B B 1930. *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine*. New York.

Waszink, J (ed) 1947. *Tertulliani de Anima*. Amsterdam: Mulenhoff.

Welker, M 1994. *God the Spirit*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wilhite, D E 2007. *Tertullian the African: An Anthropological Reading of Tertullian's Context and Identities*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

William B. Hunter, J 1948. Prophetic Dreams and Visions in Paradise Lost *Modern Language Quarterly* 9/3:277-85.

Williams, C G 1981. *Tongues of the Spirit: A Study of Pentecostal Glossolalia and Related Phenomena*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Williams, D H 1989. The Origins of the Montansist Movement: A Sociological Analysis *Religion* 19:331-51.

_____, 2013. Tertullian (Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus) (c.155-c.225), in Markham, I S (ed), *The Student's Companion to the Theologians*: Wiley-Blackwell.

Williams, E W a G H 1975. A History of Speaking in Tongues and Related Gifts, in Hamilton, M (ed), *The Charismatic Movement* Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Williams, G H 1962. *The Radical Reformation*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Williams, J R 1974. Pentecostal Spirituality *One in Christ* 10:180-192.

Wills, A J R a D W 1991. Rethinking American Religious History: A Progress Report on 'Afro-American Religious History: A Documentary History Project *The Council of Societies for the Study of Religion Bulletin* 20/3.

Wilson, E A 1999. They Crossed the Red Sea, Didn't They? Critical History and Pentecostal Beginnings, in Murray W. Dempster, B D K, and Douglas Petersen (ed), *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel*. Oxford: Regnum Books.

Witzel, M E J On the origin of the literary device of the 'Frame Story' in Old Indian literature, in Falk, H (ed), *Hinduismus und Buddhismus, Festschrift für U. Schneider.* Freiburg.

Wright, D F 1976. Why were the Montanists Condemned? *Themelios* 2.

Wypustek, A 1997. Magic, Montanism, Perpetua, and the Severan Persecution *Vigiliae Christianae* 51/No. 3:276-297.

Yeomans, L B 1926. *Healing from Heaven*. Springfield: GPH.

Young, A 2010. *In the Days of Caesar: Pentecostalism and Political Theology*. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Yung, H 2003. Endued with Power: the Pentecostal-charismatic Renewal and the Asian Church of the Twenty-first Century *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 6/1:63-82.

Zimmerman, T F 1986. The Reason for the Rise of the Pentecostal Movement, *Azusa Street and Beyond: Pentecostal Missions and Church Growth in the Twentieth Century* South Plainfield, NJ: Logos.