

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

ABSTRACT

MONTANISM : ITS ANCIENT SOURCES AND MODERN
INTERPRETATIONS

(Thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in Divinity
of the University of St. Andrews)

As in the Early Church the Montanist movement led to heated debate, so in the last two centuries it has lent itself to diverse interpretations. Of the latter, those which ascribe it in part to geographical, climatic or sociological factors, those which attribute it to pagan religious influence, or to heterodox Judaism, and those which see it as genuinely Christian - a stage in the development of Ebionism, or a reaction to Gnosticism, or an authentic renewal movement - are examined in turn, in the light of the ancient sources. Many of the arguments are shown to be fallacious. In reality it seems most probable that, though Montanism was nurtured within the Church in Asia Minor and shared much of its doctrine and practice, Montanus himself was not a genuine Christian prophet, but rather his ecstatic prophecy and certain other traits of the movement derived ultimately from the syncretistic cult of Apollo in Asia Minor. Tertullian himself, not having witnessed the actual activities of Montanus and his prophetesses, joined the movement because there he thought he found an echo of his own strongly ascetic stance, his doctrinal orthodoxy, and his emphasis on the importance of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition, and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree. The research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of Dr. J.S. Alexander.

A. Daunton-Fear

24th May, 1976.

(ii)

STATEMENT

I, Andrew Daunton-Fear, was admitted as a Research Student at the University of St. Andrews under Ordinance General No. 12 on 1st January, 1975, enrolled as a candidate for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in Divinity on 22nd January, 1975, and have pursued a course of research on the approved topic Montanism: its Ancient Sources and Modern Interpretations.

A. Daunton-Fear

24th May, 1976.

(iii)

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Andrew Daunton-Fear has fulfilled the conditions of the resolution of the University Court, No. 3 (1970), and that he is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy in Divinity.

Dr. J.S. Alexander,

St. Mary's College,

University of St. Andrews.

(iv)

M O N T A N I S M

ITS ANCIENT SOURCES AND MODERN INTERPRETATIONS

A Thesis Presented to the Senatus
Academicus of the University of
St. Andrews

In
Application for the Degree of
Bachelor of Philosophy in Divinity

by

ANDREW DAUNTON-FEAR



(v)

TO MY PARENTS

PREFACE

My interest in the history of the Early Church was first aroused by Dr. (now Professor) W.H.C. Frend at Cambridge. Since then I have been eager to undertake research in this field, and have therefore been glad of the opportunity afforded by the University of St. Andrews. When I expressed an interest in charismatic ministries in the pre-Nicene Church my supervisor, Dr. J.S. Alexander, referred me to an article by T.D. Barnes - "Tertullian's Scorpiace" (J.T.S., N.S. 20 (1969)), where the author in an aside notes the diversity of interpretations that have been made of the second-century prophetic movement Montanism. Barnes lists five such interpretations that he has encountered in the English literature alone, and comments that the task of sifting fact from fiction has been sadly neglected. Accepting the challenge I have found the investigation fascinating indeed. It has led me to study the writings of archaeologists as well as literary historians, and has given me insight not only into the Patristic writings themselves but also into contemporary pagan and Jewish religious life. In an attempt to be comprehensive I have added to Barnes' five interpretations several others culled from the French and German literature. Alas, however, as almost anyone who touches on Montanism is liable to suggest a new interpretation I fear some may have been omitted! I trust subsequent study of the field will rectify my deficiencies.

I should like to thank very sincerely Dr. Alexander for

his careful supervision throughout my research, Thomas Weckener of Deans Court for considerable help in translating the works of the German authors, Dr. J.S. Richardson for some helpful advice and assistance with some Greek translation, John Richards, author of But Deliver Us from Evil, for directing my attention to Spiritualism for possible parallels to Montanist phenomena, and Professor R.McL. Wilson, Dr. R.B. Salter, and Dr. A.J.M. Wedderburn for assistance with individual points. Finally let me warmly thank Mrs. M. Wilson for her patience and skill in typing from my most trying manuscript.

A. D-F. May 1976

ABBREVIATIONS

A.N.C.L.	Ante-Nicene Christian Library.
B.J.R.L.	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
C.B.	<u>Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia</u> , by W.M. Ramsay (1895-97).
C.C. ser. Lat.	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina.
C.S.E.L.	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.
Clem. Alex.	Clement of Alexandria.
Cyp.	Cyprian.
D.C.B.	<u>Dictionary of Christian Biography</u> , ed. W. Smith & H. Wace. Murray (1877-87).
D.C.B.L.	<u>Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature</u> , ed. H. Wace & W.C. Piercy. Murray (1911).
X De Lab.	De Labriolle.
Deut. Jahr. Wiss. Kunst.	Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst.
Epiph.	Epiphanius.
Eus.	Eusebius of Caesarea.
Expos.	Expositor.
G.C.S.	Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drie Jahrhunderte.
Geog. J.	Geographical Journal.
Harv. Th. Rev.	Harvard Theological Review.
Hippol.	Hippolytus.
Iren.	Irenaeus.
J.E.H.	Journal of Ecclesiastical History.
J.H.S.	Journal of Hellenic Studies.
J.R.S.	Journal of Roman Studies.
J.T.S. (N.S.)	Journal of Theological Studies (New Series).
Jer.	Jerome.
L.F.	Library of the Fathers.
L. & S.	<u>Greek-English Lexicon</u> , comp. H.G. Liddell & R. Scott, new ed. by H.S. Jones <u>et al.</u> O.U.P. (1940).
N.I.D.C.C.	<u>New International Dictionary of the Christian Church</u> , ed. J.D. Douglas, Paternoster P. (1974).
N.T.S.	New Testament Studies.
Nouv. Rev. Theol.	Nouvelle Revue de Theologie.
O.C.D.	<u>Oxford Classical Dictionary</u> , 2nd. ed., ed. N.G.L. Hammond & H.H. Scullard. O.U.P. (1970).
P.G.	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca, ed. J.P. Migne.
P.L.	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina, ed. J.P. Migne.
Pat. Gk. Lex.	<u>Patristic Greek Lexicon</u> , ed. G.W.H. Lampe. O.U.P. (1961-68).
Rev. Archeol.	Revue Archeologique.
Stud. Pat.	Studia Patristica.
T.u.U.	Texte und Untersuchungen.
Tert.	Tertullian.
Th. Jahr.	Theologische Jahrbücher.
Th. Z.	Theologische Zeitschrift.
Theol.	Theology.

V.C.	Vigiliae Christianae.
Z.K.G.	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.
Z.N.W.	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.

Note. Full titles of the ancient sources used in this thesis are given in the bibliographies at the end of the thesis.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Part I

ANCIENT SOURCES

Ch. 1	The Sources	4
Ch. 2	The History of Montanism : an Outline	25

Part II

MODERN INTERPRETATIONS

Ch. 1	The Product of the Secular Environment	47
	A. The Geography of Phrygia	47
	B. The Climate of Phrygia	49
	C. The Social Structure of Phrygia	50
Ch. 2	Pagan Religion in Disguise	66
	A. The Cult of Cybele	68
	B. The Cult of Apollo	83
Ch. 3	An Offshoot of Judaism	102
Ch. 4	A Christian Phenomenon	122
	A. A Development from Ebionism	123
	B. A Reaction against Gnosticism	137
	C. An Authentic Renewal Movement	149

Part III

CONCLUSION

The Charismatic Parasite	181
--------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

1.	The Extant Utterances of the New Prophets	196
2.	Modern Parallels to Montanist Phenomena	199

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

INTRODUCTION

In the last two centuries Montanism has been the subject of a number of important studies. The earliest monograph, that of F.C.A. Schwegler (1841) of the school of F.C. Baur, met with immediate criticism and led to the formulation of a number of alternative interpretations of the movement. The first and only English monograph to appear was that of J. De Soyres (1878), shortly followed by the work of another German G.N. Bonwetsch (1881). In 1913 there appeared the magisterial work of P. De Labriolle, and finally in 1929 a book by W. Schepelern, dealing specifically with the relation of Montanism to the cult of Cybele. Besides these larger studies, right up to the present a number of important articles have been published in English and German.

From the welter of divergent interpretations of Montanism an attempt must now be made to separate fact from fiction. In this study my procedure has been first to review the ancient sources, and from them to sketch in an outline of the history of the movement. Then I have examined in turn the various modern interpretations, classing them by subject rather than by date of publication. Finally from my findings I have sought to draw a conclusion which does justice to all the evidence available, and to suggest certain modern parallels to the movement.

This study is not intended to supercede the work of De Labriolle but in the main to supplement it, for it is not

an in-depth study of the whole history of Montanism, merely a reassessment of its origin and basic character.

P A R T I

ANCIENT SOURCES

CHAPTER 1THE SOURCES

Though we hear of collections of the utterances of Montanus and his prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla¹ and of a "catholic epistle" from the Montanist leader Themiso² they are no longer extant, most being destroyed no doubt as a result of the order recorded in the Theodosian Code 16.5.34 (A.D. 398). There remain only some sixteen or seventeen fragments quoted by later writers.³ The writings of the earliest opponents of the movement are also now lost, though some extracts have been preserved by Eusebius. There is also a certain amount of epigraphical evidence, but most of this can be variously interpreted.⁴

The principal sources of information about the Montanist movement are therefore Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica 5.14-20, Epiphanius, Panarion 48-49, and the later works of Tertullian. The first two are hostile to the movement, the last is sympathetic. Other sources provide supplementary information. From early in the third century there are the treatments of "Pseudo-Tertullian", Adversus omnes haereses 7, and Hippolytus, Philosophoumena 8.19, 10.25-26. From the late fourth century we have the anonymous Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox, Didymus of Alexandria, De trinitate 3.41, Jerome, Epistle 41 (to Marcella) and De viris illustribus, and Philaster, Liber de haeresibus 49. The fifth century provides us with Augustine, De haeresibus

liber 26-28 and "Praedestinatus" 1.26-28,86. Diverse fragments of information may be gleaned from several other authors. Virtually all writers regarded the movement as a dangerous heresy.

Before attempting to describe the movement from the materials they provide it is important to make a preliminary survey of our sources to assess their nature and reliability.

Eusebius

As the writer himself tells us⁵ Eusebius' Historia ecclesiastica (c.323) is based upon his earlier work the Chronicon. Whereas however in the Chronicon he dates events specifically, in the Historia ecclesiastica he is generally content merely to allocate them to the reign of the emperor of the time. In describing any particular person, event or teaching he likes to let his sources speak for themselves and often merely provides an editorial framework for the lengthy quotations he selects. (This technique marks a new stage in historiography in antiquity.) But as Eusebius regards the role of the Church to be that of witness to the unchanging truth of the apostolic message, he automatically regards heretics as enemies and refuses to quote their works directly. Our information about them comes only from their refutation by orthodox writers determined to show up these "fierce wolves"⁶ and "venomous reptiles"⁷ for what they really are. Against the "Phrygian heresy" itself Eusebius summons an anonymous writer (H.E. 5.16-17) and a certain Apollonius (H.E. 5.18) the former writing perhaps in 192, the latter c.195.⁸

Various attempts have been made to identify the Anonymous,⁹ but the writer has clearly withheld his name lest he should presume to add his works to the Scriptures¹⁰ as his opponents are all too ready to do, and Eusebius does not know his name. He is certainly a presbyter and quite possibly a bishop.¹¹ He writes from personal experience of the upheaval caused by the so-called "New Prophecy" in Ancyra, metropolis of Galatia. Writing more than thirteen years after the death of Maximilla he appears not to have had personal contact with the initial prophetic trio and speaks of the movement as *κατὰ Μιλτιάδην*. Though he has no doubts that Montanus and "the women" had been possessed by an evil spirit and that their prophecies were false, he is not prepared to accept uncritically all evidence against them. Thus he repeats the rumours that Montanus, Maximilla and Theodotus committed suicide (with demonic assistance) yet he confesses that he cannot vouch for their truth. Moreover he has taken the trouble to read some of the writings of his opponents, for he quotes from a collection of their utterances (edited by Asterius Urbanus) and a document combatting the earlier work of an orthodox writer Miltiades.

Eusebius' second authority, Apollonius, is rather different. His work, written forty years after the start of the "New Prophecy", had a two-fold purpose: to refute word by word the Montanist prophecies and to show from their lives the fraudulence of the Montanist leaders (H.E. 5.18.1). Eusebius quotes none of Apollonius' refutations of the prophecies, but his extracts from the critique of the lives of the Montanists lead us to suspect his source of placing the worst construction on every piece of evidence he can find.

It is significant that he raises no moral charge against Montanus himself, but he tells us the "first prophetesses" (one of whom was Priscilla) deserted their husbands, and a lesser light Alexander had a criminal record. He will admit no justification for the organised financial system of the Montanists. On one point he is clearly wrong. He asserts that Montanus annulled marriages and, as this statement is parallel to the assertion that he also enacted fasts,¹² it is obviously referring to a general policy and is not merely a preliminary reference to the cases of the "first prophetesses". Yet Tertullian, himself it seems continent from his baptism onwards,¹³ explicitly states that the Paraclete (the one who spoke through the Montanist prophets) did not annul marriage nor prescribe virginity or continence, though it would have been reasonable if he had.¹⁴ Having found him faulty here it is uncertain how far we can trust Apollonius elsewhere, though there may be an element of truth in his assertions. His work was sufficiently effective to provoke a reply from Tertullian (De ecstasi, bk.7)¹⁵, though this is unfortunately lost.

Eusebius' next quotation (H.E. 5.19) comes from a letter of Serapion bishop of Antioch (199-211), declaring the widespread repudiation of the so-called "New Prophecy", and sent with the anti-Phrygian writing of Apollinaris of Hierapolis to Caricus and Pontius. Though Eusebius has previously mentioned Apollinaris' work neither then¹⁶ nor now does he see fit to quote it. Perhaps it did not contain as much information on the early Montanist personnel as Eusebius' other sources.¹⁷

The letter of the Gallic Christians containing opinions "careful" (εὐλαβῆ) and "most orthodox" (ὀρθοδοξοτάτην)

is mentioned by Eusebius¹⁸ but not quoted, no doubt because it sought merely to mediate in the dispute rather than condemning the Phrygian movement outright.

That Eusebius made no reference to Tertullian's involvement with the "New Prophecy" is at least partially due to the fact that both in the Chronicon and the Historia ecclesiastica he shows himself ill-at-ease with Latin. The Western Church from the third century onwards is therefore scantily served. So marked was this deficiency that Jerome in his Latin edition of the Chronicon sought to redress the balance and added material on both Tertullian and Cyprian.

Whatever his shortcomings, however, we are extremely indebted to Eusebius for detailed information on the earliest era of Montanism.

Epiphanius

The Panarion ("medicine chest" - remedy for the poisons of all heretics) was written by Epiphanius c. 375-77 at the request of Acacius and Paulus, heads of monasteries in Coele-Syria. Intending it to be comprehensive he covered in all eighty heresies, including twenty pre-Christian ones (!) His chronological framework is hazardous,¹⁹ and his anti-heretical fervour often renders him far too credulous of slanderous reports, but he makes considerable use of the writings of the heretics themselves as well as those of his anti-heretical predecessors Irenaeus and Hippolytus. His policy is clearly explained in Pan. 48.15:

For it is our declared intention with each heresy to withhold nothing, but to reveal what we have learnt whether from general report (δὲ ἀκοῆς) or from writings (ὑπὸ ἐγγράφων) or from those whose trustworthiness is assured (ὑπὸ τινῶν ἀληθῶς πιστωσάμενων).

For his four quotations of Montanus (48.4, 10-11) and those of Maximilla (48.2, 12-13) he appears to be drawing on Montanist collections of utterances. His lengthy refutation of the legitimacy of prophetic ecstasy and his clear differentiation of it from the state of sleep may well be intended as a specific answer to Tertullian's De ecstasi.²⁰

It is possible that Epiphanius has read the anti-Montanist work of the Anonymous, at least as abstracted by Eusebius²¹ and, from the researches of R.A. Lipsius and others²² it is beyond reasonable doubt that he like Philaster drew on Hippolytus' last work $\Sigma \acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\mu\alpha \ \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma \ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \ \alpha\iota\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \beta\iota\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$.²³ The uncertainty which Epiphanius shows in dealing with the derivative sects from the parent Cataphrygian heresy (48.14,49) may well be the result of his reliance here on oral reports. He is not sure for instance whether the reports of gruesome mysteries refer to the Tascodrugites or the Quintillianists.²⁴

Epiphanius' treatment of the Montanists reflects his method of refuting heresy generally. He does not expound the heresy systematically, refuting it point by point, but picks upon features as he sees fit. Thus his treatment of Montanus' claim to authority must wait until 48.4 and 48.11 while a quotation from Maximilla is found as early as 48.2. Further, his single-minded orthodox fervour will never allow the heretics to win a point. When Montanus utters the words, "I am the Lord God Almighty dwelling in man" he is merely glorifying himself,²⁵ but when Maximilla cries, "Do not hear me, but hear Christ" it is the unclean spirit forced to condemn itself.²⁶ When Maximilla claims she is forced to prophesy whether willing or not she is clearly a fraud, for it is only

those who wish to serve God that He calls.²⁷ Epiphanius conveniently forgets here the cases of Moses²⁸ and Jeremiah.²⁹ But here Epiphanius' attitude is not unique. Like Eusebius he sees the truth of the Christian faith as unchanging and those who deviate from it must at all costs be overthrown. If he only quotes heretics that he may show how absurd they are, he does at least quote them, and without his contributions our knowledge of Montanism would be much impoverished.

Tertullian

The only serious³⁰ attempt to defend the "New Prophecy" that has survived from the Early Church is to be found in the later writings of Tertullian of Carthage. These date from the first decades of the third century and span the time when Montanism was rejected by the mainstream of the North African Church.³¹

Writings from Tertullian's Montanist phase are in the main distinguished from those of his earlier orthodoxy by the fact that they contain certain distinctive traits.

T.D. Barnes in his book Tertullian: a Historical and Literary Study (1971) lists eight of these:³²

1. The naming of Montanus, Prisc(ill)a or Maximilla or appeal to a Montanist "oracle".
2. Reference to the "New Prophecy" or rebuttal of charges of "false prophecy" or of introducing a "new discipline".
3. Commendation of the ecstatic state.
4. The mention of charismata (spiritual gifts) possessed only by the Montanists.
5. Reference to the Holy Spirit as the "Paraclete".

6. The use of "us" or "our" with references to things or persons particularly Montanist.
7. The use of "you" or "your" to distinguish Catholic Christian from Montanist.
8. Reference to the Catholics as "psychics".

Though in isolation certain of these traits might seem quite inconclusive (for example 3 or 5) often several traits are found in the same passage.³³ The term "Paraclete" can be in fact an orthodox title for the Holy Spirit and is so used by Tertullian in De Praes. haer. 8.14-15, but elsewhere his Montanist use of it is evident.³⁴ The absence of these traits in a writing is not in itself an infallible indication that that writing dates from the author's pre-Montanist phase. They are all absent³⁵ from Ad Scapulam (212), though here Tertullian is writing on behalf of the entire Christian community and not just of those who acknowledged the "New Prophecy", to Scapula, Proconsul of Africa.

The twelve extant works in which the Montanist traits are present are: Adversus Valentinianos, De anima, De resurrectione mortuorum (or carnis), Adversus Marcionem, De Corona militis, De exhortatione castitatis, De fuga in persecutione, De virginibus velandis, Adversus Praxean, De monogamia, De jejunio, and De pudicitia, written between c.206 and perhaps 220.³⁶

Certain scholars advise caution in the conclusions we draw from these writings. They point out that Tertullian was a great individualist, and that we cannot be sure that what he says as a supporter of the "New Prophecy" is true of the movement as a whole. He and the hostile sources disagree on several important points, namely the doctrinal orthodoxy

of the "New Prophecy", the nature of prophetic ecstasy, the role of women in the Church, the site of New Jerusalem, and the importance of asceticism and martyrdom.³⁷ Clearly there are some differences between "Tertullianist" and Phrygian Montanism, but that does not mean that Tertullian can tell us nothing of the mainstream of the movement. He appears to quote verbatim six utterances - two from Prisca, two from the "Paraclete" and two from the "(Holy) Spirit".³⁸ From De fuga 9 where he says, "If indeed you consult the Spirit..." quoting one utterance, and then continues, "so also elsewhere (sic et alibi)..." and quotes another, it seems he is using written collections of these oracles,³⁹ perhaps turning from page to page as he writes. If we can trust hostile Epiphanius to quote his sources accurately we should be able to trust a sympathetic writer.⁴⁰ There seems little reason either to doubt the validity of Tertullian's word when he appeals to the "New Prophecy" to confirm his argument.⁴¹ It would be surprising moreover if the bitter polemical works stigmatising Catholic Christians as "psychics" (De monogamia, De Jejunio, De pudicitia) did not defend explicit principles of the Montanist movement as a whole. On certain matters Tertullian's Montanist writings clearly reveal a change of attitude from an earlier position. De pudicitia for instance contradicts the earlier De paenitentia with regard to the validity of public penance.⁴² This can only be attributed to the influence of Montanism.

Tertullian's writings provide then very valuable evidence for the state of Montanism in the early third century. De ecstasi, particularly with its reply to Apollonius, would have considerably augmented our knowledge, but Tertullian does not

seem at any stage to have composed a comprehensive account of the "New Prophecy", and from his writings alone we should have no idea of the early history of the movement.

Hippolytus and "Pseudo-Tertullian"

At the beginning of his compendious refutation of heresies Philosophoumena (c.230) Hippolytus mentions an earlier work:

A long time ago (πάλαι) we briefly set out their (the heretics') teachings, not explaining them in detail but exposing them in rough and ready terms (ἄδρομῶς), not considering it worthwhile to bring their secret doctrines to light.

This earlier work has been generally identified with the Syntagma⁴³ to which it is thought Photius refers when he says he has read a short work (βιβλιδίων) of Hippolytus, a student of Irenaeus, covering thirty-two heresies from that of Dosithes to that of Noëtus.⁴⁴ Perhaps the Syntagma was written in the first years of the third century.⁴⁵

"Pseudo-Tertullian", the writer of the work Adversus omnes haereses (c.220) found in manuscript as an appendix to Tertullian's De praescriptione but clearly from a different author, must have been closely modelled on the Syntagma or perhaps on a summary of it,⁴⁶ for it likewise deals with thirty-two heresies from that of Dosithes to that of Noëtus. Chapter 7 dealing with the Phrygians supplies us with a little information not found elsewhere, namely that there were (in Rome presumably) two Montanist factions one led by Proclus the other by Aeschines, the latter erring even more gravely than the former for he taught that Christ was both the Son and the Father. This detail is absent from the accounts given by both Epiphanius and Philaster and one can only

speculate that either Pseudo-Tertullian relied here on his own special source, or that the others suppressed this information in favour of Tertullian's loud protestations of doctrinal orthodoxy.

The Philosophoumena seeks to rectify the deficiencies of the Syntagma by exposing the secret doctrines of the heretics for all to see. Hippolytus surveys the fields of philosophy, astrology and magic before passing on to the distinctively Christian heresies (bks. 5-9). Book 10 is a resumé of the work and concludes with a brief summary of the Christian faith. The author deals with the Montanists in book 8 and in the resumé. He adds a little to our knowledge of the movement. Though he says some of the Phrygians were Noëtian he does not mention Proclus or Aeschines no doubt, as De Labriolle remarks,⁴⁷ because they had passed from the scene and ceased to be of significance. This is scarcely surprising if when Tertullian wrote Adversus Valentinianos (c.207) Proclus was already an old man.⁴⁸

Hippolytus and Pseudo-Tertullian are the first to include the Phrygian movement in catalogues of heresies. Though they add only a few details to our knowledge of Montanism their information comes from early in the third century and deserves our attention.

Philaster

Philaster of Brescia's Liber de haeresibus dates from c.385-91.⁴⁹ The author appears to have been intent on drawing up a catalogue of heresies to outstrip all others and therefore listed one hundred and fifty-six, twenty-eight of which were pre-Christian. He conceived "heresy", however,

considerably more broadly than either Hippolytus or Epiphanius, taking it to embrace almost every erroneous opinion. He devoted chapter 108 for instance to those who imagined that the giants of Gen. 6.2 were the offspring of angels. So in his treatment of Montanism Philaster lists Artotyrites, Ascodrogites and Passalorinchites as separate entities, while Epiphanius merely refers to them as subdivisions of the Cataphrygians.⁵⁰

It is not certain whether Philaster had read the work of his contemporary Epiphanius.⁵¹ It seems very likely that both writers drew on Hippolytus' Syntagma,⁵² and the similarity of Haer. 49 to Pan. 48.1 may derive from this common source. Clearly Philaster's reference to the Cataphrygians' baptizing the dead does not come from Epiphanius, and in view of Philaster's apparent desire to amass as many names as possible, it is rather surprising to see no reference to Quintillianists, Priscillianists or Pepuzites. Moreover for Epiphanius' Tascodrugites we now find Ascodrogites⁵³ and the etymological explanation of the name of the former now appears, with significant differences, attached to the Passalorinchites.⁵⁴ From these points one forms the distinct impression that for contemporary Montanism both writers drew independently on hearsay.

Overall Philaster adds very little to our knowledge of Montanism.

Didymus and the "Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox"

Didymus the Blind, head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria in the late fourth century, was a staunch defender of the Nicene faith. His insistence on the co-equality of

the three divine ὑποστάσεις led him not only to write Περὶ Τριάδος (De trinitate) sometime between 386 and 398⁵⁵ but also a special work on the Holy Spirit in protest against Macedonianism, a heresy denying full divinity to the third Person of the Godhead.

Didymus' treatment of Montanism is quite different from that of any of the other orthodox writers. It centres around a suspiciously Sabellian utterance of the heresiarch - Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς καὶ ὁ Παράκλητος⁵⁶ - found only in De trinitate and in the anonymous fourth-century work Μοντανιστοῦ καὶ Ὀρθοδόξου διαλέξεως (Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox), and clearly reflects the Trinitarian preoccupations of his time.

The Dialogue itself was discovered in manuscript form with writings of Athanasius and published by G. Ficker in 1905. As it contains very much the same information that is found more systematically arranged in De trin. 3.41, De Labriolle's suggestion⁵⁷ that Didymus was its compiler seems very plausible.

Both treatments are of great interest to the historian of Montanism in that they show how Montanists substantiated their position by appeal to Scripture, in particular to the Fourth Gospel and I Cor. 13.⁵⁸ They also give us other interesting information about Montanus and the prophetesses.

In these sources we seem to come face to face with fourth-century Montanism. How far it faithfully reflects the earlier movement we cannot be sure.

Jerome

Jerome's chief value for the history of Montanism is in revealing the sect's continuing activity in the late fourth

century and giving contemporary information about this stage of its existence. He had probably seen Montanism in Asia Minor when he travelled through several provinces shortly after 373.⁵⁹ His longest treatment of the sect is in Epistle 41 addressed to Marcella (382-85),⁶⁰ who has apparently been baffled by a Montanist, who has pointed to the Fourth Gospel to support his views. Jerome sets out to expose and refute the false tenets of the movement. Like Didymus he is influenced by the theological climate of his time and in the first round levels against the Montanists the charge of Sabellianism. His information about the hierarchical structure of their ministry and their fasting practices may well reflect Montanism at this time or even earlier. His impartiality in doubting the truth of the stories about the blood of an infant is creditable, but how much does typical Jeromian invective colour his denunciation of Montanus as abscisus et semivir?

Much of the information in Jerome's De viris illustribus (392)⁶¹ about the key personnel of the Montanist controversy⁶² comes straight from Eusebius. This is not so of course in the case of Tertullian⁶³ which may be based largely on his subject's own writings.⁶⁴ Barnes⁶⁵ has sharply criticised some of its statements, but we have no reason to disbelieve Jerome's claim that Tertullian composed De ecstasi in six books and added a seventh against Apollonius. Internal evidence from Tertullian's writings would support Jerome's statement that the brilliant North African seceded to Montanism in middle age,⁶⁶ but the reason given, namely "because of the envy (*invidia*) and insults (*contumeliis*) of the clergy of the Church of Rome" may be coloured by Jerome's own bitter disillusionment with that quarter.⁶⁷

Augustine

Though he mentions the Phrygian heresy elsewhere in his works it is in his Liber de haeresibus (428) that Augustine gives it a systematic treatment. This work of his old age was written under protest at the request of the deacon Quodvultdeus. At first Augustine sought to evade the task by referring his correspondent to the works of Philaster and Epiphanius, but when Quodvultdeus was not to be put off, Augustine composed his own catalogue largely derived from the information of these two earlier heresy-hunters.⁶⁸ He lists eighty-eight items in all. First Epiphanius' sixty (post-) Christian heresies are abstracted, then twenty-three more are culled from Philaster. Augustine comments that the latter has mentioned yet more but he does not regard them as heresies.

Chapters 26-28 of Augustine's work are devoted respectively to the Cataphrygians, the Pepuzians or Quintillianists, and the Artotyrites. Augustine contents himself with making a few minor changes and embellishments to the information of Epiphanius. If his treatment is thus of little value to us, his chapter on Tertullian (86) is more interesting. He speaks from his own experience of "Tertullianists" in his day.

"Praedestinatus"

It is a paradox indeed that has led the anonymous writer(s) of the three-volume anti-heretical work published c.440⁶⁹ to assume the title "Praedestinatus", as this is merely the heading of section 9 of book 3, a section devoted to the refutation of Augustine's doctrine of predestination! But if the adopted title of the work is misleading the contents inspire

as little confidence. Only book 1, the catalogue of heresies, is relevant to us. The author claims to have read Epiphanius, Philaster and four other writers whose anti-heretical works are mentioned by no-one else. He merely in fact follows Augustine's Liber de haeresibus step by step and often word by word. To Augustine's eighty-eight heresies he adds two more - Nestorianism and Predestinationism.

"Praedestintus" wishes for every heresy to produce the name of the orthodox writer who refuted it. A number of the names he mentions, for example Diodorus of Crete and Theodotus of Pergamus, are otherwise unknown, and his credibility is stretched to breaking point when a number of the known names he adduces involve chronological absurdities. For example he claims that the apostle Thomas refuted Saturninus,⁷⁰ and Barnabas of Cyprus the Carpocratians.⁷¹ How then can we trust him when he asserts that Apollonius was bishop of Ephesus,⁷² or that Soter wrote against the Phrygians?⁷³

The only real interest of "Praedestinatus" for us lies in his treatment of Tertullian (26,86) whom he greatly admires and wishes partly to exonerate. His information on the "Tertullianists" may come from African traditions.

Other Sources

Various other sources of information afford us occasional details relevant to the history of Montanism, but these may be evaluated as and when they are referred to below.

REFERENCES AND NOTESPt.I ch.1

1. Hippol., Phil. 8.19.1, Eus., H.E. 5.16.17, Didymus, De trin. 3.41.3, Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox in P. De Labriolle, Les Sources de l'Histoire du Montanisme, pp.106. 2-107.32.
2. Eus., H.E. 5.18.5.
3. see Appendix 1.
4. see the views of W.M. Calder, H. Grégoire and others, pt.2 ch.1C below.
5. H.E. 1.1.6.
6. H.E. 1.1.1.
7. H.E. 5.14.1.

8. Unfortunately the chronological framework of Montanism is far from certain. Eusebius in his Chronicon dates the beginning of the movement in the eleventh (Jerome) or twelfth year (Armenian version) of Marcus Aurelius i.e. 171 or 172. Epiphanius, however, dates it about the nineteenth year of Antonius Pius i.e. 156 (Pan. 48.1).

Even recent studies disagree in their preference for one date or the other. De Labriolle (La Crise Montaniste pp.569ff) and Barnes ("The Chronology of Montanism", J.T.S., N.S. 21 (1970), 403-8) prefer the Eusebian date, Freeman-Grenville ("The Date of the Outbreak of Montanism", J.E.H. 5(1954), 7-15) prefers that of Epiphanius. Now it is true that Epiphanius' calculations are often patently absurd. In Pan 48.2, for instance, he claims that it is about 290 years from Maximilla's death to his time of writing (375), i.e. Maximilla died in 85! (See also his statements regarding the Church of Thyatira, Pan. 51.33). And Barnes points out that Epiphanius places Justin's death in the reign of Hadrian (Pan. 46.1) perhaps twenty years before his actual martyrdom.

But Eusebius' chronology is not above suspicion. In the Historia Ecclesiastica he dates the martyrdoms in Lyons and Vienne in the seventeenth year of Marcus Aurelius i.e. 177 (H.E. 5 praef. 1). In the Chronicon, however, he gives the date 167. If the latter were correct, by his chronology the martyrs could not possibly have given their judgement upon Montanism which had not by then arisen. Further, Freeman-Grenville points out that while Eusebius in the Chronicon dates Tatian's apostasy 173, Irenaeus, Tatian's contemporary, claims the apostasy occurred as soon as Justin was martyred when Tatian took over leadership of his school, i.e. in 165 (Adv. haer. 1.28.1, qu. Eus., H.E. 4.29.3). Eusebius' dating here is thus eight years too late.

Still the balance might be in favour of Eusebius, but for two further problems involved in accepting his chronology:

(1) The Anonymous writer quoted by Eusebius claims that he is writing in the fourteenth year after Maximilla's death (H.E. 5.17.4), and none of the wars and revolutions she predicted would follow her death have occurred (H.E. 5.16.18f). Now it is generally agreed

that the most likely period referred to is 180-192. This being so Maximilla died in 179 and Anonymous wrote in 192. Now Maximilla is clearly the last of the initial Montanist trio to die, for she declares that after her there will be no other prophets but the End of all (Epiph., Pan. 48.2). But it seems most unlikely that Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla all appeared, made their impact and died in a mere eight years (172-79), particularly when for Hippolytus, writing c.230, the prophetesses were well remembered but Montanus almost a forgotten figure (Phil. 8.19). This would scarcely have been the case if their ministries had been so close together.

(ii) There is the problem of the prophetic succession. The apologist Miltiades declares that the Montanist prophets have no affinity with either Agabus, or Judas or Silas or the daughters of Philip or Ammia of Philadelphia, or Quadratus or any other Christian prophet, and the Anonymous adds:

For if the Montanist women succeeded to Quadratus and Ammia in Philadelphia in the prophetic gift, let them show who among them succeeded the followers of Montanus and the women (τοὺς ἀπὸ Μονταννοῦ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν), for the apostle grants that the prophetic gift shall be in the church until the final coming, but this they could not show, seeing that this is already the fourteenth year after the death of Maximilla (H.E. 5.17.4).

If we may read between the lines it seems that Montanist apologetic has traced a prophetic succession from the Apostolic Era down to the Montanists. Now presumably, as Eusebius makes no distinction between them, Quadratus the prophet (H.E. 3.37.1ff) and Quadratus the apologist (H.E. 4.3.1.f.) are one and the same. If some of those healed by Jesus survived to his own time (H.E. 4.3.2), if he had achieved fame by the time of Ignatius' death (115), (H.E. 3.37.1), and if he addressed his apology to Hadrian (d.138) (H.E. 4.3.1), it is likely that he was born c. 80 and survived until perhaps 150-60. Now Ammia was clearly his contemporary not his successor and therefore it is unlikely that she herself lived much beyond the middle of the century. If Montanus did not start to prophesy until 172 the prophetic succession to which the Montanists appealed would surely have been broken. Not so if we accept the Epiphonian date of 156.

If then we follow Epiphanius, Apollonius, who composed his work forty years after Montanus began to prophesy (H.E. 5.18.12), wrote in 195. We must then assume a delay of perhaps fifteen or twenty years before the publication of Tertullian's reply in the seventh book of his De ecstasi (Jer., De vir. ill. 53), whereas according to the Eusebian chronology Apollonius would have written as late as 210 and Tertullian replied perhaps two or three years later (so Barnes, Tertullian, pp.253f). The longer delay, however, is quite conceivable. Origen's Contra Celsum was written some seventy years after the work it refuted.

9. as Rhodo, Asterius Urbanus, Apollinaris, see De Labriolle, Les Sources de l'Histoire du Montanisme, pp.XX ff.

10. H.E. 5.16.3.

11. He refers to Zoticus of Otrous as συμπρεσβύτερος

- (H.E. 5.16.5) and De Labriolle points out that bishop Dionysius of Alexandria uses this term when writing to presbyters Dionysius and Philemon (H.E. 7.5.6; Sources, pp.XXVf).
12. H.E. 5.18.2 - οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ διδάξας λύσεις γάμων, ὁ νηστείας νομοθετήσας...
 13. Ad. ux. 1.5-7.
 14. De mon. 3.1 - Illud enim amplius dicimus, etiamsi totam et solidam virginitatem sive continentiam Paracletus hodie determinasset, ut ne unis quidem nuptiis fervorem carnis despumare permetteret, sic quoque nihil novi inducere videretur...(10) Et nunc recogitans ista facile tibi persuadebis multo magis unicas nuptias competisse Paracletō praedicare, qui potuit et nullas, magisque credendum temperasse illum quod et abstulisse decuisset, si quae velit Christus intellegas. In hoc quoque Paracletum agnoscere debes advocatum quod a tote continentia infirmitatem tuam excusat.
 15. Jerome, De vir. ill. 40,53.
 16. H.E. 5.16.1 cf. 4.27.
 17. see De Labriolle, Sources, p.XIX, K. Aland, "Bemerkungen zum Montanismus und zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie", Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe, pp.108f. Eusebius, H.E. 4.27, says Apollinaris wrote against the Phrygians not long after the start of the movement.
 18. H.E. 5.3.4.
 19. see above nt.8.
 20. Tertullian certainly speaks of the dreaming soul as being ecstatic in De an. 45 and appeals to Adam's ecstasy of sleep (Gen. 2.21). It is this specific example that Epiphanius seeks to prove invalid in Pan. 48.4-6.
 21. cp. Pan. 48.2 with Eus. H.E. 5.17.4, 16.18-19 where the arguments that true charismata will not cease in the Church, and the falsity of Maximilla's futuristic prophecy, are in common. If so, however, it is clear that Epiphanius merely uses the points to fertilize his own ideas.
 22. see G. Salmon, "Hippolytus Romanus", D.C.B. III, De Lab. Sources, pp.XXXVIff.
 23. Nicephorus Callistus, H.E. 4.31, cf. Eus. H.E. 6.22 (referring to πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις) and Jerome, De vir. ill. 3.61 (referring to Adversus omnes haereses).
 24. 48.14.
 25. 48.11.
 26. 48.12.
 27. 48.13.
 28. Ex. 4.1,10.
 29. Jer. 1.6, 20.7-9.
 30. Irenaeus in fact emerges as a mediator between the Phrygians and the bishop of Rome in 177 (Eus. H.E. 5.3.4, 4.1-2) and in his great work against heresy he seems to be defending the Montanists for he decries those who -
 To make void the gift of the Spirit, which in the last times at the Father's good pleasure was poured out on mankind, admit not the notion which properly belongs to John's Gospel, viz., that in it the Lord promised He would send the Paraclete; but they drive from them at once both the Gospel and the Prophetic Spirit...
 (Adv. haer. 3.11.9, L.F.). Both the fourth century

- Dialogue and Didymus, De trin. 3.41.1 show how the Montanists could appeal to the Fourth Gospel. Irenaus' main preoccupation, however, is with the Gnostics and he remains firmly within the catholic Church.
31. The Passio Perpetuae (203), whose authorship is uncertain, reflects a time when there were divisions in the African Church, though the cause is not revealed (see esp. 13.1ff). Tertullian's De fuga 1 shows the author is in disagreement with those who do not accept the "New Prophecy". These include Fabius the recipient of the work. Yet Tertullian appears amicable towards him. Tertullian's later work De pudicitia reveals the bitterness of its author against the "psychics", Christians who will not accept the "Paraclete", and his separation from them (see esp. 1.10). For a further discussion of this see below pp.32f.
 32. pp.43f.
 33. e.g. in Adv. Marc. 4.22.4-5 one finds traits 2,3,6, and 8.
 34. e.g. Adv. Prax. 8.
 35. though Proculus, surnamed Torpacian, steward of Euhodias, (Ad. Scap. 4) may perhaps be Proculus the Montanist leader in Rome (cf. Eus., H.E. 6.20.3, Ps.-Tert., Haer. 7).
 36. see Barnes, Tertullian, ch. 5. That Montanism began to influence Tertullian c. 206 few would dispute. That the works in which he vehemently defends Montanist practices against the "psychics" (De monogamia, De jejunio, and De pudicitia) were among his latest is generally accepted. Now clearly Ad Scapulam dates from 212 (Barnes, op.cit. p.38), but Barnes makes this the latest work of all. If this were the case all twelve of Tertullian's clearly Montanist works (including the final version of Adversus Marcionem in five books and other substantial writings such as De anima), were produced in the space of a mere six to seven years. But there is no reason for us to postulate such a short period of intense literary activity followed by total silence from Tertullian until his death perhaps as late as 230 or 240 (see Barnes, ibid., p.2). Though it is true that the common identification of the "pontifex maximus" or "episcopus episcoporum", against whom Tertullian wrote in De pudicitia with Callistus of Rome (see De Lab., Crise, pp.453ff) has recently been seriously challenged (see e.g. C.B. Daly, "The 'Edict of Callistus'", T.v.U. 78(1961), 176ff, cf. Barnes, op.cit., App. 7) this does not prohibit a date of 220 or even later for De pudicitia and the other more virulent anti-Catholic works.
 37. e.g. H.J. Lawlor, "The Heresy of the Phrygians", Eusebiana (1912), pp.108-35, R. Gregor Smith, "Tertullian and Montanism", Theol. 46 (1942), 127-36.
 38. De res. mort. 11, De exhort. cast. 10, Adv. Prax. 8, De pud. 21, De fuga 9.
 39. so De Lab., Crise, pp.52f.
 40. though the second utterance quoted in De fuga 9 appears to be more loosely quoted again in De an. 55.5.
 41. as in De an. 58, when he is propounding an incipient purgatorial doctrine.
 42. cp. De pud. 1,2,18, 21-22 with De paen. 7-12.
 43. see nt.23 above.
 44. Bibliotheca 121.

Pt. 1 Ch. 1.

45. so De Lab., Sources, p.XLVIII, following Harnack.
46. so De Lab., Sources, pp.XXXVIff.
47. ibid., p.LXXXVIII.
48. Adv. Val. 5.
49. De Lab., Sources, p.XLV.
50. cp. Haer. 74-76 with Pan. 48.14, 49.1.
51. The matter has been debated by R.A. Lipsius, M.J. Kunze and others. De Labriolle inclines to the view that Philaster had read the Panarion (Sources, pp.XLIIIff).
52. see nt.22 above..
53. cp. Haer. 75 with Pan. 48.14.
54. Haer. 76, see below p.34f.
55. De Lab., Sources, p.152.
56. De trin. 3.41.1. cf Dial. in De Lab., Sources, p.97.25.
57. Sources, p.CIIIff.
58. De trin. 3.41.1-2, Dial. in De Lab., Sources, pp.93.15-96.4, 99.10-24, 101.7-102.20.
59. Ep. 3.3, Comm. ad Gal. 2.2., De Lab., Sources, p.XCV.
60. De Lab., ibid.
61. ibid., p.392.
62. esp. sects. 26 (Apollinaris), 39 (Miltiades), 40 (Apollonius), 41 (Serapion), and 59 (Gaius).
63. 53.
64. see Barnes, Tertullian, p.10.
65. ibid., chs. 2,3.
66. cf. above nt.31 and below p.32.
67. so C. Mohrmann "Saint Jérôme et Saint Augustin sur Tertullien", V.C. 5 (1951), 112, cf. Barnes, Tertullian, p.10.
68. The correspondence with Quodvultdeus is preserved in Augustine's Ep. 221-24.
69. De Lab., Sources, pp. CXIVff.
70. 1.5.
71. 1.7.
72. 1.26,27.
73. 1.86.

CHAPTER 2THE HISTORY OF MONTANISM : AN OUTLINE

It was about the year 156¹ that Montanus, a native of the village of Ardabav in the borderlands of Mysia and Phrygia, began his career as a "Christian prophet". The sensation he caused was in the first place less the result of his message than the trance state in which he delivered it. According to the Anonymous, Montanus, when but a new convert (νεοπίστος).

in his boundless craving for leadership opened himself to the adversary to be taken over (πνευματοφορηθηναι) and was suddenly possessed (ἐν κατοχῇ), became strangely ecstatic (παρεκπάσις γενόμενον) and began to act inspired (ἐν θουσιᾶν ἀρξασθαί) and to speak and to make strange sounds (ξενοφωνεῖν), prophesying contrary to the custom and succession within the Church from the beginning.²

Some interpreted this state as demonic, others as the work of the Holy Spirit imparting the gift of prophecy (προφητικὸν χάρισμα). Then two women were also filled with this "bastard spirit" and began to speak madly (ἐκφρόνως), improperly (ἀκρίτως) and strangely (ἄλλοτριότροπως).³ The Anonymous holds them in such contempt that he does not even tell us their names. We learn elsewhere that they were Priscilla (or Prisca) and Maximilla.⁴

Of the content of Montanus' message Eusebius' extracts from the Anonymous tell us nothing. We simply hear that the false spirit promised great blessings, sometimes deceptively gave sound reproof, and generally blasphemed the Catholic Church for refusing to acknowledge its authority.⁵ The falsity of

Montanus' claim was not easy to prove. If the Anonymous attempted a refutation Eusebius was not prepared to quote it. From the extract from the Catholic writer Miltiades and appended comments we infer that Montanus and "the women" claimed to be genuine Christian prophets in succession from Ammia, Quadratus and their predecessors.⁶ From non-Eusebian sources we learn that they made the extravagant claim that through them Jesus' promise to send the Paraclete to lead the Church into all truth was being fulfilled.⁷ But had not the promise already been fulfilled at Pentecost? Jerome was to stress this point in writing to Marcella⁸ two centuries later, and quoted at some length the record in the Acts of the Apostles. Yet we cannot be sure that by 156 Acts was widely known in Phrygia.⁹ Once the "New Prophecy" had gained momentum, however, even knowledge of Acts was not an adequate deterrent. Tertullian, who was quite familiar with Acts, found little difficulty in reconciling the two, for he saw the "New Prophecy" as the final stage in God's progressive revelation:

So, too, righteousness - for the God of righteousness and of creation is the same - was first in a rudimentary state, having a natural fear of God: from that stage it advanced, through the Law and the Prophets, to infancy: from that stage it passed, through the Gospel, to the fervour of youth: now through the Paraclete, it is settling into maturity.¹⁰

And the fourth-century Montanist disputant presents a plausible rationale which may have been used considerably earlier - the Apostles had certainly received the Holy Spirit, but only the first instalment (ἀρραβών), whereas Montanus had received the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the Paraclete.¹¹

The key term "Paraclete" (παράκλητος) was taken from the Fourth Gospel which was closely associated with the

Phrygian movement.¹² But in this gospel Christ not only promises the Paraclete, He also says: "If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him." (Jn. 14.23). And so it is not so surprising to hear that Montanus claimed to speak not only by the Paraclete but said further, "I am the Father and the Son and the Paraclete",¹³ or just, "I am the Lord God Almighty dwelling in man,"¹⁴ of which Montanus himself was merely the passive instrument.¹⁵ In the face of such great claims it is not surprising that those who were convinced urged the rest of the Church to receive their prophets¹⁶ and news of the "New Prophecy" reached Gaul as early as 177,¹⁷ and Rome,¹⁸ and soon Carthage.¹⁹ The missionaries took with them books of the prophetic utterances.²⁰ Adherents were outspoken in their profession of faith and were prepared to brave martyrdom.²¹

Besides its momentous claim to authority, what was the message of the "New Prophecy" to the Church?

First, with regard to the Father and the Son its teaching seems to have been doctrinally orthodox. Hippolytus says this of the majority of its adherents,²² and Tertullian quotes an utterance of the "Paraclete" in support of Trinitarian orthodoxy -

For God brought forth the Word as the root brings forth the shoot, the spring the river, and the sun its ray²³ and stresses that its adherence to the Church's Rule of Faith (regula fidei) guarantees the other pronouncements of the Paraclete.²⁴ The fact, however, that Montanus could claim to speak with the authority of all three Divine Persons could lead to misinterpretation, and no doubt facilitated the

Noëtian faction among the Montanists at Rome led by Aeschines,²² and the later charge of Sabellianism.²⁵

In eschatology the "New Prophecy" showed itself a true child of the second-century Asia Minor Church.²⁶ It taught the resurrection of the flesh²⁷ and a thousand-year reign for the saints on earth in a divinely built New Jerusalem to be let down from heaven.²⁸ But its sense of the immediacy of the End appears to have been more intense than that of the rest of the Church. The Spirit was indeed being poured out in the bestowal of prophecy upon the Church and from Joel 2.28f it was evident that these were the Last Days.²⁹ Maximilla herself declared, "After me there will be no other prophet but the end of all,"³⁰ and she predicted that after her death there would be wars and revolutions³¹ - no doubt the apocalyptic woes that ushered in the End.³² Martyrdom was to be embraced partly perhaps as heroism fitting to the Last Hour,³² for the Paraclete cried:

Do not desire to die in your beds, through abortions or from mild fever, but in martyrdom that He who has suffered for you may be glorified.³⁴

The soul of the martyr was thought to go straight from the death-bed to Paradise while the souls of other Christians were to await the Day of the Lord in Hades receiving a measure of their deserts for the life on earth.³⁵

One point is problematic - the belief that Pepuza was to be the site of New Jerusalem. Tertullian does not mention it. On the contrary he seems to share the view of orthodox Christian writers that New Jerusalem would descend on the site of old Jerusalem.³⁶ Now Apollonius says that Montanus named the two Phrygian villages Pepuza and Tymion "Jerusalem" and desired to assemble people there from everywhere else,³⁷

and this has generally been taken to mean that he anticipated New Jerusalem would shortly descend in that region.³⁸

D. Powell, however, in his article "Tertullianists and Cataphrygians"³⁹ follows Weizsäcker in suggesting Montanus merely sought to make Pepuza and Tymion the centre of the new Spirit-directed community, while in fact he continued to hold the orthodox view that New Jerusalem would descend in Judea. Though we have seen in chapter 1 (p.7) that it is uncertain whether we can take any of Apollonius' statements at face value, this suggestion has the merit of explaining why Tertullian, who in another context explicitly says that he is certain that "nothing ought to be received which does not agree with the true system of prophecy, which has arisen in this present age,"⁴⁰ yet fails to mention Pepuza, and why the belief that New Jerusalem was to descend at Pepuza is found explicitly in the vision of a later prophetess.⁴¹ If Weizsäcker and Powell are right this vision was the inauguration of the belief not the (unnecessary) reiteration of a prophecy of Montanus himself.

The Paraclete's real mission according to Tertullian was to institute a more rigorous discipline. He writes:

But the Paraclete, having many things to teach fully which the Lord deferred till he came...will begin by bearing emphatic witness to Christ...together with the whole order of God the Creator...And when he has thus been recognised on the ground of the cardinal rule, he will reveal those "many things" which appertain to disciplines.⁴²

First this related to monogamy upon which the Montanists laid great stress and for which Tertullian sought to show the Paraclete was the restorer of the will of God and not the institutor of a novelty.⁴³ The Montanists apparently regarded second marriages as tantamount to adultery and

excommunicated any who entered into them.⁴⁴

A certain degree of mortification was also prescribed by the Paraclete in the form of fasting. In his bitter defence of Montanist practice against the Catholic Church's charge of novelty, Tertullian reveals that the Wednesday and Friday fasts (stationes), which were optional within the Church at large, and were observed only till the ninth hour, the Montanists made compulsory and prolonged till the evening.⁴⁵ Further, for two weeks of the year (excluding Saturdays and Sundays) they observed xerophagies⁴⁶ (ξηροφαγία, from ξηρός dry and φαγεῖν, to eat) by -

keeping our food unmoistened by any flesh, and by any juiciness, and by any kind of succulent fruit; and... not eating or drinking anything with a winy flavour; also...abstinence from the bath, congruent with our dry diet,

says Tertullian.⁴⁷ Hippolytus⁴⁸ mentions also radish meals (ῥαφανοφαγία, from ῥάφανος, radish) and feasts (ἑορταί), but we hear no details of these observances.

The Montanist teaching most contrary to the teaching and practice of Jesus concerns the refusal to forgive serious post-baptismal sins. In his pre-Montanist days Tertullian had allowed penitential discipline, (ἑξομολόγησις) for one lapse following baptism.⁴⁹ As a supporter of the "New Prophecy", however, he divided sins into those remissible and those irremissible by the Church, and placed adultery and fornication with murder and idolatry in the latter class so, declaring that the Paraclete has spoken categorically:

The Church has power to forgive sins,
but I will not do it lest they commit yet more.⁵¹

But of what use was all the Paraclete's teaching if the ecstatic state in which the prophets spoke rendered it suspect? To overcome this suspicion the Montanists sought to prove

that ecstasy was an essential feature of true prophecy.⁵²

While the Montanists saw themselves as agents of the "New Prophecy" of the Paraclete which was addressed to the whole Church, their opponents repudiated such a claim.⁵³ The terms "Montanist" and "Montanism" commonly used today to describe the Phrygian movement are not found in the early literature. "Montanist" appears first in the fourth century.⁵⁴ Probably Montanus himself quickly passed from the scene⁵⁵ and in Asia Minor in the early days the movement was named rather arbitrarily after its current leaders. The Anonymous for instance refers to it as "the sect of Miltiades" (κατὰ Μιλτιάδην).⁵⁶ Outside Asia Minor, the Montanists were invariably called "Phrygians" (Φρύγες) or "Cataphrygians" (κατὰ Φρύγας).⁵⁷

The Eusebian sources tell us not merely of the "big three" (Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla) but also of Alcibiades,⁵⁸ Themiso⁵⁹, Theodotus,⁶⁰ and Alexander⁶¹ and suggest that there were later prophetesses.⁶² We hear of a degree of organisation - collectors were appointed to organise the reception of gifts as "offerings" (προσφοραί), and salaries were paid to preachers.⁶³ The movement as a whole provoked intense debate within the churches of Asia Minor. Attempts were made at public refutation⁶⁴ and even exorcism,⁶⁵ then, quite possibly before Maximilla's death, the adherents were ejected from the Church.⁶⁶

When reverberations of the movement had reached Gaul the churches of Lyons and Vienne gave their "careful" and "most orthodox" judgement on the matter, which they conveyed by the hand of Irenaeus to bishop Eleutherus in Rome⁶⁷ (177). The links between the churches in Gaul and Asia Minor seem to

have been close for Irenaeus himself came from Asia Minor,⁶⁸ and among the Gallic martyrs Attalus came from Pergamum and Alexander was a Phrygian.⁶⁹ But if the Gallic mission to Rome was an attempt to mediate in the dispute it does not seem to have averted the condemnation of the "New Prophecy" by Eleutherus. Later, however, perhaps under the careful guidance of Proculus, the decision would have been reversed but for the untimely interference of Praxeas (at least, that is how Tertullian viewed it!)⁷⁰

The greatest achievement of the Montanist mission outside Asia Minor appears to have been the conversion of Tertullian himself c.206.⁷¹ It seems that news of the "New Prophecy" reached North Africa at about the turn of the century, for the editorial framework of the Passio Perpetuae (203) clearly refers to it,⁷² and soon afterwards references to the "new prophets", the "Paraclete", etc. are evident in Tertullian's writings. At first he remained on fairly good terms with his fellow catholic Christians.⁷³ Later the cleavage widened and by perhaps 215⁷⁴ he vilifies them as "psychici" (cf. 1 Cor. 2.14) for refusing to accept the Paraclete. Augustine tells us that finally Tertullian seceded from the Montanists and formed his own sect (*sua conventicula propagavit*), which was only reconciled to the Catholic Church in Augustine's own day.⁷⁵ As no source mentions the persistence of Montanism itself in Africa later scholars have generally identified African Montanism with "Tertullianism".⁷⁶ Perhaps just as in contemporary Rome a number of separate "schools" existed within the Church each deploring the other,⁷⁷ so Tertullian "in schism" simply led his own school, distinguished from the rest of the Church in Africa by its support for the "New Prophecy" and its extreme rigorism. Probably any excommunication of the hitherto

champion of orthodoxy was as ineffective as the mutual excommunication of Hippolytus and Callistus, but separation is certainly implied by the bitterness with which Tertullian attacks the Catholic Church in his later writings. He can compare psychics with heretics and contrast both with his own party "the Spiritual",⁷⁸ or write of the "edict of the Pontifex Maximus":

This too, therefore, shall be a count in my indictment against the Psychics; against the fellowship of sentiment also which I myself formerly maintained with them; in order that they may the more cast this in my teeth for a mark of fickleness. Repudiation of fellowship is never a pre-indication of sin. As if it were not easier to err with the majority, when it is in the company of the few that truth is loved!⁷⁹

Whereas Hippolytus and his rival (Pontian, successor but one to Callistus) were exiled in the same persecution in 235 and died in exile so that both could be hailed as martyrs by the church of Rome and the breach healed, Tertullian it seems merely died of old age⁸⁰ and the gulf between his adherents and their opponents was perpetuated.

When Maximilla's prophecy of the End was not fulfilled and New Jerusalem failed to descend from heaven, the Montanists no doubt lost some credibility. The only third-century writer after Hippolytus to speak of them is Firmilian of Cappadocia. In his epistle to Cyprian regarding the rebaptism issue (256), which is preserved among Cyprian's epistles as Ep. 75, he mentions that a council of the orthodox from Phrygia, Galatia and Cappadocia had assembled at Iconium some time before (iam pridem - c.230?) and declared Montanist baptism invalid (75.7,19). Firmilian also describes the appearance of a Cappadocian prophetess c.234, but though it is often assumed that through her there was a resurgence of

Montanism,⁸¹ Firmilian does not identify her with the Cataphrygians but devotes an entirely different part of his letter to her (75.10).

In his great drive for the unity of Christendom the emperor Constantine sought to abolish all heresies. Thus, after attempting to solve the Donatist and Arian issues, in 331 he proscribed a number of sects, among them the Cataphrygians. They were ordered no longer to meet together either in public or in private. Their books were to be searched out. Their prayer-houses were to be handed over to the Catholic Church and their other properties to the State, and they were ordered to rejoin the true Church without delay.⁸² Sozomen reports that these orders were not carried out in Phrygia itself and its environs and in consequence a multitude (πλήθος) persisted to his own day.⁸³ Epiphanius writing before the end of the fourth century (375-77) mentions that still in his time the sect could be found in Cappadocia, Galatia, Phrygia, Cilicia and Constantinople.⁸⁴ By then indeed it seems to have split into a number of different sects, not all of which Epiphanius finds easy to distinguish. There were Tascodrugites⁸ (Τασκοδρουγίται), whose name he derives from τασκός plug, and δροῦγγος, nostril, saying that they prayed with a finger against their nostril to signify sorrow and honesty (!), and he equates them with the Passalorynchites (Πασσαλορυγγίται from πάσσαλος, peg, and ῥύγχος, snout, an etymology he does not give us). Philaster, however, perhaps in his desire to swell the number of heresies, distinguishes between the two. He says it is the latter who place a finger against their nose or mouth as if to keep perpetual silence (!), whereas he

calls the former Ascodrogites (Ascodrogitae), whom he says are to be found in Galatia, and revel like Bacchanals.⁸⁶

Augustine, perhaps bemused by the conflict among his sources, omits both names from his catalogue of heresies. Jerome, however, confirms their existence when, speaking of the variety of competing sects any visitor to Ancyra in Galatia can see, he exclaims:

Whoever has heard of Passalorynchites, Ascodrogites, Artotyrites or other such monstrosities rather than names in any part of the Roman world?⁸⁷

To the rest of the sects derivative from the Cataphrygians Epiphanius devotes a separate section of the Panarion (49). He mentions Quintillianists (Κοϊντιλλιανοί) also known as Pepuzites (Πεπουζιανοί), Artotyrites (Ἀρτοτυριταί), and Priscillianists (Πρισκιλλιανοί). If the last mentioned were founded by Priscilla, one of the original Montanist trio, it seems that she must have been relatively independent, for Maximilla left no sect of her own. Quintilla was presumably a later prophetess, and it is to her that we should probably attribute the vision of Christ as a woman who declared that Jerusalem would descend at Pepuza.⁸⁸ It seems that these derivative Phrygian sects maintained a feminine bias. They gave special credit to Eve, as she first ate of the tree of knowledge (!) and they found in Moses' sister Miriam and in Philip's four prophetess daughters justification for having women among their clergy.⁸⁹ He relates also that often at their meetings seven virgins would enter clad in white and carrying torches. They would prophesy and exhibit a kind of inspiration (ἐνθουσιασμός) which deceived their hearers provoking them to tears. And they themselves wept as if in penitence and lamentation for the state of human life.

The Artotyrites⁹⁰ were so called, Epiphanius tells us, because they used bread (ἄρτος) and cheese (τυρός) in their mysteries. Augustine explains this is because the first men made offerings of the fruit of the earth and sheep.⁹¹

It seems that there were other developments in Montanist practices and perhaps in organisation with the passing of time. Though Sozomen in the mid-fifth century says that the Montanists still observed only a two-week fast whereas the orthodox all observed longer periods⁹² (perhaps he knew a particularly conservative group), Jerome before the end of the fourth century can speak of their observing three annual fasts compared with one of forty days observed by the catholic Church.⁹³

Sozomen attributes to the Montanists a novel method of computing Easter:

For they treat the ninth day before the Kalends of April as the beginning of the creation of the sun and of the first month. From it they count to the fourteenth day (spoken of in the holy Scriptures), and this, they say, is the eighth day before the Ides of April. On that day they celebrate the Pascha if the day of the resurrection (i.e. Sunday) falls on it, (otherwise) they celebrate the feast on the next Lord's Day, for it is written, they say, (it may be on any day) from the fourteenth to the twenty-first day.⁹⁴

This seems to be a development from the Quartodecimian method which they had previously accepted.⁹⁵ It is by no means certain that it was employed outside Asia Minor. Tertullian earlier implied that Montanists shared with the Church the same Easter.⁹⁶

A horrific story was associated with the Montanists by the middle of the fourth century: a child was taken and its blood extracted for use in Montanist mysteries.⁹⁷ It is reminiscent of the early pagan accusations against the

Catholic Church which were totally repudiated by the Christian apologists of the second century.⁹⁸ The fact that the story when applied to the Montanists assumes no fixed form and that its truth is doubted by so hostile a critic as Jerome⁹⁹ shows its libellous nature.

It is Jerome who tells us of the Montanist hierarchy:

Among us bishops hold the place of the apostles; among them the bishop comes third. For in first place they have patriarchs from Pepuza in Phrygia, second are those called κoinωνοί, and then in third place, that is almost in the bottom grade, come bishops.¹⁰⁰

That the Montanists simply took over the normal three-fold ministry of the Church and added the upper grades of patriarch and koinonos ("associate" or "fellow-worker") is confirmed by the Justinian Code.¹⁰¹ This form of hierarchy no doubt gradually evolved, the patriarch and koinonoi taking over from the earlier prophets and their associates. That episcopal status did not count for much among the Montanists is confirmed by Sozomen when he tells us of village-bishops (χωρεπίσκοποι among the Novatians and Montanists of Phrygia.¹⁰²

Montanism was proscribed in a series of edicts from the end of the fourth century, recorded in the Theodosian Code.¹⁰³ Montanists were forbidden to assemble, their buildings were confiscated and their books burnt. They were debarred from receiving donations or bequeathing legacies to other Montanists. But the fact that the edicts were reiterated several times implies their limited success.

In the West there is only occasional mention of the sect subsequently. The Liber Pontificalis (c.530) tells us that Innocent I (401-7) came across a number of Cataphrygians and relegated them to exile in a monastery.¹⁰⁴ Gregory the

Great in his Epistle 11.67 (601) lays down the baptismal requirements for Cataphrygians who are to be received back into the Church.¹⁰⁵ There is even a report of some of them together with Manichees and Arians in twelfth-century Flanders.¹⁰⁶

In the East Justinian again proscribed the Montanists in a series of edicts (529-31). They were not to hold meetings or administer sacraments, to bequeath legacies to other Montanists, to buy slaves, or to have shops in the ancient precincts of Constantinople. They were not to receive aid or relief and anyone found helping them would be fined 6 lb. of gold, and so would any provincial governor negligent in putting these measures into effect.¹⁰⁷ Procopius of Caesarea (early sixth century) reports that many emissaries were sent out to force the heretics to recant, but the Montanists of Phrygia shut themselves in their churches and set fire to them, preferring to perish rather than comply.¹⁰⁸ Such a summary end to the movement is scarcely credible. As in the West it may have lingered on to the twelfth century before passing into oblivion.¹⁰⁹

REFERENCES AND NOTESPt.1 ch.2

1. see above ch.1, nt.8.
2. Eus., HE 5.16.7. Here the Anonymous uses terminology familiar in descriptions of pagan prophetic trance, see below pp.70f,153ff.
3. HE 5.16.9.
4. e.g. Hippol., Phil. 10.25-26. Maximilla but not Priscilla is named later in Eusebius' extracts from the Anonymous, e.g. HE 5.16.13.
5. HE 5.16.9.
6. ibid. 5.17.2-4.
7. Jn. 14.15f, etc., Hippol., Phil. 8.19, Didymus, De trin. 3.41.2, etc..
8. Ep. 41.1.
9. E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: a commentary (Eng. tr. 1971 from 14th Germ. ed. 1965) p.9, ftnt.1, mentions that Harnack believed Acts was hidden in obscurity right up to the time of Irenaeus. Haenchen himself (pp.8f) brings forward far from conclusive evidence of quotations by Justin Martyr.
10. De virg. vel. 1.
11. Dial. in De Lab., Sources, p.103.9, 104.3.
12. Irenaeus shows the association when he attacks certain "false prophets", who both desire to drive the prophetic Spirit from the Church and reject the Fourth Gospel with its teaching about the Paraclete (Adv. haer. 3.11.9, qu. above ch.1, nt.30). These "false prophets" appear to be Epiphanius' "Alogi" (Pan. 51) who rejected both the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. For a full discussion see De Lab., Crise, pp.190ff.
13. Didymus, De trin. 3.41.1, cf. Dial. in De Lab., Sources, pp.97.25, 101.16 (see App.1, no.3). G. Ficker when publishing the Dialogue in 1905 declared this utterance to be a later fabrication. He believed it was the result of a combination of Montanus' claim to have the fullness of the Paraclete, and to have the Father dwelling in him, with the later charge that the Montanists were Sabellian ("Widerlung eines Montanisten", Z.K.G. 26 (1905),462f). But such an explanation is unwarranted. The Montanist of the Dialogue never denies the genuineness of the utterance. Further, if, according to the Pauline and Johannine literature, part of the heritage of the ordinary believer is the indwelling Christ (see Gal. 2.20, Col. 1.27, Jn. 14.23, etc.), this is certainly no less true for the prophet, who might well claim that this Christ spoke through him.
14. Epiph., Pan. 48.11 (App.1, no.1). Παντοκράτωρ is used as an epithet of God in Rev. 1.8, 4.8, 11.17.
15. Epiphanius attributes to Montanus the utterance - Behold man is like a lyre and I fly over it like a plectrum. The man sleeps but I am awake. Behold I am the Lord who removes men's hearts and gives them (other) hearts. (Pan. 48.4, App.1, no.4).
16. cf. Δεῖ ἡμᾶς φησε, καὶ τὰ χαρίσματα δεῖχσθαι (Epiph., Pan. 48.1).

Pt.1 Ch.2

17. Eus., HE 5.3.4. The Chronicon places the persecution at Lyons and Vienne in the year 167, the Historia Ecclesiastica in 177 (HE 5 praef.1). Barnes refuses to choose between them ("Pre-Decian Acta Martyrium", J.T.S., N.S. 19 (1968), 518.)
18. cf. Eus., HE 5.4.1-2 (Irenaeus' visit with the Gallic letters), 2.25.7 (Proclus).
19. Perpetua and her companions were put to death probably in 203. The divisions within the North African church evident in Satorius' dream (Pass. Perp. 13) may have been over the "New Prophecy". Certainly the editorial framework thought to be nearly contemporary (see Barnes, Tertullian, App. 17), was by a supporter of the movement.
20. Hippolytus speaks of the "countless books", (βίβλους ἀπείρους) of the Phrygians (Phil. 8.19) cf. the collection by Asterius Urbanus (Eus. HE. 5.16.17).
21. cf. Tert., De fuga 9.
22. Phil. 8.19, cf. Ps-Tert., Haer. 7.
23. Adv. Prax. 8 (App.1, no.6). "Word" (sermo cf. λόγος) is the Fourth Gospel's designation for Jesus (Jn. 1.1ff, etc.)
24. De mon. 2. No line can therefore be drawn between Trinitarian Tertullian and supposedly Sabellian Phrygian Montanism as some have claimed, e.g. Lawlor, Eusebiana, pp.110ff, see discussion below p.
25. Jerome, Ep. 41.3, cf. Didymus, De trin. 3.41.1.
26. cf. K. Aland, "Der Montanismus und die kleinasiatische Theologie", Z.N.W. (Berlin) 46 (1955), 113.
27. Tert., De res. mort. 11,63.
28. Tert., Adv. Marc. 3.24.
29. Pass. Perp. 1, Tert., De res mort. 63.
30. Epiph., Pan. 48.2 (App.1, no.12).
31. Eus., HE 5.16.18.
32. cf. Tert., Apol. 32:
For we know that a mighty shock impending over the whole earth - in fact, the very end of all things, threatening, dreadful woes - is only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman empire.
33. cf. "In De Fuga in Persecutione Tertullian says that Antichrist is now close at hand and gaping for the blood of Christians." (R.E. Roberts, Theology of Tertullian, p.210; cf. 2 Thess. 2.3ff). It is not, however, certain that Montanist teaching about asceticism or martyrdom was motivated by eschatological expectation (see below p.160).
34. De fuga 9, cf. De an. 55 (App.1, no.9). Lawlor (Eusebiana, pp.130ff) seeks to contrast Tertullian's genuine concern for martyrdom with Phrygian sham concern. He points out that (i) There is no evidence that any of the early Montanist prophets died for the faith. (ii) Themiso, who called himself a martyr, in fact secured his release by payment of a large bribe (Eus., HE 5.18.5). (iii) In the Acta Acacii the magistrate Martianus appeals to bishop Acacius during the Decian persecution to renounce his faith, as the Cataphrygians, "men of an ancient religion", had done so. (iv) W.M. Ramsay

- (Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia esp. p.501) points out that martyrdom was rare in Phrygia as a whole in the late second and early third centuries. It must be remembered, however, that the Acta is full of inaccuracies (see H. Delehay, Les Passions des Martyrs, pp.347ff) and therefore its evidence is dubious. Ramsay's assertion may well be true, but that does not invalidate the genuineness of the Montanist ideal. No doubt there were those who failed this ideal and Themiso may have been one, Quintus (Mart. Poly. 4) possibly another (i.e. if Eusebius' date for the death of Polycarp (168) is right, see W. Telfer, J.T.S., N.S. 3(1952), 79-83), but there is no need to conclude that all their martyrs were like this. And if none of the early Montanist prophets died for the faith neither did Tertullian. Further, the mass parade of Christians before Arrius Antonius, Proconsul of Asia, in 185 asking for martyrdom (Tert., Ad Scap. 5) may well have been in obedience to the Paraclete's teaching. (see below p.162).
35. Tert., De an. 55,58. Yet according to Adv. Marc. 3.24 the bodies of Christians rise at different times during the millennium, according to their deserts.
36. Adv. Marc. 3.24, cf. Justin, Dial. 80.1, etc.
37. Eus., H.E. 5.18.2.
38. cf. De Lab., Crise, p.90.
39. V.C. 29 (1975), 44 referring to Weizsäcker's view qu. De Lab., Crise, p.89. Powell appears to me to be wrong in suggesting that the immediacy of the End was not part of Montanus' own teaching but was only introduced towards the end of Maximilla's prophetic career, when there appeared to be no prophetess to succeed her (op.cit., 43), for he ignores the application of Joel 2.28f to the "New Prophecy".
40. De an. 2.3: nos...certos nihil recipiendum quod non conspiret germanae et ipso iam aevo pronatae propheticae paraturae.
41. Epiph., Pan. 49.1 (App.1, no.16). Powell thinks this was the vision of the otherwise unknown prophetess Quintilla, for "There is point in giving added weight to the vision of a later prophetess by attributing it to one of the founders of the movement, but none in reversing the process." (op.cit. 44). This may be so, but he is less convincing when he suggests that the vision inaugurated a "realised eschatology" i.e. that both infinitives are in the present tense in the Greek:
 τουτουσι τον τόπον είναι ἅγιον, και ὡς τῆν
 Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατείναι.
 which means that the Spirit-directed community of Montanists at Pepuza already constituted New Jerusalem for those who had eyes to see (ibid. 45), for in κατείναι, εἶμι (ibo) can bear the future sense (see L. & S.), and realised eschatology is not found in Patristic thought as a whole - cf. A.J. Visser: "Completely lacking (in ancient Christian eschatology) is an actualistic eschatology aiming at salvation only here and now, that has nothing in store for the Beyond as it is defended by many modern scholars" ("A Bird's-Eye View of Ancient Christian Eschatology", Numen 14 (1967), 22): Much more likely is the view of Aland that the eschatological hopes of the sect always lay only just under the surface

Pt. 1 ch.2.

- of Montanist thought to be re-awakened sporadically by new prophetic outbursts (K.E., p.118).
42. De mon. 2, cf. De virg. vel. 1. Lawlor (Eusebiana, pp.123ff), followed by Gregor Smith (Theol. 46 (1942), 132) challenges the idea that the Phrygians were really ascetic. He points out that Apollonius' evidence (Eus., H.E. 5.18.2-4,7,11) portrays them as greedy and worldly. Yet underneath this polemical exaggeration the facts were probably no more than that Montanus did indeed organize the systematic collection of offerings and the payment of salaries to his full-time workers, so that they could maintain a reasonable standard of living. Such a practical frame of mind may in fact show the influence of Montanus' previous cultic experience (see below p.93).
- But the basic question is whether the Phrygians in fact upheld the same principles that Tertullian defended in De exhort. cast., De mon., and De jej.. Even Apollonius gives us cause to believe this so. He says Montanus taught the annulment of marriage and instituted fasts (5.18.2) and that Priscilla left her husband and assumed the pose of a virgin (5.18.3). It seems clear that Montanus in fact instituted not the dissolution of marriage but monogamy, (see above p.12). But his very report of fasts and marriage restrictions implies some measure of asceticism. Moreover, Tertullian's writings do not convey the impression that he invented the new legislation himself.
43. De mon. 4.
44. De mon. 15, De pud. 1.
45. De jej. 10, cf.1. The ninth hour was 3.00p.m.
46. ibid. 15.
47. ibid. 1. Tertullian is actually stating the charge against the Montanists, but, as he nowhere repudiates it, presumably he accepts it.
48. Phil. 8.19.
49. De paen. 7-12.
50. De pud. 2,5.
51. ibid. 21 (App.1, no.7). And Lawlor (Eusebiana, pp.122f) is quite wrong in taking the sneering rhetorical question of Apollonius: "Does the prophet absolve the martyr of robbery or the martyr forgive the prophet for avarice?" (Eus., H.E. 5.18.7) as evidence for the Phrygians' allowing their martyrs the power of absolution (contrary to De pud. 22), for there is no question of the "martyr" here forgiving sins since, according to Apollonius himself, the prophet had made no attempt to repent. Besides it is only the absolution of mortal sins that Tertullian disallows in De pud., and he does not place avarice in this category.
52. Lawlor (Eusebiana, pp.118f) is right in believing the earliest Phrygians and the African Montanists experienced different forms of ecstasy, but then there is no record of the African ecstasies prophesying as the Paraclete. Tertullian tries, however, to show that "possession-ecstasy" is as innocent as "visionary ecstasy" (see below pp.154f).
53. so Serapion, Eus., H.E. 5.19.2, etc.

Pt.1 ch.2

54. It is used both by Didymus in De trin. and in the Dialogue.
55. Certainly Hippolytus (Phil. 8.19) emphasises the role of Priscilla and Maximilla more than that of Montanus.
56. Eus., H.E. 5.16.3.
57. Clem. Alex., Strom. 7.17.108.1, Hippol., Phil. 8.19, Epiph., Pan. 48.1, etc.
58. H.E. 5.3.4.
59. ibid. 5.16.17, 18.5.
60. ibid. 5.3.4, 16.14-15.
61. ibid. 5.18.6-10.
62. Apollonius speaks of Priscilla and an unnamed prophetess as "the first prophetesses." (Eus., H.E. 5.18.3).
63. ibid. 5.18.2.
64. ibid. 5.16.17.
65. ibid. 5.19.3 (Sotas of Anchialus sought to exorcise Priscilla but was prevented by her supporters).
66. ibid. 5.16.10. The Anonymous quotes the utterance of Maximilla: "I am driven away from the sheep like a wolf. I am not a wolf, I am word and spirit and power." (ibid., 5.16.17, App.1, no.13).
67. Eus., H.E. 5.3.4.
68. Iren., Adv. haer. 3.3.4, Eus., H.E. 5.20.5.
69. Eus., H.E. 5.1.17 (Attalus), 5.1.49 (Alexander).
70. Tert., Adv. Prax. 1.5, where Eleutherus was probably one of the earlier bishops of Rome to whose verdict against the Phrygians Praxeas appealed, and Zephyrinus perhaps the current bishop (see De Lab., Crise, pp.267ff).
71. see Barnes, Tertullian, ch.5, etc.
72. see above nt.19.
73. see De fuga 1, De exhort. cast. 1. Both of these works were written to men who did not share Tertullian's views of the "New Prophecy".
74. cf. above ch.1, nt.36.
75. Haer. 86.
76. so J.M. Fuller, D.C.B. IV, p.819, and subsequent writers.
77. so G. La Piana, "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century", Harv. Th. Rev. 18 (1925), 213, G.L. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, pp.53ff.
78. De mon. 1.
79. De pud. 1.10: Erit igitur et hic adversus psychicos titulus, adversus meae quoque sententiae retro penes illos societatem, quo magis hoc mihi in notam levitatis obiciant. Numquam societatis repudium delicti praeiudicium. Quasi non facilius sit errare cum pluribus, quando veritas cum paucis ametur.
- Powell (V.C. 29 (1975), 33ff) believes that when Tertullian disiunxit a psychicis (Adv. Prax. 1) he did not formally go into schism nor was he formally excommunicated, rather his party formed an ecclesiola in ecclesia hoping to persuade the catholic Church to recognize the "New Prophecy". Powell points out that even at his most militant Tertullian refers to the Catholic Church as a "virgin" and "Christ's betrothed" (De pud. 1.7-8, De mon. 11.2).

Pt.1 ch.2.

- Now undoubtedly some of Tertullian's Montanist works are conciliatory (notably De fuga and De exhort. cast.), but his explicit statements in Adv. Prax. 1.7 (disiunxit a psychicos) and De pud. 1.10 qu. above clearly reflect a renunciation of fellowship. Adv. Prax., De mon., De jej. and De pud. with their vilification of the "psychics" must all have been written subsequently. They clearly show that he has now abandoned the path of persuasion. De pud. goes further than the rest for it is there that Tertullian can speak of "your churches" (10.12), and distinguish between "the Church" and "your church" (21.16). Even in this work he can indeed still speak of the body within which the edict of the Pontifex Maximus was published as the virgo and sponsa Christi (1.8), but he considers it is being gravely maladministered. The ecclesia numerus episcoporum is not living according to its true nature as ecclesia spiritus (21.17), and therefore he can have nothing to do with it.
80. Jerome, De vir. ill. 53.
 81. eg. Lawlor, Eusebiana, p.113, Aland, K.E., pp.116-118.
 82. Eus., Vit. Con. 3.64-66.
 83. H.E. 2.32.6. Sozomen was writing c.450.
 84. Pan. 48.14.
 85. ibid.
 86. Haer. 75 (Ascodrogitae), 76 (Passalorinchitae).
 87. Comm. ad Gal. 2.2. (AD 386).
 88. see nt.41 above.
 89. Epiphanius speaks of female bishops and presbyters. Ambrosiaster (Comm. ad 1 Tim. 3.11) says that the Cataphrygians used 1 Tim. 3.11 as a pretext for having deaconesses.
 90. Pan. 49.2.
 91. Haer. 28.
 92. H.E. 7.19.7
 93. Ep. 41.2. This Lawlor ignores in his depreciation of the asceticism of the Phrygian Montanists (Eusebiana, p.130).
 94. H.E. 7.18.14-15:
 Ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς πρὸ ἑννέα καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων, ὡς ἀρχῆς οὕσης κτίσεως ἡλίου καὶ πρώτου μηνός, ἀναλογίζονται τὴν εἰρημένην ταῖς ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ· καὶ ταύτην εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν πρὸ ὀκτὼ εἰδῶν Ἀπριλλίων καθ' ἣν αἰεὶ τὸ Πάσχα ἄρουνται, εἰ συμβαίῃ καὶ τὴν ἀναστάσιμον αὐτῆ συνδραμεῖν ἡμέραν, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ κυριακῇ ἑορτάζουσι. Γέγραπται γάρ, φησὶν ἀπὸ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης μέχρι εἰκοστῆς πρώτης. (Hussey).
 95. cf. Epiph., Pan. 50.1, see De Lab., Crise, pp.514ff.
 96. "We celebrate Easter by an annual rotation in the first month." (De jej. 14).
 97. Cyril, Cate. 16.8 (347-8), declares that Montanists take

Pt.1 Ch.2.

unfortunate children and cut them in pieces for use in their mysteries. Thereafter the story is progressively elaborated. For further details and discussion see below pp.75f.

98. e.g. Tert., Apol. 7-9.
99. Ep. 41.4, so also Theodoret, Epitome 3.2, (mid-fifth century).
100. Ep. 41.3.
101. 1.5.20 (AD 530).
102. H.E. 7.19.2, referring also to chorepiscopi in the orthodox churches in Arabia and Cyprus.
103. 16.5.34,40,48,57,59,65, 10.24, see De Lab., Sources, nos.153-59.
104. ibid., no.138.
105. ibid., no.198.
106. Auctarium Aquicintinum, see De Lab., Sources, no.225.
107. Codex Iustinianus 1.5.18-21, see De Lab., Sources, nos. 188-91.
108. Procopius, Hist. Arc. 11.14-23, see De Lab., Sources, no.193.
109. Honorius of Autun, Haer. 42, see De Lab., Sources, no.221.

PART 2

MODERN INTERPRETATIONS

CHAPTER 1

THE PRODUCT OF THE SECULAR ENVIRONMENT

Phrygia was the birth-place of Montanism and it was there that the movement persisted in considerable strength for several centuries. Were there special non-religious factors at work in Phrygia moulding the movement into its distinctive form? Some scholars have suggested variously the geography, the climate and the social structure of society there. We shall consider each of these in turn.

A. The Geography of Phrygia

In his book Enthusiasm (1950) R.A. Knox suggests that the distinctive geography of Phrygia may be a partial explanation of the ecstatic nature of Montanism. He quotes the words of F. Prat:

The new Judaism (he is speaking of the New Testament heresies) was bound to find favour among the Phrygians, a people famous at all times for their tendency to illuminism. Their natural surroundings, rugged, tortuous, convulsed at intervals by terrible earthquakes, rent by crevices which breathe out, even now, sulphurous fumes, seemed as if this must have been the scene of age-long warfare between supernatural powers. At Hierapolis, not far from Colossae, you were shewn an entrance to hell called the Plutonium....The rites practised in honour of Cybele, of Diana, of Sebazius, prove how far the mystic exaltation of these peoples could go. Phrygia was always the nursery of the most extravagant Gnostic sects. You passed easily, there, from the most abandoned licence to the most rigid Puritanism. C'était la patrie de tous les fanatismes et de tous le excès¹

and he concludes:

If such an estimate (by a careful writer) is justly conceived, we can hardly doubt that the prophet of second-century enthusiasm was, to some extent, the child of his surroundings.²

But such an explanation of the ecstatic prophets of Montanism is not satisfactory. In the first place mystic exaltation and orgiastic dance were characteristic of many oriental religions. Egypt was the home of the mysteries of Isis,³ in Palestine we hear of the crazed dances of the prophets of Baal,⁴ and it was from Syria that Elagabalus later introduced the horrifying rites of his sun-god to Rome.⁵ Asia Minor had no monopoly in the field of ecstatic behaviour.

Secondly, Prat's description is specifically of the Lycus Valley and does not apply to Phrygia in general for much of which rolling plains stretch unrelieved as far as the eye can see. W.M. Ramsay speaks from his own experience of the melancholy atmosphere that pervades the Phrygian countryside.⁶ Elsewhere he writes:

Not vigour and initiative, but receptivity and impressibility, swayed the spirit of the people, marked their fate, and breathed through the atmosphere that surrounded them....

There is a sense of rest, of inevitable acquiescence in the Infinite Power which is around you, all pervasive and compelling. The sense of individuality and personal power grows weak and shrinks away, not daring to show itself in the human consciousness.⁷

And it is on these Phrygian uplands that we hear of the activity of Montanus, first in his native village Ardabav in the borderlands of Phrygia and Mysia,⁸ then at Pepuza⁹ not far from Eumeneia.¹⁰ It would seem then that psychologically the Phrygian vista would act not as a stimulant but a depressant. So geography can scarcely be thought of as a determinative factor for the nature of religious activity in Phrygia.

B. The Climate of Phrygia

F. Cumont in Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain (2nd. ed. 1909) sees the climate of Phrygia as an explanation of the ecstatic element in Montanism:

The religion of Phrygia was perhaps even more violent than that of Thrace. The climate of the Anatolian upland is one of extremes. Its winters are rough, long and cold, the spring rains suddenly develop a vigorous vegetation that is scorched by the hot summer sun. The abrupt contrasts of a nature generous and sterile, radiant and bleak in turn, caused excesses of sadness and joy that were unknown in temperate and smiling regions, where the ground was never buried under snow nor scorched by the sun. The Phrygians mourned the long agony and death of the vegetation, but when the verdure reappeared in March they surrendered to the excitement of a tumultuous joy....Violent ecstasis was always an endemic disease in Phrygia. As late as the Antonines, montanist prophets that arose in that country attempted to introduce it into Christianity.¹

Of course it is easy to imagine the joy with which the spring was welcomed, but such a joy was by no means confined to Phrygia. It was no less evident in many hot and dry countries of the Middle East.² Indeed in Phrygia the spring festival of the Cybele cult was celebrated violently with raucous music and frenzied dancing,³ but we hear nothing of these in connection with Montanus' ecstasies. In fact we have no reason to associate his ecstasies with joy at all. The only Montanist services described in the literature are sad occasions when seven virgins enter⁴ grief-stricken and by their prophetic "enthusiasm"⁵ provoke their audience also to tears. Clearly the climate of Phrygia was not a significant factor in the rise of Montanism.

C. The Social Structure of Phrygia

A sociological explanation of the development of Montanism is suggested by some words of W.H.C. Frend in Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church (1965):

As time went on, Montanism took on more and more the character of a revolt, the prophetic and eschatological religion of the native countryside against the Hellenized Christianity of the towns.¹

No matter how the movement originated Montanism is here seen to develop in conscious contrast to the Christianity of the alien civilization. In considering this suggestion it is necessary first to look at the organization of Phrygia under the Roman administration, and then to see what evidence there is for differing forms of Christianity in city and country before drawing conclusions.

According to Herodotus² the Phrygians (Φρύγες), from whom West Central Anatolia took its name, were from Macedonia or West Thrace and entered Anatolia via the Hellespont. Diodorus³ tells us that they held sway of the sea for twenty-five years c.900 B.C.. Though they then lost control of the sea-board they retained some inland power and established their capital at Gordium. C. 700 B.C. the centre of power shifted to Lydia and from then onwards the Phrygians were always a subject people under Lydian, Persian, Greek and then Roman rule. That they retained any identity is largely due to the geography of the subcontinent, where the high central plateau is effectively shut in by mountain ranges along the north and south and to a lesser extent the west. In the third century B.C. three marauding Gallic tribes entered Anatolia and eventually settled to the east

of Phrygia. Under Roman rule most of Phrygia was incorporated into the province of Asia in 116 B.C.. The most eastern part with the Gallic territory was constituted the province of Galatia in 25 B.C..⁴

Phrygia had some ancient cities, such as Colossae and Celaenae (later Apameia), and others were founded by the Greeks. As Hellenistic influence spread so the city-state became the pattern of government, where the assembly (ἐκκλησία) of the people elected its council (βουλή). We also hear of the existence of a council of elders (γερονσία), an institution unknown in classical Greece.⁵ Yet the country by and large remained agricultural and Hellenism was little more than a thin veneer covering the native orientalism.⁶

The Romans based their administration on the cities and greatly encouraged further urbanization. Though they allowed the cities a large measure of self-government at first, the ruling power was vested in the local aristocracies. In return for this favour the Romans expected loyalty and public beneficence - the erection of public monuments, the maintenance of gymnasia, etc. - and the collection of taxes. At first the aristocracy took up their prestigious roles with zest and the cities flourished. By the end of the second century A.D., however, the financial demands upon them were becoming an intollerable burden.

Each city was responsible for the administration of the territory around it, much of which was cultivated by a rustic population living in villages. The Romans viewed these villages as "attached" to the cities, but the citizens viewed the villagers as "by-dwellers" (παρόικοι or κάτοικοι)

not entitled to the full rights of municipal citizenship. Villagers desiring full citizenship felt some animosity against those who wished to deny it.⁷ Away from the city large tracts of land formed imperial or senatorial estates. The peasants who worked these estates were tenant-farmers responsible to imperial or senatorial agents, and lived in villages little touched by Hellenism. Besides giving the authorities a percentage of their produce villagers had additional responsibilities, such as providing animals for the imperial post as it crossed a certain tract of territory.⁸ In times of famine or war the brunt of taxation and public duties proved particularly heavy. After a period of prosperity under Antonius Pius (138-61) pestilence, famine and war under Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus brought the empire to the verge of bankruptcy. Four inscriptions have been found addressed by villagers to Septimus Severus, complaining of oppression by imperial agents (in Lydia) and by "leaders and prominent men of the city", who had entered the estate and "exacted what was not owed to them" (in Phrygia).⁹ In 244-47 the latter appealed again, this time against imperial agents. It thus seems clear that there was some potential for friction between the rustic population and those who were its administrative overlords, though in fact no concerted resistance by the peasantry developed.¹⁰

Were different forms of Christianity associated with city and country in Asia Minor? For the earliest era of the Christian faith we have no reason to believe this was the case. S. Paul's missionary work as indicated in his letters and recorded in the Acts of the Apostles was centred on the

cities, but it seems, no doubt through travellers and trade, the new faith percolated rapidly to the territories around the cities. Ramsay believed that it was the Christian faith which spread the Greek language outside the great cities first in south-west Phrygia (in the second century), then in north and east Phrygia (in the third century).¹¹ The reason for this was, partly at least, that the Christian sacred writings were in Greek. And Pliny, writing of the situation in nearby Bithynia as early as 112, speaks of Christianity's penetration not only to the cities but also to the villages and country by that time.¹²

Even by the end of the first century, however, it is evident that the quality of Christian life and witness in the local churches varied greatly. Of the seven city churches of Asia addressed in the Apocalypse there is a marked contrast for instance between the faithful and uncompromising Philadelphians and the luke-warm Laodiceans.¹³ And the epigraphist W.M. Calder suggested that from these two particular churches there emanated two contrasting streams of Christianity in Phrygia represented by the third-century epigraphical evidence: in the north an uncompromising, rigoristic stream, which he identifies with the Montanists, and in the centre and south-west a laxer variety prepared to come to terms to some extent with the secular world. These he identifies with the orthodox Church.¹⁴ Let us consider the evidence.

The first and most impressive representative of the epitaphs from central and southern Phrygia is that of a certain Avircius (known previously from a tenth-century

biography), discovered by Ramsay in 1883 at Hieropolis¹⁵ in what was later known as the "Phrygian Pentapolis".

This important text deserved quotation in full:

I, a citizen of the elect city, erected this tomb in my lifetime, that I might have clearly there a place for my body; my name is Avircius, a disciple of the pure Shepherd who feeds the flocks of sheep on mountains and plains, who has great all-seeing eyes; he taught me...faithful scriptures. To Rome he sent me to behold sovereignty and to see a queen, golden-robed and golden-sandalled; a people I saw there which has a splendid seal, and I saw the plain of Syria and all the cities, and Nisibis, crossing the Euphrates; but everywhere I met with brethren; with Paul before me, I followed, and Faith everywhere led the way and served food everywhere, the Fish from the spring - immense, pure, which the pure Virgin caught and gave to her friends to eat for ever, with good wine, giving the cup with the loaf. These things I Avircius ordered to be written thus in my presence. I am truly seventy-two years old. Let him who understands these things, and everyone who is in agreement, pray for Avircius. No-one is to put anyone else into my tomb; otherwise he is to pay the Roman treasury 2,000 gold pieces, and my good native city of Hierapolis 1,000 gold pieces.¹⁶

The most surprising feature of this very interesting epitaph is that nowhere does the author explicitly confess his religious allegiance. For the Christian every phrase is pregnant with symbolic meaning, but for the uninitiated this would not be so. Indeed one scholar has made an ingenious attempt to show that the epitaph could have been the work of a priest of Cybele,¹⁷ but he has not won general support. Ramsay and many after him have identified Avircius with the Avircius Marcellus to whom Eusebius' Anonymous addressed his anti-Montanist work. A difficulty for this suggestion is that Hieropolis was far nearer the centre of early Montanism, Pepuza (perhaps 45 miles away), than to Galatian Ancyra (c.180 miles away),¹⁸ where the Anonymous came into contact with Montanism at first hand. One would have expected repercussions of the "New Prophecy" in Hieropolis well before it reached

Ancyra. Yet there may have been factors which favoured the development of Montanism in Galatia before it had fully penetrated the cities of central Phrygia, and Avircius may have preferred to await information from the astute Anonymous rather than to accept it from less perceptive sources nearer to hand. Certainly the Anonymous was in touch with the Hieropolis area, for he mentioned Zoticus of Otrous a neighbouring city to Hieropolis, and called him a "fellow-presbyter". If the epitaph is indeed that of Avircius Marcellus we can see in its glorification of the universal Church an oblique thrust at the merely local Montanist movement.

The next example of a "veiled confession" of Christianity occurs in an epitaph clearly modelled on that of Avircius and dated 216²⁰ (which allows us to date Avircius' epitaph itself to 200 \pm 10 years). Next there follows a series of epitaphs (including dated examples from 246 to 273),²¹ ending with a distinctive warning that anyone daring to deposit another body illegally in the tomb "will be accountable to the living God" ($\xi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \zeta\omega\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, with variants). Noting that unquestionably pagan epitaphs of this time placed their tombs under the protection of "the gods" or a named pagan deity Ramsay saw in this particular formula an indication of Christianity. His view has since been strongly defended by Calder,²² the distinctive warning becoming known as the "Eumeneian formula" since epitaphs bearing it have been found in largest numbers around Eumeneia.

Ramsay's close scrutiny of these epitaphs brought to light other traits which seem indicative of Christianity. Certain names,²³ though also used by pagans, were especially

common here, for example Alexander, Zoticus, Tatia, and Ammia. Some appear to have been chosen for their association with local Christian heroes, others because of their suitability for Christians (for example Zoticus, "full of life"). The name Nonna is found once, and Ramsay points out that it was originally an Egyptian word meaning "old woman", but was applied to virgins and widows who professed chastity and became almost a special order within the Church.²⁴ The appearance of the name Maria in an inscription dated 263-64²⁵ may be the morning star of a specifically Biblical nomenclature which began to flower in the mid-fourth century.

On some of these epitaphs $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ ("sleeping place") occurs²⁶ and points to the hope of resurrection, whereas the normal term $\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\omicron\nu$ strictly implies that the dead person is deified as a "hero" and worshipped by his descendants. Sometimes even special indications of joy are found such as "to the happy dead"²⁷ and "rejoice with me God-lovers and good hunters of the new" (or "newly caught")²⁸ suggest Christianity. Permission granted to someone outside the family to be buried in the family tomb, found on some of the epitaphs, may also be of Christian provenance as it is very rare in unquestionably pagan cases.²⁹

On such epitaphs especially around Eumeneia some of those commemorated are described as $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ (member of the city council) or $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (member of the council of elders).³⁰ The implication of this is clear as Ramsay states:

If Chr(istians) entered the Imperial Service or the municipal career, some sacrifice of strictest principle was required of them, and as magistrates they had to comply with many non-Chr(istian) religious forms in a public way, for religion entered far more closely into the details of life in ancient times than it does in modern society and government. The simple fact that so many Chr(istian) senators at Eumeneia are

known to us, shows that the spirit of accommodation ruled there.³¹

The impression we gain then of the Church in central and southern Phrygia, where "veiled confession" epitaphs were more common, is that, while deriving the most benefit from Greco-Roman civilization, it desired not to offend its pagan neighbours more than necessary.

In marked contrast to the "veiled confession" inscriptions are another set of epitaphs discovered in the Tembris Valley of north-west Phrygia. The area bore the Greek name Praepenissos, and here it seems a rustic population lived in loosely federated villages upon an imperial estate.³² Hellenism was very little felt and only Soa the capital had a βουλή of the δήμος. No local officials are mentioned in the inscriptions, which are themselves written in very poor Greek³³ with numerous spelling mistakes, weird constructions and new words, which betray the influence of the Phrygian vernacular. But the feature which sets certain of the epitaphs apart (one dated 248-49, another 278-79 and the rest undated) is their open confession that both the dead and the living are Christians. Of the fourteen epitaphs listed by J.G.C. Anderson as Christian, nine contain the phrase:

Χρηστιανοὶ Χρηστιανοῖς

"Christians to Christians" (with variants), which appears either at the beginning or more often at or near the end of the inscription. That the phrase has become a slogan is evident from the ungrammatical use of the plural in some cases where clearly the singular is required.³⁵ The spelling of "Christian" varies. Three have Χρηστιανοί, five Χρηστιανοί (one spelt 'εῖα νοί) and one Χριστιανοί.

The confusion of the unfamiliar stem $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau'$ with the familiar $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau'$ was quite common in the early history of the Church, and was picked upon by Christian writers as a sign of pagan ignorance.³⁶

The "Eumeneian formula" is not found on any Tembris Valley epitaph, but instead there sometimes appears the quaint warning:

$\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ (\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\omega\upsilon\varsigma)\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$

"You (who read this) must not wrong God" (with a variety of spelling mistakes).

These open declarations of faith, unparalleled in the pre-Constantinian Church, would appear to be consonant with the Montanists' attitude to martyrdom revealed by Tertullian in his quotations from the "Paraclete"³⁷ and Calder concluded:

In the Tembris valley inscriptions we can read a chapter of its (Montanism's) local history in the 3rd century. Worsted in the Hellenized cities of central Phrygia, it turned to the rustic region of northern Phrygia and sought its converts among the small towns and villages which were as yet but slightly affected by Hellenism.³⁸

Since Anderson's basic study other examples of "open confession" epitaphs have been found both in and around the Tembris Valley,³⁹ and Calder has also pointed out a few scattered examples of the use of the word "Christian" in other parts of Phrygia.⁴⁰ Grégoire confirmed the existence of Montanism in north Phrygia by pointing to an epitaph he had previously published whose Montanist provenance can scarcely be doubted:

$\Pi\quad +\quad \Pi$
 Λουπικῖνος Μουντάνη
 συνβίω Χριστιανῆ
 πνευματικῆ μνήμης
 χάρις

which was found at Dorylaeum and dates from the fourth century (perhaps the reign of Julian).⁴¹ Further confirmation for Montanism in the vicinity of Philadelphia comes from an inscription of Praulios, a $\kappa\omicron\iota\chi\omega\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$, and dated 515.⁴² And so, despite the defection of Grégoire,⁴³ Calder felt confident enough to reaffirm his original theory more than thirty years after he first propounded it.⁴⁴

But the evidence is not so clear-cut as Calder's theory would suggest. The New Prophecy did not only appeal to the simple-minded. It could also convince the brilliant Tertullian, Proculus in Rome who published anti-heretical works,⁴⁵ and the anonymous fourth-century disputant whose arguments are recorded in the Dialogue. Within Asia Minor itself it was not just the country people who responded, the church in Thyatira was completely won over and remained Montanist it seems for many years,⁴⁶ and several derivative sects of Cataphrygians were in evidence in Ancyra, metropolis of Galatia, at least to Jerome's day.⁴⁷ Further, it is not only the "open confession" epitaphs that appear in the "rustic region" of the Tembris. Anderson lists three of the "veiled confession" variety as well as the nine with the "Christians to Christians" slogan.⁴⁸ Again the mere use of the word "Christian" in an epitaph is not necessarily an indication of either Montanist or orthodox provenance. Calder himself rightly doubted whether one discovered at Apollonia was Christian at all,⁴⁹ and in one of the Tembris examples⁵⁰ the father of Zoticus who makes the dedication is called Marcion, which could possibly imply some connection with the Marcionite sect.

Indeed it seems safer to prefer Grégoire's final

conclusion⁵¹ that it is impossible to separate orthodox Christians from Montanists just by the open declaration of faith. Christians adopted one style or another on their epitaphs as they saw fit. Perhaps some were being provocative in obedience to the exhortation of the "Paraclete", while others were merely emboldened to confess their faith more openly than in other parts of the Roman Empire because of the greater numerical strength of Christians in Phrygia than elsewhere - the result of a long period of missionary endeavour.

To return to the statement of Frensd, it does not seem possible then to draw a clear contrast between a "prophetic and eschatological religion of the native countryside" and the "Hellenized Christianity of the towns" in Phrygia, however tempting the suggestion. And we can scarcely think of Montanism as a "revolt" in any quasi-political sense, for we hear of no Montanist Circumcellions and no Phrygian rebels comparable to the Mauretanian chieftains Firmus and Gildo with whom Donatists in North Africa threw in their lot.⁵²

If there was no clear distinction between the Christianity of city and country in Phrygia should we adopt Anderson's view that Montanism represented a "conservative national movement opposed to the centralising unifying policy of the Church as a whole?"⁵³ Clearly not, for Montanism may have been conservative but its impetus certainly did not come from nationalism. The New Prophecy addressed itself to the whole Church⁵⁴ and its missionaries sped quickly to Rome, Carthage and elsewhere. Even in the fourth century Montanist propaganda seeking to convert Marcella required Jerome himself to take action, and the Dialogue may be the record of a debate between Didymus and a Montanist in Alexandria.⁵⁵

No less an authority than A.H.M. Jones has warned us of the fallacy of attributing heresies of the fourth century to nationalism or other sociological causes.⁵⁶ Some have viewed Donatism primarily as a nationalistic movement, but, Jones points out, though the majority of Donatists must have been Punic- or Berber-speaking, they seem to have taken no special pride in these languages. Donatist inscriptions were in Latin. Their religious terrorists the Circumcellions used a Latin war-cry, "Deo laudes!" A Donatist church was established in Rome to be not an outpost of Africanism but a "church of the Martyrs". Donatist leaders repeatedly sought recognition from the imperial authorities and only supported the Mauretanian rebels Firmus and Gildo when it was obvious that the Romans would not accept their claim to be the true Church. And Jones protests:

Modern historians are, I think, retrojecting into the past the sentiments of the present age when they argue that mere religious or doctrinal dissension cannot have generated such violent and enduring animosity as that evinced by the Donatists, Arians, or Monophysites, and that the real moving force behind these movements must have been national or class feeling.⁵⁷

In contrast he cites the well known description of Constantinople in the heat of doctrinal controversy.⁵⁸ And his warning serves as a timely reminder to anyone who might be tempted to explain Montanism primarily in sociological terms.⁵⁹ Religious fervour does capture the popular mind from time to time, particularly when its proponents speak with an authoritative voice and present a challenge to their hearers, and this was clearly the case with the New Prophecy.

REFERENCES & NOTESPt. 2 ch. 1A - CA - The Geography of Phrygia

1. Théologie de Saint Paul, I, p.342.
2. Enthusiasm, p.29.
3. Apuleius (Meta. 11.23) tells us of the ecstasy of an initiate of this cult.
4. I Kings 18.
5. Herodian, Hist. 5.5-6.
6. "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia III", Expos. 3rd. ser. 9 (1889), 144.
7. "Geographical Conditions determining History and Religion in Asia Minor", Geog. J. 20 (1902), 272f.
8. Eus., H.E. 5.16.7.
9. ibid. 5.18.2.
10. See map 2, "Asia Minor" in A.H.M. Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces.

B - The Climate of Phrygia

1. Eng. tr. (1911) p.50. The 4th Fr. ed. (1929) adds nothing significant.
2. cf. Canaanite and Babylonian New Year festivals.
3. see below pp.68f.
4. Epiph., Pan. 49.2.
5. ἐνθεουσιασμός, from ἐν + θεός, The state of being "full of god" or "inspired", cf. Iamblichus, De myst. 3.4-5.

C - The Social Structure of Phrygia

1. p.294.
2. 7.73.
3. 7.11.
4. Convenient summaries of this information are to be found in the articles "Asia", "Galatia" and "Phrygia" in the Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2nd.ed.(1970) by N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard, and the article "Phrygia" in D.C.B. III.
5. see V. Chapot, La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie, pp.216ff.
6. M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, pp.236ff, Chapot, op.cit., pp.542f quoting Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia (henceforth C.B.) p.130; F. Millar, The Roman Empire and its Neighbours, p.197.
7. Rostovtzeff, op.cit., p.237 referring to speeches by Dio Chrysostom, etc.
8. A dispute between two Phrygian villages over the distribution of this liability is shown in the "Sulmenli inscription" reported by W.H.C. Frend in "A third-century Inscription relating to angareia in Phrygia", J.R.S. 46 (1956), 46-56.

Pt. 2 ch. 10

9. see D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor I, pp.678ff.
10. see A.H.M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire, p.811.
11. "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia I", Expos. 8 (1888), 245.
12. Ep. 10.96.9.
13. Rev. 3.7-13, 14-22.
14. "Philadelphia and Montanism", B.J.R.L. 7 (1922), 309-54.
15. Hierapolis, which is actually given in the epitaph, is in fact the more literary Greek form for what the less educated Phrygians called Hieropolis, see Ramsay, C.B., pp.680ff. The "Phrygian Pentapolis" is first encountered in the Byzantine period (Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, p.66).
16. qu. J. Stevenson, A New Eusebius, p.143. I have taken the liberty of altering the punctuation slightly and of retaining Hierapolis as in the Greek. The following Greek text comes from Ramsay, C.B., pp.722f, incorporating two emendations by Calder (J.R.S. 29 (1939), 1-4):

Ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολεῖτης τοῦτ' ἐποίησα
 ζῶν, ἵν' ἔχω φανερω[ε]ῖς σώματος ἔνθα θέσει,
 οὐνομ' Ἀουίρκιος [ἄν, ὁ] μαθητῆς ποιμένος ἀγνοῦ,
 ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας ὄρεσι[ω] πεδίοις τε,
 ὀφθαλμοῦ ὃς ἔχει μεγάλου [καὶ πάνθ'] ὀρόωντας.
 οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε [...] γράμματα πιστά,
 εἰς Ῥώμην ὃς ἔπεμψεν ἐμὲν βασιλ[εῖα] ἀθρῆσαι
 καὶ βασιλίσσαι ἰδεῖν χρυσόστολον χρυσοπέδιλον.
 λαὸν δ' εἶδον ἐκεῖ λαμπρὰ σφραγεῖδα ἔχοντα
 καὶ Συρίης πέδον εἶδα καὶ ἄσπερα πάντα, Νίσιβην,
 Εὐφράτην διαβάς· πάντη δ' ἔσχαρον συνομή[μους].
 Παῦλον ἔχων ἐπό[μην], Πίστις πάντη δὲ προῆγε
 καὶ παρέθηκε τροφήν πάντη, Ἰχθῦν ἀπὸ πηγῆς,
 πανμεγέθη, καθαρόν, ὃν ἐδράξατο παρθένος ἀγνή,
 καὶ τοῦτον ἐπέδωκε φίλοις ἕσθαι διὰ πάντας,
 οἶνον χρηστὸν ἔχοντα, κέρασμα δειδῶσα μετ' ἄρτου.
 ταῦτα παρεστὼς εἶπον Ἀουίρκιος ὡδε γραφῆναι.
 ἑβδομηκοστὸν ἔτος καὶ δεῦτερον ἦγον ἀληθῶς.
 ταῦθ' ὁ νοῦν εὐξαιθ' ὑπὲρ [αὐτοῦ] πᾶς ὁ συναδός.
 οὐ μέντοι τύμβῳ τις ἐμῷ ἕτερον τινα θήσει.
 εἰ δ' οὐδ', Ῥωμαίων ταμνίῳ θήσει διαχειρία χρυσᾶ,
 καὶ χρηστῇ πατρίδι Ἰεράπολι χεῖλια χρυσᾶ.

17. G. Ficker, criticised by Ramsay, C.B., p.732.
18. These distances are mere measurements from the map "Asia Minor" in Jones, Cities of the E.R.P.

Pt.2 ch.1C

19. Eus., H.E. 5.16.5.
20. Ramsay, C.B., no.656.
21. Calder, Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua 7 (1956), p.xxxvii.
22. "The Eumeneian Formula", Antolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler (1939), pp.15-26, accepted by Grégoire, "Épigraphie Hérétique...et Hérésie Épigraphique", Byzantion 10 (1935), 247.
23. C.B., p.492.
24. ibid., p.732.
25. ibid., no.365.
26. "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia II", Expos. 8 (1888), 426f. (no.27 dated 250-1, no.28 dated 260-1).
27. ibid., 422f (no.21).
28. C.B., no.389, where $\nu\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\phi\eta\rho\omicron\iota$ might bear the active or passive sense.
29. ibid., pp.532f.
30. e.g. ibid., nos. 361,364, and Calder subsequently discovered that the latter relates to a blacksmith who was also an athlete and had won prizes in pagan athletic festivals (see "Leaves from an Anatolian Notebook", B.J.R.L. 13 (1929),259f).
31. C.B., p.504, cf. can. 56 of the Council of Elvira (c.305) which forbade duoviri, the chief magistrates of a city, to enter the church during their year of office because no doubt they would have to take a leading part in pagan celebrations (see C.J. Hefele, A History of the Christian Councils, I, tr. by W.R. Clark, 2nd ed., (1872) p.161.
32. See J.G.C. Anderson, "Paganism and Christianity in the Upper Tembris Valley", Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire, ed. W.M. Ramsay (1906), pp.183ff.
33. ibid., p.195.
34. ibid., pp.214-27.
35. e.g. ibid., p.214, no.12:

Αὐρ. Ζωτικὸς Μαρτί-
 νος τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ γο-
 νεῦσι ἔτι ζῶν Μαρτί(ω)ν
 κὲ Ἄππῃ κὲ ἀδελφῶ Ἄρτε-
 μᾶ μνήμης χάριν
 Χριστιανοὶ Χριστιανοῖς.
36. so Tert., Apol.3 and Lactantius, Div. inst.4.7.5, cf. Suetonius, reference to "Chrestus" (Claud. 25).
37. De fuga 9, see App. 1, nos.8,9.
38. "The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies", Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay (1923), p.64.
39. see Calder, "Leaves from an Anatolian Notebook", 267ff.
40. "Philadelphia and Montanism", 344ff - no.13 (near Thyatira), no.14 (Apameia).
41. "Épigraphie Chrétienne: I Les inscriptions hérétiques d'Asie Mineure", Byzantion 1 (1924), 708.
42. Grégoire, "Du Nouveau sur le Hiérarchie de la Secte Montaniste", Byzantion 2 (1925), 329-35.

Pt.2 ch.1C

43. Les Persécutions dans l'Empire Romain (1951), p.18, where he no longer sees an open declaration of faith as an adequate index for distinguishing between Montanists and orthodox Christians.
44. "Early-Christian Epitaphs from Phrygia", Anatolian Studies 5 (1955), 25-38.
45. Tert., Adv. Val. 5, cf. Eus., H.E. 2.25.6 etc.
46. Epiph., Pan. 51.33, cf. De Lab., Crise, pp.197ff, 575ff.
47. Comm. ad Gal. 2.2, cf Epiph., Pan. 48.14.
48. "Paganism and Christianity", nos. 16,22,24.
49. "Philadelphia and Montanism" 348f, no.15.
50. see above nt.35.
51. see above nt.43. This verdict would seem to be confirmed by some epitaphs recently published by E. Gibson, ("Montanist Epitaphs at Uşak", Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies 16 (1975), 433-42), who believes they are late second- or early third-century and Montanist. One epitaph mentions a Bishop Diogas, who may be the same individual who raised another monument to a female presbyter (Inscriptiones Bureschianae, no.55, cf. Epiph., Pan. 49.2 which mentions female bishops and presbyters among the Quintillianists). None of the epitaphs bears the word "Christian".
52. For the African situation see Frend, The Donatist Church (1952). Jones speaks of the peasantry of the empire as a whole as "singularly passive" (The Later R.E., p.811).
53. op. cit., p.202 ftnt.
54. Δεῖ ἡμῶς, φύσει, καὶ τὰ χάρισματὰ δεῖσθαι (Epiph., Pan. 48.1.)
55. cf. De Lab., Sources, p.CIII f.
56. "Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?" J.T.S., N.S. 10 (1959), 280-98.
57. p.295.
58. "If in this city you ask anyone for change, he will discuss with you whether the Son is begotten or unbegotten. If you ask about the quality of bread, you will receive the answer that 'the Father is greater, the Son is less'." If you suggest that a bath is desirable you will be told that, 'there was nothing before the Son was created'." Gregory of Nyssa, On the Deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit, P.G. 46, ed.577, qu. Frend, The Early Church, pp.186f
59. Frend in fact is careful not to do this. His statement quoted above only refers to the later movement.

CHAPTER 2PAGAN RELIGION IN DISGUISE

Phrygia, the birth-place of Montanism, was also the homeland of the ancient cult of Cybele or Magna Mater. Some scholars of the last two centuries, while refraining from facile explanations by means of the geography or climate of Anatolia, have yet drawn parallels between the two religious movements. The first to have done so appears to have been A. Neander in his Allgemeine Geschichte der christliche Religion und Kirche (1827):

The natural peculiarities of the old Phrygian race reveal themselves in his (Montanus') mode of conceiving Christianity, and in the shape which the zeal of the new convert (Montanus) assumed. The religion of nature which prevailed among the ancient Phrygians, bespeaks the character of this mountain race - inclined to fanaticism and superstition, readily believing every pretension to magic and ecstasy; and we are not surprised when we find the Phrygian temperament, which had formerly found a vent in the ecstatic frenzy of the priests of Cybele and Bacchus, exhibiting itself once more in the ecstasies and somnambulisms of the Montanists.¹

H.H. Milman reiterates the same view in his History of Latin Christianity (1867):

The land of heathen orgies was the natural birthplace of that wild Christian mysticism; it was the Phrygian fanaticism speaking a new language; and as the ancient Phrygian rites of Cybele found welcome reception in heathen Rome, so also that, which was appropriately called Cataphrygianism, in the Christian Church.²

Both scholars stop short of stating explicitly a parent-child relationship between the cult of Cybele and Montanism, content rather to suggest that it was the constant

substratum of the Phrygian temperament which produced a common denominator.

Direct links between Montanism and pagan cults were forged by the Patristic writers themselves. In his letter to Marcella Jerome scoffed at Montanus as abscisus et semivir.³ Though semivir merely means "effeminate", abscisus points to castration and implies that he was once a Gallus, a priest of Cybele. Some scholars such as E. Fascher, (1927),⁴ have been prepared to accept this at face value, and W. Schepelern, in Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte (1929) for later Montanism, and G. Freeman, "Montanism and the Pagan Cults of Phrygia" (1950)⁵ for Montanism as a whole, have sought to show points of contact with the pagan religion.

With Ficker's publication of the Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox in 1905 a new possibility emerged, namely that Montanus was once a priest of Apollo. In this debate the Orthodox levels this charge against Montanus and the Montanist does not deny it.

Whether once a Gallus or an Apolline priest, Montanus could well have introduced to his new religious allegiance elements from his previous religious experience. We must therefore examine with some care those elements in Montanism which might have been borrowed from the two pagan cults.

A. The Cult of Cybele

Whereas the dominant concept of a Supreme Deity in ancient European and Semitic thought was that of a King or a Father, the Anatolians and Cretans believed in the divine motherhood of nature. It was from the "Great Mother" that all life was thought to have come. Archaeological investigation has revealed the worship of the Mother Goddess in Crete from the third and second millennia before our era¹ and of Cybele in Phrygia from at least 700 B.C..² The Cretan deity appears as Rhea, mother of Hera, Zeus, Poseidon and Hades, in the writings of Homer, and from the fifth century B.C. the terms "the Mother of the Gods", "the Great Mother", Rhea and Cybele are used interchangeably in the literature.³ Though Mother of gods, men and animals this goddess was especially Mother of wild nature, symbolized in engravings by her attendant lions. In mythology Rhea was attended by an armed bodyguard of Curetes, Cybele by similar Corybantes, but there is some confusion about the two.⁴ The frenzied dance of the latter bequeathed new terminology to the Greek language. Strabo relates that "as Corybantes are orgiastic and enthusiastic we say those who are excited by frenzy are corybanting".⁵ The Corybantes are not always associated in the literature with Cybele. I.M. Linforth's careful examination of Plato's references to the Corybantic rites⁶ reveals no connection with her cult, which would imply that they were of independent origin. By the first century B.C. at least it is the eunuch priests, the Galli, who take their role in the ritual of the Cybele cult and carry out a

frienziend dance to the accompaniment of cymbals, drums and flutes, and cut themselves so that the blood flows.⁷ According to Ovid their name was derived from the river Gallus in Phrygia. Those who drank from it were said to go mad.⁸ The emasculation of the Galli was in imitation of Attis, the legendary young lover of Cybele who, having been unfaithful, castrated himself and died.⁹

At the great spring festival of the cult, which in Rome in the fourth century A.D. at least was held from March 15 to 27th,¹⁰ offerings were made for the fertility of the crops, the death and resurrection of Attis were re-enacted, and initiates were received into the cult.¹¹

The cult was introduced to Rome from Pessinus in Galatia in 204 B.C., but its influence was severely curbed until the time of Augustus. Thereafter its influence spread throughout the Roman Empire, for, though the orgiastic ceremonial ran counter to the traditional Roman gravitas, it appealed to the common people,¹² and the cult persisted at least to the end of the fourth century.

Putting on one side Jerome's statement that Montanus was abscisus et semivir, what other evidence is there of the influence of the cult of Cybele upon Montanism? Ecstatic prophecy, prophetic dress, women in the ministry, the murderous ceremony involving an infant, xerophagies and certain other elements have all been suggested. We shall examine each point in turn before returning to consider the credibility of Jerome's statement.

Prophetic Ecstasy

Speaking of Montanism Fascher declares, "The form and significance of its prophecy seem typically heathen,"¹³ and he mentions specifically the inducement of ecstasy through special techniques (which in fact finds no support in our sources) and the prophet's total loss of consciousness while he is prophesying, which is certainly implied by the Anonymous' description of Montanus, who in his boundless desire for leadership -

δόντα παράδου εἰς ἑαυτὸν τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ
πνευματοφορηθῆναι τε καὶ αἰφνιδίως ἐν κατοχῇ
 τινι καὶ παρεκστάσει γεγόμενον ἐνθουσιᾶν
 ἄρξασθαι τε λαλεῖν καὶ ξενοφωνεῖν ,¹⁴

and by the utterance of Montanus preserved by Epiphanius:

Ἴδου ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ λύρα, καὶ γὰρ ἐφίπταμι
 ὡσεὶ πλήκρον· ὁ ἄνθρωπος κοιμᾶται καὶ γὰρ
 γρηγορῶ· ἴδου, κύριός ἐστιν ὁ ἐξιστάων
 καρδίας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ διδοὺς καρδίας ἀνθρώποις.¹⁵

The state described is one of possession quite familiar in the literature of antiquity.¹⁶ The individual was thought to be seized (ἐν κατοχῇ) by an invisible god or daemon, the human consciousness thrust out (ἐν παρεκστάσει, ἔκ + ἴστημι) while the invading spirit took control of the body, its presence signified by a strange voice (ξενοφωνεῖν) and other physical symptoms.¹⁷ In such a state the human vessel was "full of god" (ἐνθουσιᾶν, ἐν + θεός), carried about at will by the spirit (πνευματοφορηθῆναι), which would speak in the first person singular.

Much of this terminology is found in descriptions of

the ecstatic trance of worshippers of Cybele. Porphyry for instance says that some become ecstatic (τῶν ἐξισταμένων ἔνθεον τῶν εὐσίων) at the sound of the pipes, cymbals or drums or some special tune and reach a state of excitation (ἔνθεον ὄντων) as in the case of those who experience Corybantic rites or rites of Cybele or are possessed by Sebazius (οἱ τῶν Σεβασίων κάρτοχοι).¹⁸

And Arrian, who as governor of Cappadocia under Hadrian had no doubt experienced the cult of Magna Mater at first-hand, speaks of those possessed as predicting the future, being carried about by the gods (θεοφροσύμενοι) and mad.¹⁹

But the terminology used to describe Montanus' prophetic trance is not distinctive to the cult of Cybele, but rather forms part of the general religious terminology of antiquity.²⁰ What was to some extent distinctive was the furious ceremony at the climax of which the Galli might prophesy. To the din of flutes, drums and cymbals these would-be prophets flung themselves about, whirled their long hair, wielded weapons and wounded themselves.²¹ None of our sources suggest that Montanus' ecstatic prophecy needed such provocation, and therefore it does not seem to have been derived specifically from the native cult of Phrygia.

Prophetic Dress

Freeman²² points out the similarity between what we know of the dress of the Galli and some of the information given by Apollonius about Montanist prophets. After his emasculation a Gallus went to extreme lengths to disguise his original sex. He donned a long silk robe, normally worn by women, ornamented by jewels and images, dyed his hair

blonde and had it curled and perfumed, put on facial make-up including eye-shadow and thereafter carried a mirror with him like a woman.²³

Now Apollonius challenges the Montanists to answer these questions:

Tell me, does a prophet dye his hair? Does he pencil his eyelids? Does he love ornaments?... Let them state whether these things are right or not, and I will show that they have been done among them.²⁴

It is indeed tempting to deduce that the "ex-Gallus" introduced his old practices into his new movement.

The conclusion is less assured when one realizes that such dress and ornamentation were not the sole prerogative of the Galli. A long robe was the ordinary costume of priests of Semitic cults.²⁵ For ornamentation a Sacerdos Maxima bore an image of Zeus upon her breast and priestesses of Demeter and Core were adorned with gold plates engraved with the figures of their goddesses.²⁶ Now if we can in fact deduce from the report of the hostile Apollonius that a male prophet dyed his hair and painted round his eyes this would most closely resemble the practices of the Galli but this is not certain. Whereas Apollonius elsewhere²⁷ specifically attributes certain practices to Montanus he does not do so here. If, however, he is here just referring to prophetesses he could merely be suggesting that they, far from being divorced from the world, followed its current fashion.²⁸

This piece of evidence is therefore of uncertain value.

The Place of Women in the Ministry

There was a stage in the early history of Montanism when it seems the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla held

ultimate authority, as Hippolytus, writing c. 230, declares them the chief culprits for the Phrygian deception and tells us that it was from them that the Cataphrygians learnt their fasting practices.²⁹ Origen deplores the fact that they gave public instruction,³⁰ and the Orthodox disputant of the fourth-century Dialogue declares that they dared to publish books in their own names.³¹ The fact that they were prophetesses no doubt alone legitimised their public ministry for Tertullian³² as he firmly insists even in his Montanist days that no woman may teach, baptize or offer the eucharist³³ and it is noticeable that the sister with the charismatic gift of revelations does not interrupt the service in his church but merely communicates her revelations to a select group afterwards.³⁴

The fact that Apollonius refers to Priscilla and another prophetess (presumably Maximilla) as the "first prophetesses"³⁵ suggests there were others later of which Quintilla³⁶ was no doubt one. But we first hear of women in the regular ministry of the movement from Ambrosiaster (c. 370). Commenting on I Tim. 3.11 he says of the Cataphrygians -

Using the pretext that after deacons (Paul) addressed women they falsely presume that they ought also ordain deaconesses.³⁷

These could have been employed (as in the case of the Corrylidians)³⁸ for such practical considerations as safeguarding the modesty of women during baptism. Epiphanius tells us moreover that the Quintillianists:

make women bishops among them and women priests, and the rest; there is no distinction of sexes, for in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.³⁹

And this might find confirmation in Calder's discovery of a

late third-century cathedra near Bekilli on the north bank of the Maeander dedicated to both a man (Diogenos) and a woman (Aphia).⁴⁰ He points out that it resembles the cathedra of an orthodox bishop or priest found at Laodicea Combusta.

Now Freeman stresses the fact that though women were admitted to the orders of bishops, priests and deacons the literary sources do not mention female patriarchs or koinoni, and the epigraphical evidence such as it is records only men in these posts. And he finds here a close parallel to the hierarchy of the Cybele cult where the Archigallus (cf. patriarch) and the other Galli (cf. koinonoi) were always male but the sacerdotes and lower clergy could be either male or female.⁴¹

But this is far from conclusive. His epigraphical evidence consists of one inscription referring to a patriarch and one to a koinonos. Calder has reported another referring to a male koinonos.⁴² But three inscriptions from the fifth and sixth century scarcely allow an assured conclusion even about the late Montanist hierarchy, and they say nothing about the earlier movement. Probably, as in the orthodox churches, the rank of patriarch was a comparatively late development. If in the early movement supreme authority was held by prophets, Priscilla, Maximilla and Quintille could well be viewed as precedents for female patriarchs. Certainly without far more epigraphical evidence we can make no generalisations.

Even if Freeman is right about the Montanist hierarchy, the overall parallel with the Cybele cult is far from clear. Were the pagan sacerdotes the counterpart of the bishops, the presbyters or both? The orders of dendrophoroi, cannophoroi,

hymnologoi, etc. all have far too specific a function within the Cybele cult⁴³ to be the counterpart of the Montanist diaconate.

Since then a close parallel eludes us we have no reason to trace in the Montanist ministry the influence of the pagan cult. It is a feature of the province of Asia that women played an important part in public life holding positions of gymnasiarch, agnothete, etc., posts elsewhere reserved for men,⁴⁴ Perhaps this facilitated the evolution of a female ministry in Montanism. It must be remembered, however, that Epiphanius' statement refers to the derivative Quintillianist and not to the parent Cataphrygian sect as such.

Infanticide

As early as the mid-fourth century we hear stories of infanticide associated with the Montanists. The first account, that of Cyril,⁴⁵ speaks of infants being cut in pieces and eaten as part of the Montanist mysteries. Epiphanius⁴⁶ and Augustine⁴⁷ speak of the child's being pricked all over and the blood extracted. The former connects the activity with initiation and Philaster⁴⁸ connects it with Easter. Augustine says that if the child dies he is held to be a martyr, if he lives he becomes a great priest. Jerome,⁴⁹ Theodoret⁵⁰ and Praedestinatus⁵¹ disbelieve the story.

Now most scholars would support De Labriolle in his cursory treatment of the subject.⁵² He points out that accusations of ritual murder were frequently made against suspect minority groups in antiquity - magicians, Gnostics, Manichees, Jews and orthodox Christianity itself. The fact that the

story was applied to the Montanists only in the mid-fourth century⁵³ and that the inveterate heresy-hater Jerome should remark: sit falsum omne quod sanguinis est seem decisive in showing it untrue.

More recently, however, Schepelern⁵⁴ and Freeman,⁵⁵ apparently independently, have suggested a sitz im leben from which the story might have arisen. They point out that the fourth-century Christian poet Prudentius tells of a tattooing ceremony in the initiations for the cult of Attis and Cybele.⁵⁶ (Tattooing was in fact quite well known in the ancient world.) And they suggest that the Montanists might have tattooed infants as well as baptising them before the Easter Eucharist.

This ingenious suggestion is confronted, however, with a number of difficulties. Prudentius is a late witness for a ceremony within the cult of Cybele and his report is unconfirmed. Even if he is accurate the story about the Montanists does not form a close parallel. Only Epiphanius and Augustine speak of the pricking of the child and both say that only one child is involved in the ceremony. If tattooing were part of Montanist initiation all infants to be baptised would be involved. Certainly the early movement knew nothing of such a practice, for if they had it would surely have been publicised as were monogamy, xerophagies, etc., but our early sources are entirely silent. In each of the later writers the story assumes a slightly different form, which would imply that its basis was unfounded legend and not historical fact against which the story could be checked.⁵⁷

Xerophagies

Tertullian tells us that the Montanist xerophagies consisted of two weeks of dry fare per year excluding Saturdays and Sundays.⁵⁸ During this time no flesh could be eaten, nor anything juicy including fruit and wine, and no bath was permitted.⁵⁹ He tells us that for introducing this observance the Montanists were accused of introducing a novelty similar to the rigorism (*castimoniae*, *castus*) of Apis, Isis and Cybele.⁶⁰ He is prepared to admit the similarity but declares that the pagan rites are the devil's imitation of the true divine ordinance.

But how close was the similarity? By the fourth century A.D. at least the Cybele spring festival included nine days of fasting (March 16th - 24th) leading up to the Hilaria (25th).⁶¹ This was the Castus Matris Deum, a period of total sexual abstinence and of a restricted diet involving abstinence primarily from bread and cereal products, but also from root vegetables, certain fruit, pork, fish and wine. On the "Day of Blood" (March 24th) the worshippers were reduced further to milk and honey, and there was special food for the neophytes.⁶²

If the Montanist xerophagy came immediately before Easter this period of abstention was certainly longer than the Catholic fast, which consisted of merely the "preparation day".⁶³ The idea of a prolonged period of abstention could well have come from the native cult, but the parallel is limited, for the Montanist abstention was not for nine days on end but for two weeks excluding Saturdays and Sundays, clearly moulded by Judaeo-Christian sentiments. Further, though both cults required abstention from some of the same foods (fruit, meat

and wine) the Cybele cult further prohibited cereal products whereas we infer that these were some of the most important constituents of xerophagies (ξηρός, dry).

The Posture for Revelations

Knox⁶⁴ mentions the suggestion that in the utterance of Prisca:

For purity brings harmony, and they (chaste ministers) see visions, and looking down they also hear⁶⁵ distinct voices as beneficial as they are mysterious,

the posture of "looking down" finds a parallel in the frenzied ceremonial described by Apuleius when he says that the participants bent their necks down.⁶⁶ But any similarity is extremely superficial, for the frenzied dancers bent their necks so that they could whirl their long hair in a circle⁶⁷ not hear voices. It is scarcely credible that "distinct voices" could be heard at all in the frenzied hubbub of the ceremonial. Schepelern suggests as a closer parallel Elijah's action on Mount Carmel when he bowed himself to the ground and put his face between his knees in a posture of supplication.⁶⁸

The Quintillianist Virgins

Schepelern⁶⁹ suggests that there may be a parallel between the seven white-robed virgins who enter Quintillianist assemblies with torches, who weep themselves and whose stirring prophesying calls forth tears from the other worshippers, and the annual weeping for the death of Attis at the Cybele spring festival. But again the parallel is illusory as Epiphanius makes it quite clear that the virgins' tears at the Quintillianist services are connected not with mourning

but repentance, and are concerned not with an individual's death but with the plight of the human race.

The Artotyrites

Epiphanius⁷⁰ tells us that the Montanist sect the Artotyrites are so called because they use bread (ἄρτος) and cheese (τυρός) in their mysteries. Augustine⁷¹ says that they justified it on the grounds that the first men made offerings of the fruit of the earth and sheep. Schepelern⁷² suggests that in fact they merely took over the thank-offering originally made to Magna Mater for her protection of agriculture and cattle-breeding. This may well be so, though offerings to Cybele were not it seems confined to bread and cheese but extended probably to fruit and legume vegetables as well.⁷³

The Tascodrugites and Passalorynchites

According to Philaster the Ascodrogites in Galatia insanelly revel like Bacchanals.⁷⁴ Such behaviour would certainly resemble the orgiastic worship of the Cybele cult if indeed Philaster is not caricaturing the sect. Schepelern⁷⁵ sees in the different ways in which Epiphanius and Philaster attempt etymological explanations of the Tascodrugites and Passalorynchites⁷⁶ a declaration of ignorance about the origin of the sects and suggests that their distinctive practices may in fact have come from pagan cults in Asia Minor. It is quite possible that, cut adrift from Christian orthodoxy, such sects could have practised syncretism, but this is speculation and not fact.

Our examination then of the alleged parallels has yielded in toto but little evidence of a dependence of Montanism on the cult of Cybele. Several parallels are quite illusory. Montanist prophetic dress, the xerophagies and the special practices of the Artotyrites and perhaps the Tascodrugites may all show the influence of the native cult. But the Artotyrites and Tascodrugites are merely later splinter groups of the Cataphrygians and their distinctive practices can scarcely be attributed to Montanus.⁷⁷ Apollonius in his criticism of the behaviour and dress of Montanist prophets does not link these with pagan religious practices and we are not compelled to do so either. Montanist xerophagies suggest to orthodox Christian critics as much it seems the practices of the mysteries of Apis and Isis as Cybele.⁷⁸ But even these pieces of evidence together would scarcely make Montanism a baptised version of the Phrygian native cult. There remains to be considered Jerome's reference to Montanus as abscisus et semivir.

Freeman⁷⁹ prefaces Jerome's statement to the alternative posed by the fourth-century Dialogue that Montanus had been a priest of Apollo. He points out that Jerome had had personal contact with the Montanists and, besides using Eusebius' Historia ecclesiastica, may have had access to Eusebius' sources. This is most unlikely as we have seen,⁸⁰ as his work De viris illustribus does not supplement Eusebius' information about the early orthodox opponents of the New Prophecy. Besides, one can hardly believe that if his source had stated that Montanus had been a Gallus Eusebius would have failed to make full use of such a trump card.

Jerome's personal contact with the Montanists appears

to have been on his visit to Ancyra in Galatia shortly after 373.⁸¹ Though this could well have furnished him with fresh information about the contemporary movement it is far less likely to have afforded him new and accurate information about the pre-Christian history of Montanus himself more than two centuries earlier. Whence then his assertion that Montanus was abscisus et semivir?

We have ample evidence that Jerome could be quite unscrupulous in the attacks he mounted on his adversaries. He reveals his attitude to those he considered heretics in his own words:

I have never spared the heretics and have striven with all zeal that the enemies of the Church might become my enemies too.⁸²

and he is prepared to make sweeping charges that cannot possibly be substantiated, such as:

They (the heretics) indulge in the basest of passions; they occupy themselves with debauchery, and whatever they say or think they say in praise of God sounds like the howling of wolves and insane Bacchanals.⁸³

He can speak of them as spawned in drunkenness and incest and devoting their whole lives to pleasure-seeking.⁸⁴

Such was the stock-in-trade of the polemicist of Jerome's time, for it was the tacitly accepted principle of the law-courts that ridicule and abuse for one's opponents was permissible.⁸⁵ Was Jerome's assertion about Montanus then merely empty invective? Why then this particular form of abuse? Its power of devastation would have been greater if it contained at least an element of truth. Ficker⁸⁶ suggests Jerome had read the Dialogue and it was upon the charge that Montanus was an "idol priest", a "priest of Apollo" that he based his declamation. If this is so either Jerome is

deliberately falsifying his evidence, for an Apolline priest was not abscisus, or else he bears witness to a syncretistic milieu in which distinctions between Hellenic and oriental cults were no longer valid. This possibility will be considered further in the next section.

If there was indeed some element of truth behind Jerome's assertion about Montanus it would in part account for the xerophagies and perhaps even the distinctive dress of the prophets of the new movement.

B. The Cult of Apollo

The worship of Apollo was introduced to Greece it seems from the north by the Doric invaders at the end of the Mycenaean period.¹ Described by Farnell as "certainly the brightest creation of polytheism...also the most complex,"² Apollo is said by Pausanias (c. A.D. 150) to have gathered fifty-eight different epithets,³ many of which were no doubt the names of lesser gods whose cults he assimilated. Besides being a dominant deity in Greece he was also very influential in the north and west of Asia Minor. According to Homer the Trojans claimed him as their protector,⁴ the Homeric Hymn to Apollo⁵ makes him the son of Leto and twin-brother of Artemis, two female deities prominent in Lydia, and Apolline coin types are found in greatest abundance among the cities of the coasts of Asia Minor.⁶ Colonists who had consulted the Apolline oracle at Delphi as to where to go took with them the worship of this deity for instance to Magnesia on the Maeander,⁷ likewise it seems to those cities named Apollonia.⁸ With the spread of Hellenism the worship of Apollo penetrated the interior of the sub-continent, assimilating lesser cults such as that of Lairmenos or Lairbenos near Dionysopolis in the Maeander Valley.⁹

Among Apollo's many epithets are those associating him with music¹⁰ - Μουσαῖος, Μούσαρχος, and Μουσαγέτης the last two styling him as "leader of the Muses". As early as Homer he was well known as the god of song and music, and the lyre was constantly associated with him both in literature and in art. Of the latter Farnell writes:

There is no religious type that Greek art worked upon with so much devotion as that of the lyre-playing Apollo; on a large number of monuments, early and late we recognise the god of music, the leader of the Graces and the Muses.¹¹

Though not so associated by Homer Apollo later became regarded as the patron of prophecy in the Hellenic world. At Delphi his most important oracle began its activity some time between the Mycenaean and Hellenic civilizations¹² and thereafter was consulted for over a thousand years of recorded history. There were also other Apolline oracles¹³ in Greece and two of great importance in Asia Minor at Didyma (Branchidai) near Miletus and at Claros near Colophon.

On early Greek maps Delphi is represented as the centre of the world. In the classical era it constantly assumed the role of mediator between rival city-states, but it was also consulted by important figures from abroad and of course by private Greek citizens over personal matters. The answers given to enquirers were believed to come from Apollo, or perhaps a daemon¹⁴ as his agent, acting through a medium, the Pythia.

The Pythia had to be a free-born Delphian woman but, according to Plutarch, (who was himself a priest at Delphi for about thirty years at the beginning of the second century A.D.), she could be of quite humble origin.¹⁵ At first apparently a young virgin had been chosen for the role, but after one had been seduced by an enquirer, the Delphic authorities employed only women over fifty years old. If the candidate chosen was married she had to leave her husband, assume the costume of a young woman, and live as a virgin in the official residence. By the third century A.D. the post had become associated with priestly families.

The Pythia prepared herself for consultations¹⁶ by taking a ceremonial bath in the stream Castalia and by being fumigated at the temple hearth using a mixture of laurel leaves and barley meal. Then the priests took a goat into the innermost sanctuary and, in front of the statue of Apollo, sprinkled it with water to see if it would tremble all over and so afford a favourable omen. If so the Pythia was admitted to the sanctuary. Almost certainly she did not inhale gas from a chasm in the ground,¹⁷ as was popularly believed, but seated herself on the sacred tripod and went into a trance. There she was apparently hidden from the enquirers' view.¹⁸ After suitable purifications and offerings the enquirers then in turn presented their questions to the prophet or priest, who conveyed them to the inspired Pythia and relayed back a reply, which, in the earlier period at least, was in verse.¹⁹

At the other oracular centres the preliminaries to the prophetic trance differed. Iamblichus²⁰ tells us that at Claros the prophetess drank water from a special fountain and fasted for a day and night before prophesying, and at Branchidai the prophetess held a wand or sat on an axle, or dipped her feet or the edge of her clothing in water or inhaled water vapour.

We are not specifically told whether the Pythia could remember what she had said in trance, but it is most unlikely, for her counterpart the priestess of Zeus at Dodona did not,²¹ and the Pythia's utterances purport to come direct from Apollo,²² which implies her own personality was completely suppressed in trance,²³ and presumably her voice changed.²⁴ No doubt there were also other physical symptoms of the trance,²⁵ but violent exertion would imply an evil spirit

had taken possession of her, and, after one such mishap, a Pythia died a few days later.²⁶

One of the well-known features of the oracle at Delphi was the enigmatic nature of the answers it gave to enquirers. Heraclitus who, writing c. 500 B.C., consciously sought to imitate its style, reports that "the god of Delphi neither declares the truth nor conceals it but points to it".²⁷ Yet correctly interpreting its enigmas was by no means easy, which allowed the oracle to save face when its apparent predictions did not come true. What an unfortunate victim or even an impartial observer might blame on a false prediction the Delphians passed off as the result of foolish or naive interpretation. The classic case is that of the unfortunate Croesus, king of Lydia c. 550-46 B.C., who on the seemingly straightforward assurance of victory:

"Croesus, having crossed the Halys, will destroy a great empire"²⁸

launched an attack on the armies of Cyrus the Persian, but was himself defeated and captured. A great empire had been destroyed, but it was his own.

Often oracular prophecies were more obviously obscure. When Croesus had enquired of Delphi whether his monarchy would long endure, he had received the reply,

But when a mule shall have become king of the Medes, then, soft-footed Lydian, flee by the pebbly Hermus, do not linger, nor feel shame at being a coward,²⁹

he rashly concluded that, as a mule could never be a king, his dynasty would last for ever. After his defeat the official explanation of the utterance was far more subtle - the "mule" was Cyrus, son of a low-born father and high-born mother.

Such enigmatic utterances were characteristic also of the

other oracular centres. Oenomaus, a Cynic philosopher of the early second century A.D., was disgusted by his experiences of the oracle at Claros, and finally when he sought guidance as to where to go to find a certain wise man and received the reply,

When a man shoots stones from a widely-whirling sling
he kills unspeakably great grass-eating geese,³⁰

he gave up his quest suggesting that the oracle should hang itself on its "widely-whirling sling". He had come to the conclusion that the enigmatic nature of oracular utterances was merely a screen for human ignorance, the oracles being perpetrations of human fraudulence.³¹

The Christian apologists believed the oracles were operated in fact by evil demons, whose true character was shown up by their deceptiveness and their willingness to incite enquirers even to sacrificial murder and to adultery.³² The decline of the oracles coincided with the period of the spread of Christianity within the Roman Empire.³³ Clement at the end of the second century could claim they were dead (though private mediums still persisted),³⁴ and in the fourth century the emperor Julian's attempt to revive Delphi was a total failure.³⁵

Now in considering the possibility of dependence between Montanism and the Apolline cult we shall, as in section A above, examine first implicit evidence before turning to evaluate the explicit statement of the fourth-century Dialogue. Certain points of contact between the two cults could be suggested: Apollo was the divine patron of prophecy in Greek religion, and the lyre one of his most important cultic symbols; both married candidates who became

Pythiai and Priscilla assumed the role of virgins; and the death of the unfortunate Pythia reported by Plutarch (Def. orac. 51) bears some similarity to the rumours of the deaths of Montanus, Maximilla and Theodotus (Eus., H.E. 5.16.13-15). We shall consider each point in turn.

Prophecy

Clearly Apollo, more than any of the other gods of the Greek pantheon, was associated with prophecy. Zeus had oracles at Olympia and Dodona but otherwise all the important oracles were Apolline. In his account of madness ($\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha$) Plato lists four types,³⁶ clearly distinguishing between prophetic madness whose patron was Apollo, and telestic or ritual madness whose patron was Dionysos. Clearly, while the ecstatic prophecy of the Cybele cult would be classed with that of the Dionysiac cult, Montanus and his prophetesses would seem closer to the Apolline type.

Neither the Apolline mediums nor the Montanist prophets, so far as we know, needed raucous music or frenzied dancing to stimulate their prophetic trances.³⁷ It is quite possible that Montanus undertook a discipline of prayer and fasting before prophesying - such unexceptional Christian practices would not be seen as worth reporting in our sources - and fasting was part of the preparation of the Apolline prophetess at Claros.

On the other hand we have little reason to believe that the "Paraclete" generally spoke enigmatically. Certainly without the context provided by Tertullian for Prisca's pithy saying: carnes sunt et carnem oderunt³⁸ we should not know how to interpret it, but this scarcely justifies Hilgenfeld's³⁹

claim that here Tertullian preserves the "raw" form of a Montanist utterance, whereas elsewhere, when the meaning is straightforward, he only gives the interpreted form. If Tertullian's general principle was to give only the secondary form why should he make an exception here? To baffle his readers? If so why should he give such an explicit interpretation in the context? It is far more reasonable to assume that, as Tertullian extensively quotes the actual text of Scripture to sustain his arguments, so here and elsewhere he passes on the ipsissima verba of the Paraclete and not merely his own interpretation. With regard to this particular utterance of Prisca he may have snatched it from its context in a collection of her sayings. Certainly he finds no difficulty in giving it a direct application.

Further, when Epiphanius criticises as incoherent Montanus' utterance:

"Why do you say, 'Will (only) the superman be saved?...'"⁴⁰
 it is not that it is enigmatic but that it is all too clearly an attempt to outbid a prophecy of Jesus Himself that draws his ire. Indeed it is the clear and explicit statements of the new prophets that allow the Antimontanists scope for their criticism. The Anonymous⁴¹ and Epiphanius⁴² can point for instance to actual predictions that have not been fulfilled, which therefore show Maximilla to be a false prophet. So in fact the pattern of Montanist prophesying does not correspond in this respect to its Apolline counterpart.

The Lyre

It is interesting in view of the fact that the lyre was so closely associated with the symbolism of the Apolline cult

that Montanus should adopt the metaphor of the lyre and the plectrum to describe man in prophetic trance under the influence of God.⁴³ The flute was more closely associated with Phrygia and in fact with the ritual of the Cybele cult. A Greek myth tells of the phrygian Marsyas with his flute challenging Apollo with his lyre to a contest. When the latter won he promptly flayed his challenger alive.⁴⁴

However the metaphor of a musical instrument for the work of the Holy Spirit in a human being is not confined to Montanus' saying. While Athenagoras compares the prophet's mouth to a flute,⁴⁵ Hippolytus speaks of the Logos' operating in the prophets as a plectrum,⁴⁶ and the Cohortatio ad Graecos says that the Holy Spirit's action in the just is like a plectrum from heaven playing on a cither or lyre.⁴⁷ Such references suggest that metaphors of musical instruments including lyres for divine work within men were commonplace in the second century.

Sacral Virginity

The fact that the chief organ of the oracle at Delphi was female is at first surprising. Normally in Greek religion men held the priesthoods of gods, women of goddesses. At Didyma and Claros the original mediums were men. That the Pythia was female is probably the result of the Apolline cult's taking over the earlier oracle of the goddess Gaia-Themis.⁴⁸ More interesting for us, however, is the fact that the Pythia could be a married woman, yet, once appointed, she had to leave her husband and dress and live thereafter as a virgin in the official residence.⁴⁹

Now if we can trust Apollonius here⁵⁰ Priscilla provides

us with a parallel within Montanism. It is unfortunate that Eusebius only quotes the conclusion of his argument:

Thus we prove that these first prophetesses themselves deserted their husbands from the moment that they were filled with the spirit. What a lie it is then for them to call Priscilla a virgin!⁵¹

It would not seem so absurd to anyone familiar with the practice at Delphi. But in fact there were plenty of other parallels outside the Apolline cult. Tertullian mentions the priestesses of Ceres who also separated from their husbands and children when chosen for office,⁵² and in some cases absolute continence was required as for the Vestal Virgins in Rome. But chastity does not seem to have been characteristic of women in the service of Anatolian native cults. Though sexual relations between a man and his wife could be deemed impure,⁵³ in the cult of Leto and Lairmenes *ἱεραί* (female cultic servants) were in effect cult prostitutes during their allotted tenure of service.⁵⁴ And one does not in fact need to invoke pagan influence at all to explain Priscilla's desire for chastity. Philip's prophetess daughters died as virgins,⁵⁵ and Melito the prophet and bishop of Sardis was himself an eunuch.⁵⁶

Premature Death

As possession was a widely recognised phenomenon in antiquity so it was believed that a malicious spirit could harm a medium. Plutarch tells of one occasion⁵⁷ on which overseas enquirers arrived at Delphi to consult the oracle and the sacrificial omen proved unfavourable, whereupon the priests unwilling to disappoint their visitors, redoubled their efforts until the omen changed. The Pythia most

unwillingly went into the Sanctuary to prophesy, emitted some hoarse croaks as if possessed by a deaf and dumb spirit, and finally with a terrible cry threw herself towards the door, causing the cult officials on duty to flee. When they returned a little later there they found her in her right mind, but within a few days she was dead.

Now the Anonymous reports of some of the early Montanist leaders:

It was a different death (from martyrdom) that Montanus and Maximilla are said to have died; for the story goes that each of them was inspired by a mind-destroying spirit to commit suicide, though not together, and there was much gossip at the time of the death of each. But thus it was that they died, and destroyed their lives like the traitor Judas. So also general report says that a certain Theodotus, that remarkable man, the first steward as it were of their alleged prophecy, was sometimes taken up and raised to Heaven, when he fell into a trance and trusted himself to the spirit of deceit, but was hurled down and died miserably.⁵⁸

Now of course no such parallel could show any dependence between Montanism and the Apolline cult. The most that could be deduced from the two stories is that malicious rather than benevolent spirits could have animated both cults. But even here we are treading on very uncertain ground for the Anonymous, though eager wherever possible to discredit the Montanists, himself admits that he cannot vouch for the authenticity of his story. De Labriolle thinks the parallel drawn with Judas makes it even less credible,⁵⁹ but to comment on a likeness is not necessarily to create it, particularly in a context of acknowledged uncertainty.

None of the points considered indicate a necessary connection between Montanism and the cult of Apollo, though the fact that they have ecstatic prophecy in common may be

suggestive. There remains to be considered the explicit statement of the Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox that Montanus was:

ὁ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερεὺς

That the Dialogue is not merely an artificial literary creation seems clear from the fact that the debate is inconclusive. The Orthodox disputant appears to have the upper hand yet the Montanist obviously possesses considerable polemical dexterity and never concedes defeat. The cut and thrust of the debate is in marked contrast to the "dialogue" of, for instance, Minucius Felix' Octavius, or of the Clementine literature, where an artificial setting appears contrived for the lengthy presentation of the orthodox case.

If then we can accept the genuineness of the debate how seriously can we treat its statement about Montanus? Ficker confesses himself unable to say anything about its origin or authenticity.⁶⁰ It is evident, however, that in the debate, when the orthodox disputant alleges that Montanus was "the priest of Apollo", the Montanist does not deny the charge but merely seeks to defuse it by pointing out that the Apostle Paul's Christian ministry was not invalidated by the fact that he had formerly been a persecutor of the Church.⁶¹ Is the Montanist taken off-guard by the allegation and covering up his own ignorance about Montanus' pre-Christian history by conceding the point and seeking to neutralize it? Admittedly he is speaking two centuries after the time of Montanus, but it would be rather surprising if a man who showed himself so knowledgeable in defending his own position from the Fourth Gospel were at the same time so ignorant of the historical facts relating to his own movement. If he

doubted the allegation we should expect from him a denial or at least a demand for evidence.

Now De Labriolle suggests the term "the priest of Apollo" is not a precise designation but merely a reference to paganism in general,⁶² and this would seem supported by the other term applied by the Orthodox to Montanus: ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ εἰδώλου,⁶³ the term reiterated by Didymus in De trinitate.⁶⁴ Religious syncretism seems in fact to have run rife in Asia Minor, the Greek deities merging into and no doubt sobering down the earlier native cults. At Dionysopolis in south-west Phrygia for instance there appeared the cult of Mater Leto and Apollo Lairmenos, which Ramsay believes was merely a Hellenization of the Leto and Lairmenos mother-and-son cult comparable to Cybele and Attis in northern and eastern Phrygia,⁶⁵ and at Hieropolis in what was later the Phrygian Pentapolis there was an Apolline temple of whose deity Ramsay writes:

In reality he was a purely Phrygian deity, a sun-god, who in some respects, and especially as a god of prophecy and as a solar deity, approximated to the character of the Greek Apollo.⁶⁶

It is from this sort of religious background that Montanus came into the Church. If the Christian mission was proving successful in the borderlands of Phrygia and Mysia where he lived probably numbers of pagan cultic officials were being won over and the fact that he had been a temple priest would not have been particularly noteworthy. Yet his having held a position of authority in the pagan cult would make him eager for leadership within the Church.⁶⁷ Further, ecstatic trance would be to him the normal mode of prophecy. And there is one other piece of information which might be relevant. Among the charges levelled by Apollonius against

Montanus were the following:

It is he...who appointed collectors of money, who organized the receiving of gifts under the name of offerings, who provided salaries for those who preached his doctrine.⁶⁸

He implies Montanus possessed considerable financial and organizational acumen. Now in the ancient world many of the temples acted as banks.⁶⁹ Sums of money were deposited for safe-keeping under the protection of the deity and became a source of loans to communities and individuals. In the Greek world probably the most important temple-bank was that of Apollo at Delos, and in Asia Minor, besides the important temples of Artemis in Ephesus and Sardis, it seems that even quite minor temples carried on a similar business on a smaller scale. Is it not possible that Montanus had served in one of these and thus acquired his financial acumen? From his syncretistic religious background he could also have introduced the idea of a special pre-Easter fast (if that was what the xerophagy was) and perhaps even special prophetic dress.⁷⁰

But if the Hellenized Anatolian religion did leave some mark upon early Montanism the substance of much of the teaching of the new prophets came from Christianity, to which they claimed to belong and to which they addressed their message.

REFERENCES AND NOTESPt. 2 Ch. 2

1. Eng. tr. J. Torrey, rev. A.J.W. Morrison (1851), II, pp.204f.
2. I, pp.47f. Both cults received overall a rather cool reception; but that is not relevant to our present discussion.
3. Ep. 41.4.
4. p.222.
5. Dominican Studies 3, 297-316.

A - The Cult of Cybele

1. L.R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States, III, p.296.
2. Ramsay, "Sepulchral Customs in Ancient Phrygia", J.H.S. 5 (1884), 245ff.
3. Farnell, op. cit., p.292.
4. cf. Strabo, Geog. 10.3.12,21.
5. ibid. 10.3.21 (Loeb): τῶν δὲ Κορυβάντων ὀρχηστικῶν καὶ ἐν θουσκαστικῶν ἔντων, καὶ τοὺς μακρικῶς κινουμένους κορυβαντιῶν φάμεν.
6. "The Corybantic Rites in Plato", University of California Publications in Classical Philology 13 (1946), 121-62, esp. 157.
7. The Roman writers are bemused by the noise and violent ceremonial of the oriental cult - see Lucretius, De rerum natura 2. 598-567, Varro, Saturarum Menippearum ed. A. Riese (1865), p.132, Ovid, Fasti 4. 179-372. Apuleius, writing 1½ to 2 centuries later (second century A.D.) is scarcely more favourable in his description of local ceremonies in the Middle East, Metamorphoses 8.27.
8. Fast. 4.361-66.
9. cf. ibid. 223-42; Arnobius, Adversus Nationes 5.5-7 gives a very different account, which he claims he derives from the mythologist Timotheus, but the fatal operation is the same.
10. The main events are recorded by the Philocalian Calendar A.D. 354.
11. For full details see H. Graillet, Le Culte de Cybele, ch.3.
12. cf. Lucretius, De rer. nat. 2.622-23:
ingratos animos atque impia pectora volgi
conterrere metu quae possint numini divae.
13. Prophetes, pp.222f.
14. Eus., H.E. 5.16.7.
15. Pan. 48,4, see App. 1, no.4.
16. see E.R. Dodds, The Ancient Concept of Progress, ch. 10 "Supernormal Phenomena in Classical Antiquity", cf. H. Bacht, "Die prophetische Inspiration in der kirchlichen Reflexion der vormontanistischen Zeit", Scholastik 19 (1944), 1-18.

17. "For the inspiration is indicated by the motions of the whole body, and of certain parts of it, by the perfect rest of the body, by harmonious orders and dances, and by elegant sounds, or the contraries of these...." (Iamblichus, De myst. 3.5, tr. T. Taylor).
18. Ep. ad An. 2.2c.: τῶν ἐξισταμένων ἑνοί τινες αὐλῶν ἀκούοντες ἢ κυμβάλων ἢ τυμπάνων ἢ τίνος μέλους ἐνθουσιῶσιν, ὡς οἱ τε κορυβαντιβόμενοι καὶ οἱ τῷ Σεβαζίῳ κάτοχοι καὶ οἱ μητρίβουτες.
19. ap. Eustathius, Dionysius Periegetes 809: ὅτι μαινόμεται τῇ Ῥέῃ, καὶ πρὸς Κορυβάστων κατέχονται, ἢ γοῦν κορυβαντιῶσι δαιμονῶντες. ὅταν δὲ κατὰσχῆ αὐτοὺς τὸ Θεῖον, ἐλαυνόμενοι καὶ μέγα βουῶντες καὶ ὀρχούμενοι προθεσπίζουσι τὰ μέλλοντα, θεοφορούμενοι καὶ μαινόμενοι.
20. See nts. 18-19 where κάτοχος is used of the cult of Sabazios while the cognate κατέχομαι is used of the effect of the Corybantes. Plato can use the terms ἐνθεός, κατεχόμενος and ἐνθουσιαστικῶν of poetic inspiration when the poet is supposedly possessed by one of the Muses (Ion. 533D-536D). ἔκστασις was the normal state in which pagan prophecy was delivered, cf. De Lab., Crise, pp.165f.
21. Apuleius, Met. 8.27, cf. Servius, Aen. 10.220, etc., though there are marked similarities in fact even here between the Cybele cult and the orgiastic cult of Dionysos (cf. Strabo, Geog. 10.3.13-14).
22. "Montanism", 298f.
23. Graillet, Culte, pp.297-301.
24. Eus., H.E. 5.18.11.
25. Graillet, loc. cit.
26. ibid.
27. H.E. 5.18.2 (annulling of marriages, enacting fasts, etc.).
28. cf. Tert., De cult. fem. 2.4-13 where make-up (5), hair-dyeing (6) and ornamentation (7) are specifically mentioned and deplored.
29. Phil. 8.19.
30. Cat. ad. Cor. 14.36.
31. Dial. in De Lab., Sources, p.106.2-107.32, cf. Didymus, De trin. 3.41.3. Tertullian may well be quoting such a volume issued perhaps as "Prophecies of (the Paraclete through) Priscilla" in De exhort. cast. 10, De res. mort. 11 (cf. above p.12).
32. cf. Adv. Marc. 5.8.
33. De virg. vel. 9.
34. De an. 9.
35. Eus., H.E. 5.18.3.
36. Epiph., Pan. 49.1.
37. Comm. I ad Tim. 3.11: propter quod post diaconos mulieres alloquitur etiam ipsas diaconas ordinari debere vana praesumptione defendunt.
38. Epiph., Pan. 79.3.
39. ἐπίσκοποι τε παρ' αὐτοῖς γυναῖκες καὶ πρεσβύτεροι γυναῖκες καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὧν μηδὲν διαφέρειν φασίν· ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ (Pan. 49.2),

- so also for the Corrylidiens (79.1). De Labriolle (Crise, pp.510f) is unnecessarily sceptical when he suggests this is Epiphanius' own invention - a deduction from the feminine bias of the sect. He points out that those who later draw on the Panarion such as Augustine (5th C.) and John of Damascus (8th C.) do not reiterate this detail. But neither do they reiterate other details such as his reference to Tascodrugites and Passalorynchites. Their interest lies chiefly in the parent sect. The Quintillianist peculiarity was, however, known in the early Church even if in somewhat garbled form, for the sixth-century Gallic bishops Licinius, Melanius and Eustochius reproach the presbyters Lovocatus and Cathernus with the error of "Pepodius" (De Lab. Sources, no. 187), no doubt the supposed founder of the Pepodians (i.e. Pepuzians, Pan. 49.1).
40. "The New Jerusalem of the Montanists", Byzantion 6 (1931), 423.
 41. "Montanism", 311-16.
 42. "Early-Christian Epitaphs from Phrygia" (1955), 37f.
 43. see Graillot, Cults, pp.255ff, ch. 7.
 44. see Chapot, Province Romaine, pp.158ff; Ramsay speaks of the matriarchal social system of primitive Phrygia, C.B., p.94.
 45. Cate. 16.8 (347-8).
 46. Pan. 48.14-15.
 47. Haer. 26,27.
 48. Haer. 49.
 49. Ep. 41.4.
 50. Epitome 3.2.
 51. 26.
 52. Crise, pp.522f.
 53. Praedestinatus (26) says that Tertullian himself had denied the stories of the blood of the infant, but in the light of Praedestinatus' unreliability it may be that he is merely half-remembering Tertullian's defence of the Church as a whole against a similar charge - Apol. 6-9 (so Freeman, "Montanism", 301f).
 54. Montanismus, pp.122ff.
 55. "Montanism", 299ff. He makes no reference to Schepelern or other German writers.
 56. Peristephanon 10. 1076-80:

Quid, cum sacrandus accipit sfragitidas?
acus minutas ingerunt fornacibus,
his membra pergunt urere, ut igniverint;
quamcumque partem corporis fervens nota
stigmatit, hanc sic consecratam praedicant.
 57. cf. Aland, K.E., pp.135f.
 58. De jej. 15.
 59. ibid. 1.
 60. ibid. 1,16.
 61. Graillot, Culte, pp.119f.
 62. ibid., p.130.
 63. De jej. 14. i.e. the Saturday before Easter Day.

Pt. 2 Ch. 2A - B

64. Enthusiasm, p.28.
65. Tert., De exhort. cast. 10, see App. 1, no.11. (ponentos faciem deorsum).
66. Met. 8.27 capite demisso cervices lubricis intorquentes motibus crinesque pendulos in circulum rotantes.
67. ibid.
68. 1K. 18.42, Schepelern, Montanismus, p.149.
69. op. cit. p.127 referring to Epiph., Pan. 49.2.
70. Pan. 49.2.
71. Haer. 28.
72. op. cit., p.126.
73. cf. ibid., pp.113f.
74. Haer. 75. (Bacchanals were participants in the orgies of the cult of Dionysos.)
75. op. cit., p.127.
76. Epiph., Pan. 48.14, Phil., Haer. 76, see above pp.34f.
77. This Schepelern readily admits (op. cit. p.129) for he believes that Montanism was a child of Johannine Christianity (ibid., pp.160ff), and it is only the later movement that shows traits which could be attributed to the influence of the Cybele cult.
78. Tert., De jej. 16.
79. "Montanism", 297.
80. see above p.17.
81. see above ibid.
82. Dial. contra Pelag. praefat. 2.
83. Comm. in Oseam P.L. 25 (1865), 923A.
84. Comm. in Ezechielem P.L. 25 (1865), 245C, 307A.
85. see D.S. Wiesen, St. Jerome as a Satirist, pp.168ff.
86. Z.K.G. 26 (1905), 460f. Certainly Jerome's charge of Sabellianism and his knowledge of the Montanist argument that the "entirety" of the Paraclete that Paul had lacked Montanus had received could have come from the Dialogue. But there is also much the two documents do not have in common, and De Labriolle rejects any idea of dependence between them (Sources, p.XCVII).

B - The Cult of Apollo

1. see Farnell, Cults IV, pp.98ff; R.D. Miller, The Origin and Original Nature of Apollo, discusses also the alternative suggestion of U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf of an Asiatic origin of the cult.
2. loc. cit.
3. Miller, op. cit., p.1. Zeus is credited with sixty-seven.
4. Il. 4.508-13, 15.243-366, 16.698-804, etc.
5. 14, et passim.
6. Farnell, op., cit. p.319.
7. H.W. Parke & D.E.W. Wormell, The Delphic Oracle I, pp.52ff.
8. Farnell, op. cit., p.162.
9. Ramsay, C.B., p.133.
10. see Miller, op. cit., p.49.
11. op. cit., p.325.
12. Parke & Wormell, op. cit., p.7.
13. Farnell, op. cit., pp.218ff.
14. Plutarch, Def. orac. 16.
15. Pyth. orac. 22.
16. Parke & Wormell, op. cit., 30-34.

17. ibid., pp.21ff (a geological verdict).
18. ibid., pp.28f.
19. Plutarch, Pyth. orac. 25.
20. De myst. 3.11.
21. Aelius Aristides, Orat. 45.11, and Origen implies the same of the Pythia (Cont. Cels. 7.3-4).
22. Hence the direct speech of oracles collected by Parke & Wormell, op. cit. II.
23. see Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety, p.54.
24. Plutarch (Def. orac. 51) actually mentions one such change to a raucous croak, and she may well have undergone some change of voice whenever in trance, as the possessed in all parts of the world have been reported as speaking in a different voice, see T.K. Oesterreich, Possession: Demoniacal and Others, pp.10, 14-21 et passim.
25. cf. Iamblichus, De myst. 3.5 qu. section A nt. 17 above.
26. Def. orac. 51, cf. Dodds, The Ancient Concept of Progress, pp.196,202.
27. Frag. 93, Diels-Kranz.
28. Parke & Wormell, op. cit. II, no.53.
29. ibid. no.54.
30. ap. Eus. P.E. 5.23.
31. ibid., 5.22.
32. cf. ibid. 3.17, 4.9-16,5.
33. ibid. 5.1.
34. Prot. 2.11.1-2.
35. see Parke & Wormell, op. cit. I, pp.289f.
36. Phaed. 265B.
37. The terminology applied by the Anonymous to Montanus (Eus., H.E. 5.16.7:κατέχημα, ἐνθουσιασμός, ἕκστασις, etc.) was of course relevant to Apolline prophets (cf. Iamblichus, De myst. 3.4-11, etc.).
38. De res. mort. 11.
39. Die Glossolalie in der alten Kirche, pp.124f. Hilgenfeld makes the further surprising claim that S. Paul would have called Montanist prophecy "glossolalia because it required such interpretation.
40. Pan. 48.10, see App. 1, no.5.
41. Eus. H.E. 5.16.18.
42. Pan. 48.2.
43. ibid. 48.4.
44. Apollodorus 1.4.2, cf. "Marsyas", O.C.D.
45. Legat. 9.
46. De antichristo 2.
47. 8.
48. Parke & Wormell, op. cit. I, p.10.
49. Plutarch, Pyth. orac. 22.
50. and Priscilla's concern with the importance of chastity is confirmed by her utterance about the chaste minister, Tert., De exhort. cast. 10, see App. 1, no.11.
51. Eus., H.E. 5.18.3.
52. Ad. ux. 1.6, De exhort. cast. 13, De mon. 17.
53. Ramsay, C.B., pp.136f.
54. ibid., p.137.
55. Eus., H.E. 3.31.3-5 (though Eusebius is confused by the two Philips).
56. ibid. 5.24.5, cf. Jer., De vir. ill. 24.
57. Def. orac. 51.

Pt. 2 Ch. 2B

58. Eus., H.E. 5.16.13-14.
59. Crise, p.22.
60. Z.K.G. 26 (1905), 462.
61. De Lab., Sources, p.103.4-18.
62. ibid., p.XCVII, though his suggestion that there is a parallel case in Acta Acacii is rather unfortunate as there 'Apollo' is not a general reference to paganism but specifically to the protector god, clearly distinguished from Aescclapius, Venus, Jupiter and Juno, all of whom are also mentioned.
63. ibid., p.103.14.
64. 3.41.3 (ἱερεὺς πρῶτον εἰδῶλου).
65. C.B., p.133.
66. "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia" III, 160.
67. cf. Anonymous' allegation that it was out of a desire for prominence (φιλοπρωτεία) that Montanus turned to ecstatic prophesying (Eus., H.E. 5.16.7)
68. Eus., H.E. 5.18.2.
69. see Rostovtzeff, The Social & Economic History of the Hellenistic World, pp.1278-80, D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor I, p.142.
70. see above pp. 71f,77f.

CHAPTER 3AN OFFSHOOT OF JUDAISM

Quite recently the origin of Montanism, Phrygian and North African, has been sought in Diaspora Judaism. J. Massingberd Ford in ^{his} article "Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?" (1966) writes:

I suggest that the rather heterodox Jewish background of Asia Minor, especially of Phrygia, provided material and practices which the Montanists could adopt and which, at first, went unsuspected by the Church.¹

And again,

It seems possible that Tertullian, like the Asiatic "New Prophecy", emanated from Jewish-Christian circles.²

He then adduces a considerable array of parallels both from heterodox and orthodox Jewish sources. We shall consider each of these in turn dealing, as she does, first with Phrygian Montanism, then with Tertullian.

Phrygian Montanism

In his chapter on the Jewish population of Phrygia³ Ramsay has gathered together much relevant information. He points out that c. 200 B.C. Antiochus the Great introduced into Phrygia and Lydia from Babylon 2,000 Jewish families as colonists and granted them great favours.⁴ They formed no doubt part of the aristocracy of the towns and favoured the forces of Hellenism against the native population. Inscriptions at Akmonia, Sebaste, Eumeneia, Apameia, Dokimion and Iconium record Jewish legends and names. For a considerable

while the Jews retained their identity, remitting regular financial contributions to Jerusalem.⁵ Till A.D. 70 the Jews were regarded by the Romans as a separate self-administering community in Apameia and elsewhere, and even in the third century an Apameian epitaph invokes "the law of the Jews" for protection.⁶

But privilege involved compromise. The Jews by and large appear to have abandoned Hebrew names and language. Inscriptions around Akmonia tell of Jews of rank and position and, partly no doubt as the result of their holding city magistracies, they practised religious syncretism. Women played an unusually prominent part in public life, and one in the first century A.D., Julia Severa, is known to have been both a leader of the synagogue at Akmonia and high priestess of the Imperial cult.⁷ The influence of Judaism is visible in the pagan cults of Zeus Hypsistos and Sabazios. In fact so close came the cults of Sabazios and Sabaoth that Christians tended to regard the Sabazians as merely dissidents from the Synagogue.⁸ The Talmud declared that the wines and baths of Phrygia had separated the ten tribes of Israel from their orthodox brethren.⁹

It was among this heterodox Judaism that Christianity took root. We know from the New Testament that Timothy was the uncircumcised son of a Jewess and a Greek,¹⁰ and the heresy that quickly menaced the church at Colossae was a mixture of Jewish legalism and pagan philosophical speculation.¹¹ It is in such a milieu that Ford sees the roots of Montanism and she suggests numerous points of contact.

The Montanists, she recalls, like the Jews based their calculations of Easter on 14th Nisan, though by the fifth

century at least they had deviated from the Jewish practice.¹² But the Jewish connection was not peculiar to the Montanists. The whole of the Church in Asia Minor was Quartodecimian.¹³

The eschatology of Montanism, Ford declares,¹⁴ breathes the same atmosphere and is but an exaggeration of the eschatology of the Apocalypse. This is undeniable, but to be dependent on the Apocalypse is to be one step removed from direct Jewish influence.

The prominence of women in the New Prophecy Ford considers to be the outcome of the prominence of Jewesses in the Imperial cult in Phrygia.¹⁵ Preeminent among them was Julia Severa, but there were also other important women such as Cornuta and Poppæa. But the unusual prominence of both Jewish and Montanist women can be attributed to a common cause - the influence of the society in which they lived, where many women held positions of importance, a heritage it seems from the ancient matriarchal structure of the society of primitive Phrygia.¹⁶

As the information we have about the thought and practices of the Phrygian Jews is scanty, Ford turns elsewhere in his search for parallels to Montanism. The seven white-robed virgins who entered Quintillianist meetings weeping derived perhaps, she suggests, from Jewish observances on the Day of Atonement:

"We observe," she says, "...that the Day of Atonement was not always a complete day of mourning but that some Jewish groups kept it with wailing and with dancing of virgins."¹⁷

She appeals to N. Wieder.¹⁸ But what Wieder tells us does not bear out this claim. He says that there were two contrary ways in which Jews celebrated the Day of Atonement.

Orthodox Rabbinic Judaism, followed in this instance by Philo,

regarded it as a day of rejoicing and it was in this mood that Jewish girls danced clad in white.¹⁹ On the other hand the Book of Jubilees (34.13-19) and the Qumran Damascus Document (6.19), followed centuries later by such Karaite leaders as Anan and Al-Qumisi, regarded it as a day of lamentation. All the usual accompaniments of a fast should be observed, says Al-Qumisi,²⁰ and these included the wearing of sackcloth and ashes and weeping aloud until one fainted. Thus while white clothing and dancing girls were associated by the Jews with joy, the dull garb of sackcloth was worn for lamentation. The Quintillianist virgins, however, lamented in white,²¹ a combination for which the Jewish practices provide no precedent,

Whereas the general practice of the Church was to allow voluntary fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays until the sixth hour of the day (12 noon), Montanists made the fasts compulsory and extended them beyond the ninth hour (3.0p.m.).²² On what grounds? Ford suggests they were copying the Jewish habit of fasting till sunset. She refers us to the Therapeutae.²³ But to find a parallel is not to discover the derivation of a practice. The Therapeutae were recluses in Egypt, the Montanists were in Asia Minor, where Judaism appears to have been of a very different character.

Ford brings forward the eating of radishes as a minor feature that Montanism could have derived from Judaism. She points out that Hippolytus mentions that the Montanists had radish feasts (ῥαφανοφαγία) and that the radish features in the Passover Haggadah and is discussed in the Mishnah.²⁴ Here he is appealing not to heterodox Judaism at all but to orthodox Rabbinic sources (dealing it seems with several different vegetables). Even so one can scarcely claim a

parallel. In the Passover Haggadah "horse-radish" or "bitter herbs" (קָרְוֹר) is awarded a fairly minor place, being eaten in the ninth act of the liturgy with unleavened bread. In contrast Hippolytus mentions raphanophagies alongside xerophagies,²⁵ which would imply the radish had a place of its own in Montanist observances (though in fact Tertullian is silent on this point). The discussions of the Mishnah merely mention long and round radishes (רַבִּינִי, רַבִּינִי) as two of many types of vegetable under discussion.²⁶ Further, there is no indication that the Jews had a monopoly of the radish market!

Ford's parallels to xerophagies are also taken from orthodox Judaism and are just as tenuous.²⁷ She suggests the Jewish vows of abstinence such as those taken by the Rechabites²⁸ and Nazirites,²⁹ and dealt with in the Mishnaic tracts Nedarim and Nazir, provide a basis from which the Montanist practices developed. But such a derivation is far from certain. As Ford admits, there can have been no close link between Montanist abstinence and the Nazirite vow, as the latter involved refraining from cutting one's hair and careful avoidance of any contact with the dead, neither of which are attributed to Montanism in any of our sources. The Rechabite parallel is similarly poor. The Rechabites promised abstinence from wine and from any settled life,³⁰ but we have no evidence that the Montanists were nomads. The tractates Nedarim and Nazir deal with personal and voluntary vows. Neither mention a two-week period (the length of the xerophagy) as especially commendable. Certainly Jewish influence is seen in the omission of the Sabbath from the xerophagy (as indeed Christian influence led to the omission of Sunday), but a restricted diet in preparation for a holy

day was by no means confined to Judaism. Though Tertullian repudiates the charge that the Montanists were copying the practices of the cults of Isis or Cybele, he admits the parallel.³¹

Again Ford finds Jewish parallels to abstinence from a bath as a mark of piety³² or as an accompaniment of mourning.³³ But if bathing was regarded as an indulgence to be abstained from at a time of austerity this was not confined to the Jews. To have unwashed feet for instance was part of the asceticism of Anatolian native cult prostitutes.³⁴

To the Montanist reverence for prophets Ford suggests parallels at Qumran and among the Karaites.³⁵ Unfortunately she gives no specific references, and it appears that pride of place in these two Jewish movements was given not to prophets but to sages (the "Teacher of Righteousness" and the Karaite scholars respectively), whose principal aim was interpretation of the old Torah in ways that diverged from the orthodox Rabbinic tradition. In contrast the Montanist prophets proclaimed not a new interpretation but a new law, a new stage of revelation parallel to the earlier Law (of Moses) and Gospel (of Jesus).³⁶ Even if we could find a closer parallel between the Montanist and Jewish sectarian authority figures we should need evidence that there was contact between the Montanists of Asia Minor, the Therapeutae of Egypt, and the forerunners of the eighth-century Karaites in Babylon, before we could infer the Montanists derived their prophetic emphasis from the Jewish movements. Such evidence Ford fails to provide.

We do hear of cases of ecstatic prophecy within Judaism.³⁷ The strange behaviour of the pre-classical Old Testament

prophetic bands appears to be ecstatic.³⁸ Again Philo tells us that the Therapeutae

are carried away by a certain heavenly love, give way to enthusiasm, behaving like to many revellers in Bacchanalian or Corybantian mysteries, until they see the object which they have been earnestly desiring.³⁹

But in each case the ecstasy is a group phenomenon and in the first example there is musical accompaniment, which suggests a scene closer to the Cybele ritual than to what we hear of the Montanist prophets. Moreover time separates the Montanist prophets from the era of the pre-classical Old Testament prophets and space separates them from the Therapeutae of Egypt. Emotional fervour (ἐνθουσιασμός) was a widespread phenomenon in the ancient world⁴⁰ and, as we have seen, one does not have to look further than the religious scene within Asia Minor contemporary with the Montanists for examples of ecstatic prophecy.

Prophetic continence likewise was not a distinctively Jewish phenomenon. In an earlier article Ford tells of the Rabbinic claim of continence for Moses, Elijah and certain other figures of Israelite history,⁴¹ but, as we have seen above, virginity was also espoused in several pagan cults,⁴² a fact that Tertullian brings forward on more than one occasion.⁴³

Certainly there were from the earliest days of the Christian mission in Phrygia close links between Christianity and Judaism, and those links persisted. Ramsay tells us that it is extremely difficult to tell whether inscriptions at Akmonia are Jewish or Judaeo-Christian,⁴⁴ and that there as at Hierapolis in the Lycus Valley there appear to be instances of late second-century Christianity's taking shelter under

the legality accorded to Judaism,⁴⁵ but this relates to the whole Christian Church as it sprang from the Synagogue, and not to Montanism in particular.

The Writings of Tertullian

There is no consensus of scholarly opinion to tell us when the Christian Gospel first took root in North Africa or in what circles it was first nurtured.⁴⁶ Certain facts are however plain. First, by early in the second century A.D. there was an important Jewish settlement in Carthage. Rabbi Akiba (c. 50-132) visited Carthage and M. Simon declares that no other region of the Roman Empire (besides Palestine) was of comparable importance in the Rabbinic writings to Africa.⁴⁷ Simon believes the first Jewish colonists could have reached Africa before Nebuchadrezzar laid siege to Jerusalem⁴⁸ (early sixth century B.C.), but here he is speculating.

Secondly, Christians were quite numerous in North Africa by the end of the second century. Even if Tertullian is indulging in considerable exaggeration when he declares that (by 197) Christians form almost the majority in every town⁴⁹ they must have been present in considerable numbers. By early in the third century Agrippinus of Carthage could convene a council of "very many" bishops of the province.⁵⁰

Thirdly, this African Christianity appears to have had a Judaeo-Christian flavour. Christians refused to eat meat containing blood, a peculiarity by which their persecutors could separate them from non-believers.⁵¹ This shows that they still adhered strictly to the injunction of the apostolic letter of Acts 15.

Fourthly, as W. Telfer has pointed out in his article "The Origins of Christianity in Africa",⁵² there were close links between North African Christianity and the Christianity of the East, especially Asia Minor and Syria. Thus bishoprics proliferated in Africa much as they had in Syria and Asia Minor, in contrast to Italy where the development of sees other than Rome was slow. Further, Tertullian seems conversant with so much that the Church in Asia Minor has experienced - Montanism, Marcion, Praxeas, the origin of Acta Pauli et Theclae (De bapt. 17), the treatment of Christians by the magistrates in Byzantium, Asia and Cappadocia (Ad Scap. 3), etc.. Later when Cyprian clashed with Stephen of Rome the former immediately turned for support to Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, leading bishop of Asia Minor. Therefore, although there are points of contact between the North African Church and Rome in the joint cult of SS. Peter and Paul, in liturgy, epigraphy and in the "rule of faith",⁵³ the claim of Innocent I⁵⁴ (416) that Carthage like Gaul and Spain was evangelized by Roman missionaries can be no more than a partial truth.⁵⁵ Neither Tertullian nor Cyprian show filial dependence on Rome. Indeed it is possible that Augustine was right when he claimed that Christianity reached Africa in the Apostolic Age.⁵⁶ Perhaps the first missionaries were Judaeo-Christians⁵⁷ from Ephesus or some other part of Asia Minor.

But when Ford writes:

It seems possible that Tertullianism, like the Asiatic "New Prophecy", emanated from Jewish-Christian circles,⁵⁸

he is suggesting something rather different. ~~She~~ He thinks it possible that Tertullian's work Adversus Iudaeos was written at a time when its author had little interest in Judaism

(his pre-Montanist phase) but then, desiring more knowledge of the Old Testament for his Adversus Marcionem, he repaired to Jewish scholars for information. Thereafter his works betrayed considerably more Jewish influence. Ford then sets forth a number of parallels between Tertullian's writings and Rabbinic writings and practice.

Akiba, who had visited Carthage, had himself insisted on very strict marriage laws, had practised "scholastic continence" and had exhibited a zeal for martyrdom.⁵⁹ But Akiba particularly emphasises laws against incest, whereas Tertullian is primarily concerned with monogamy, and where he speaks of chastity he is not interested in "scholastic continence" but continence for all Christians.⁶⁰ Certainly both Akiba and Tertullian were prepared to accept martyrdom for what they believed. In this they were heirs of a long Judaeo-Christian tradition.⁶¹ But as the Paraclete's uncompromising stand for martyrdom⁶² was clearly not derived from the syncretistic Phrygian Jews⁶³ we cannot assume Tertullian's attitude even before he became a Montanist derived from the Synagogue.

Ford summarises Tertullian's defence of the Old Testament ritual laws as follows:

These were ordained so that the people would be bound to God and by their performance of detailed requirements laid upon them be ever mindful of God's presence.⁶⁴

In this she sees a reflection of R. Johanan b. Zakkai's answer to one who scoffed at the rigmarole involving a red heifer (Lev. 19.1ff) - God has not yet chosen to reveal the reasons for the individual statutes of the Law. They are just to be accepted as expressing the divine will.⁶⁵ But there is no need here to see Tertullian's dependence on the

Rabbi, his attitude would seem to be little more than common sense.

It is a similar matter when we consider specific texts or topics.⁶⁶ The Midrash Numbers Rabbah 14.1, and Tertullian, in Adv. Marc. 2.21.2, both excuse Joshua's breaking the Sabbath by marching around Jericho with his army on the grounds that he did so because God commanded it. But Tertullian had no need to resort to Rabbinic scholars for this view. It is clearly stated in Josh. 6.2ff. It is in fact most unlikely that he depends on the Midrash because the latter merely refers to Joshua's carrying out warlike operations, whereas Tertullian speaks specifically of the act of carrying the ark around Jericho, which he claims was acceptable on the Sabbath, whereas personal work such as gathering sticks is forbidden on the Sabbath.

Nor is it very surprising to learn that both Tertullian and the Rabbis excused Israel's act of theft in despoiling the Egyptians before leaving Egypt (Ex. 12.35f) on the grounds that they were merely taking compensation for all their hard labour.⁶⁷ This interpretation seems to have been widely held in Jewish and Christian circles.⁶⁸

In Tertullian's discussion of the human soul two of the author's views, namely that the soul is within the body of the foetus in the womb and that when the body sleeps the soul remains awake, do appear to be parallel to Rabbinic beliefs,⁶⁹ but whereas the Rabbinic sources cited make merely a brief comment, Tertullian's views form part of the long and careful argumentation of De anima. He asks for instance (De an. 25) why a person's character so resembles his parents if his soul does not come from their seed. His view may be merely a

deduction from his own observations. And when he admits his view of sleep is held in common with the Stoics⁷⁰ one cannot exclude influence from that quarter. Certainly Tertullian's association of "soul" with "blood", "breath" and "spirit" are Hebraic thought but it comes no doubt directly from the Old Testament itself.⁷¹

Tertullian's arguments for the resurrection of the body find only faint parallels in the Rabbinic literature. When he declares that God who can create ex nihilo is certainly capable of merely restoring the flesh (in resurrection),⁷² Ford cites as a parallel the statement in the Babylonian Talmud:

As the womb takes in and gives forth, so the grave takes in and will give forth.⁷³

There is, however, no indication that by creation ex nihilo Tertullian is thinking of the process of human birth. Other alleged parallels are even more difficult to discern.⁷⁴ The analogy of the phoenix for resurrection is to be found in the Rabbinic literature⁷⁵ but Tertullian's comments on the remarkable bird appear to be quite independent.

Ford comments on the kinship between De idolatria and Jewish teaching and refers us to W.A.L. Elmslie's commentary on the tractate Abodah Zarah in the Mishnah.⁷⁶ But careful reading of the two roughly contemporary works against idolatry reveals that the two treatments differ considerably. Certainly both forbid frankincense-selling,⁷⁷ and the manufacture of the trappings of idolatry (though here Tertullian mentions specifically the embellishments of buildings i.e. altars, niches, etc., whereas Abodah Zarah deals with the adornments of idols themselves, i.e. necklaces, earrings, etc.).⁷⁸ Garlands are deplored by both, but whereas Tertullian specifies those at doorways and gate-posts of one's

house, Abodah Zarah declares garlanded shops out of bounds for Jews.⁷⁹ On the other hand there is much material in each writing which finds no parallel in the other. Tertullian mentions for instance astrology⁸⁰ and school-teaching⁸¹ as unacceptable for a Christian, while Abodah Zarah devotes one of its five sections to the subject of libation wine,⁸² and several chapters of another section to Asheroth.⁸³ Thus overall the kinship between the two works is really their common attitude of hostility to idolatry,⁸⁴ an attitude deriving from their common veneration for the Old Testament.

The alleged parallel⁸⁵ between the proscription of the wearing of crowns in the Babylonian Talmud and Tertullian's De corona is quite illegitimate. Whereas the former deals with bridal crowns, one of which was a replica of the city of Jerusalem, the latter deals with military chaplets and their association with pagan gods.

The supposed Jewish derivation of the xerophagy has been examined above,⁸⁶ where Tertullian was our chief source of information for the Montanist practice. There is no need to discuss it again here. With regard to actual fasts Tertullian does point to Jewish fasts as a precedent for there being special observances at all among the Montanists,⁸⁷ but clearly he would deny the latter were derived from Judaism.⁸⁸

Ford's parallels in the article under consideration are now exhausted, but there remain four further points to be considered from his earlier article "St. Paul the Philogamist".⁸⁹ First she claims Ad uxorem's style resembles that of a Jewish ethical will.⁹⁰ This is an interesting suggestion. An

ethical will purported to be the death-bed wishes of the head of a family addressed to his sons.⁹¹ The prototype is that of Jacob (Gen. 49). Many ethical wills took their style from the early chapters of the Book of Proverbs, each paragraph opening, "My son..." As there is no reason to believe, however that Tertullian had any children, but rather it seems practised continence from baptism onwards,⁹² could he not have addressed one to his wife instead? It is possible but, in view of the fact that ethical wills only really became a literary genre in the Middle Ages, and Tertullian is scarcely writing from his death-bed, he may well be acting simply from a sense of expediency, no precedent being required. He justifies his action with the words:

If we draw up wills for such (worldly) matters,
 why ought we not much more to take forethought
 for our posterity in things divine and heavenly...?⁹³

Secondly, Ford believes Tertullian is drawing on Rabbinic material when he finds him using the fact that God took only one rib from Adam to form Eve as an argument for monogamy, when he sees monogamy as a reflection of the unity of God, when he sets forth certain Old Testament heroes as paragons of monogamy or continence, and when he mentions the continence of the animals in Noah's Ark.⁹⁴ This last parallel could ultimately derive from Rabbinic exegesis, but the other examples are not sufficiently striking to warrant such an explanation. Determined to wrest from the Old Testament subject matter to support his arguments he could have deduced them independently.

Then there is what Ford himself admits is an incomplete analysis of Tertullian's rules of exegesis.⁹⁵ He believes, however, even from a tentative examination, that Tertullian

uses at least four standard rules of Rabbinic exegesis. His most impressive example is his first, that from a negative statement a positive rule is to be inferred and vice versa. This is evident in De exhort. cast. 4.1-2 where Tertullian argues that in allowing remarriage S. Paul admits he has no commandment from the Lord (I Cor. 7.25,28), and therefore, Tertullian concludes, as the Lord nowhere permits, he thus forbids second marriages. Again in De. mon. 4.4 the exegetical rule is succinctly stated:

negat Scripture quod non notat.

However it is quite conceivable that Tertullian's rhetorical training⁹⁶ led him to such a rule himself. A far more comprehensive study is necessary before dependence can be inferred with certainty.

Finally there is the puzzle of Tertullian's statement in De mon. 7.6,7 that the Law forbids priests to marry. The Pentateuch, however, contains no such instruction. Some have seen this as an instance of Tertullian's misquoting perhaps Lev. 21.14. Ford tells us⁹⁷ that Le Saint has said the Talmud and later Rabbinic literature interpreted this text as requiring the High Priest to be monogamous, but as no specific references are given we cannot here pursue the matter further.

J.M. Ford's evidence in toto does not compel us to believe that Tertullian ever came under the direct influence of Rabbinic scholars. In his earlier writings he mentions the hostility of the Jews towards Christians,⁹⁸ and himself composed the treatise Adversus Iudaeos.⁹⁹ In Adversus Marcionem where, if Tertullian had repaired to Rabbis for information, we should expect him to show some gratitude for

services rendered, he writes:

Let the heretic now cease to borrow his poison from the Jew, an asp from the viper, as they say.¹⁰⁰

Certainly there are parallels between Tertullian's writings and the Rabbinic literature, but they seem to be largely "analogical not genealogical" to quote Metzger's terminology,¹⁰¹ i.e. accidental coincidences rather than derivations, as Judaism and Christianity shared a common religious heritage. The Judaism evident in Phrygian Montanism and in the writings of Tertullian was the heritage of the early Church as a whole.

REFERENCES AND NOTESPt. 2 Ch. 3

1. J.E.H. 17 (1966), 152.
2. ibid. 154.
3. C.B., ch.15.
4. Josephus, Ant. 12.3,4.
5. Cicero (Pro Flacco 68) tells us that in 62 B.C. Flaccus, proprætor of Asia, refused to allow these contributions to go out of Asia and seized them himself. They amounted to nearly 100 lb. of gold at Apameia, 20 lb. at Laodicea, an unknown amount at Adramyttion and a little at Pergamum.
6. C.B. p.538, no.399 bis, no doubt relating to a local guarantee of protection by the city for the graves of Jewish residents.
7. ibid. nos. 550,559.
8. Graillot, Culte, p.218.
9. b Shab. 147b, (so Lightfoot, Colossians, p.22).
10. Ac. 16.1-3.
11. Col. 2.8,16ff, 20ff.
12. Sozomen, H.E. 7.18.12-14, Ps.-Chrysostom, Ep. 7, Ford, op. cit., 146f.
13. Eus., H.E. 5.24.1-8.
14. op. cit. 147.
15. ibid. 148.
16. see above p.75 esp. nt.44.
17. op. cit. 148.
18. The Judean Scrolls and Karaism, pp.163ff,186.
19. "There were no more joyous days in Israel than the fifteenth of Ab and the Day of Atonement on which the daughters of Jerusalem, garbed in white borrowed garments (so as not to put to shame the poor)...would dance in the vineyards." (R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, Mishnah, Ta'an. 4.8).
20. Wieder, op. cit., pp.167f.
21. Epiph. Pan. 49.2.
22. Tert., De jej. 10.
23. Philo, De vit. cont. 1,4, Ford, op. cit. 149.
24. ibid.
25. Phil. 8.19.
26. Kil. 1.3,5,9, Maas. 5.2,8, Maksh. 4.6, Uktz. 1.2.
27. op. cit. 149.
28. Jer. 35.
29. Jud. 13.2ff (Samson), cf. Lk. 1.15 (John the Baptist).
30. Jer. 35.7-11.
31. De jej. 16.
32. Eus., H.E. 2.23.5 (James the Just).
33. b M.K. 15b.
34. cf. Ramsay, C.B. p.95 discussing inscription 18.
35. op. cit. 150.
36. Tert., De virg. vel. 1.
37. Ford, op.cit. 151f.
38. I Sam. 10.5-13.

39. De vit. cont. 2.11f:

ὑπ' ἔρωτος ἄρπασθέντες οὐρανόι, καθάπερ
οἱ βακχευόμενοι καὶ κορυβαντιῶντες,
ἐνθουσιάζουσι μέχρι ἂν τὸ ποθοῦμενον ἴδωσιν.
(Conybeare).

40. cf. Strabo, Geog. 10.3.9, though here again a group phenomenon with musical instruments is referred to.
41. "St. Paul the Philogamist", N.T.S. 11 (1964-65), 333f.
42. see above pp. 90f.
43. Ad. ux. 1.6, De exhort. cast. 13, De mon. 17.
44. C.B., p.474.
45. see discussion of inscriptions 411,412, pp.545ff.
46. The evidence of Monceaux, "Enquête sur l'Épigraphie Chrétienne d'Afrique II: Inscriptions Juives", Rev. Archéol. 4e ser. 3 (1904), 354-73, Friend, "The Seniores Laici and the Origins of the Church in North Africa", J.T.S. N.S. 12 (1961), 280-84, and others who favour a Jewish or Judaeo-Christian origin, has been seriously questioned by Barnes, Tertullian, App. 22. His own conclusions are, however, open to question, see nts. 56,57 below.
47. Recherches d'Histoire Judéo-Chrétienne, p.48.
48. ibid.
49. Apol. 37.
50. Cyp., Ep. 73.3. Augustine puts the number of bishops at seventy (De un. bapt. contra Pet. 13).
51. Tert., Apol. 9.13-14, Minucius Felix, Oct. 30.6, cf. Eus., H.E. 5.1.26 referring to Biblis in Gaul in 177.
52. Stud. Pat. 4, T.uU. 79 (1961), 512-17.
53. This evidence is mentioned by Monceaux, Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne I (1901), p.4f.
54. Ep. 25.2.
55. Monceaux, Histoire I, p.7, suggests a multiple foundation of the Church in Carthage, but believes the earliest missionaries were from the Orient.
56. Enarr. in Psalm. 44.23,32. Barnes would no doubt dismiss this for he thinks Acts. 2.9ff ought to describe accurately the extent of the Jewish Diaspora before the first Jewish War (Tertullian, p.285). Yet it would be surprising if Luke, a Gentile, in fact could have known the exact extent of the Diaspora, and that his list is not comprehensive is shown by its omission for instance of Cyprus, the home of Barnabas the Levite (Ac. 4.36). This does not prove that Christianity reached Carthage in the first century, but certainly some explanation is needed to account for the numerical strength of the Church in Africa by the time of Tertullian.
57. Barnes, Tertullian, App. 22, thinks it implausible that Christianity should have arisen out of the Jewish community in Africa because Judaism and Christianity separated at the time of the first Jewish War. But such a verdict ignores the state of affairs in Phrygia, where the relationship between Christianity and Judaism remained close it seems to at least the second century (see above p.108). And it is not impossible that Christianity reached Africa before the first Jewish War (cf. nt. 56).

Pt. 2 Ch. 3.

58. J.E.H. 17 (1966), 154.
59. ibid. 155.
60. Hence the whole tenor of De exhortatione castitatis.
61. See Frend, Martyrdom, ch. 2 "Judaism and Martyrdom".
62. Tert., De fuga 9, App. 1 nos. 8,9.
63. see above p.103.
64. op. cit. 155. He is thinking no doubt of such passages as Adv. Marc. 2.18-19.
65. Num. R. 19.6-8.
66. Ford, op. cit. 155-57.
67. Adv. Marc. 2.20, cf. Ford, op. cit., 156 referring us to Daube.
68. for references see A.N.C.L. 7, p.99, ftnt.3.
69. Ford, op. cit. 156 cites Gen. R. 24.10f (incorrect) and Deut. R. 2.37 as parallels to De an. 25 and 45 respectively.
70. De an. 43.
71. With De an. 25, 10-11 cf. respectively Lev. 17.10ff and Gen. 2.7.
72. De res. mort. 11.
73. b. Ber. 15b, Ford, op. cit., 157, ftnt.2.
74. On the analogy of day from night and season from season compare De res. mort. 12 with b. Shab 88b and b. Ber. 60b.
75. Gen. R. 19.5, cf. De res. mort. 13.
76. "The Mishna on Idolatry: 'Aboda Zara", Camb. Texts & Studies, 8.2 (1911).
77. De idol. 11, A.Z. 1.5.
78. De idol. 8, A.Z. 1.8.
79. De idol. 15, A.Z. 1.4.
80. De idol. 9.
81. ibid. 10.
82. A.Z. 5.
83. ibid. 3.7-10.
84. though Barnes, Tertullian, pp.97f,100 suggests three points of virtual contradiction between the two works.
85. b Sot. 49a,b, De cor. 12, Ford, op. cit. 157.
86. see above p.106.
87. Aspice ad Judaios fastos et invenies nihil novum. (De jej. 13.6).
88. Horum igitur tempora observantes et dies et menses et annos galaticamur? Plane, si Iudaicarum caeremoniarum, si legalium sollemnitatum observantes sumus; illas enim apostolus dedocet compescens veteris testamenti in Christo sepulti perseverantiam et novi sistens. (De jej. 14.1)
89. N.T.S. 11 (1964-65), 326-48, esp. 331ff.
90. p.332.
91. For a useful summary of the information see Y. Dan's article "Jewish Ethical Wills", Encyc. Jud. 16 (1971).
92. Ad. ux. 1.5-7, cf. De exhort. cast. 1.
93. Ad. ux. 1.1.
94. op. cit. 333ff giving references.
95. ibid. 335, ftnt. 10.
96. cf. R.D. Sider, Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian (1971).
97. op. cit. 337f.

Pt. 2 Ch. 3.

98. Ad. nat. 1, Apol. 7, Scorp. 10. The validity of Scorp. 10 as indicative of the state of affairs in Tertullian's time was contested by Barnes, "Tertullian's Scorpiace" J.T.S., N.S. 20 (1969), 105ff, but effectively vindicated by Friend. "A Note on Jews and Christians in Third-Century North Africa", J.T.S., N.S. 21 (1970), 92-6.
99. There has been controversy over the authenticity of this work - see Monceaux, Histoire I, pp.297ff, who thinks chs.9-14 came from Tertullian's pen. Barnes (Tertullian, pp.106f) agrees but believes Tertullian laid aside the work unfinished and it was published by someone else. This was indeed the case with a version of Adversus Marcionem, (1.1). Adversus Iudaeos would appear to be a genuine Christian apologetic against the Jews intended in the first place no doubt to strengthen Christians in the face of Jewish proselytization and hostility.
100. Adv. Marc. 3.8.
101. qu. Barnes, Tertullian, p.92, ftnt.10.

CHAPTER 4A CHRISTIAN PHENOMENON

Recognising that Montanism arose in an area that had long been open to the Christian mission and that it retained unchanged much of the Church's doctrine and practice, many scholars have seen Montanism as fundamentally a theological movement of Christian origin. One suggests it was a development from Ebionism, others see in it a reaction to Gnosticism, but most emphasise its desire to renew the spiritual and moral life of the Church. Clearly these explanations are not mutually exclusive, but for convenience they will be treated here separately. Ultimately all explanations of Montanism as an authentically Christian movement see in its hostile reception a judgement upon the catholic Church itself.

A - A Development from Ebionism

In his book Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts (1841) F.C.A. Schwegler describes Montanism as part of an evolutionary pathway of Jewish Christianity:

It in fact - to anticipate the result of what follows - fits into the same series of dogmatic endeavours, which can be traced in their various forms of development from their root Essenism, through the party of the deviant teachers at Corinth and the Ebionites of Epiphanius right up to the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies as their probable culmination point.¹

A little later he is even more explicit in stating:

"Montanism is Ebionism."

This he regards as the basic idea which can be substantiated by an examination of individual features of the movement.²

Now "Ebionism" is a term that needs some clarification. M. Simon³ is careful to distinguish between four closely related movements: early Jewish Christianity which, while being doctrinally orthodox, retained certain Mosaic practices; Pharisaic Ebionism which, clinging to many of the observances of the Jewish Law, refused to follow the Church to a fully-fledged Christology; Gnostic or Essenic Ebionism which embraced the Jewish Law but also introduced new doctrines; and Jewish Gnosticism (totally non-Christian). The Jewish Christians of the earliest era of the Church included James the Just and his supporters, some of whom constituted the Judaizers against whom Paul constantly fought.⁴ The most intransigent of these had in Justin's day become something of an anomaly within the Church⁵ and by the time of Irenaeus could be regarded as a heresy - (Pharisaic) Ebionism - practising circumcision and other Jewish customs

and holding Jesus to have been the natural son of Joseph.⁶ Their name came from the Hebrew נָצוּר ("poor") either because of their literal poverty⁷ or because they were regarded as intellectually poor as a result of their slavery to the Law.⁸ It is probably these whom Epiphanius designates "Nazarenes",⁹ as distinct from the (Essenic) Ebionites which he describes in Pan. 30 and believes originated at Pella in Peraea whither the Jerusalem Church had fled to escape the destruction of the city.¹⁰ There may have been an influx of Essenes into the Church at this stage.¹¹ It was from these Ebionites that the Pseudo-Clementine literature and the Book of Elchasai arose.¹² The Jewish Gnostics may perhaps be represented by the troublers of the Colossian Church whom Paul attacked in his epistle.¹³

Now one of Schwegler's chief faults is that he fails to distinguish consistently between these movements. He declares that it is the Ebionites of Epiphanius and the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies that are so close to Montanism,¹⁴ but frequently he brings in instead examples from early Jewish Christianity. This will become clear as we examine his various points.

Prophecy

The Montanist ecstatic trance finds parallels, Schwegler claims, in most forms of Ebionism.¹⁵ In Judaism, where God is viewed as absolute power, it is natural to see that when the infinite invades the human mind it drives out the finite self-consciousness. This is found in isolated cases in the Old Testament, in the legend of the origin of the Septuagint, in the writings of Philo, and perhaps among the Essenes.

Now, as Schwegler's earliest critic L. Georgii protests,¹⁶ he has completely ignored here the influence of Greek (especially Platonic) philosophy and oriental religion, and in fact none of Schwegler's examples come from Ebionism. Indeed, the Clementine Homilies indulge in a polemic against ecstatic prophecy and vision-based divine revelation, as Schwegler himself admits!¹⁷

Now disregarding the mode of prophecy (i.e. ecstasis) Schwegler declares the Clementines furnish the key to Montanism in their concept: "All revelation of religious truth is prophecy".¹⁸ He points out that the Clementines draw a contrast between the Greeks who speculate from the visible to the invisible, their conclusions moulded by wishful thinking, and the Prophet (Jesus) who declares the truth.¹⁹ Prophecy is of course of key importance to Montanism. But would Ebionism with its fundamental interest in the old Law be likely to produce the New Prophecy? A. Ritschl thinks not.²⁰ The matter is inconclusive.

Schwegler seeks a further parallel between the two movements when he points out that, though strictly speaking the principle of prophecy deprives tradition, Scripture and human reason of their authority, both the Ebionites and the Montanists seek to retain these other sources of authority in tension with prophecy.²¹ Sometimes they appeal to them in concert, sometimes they allow them to conflict as when they contrast truth with custom.²² We are familiar with Tertullian's desire to justify the New Prophecy by pointing out that it maintains the Rule of Faith.²³ In like manner the Clementines stipulate that the utterances of apostle, teacher or prophet must be judged by the preaching of James.²⁴ At

the same time we may recall that Tertullian will on occasion allow the Paraclete to override Paul,²⁵ while the Ebionites of the Clementines impugn as false those parts of Scripture which imply deficiencies in the nature of God, or of their special Old Testament heroes.²⁶ But, whereas we may admit these analogies, in their details these examples are so different that they offer no evidence of a dependence between the two movements. A. Réville²⁷ in fact draws our attention to a clear contrast: while the Montanists might appeal to the regula fidei for justification, the Ebionites with their denial of the Virgin Birth clearly deserted it.

Asceticism

The Montanist asceticism, Schwegler points out, derives from an antithesis between matter and spirit.²⁸ The prominent antithesis for his Ebionites is between this world ruled by the devil and the next ruled by Christ.²⁹ In this world the human individual is the scene of a struggle between these two powers. If a man turns to idols and participates in their sacrificial meals he loses his freedom of choice falling body and soul under the power of demons.³⁰ Tertullian's writings teem with similar dualistic ideas. As at the first birth an evil spirit secures its hold over the human soul, so at the second (baptism) the Holy Spirit takes control instead.³¹ When critics of Montanism pointed to the similarities between xerophagies and the practices of the mystery cults Tertullian retorted that the devil is the imitator of the divine.³² Yet nothing is proved by noting that both the Ebionites and Montanists were dualists. Both were well able to derive their dualism independently from

their Christian milieu and indeed from the teaching of Christ himself who, according to the Fourth Gospel, declared "My kingdom is not of this world"³³ while speaking of the devil as "the prince of this world".³⁴

When we turn to the question of dietary restrictions in Montanism Schwegler declares these point unmistakably back to Ebionism.³⁵ He then refers us as a parallel to the "Ebionites" of the Epistle to the Romans who abstained from wine and flesh and restricted themselves just to vegetables,³⁶ and to James who according to Hegesippus was a Nazirite, drinking no wine or strong drink and eating no flesh.³⁷ Even if the parallels were close, however, it must be noted that both of these examples are merely of early Jewish-Christians and not Ebionites. He then legitimately points out that Epiphanius' Ebionites abstained from flesh,³⁸ and the Clementines regarded eating animals an unnatural innovation.³⁹ But even so, the Montanists did not make abstinence from flesh a general principle of their diet observing it only for two weeks of the year during their xerophagies, as Tertullian is keen to point out.⁴⁰ Schwegler in fact admits that in fasting practices the Montanists stand between the Catholics and the Ebionites and closer to the former.⁴¹ The actual Montanist practices therefore remain unexplained. And it is quite valueless to see some vague parallel⁴² between the eucharistic deviations of Epiphanius' Ebionites who celebrated with bread and water,⁴³ the Ebionites of the Clementines who used bread and salt,⁴⁴ and the Artotyrites who offered bread and cheese.⁴⁵ These observances were all different and therefore afford no evidence of dependence.

Schwegler claims that the Montanists' hatred of matter leads them further to a hatred of natural beauty and art.⁴⁶ His evidence for this comes entirely from the writings of Tertullian, who being such an individualist could well be presenting merely his own views rather than those of Montanism in general, especially as Schwegler refers us in part to writings which today are thought to come from Tertullian's pre-Montanist period.⁴⁷ Schwegler points out that Tertullian may defend nature against Marcion⁴⁸ but when not engaged in combatting such a foe his own view is very different. He decries feminine beauty as that which leads to lust;⁴⁹ with fanatical zeal he attacks religious painting, even the picture of a shepherd on a chalice;⁵⁰ and he composed a special treatise against the heretical painter Hermogenes. But this is not wholly fair. Indeed throughout Tertullian's writings his puritanical outlook is evident, but when he attacks the picture of the shepherd on the eucharistic cup his virulence is aimed not at the fact that it is an artistic creation as such but that it is a shepherd that is depicted. It recalls for him the Shepherd of Hermas, a writing whose doctrine of forgiveness of post-baptismal sin he deplores. And in his work against Hermogenes he may decry the fact that this painter despises God's law in his artistic effort⁵¹ and he delights to use his painting as a barb for a parting shot,⁵² but the work is clearly devoted to a refutation of Hermogenes' false philosophical tenets not to his painting. Schwegler points out further that in his work devoted to a discussion of the fleshly form of Christ Tertullian will not even attribute beauty to Christ's human body.⁵³ But here his thought is clearly moulded by Isaiah 52-53,⁵⁴ rather than scorn for the

flesh as such, which he in fact has praised only shortly before.⁵⁵

Schwegler does not produce Ebionite parallels to Tertullian's evident animosity to natural beauty. He stresses, however, that the distrust of art characteristic of the early Christian centuries was an inheritance from Judaism.⁵⁶ Who would dispute this?⁵⁷ Yet this is merely a dependence of Christianity generally on Judaism, which offers no support for the claim that Montanism specifically derives from Ebionism.

Even Montanist zeal for martyrdom, Schwegler thinks, may be at root a desire for the spirit to be free from its fleshly body,⁵⁸ but to demonstrate the "Montanist" view that the body is a prison for the soul (a commonplace of Greek philosophy) he quotes from Tertullian's Apology⁵⁹ - a work from the author's pre-Montanist period - and draws a parallel with the attitude of the Essenes.⁶⁰ Here he says nothing either about Montanists or Ebionites.

To the question of the Montanist's view of marriage Schwegler devotes considerable attention.⁶¹ He sees intertwined three different attitudes: (1) outright condemnation - the Christian life should be one of total abstinence from sex; (2) marriage allowed somewhat grudgingly as a means of avoiding immorality; and (3) marriage praised and made into a symbol of deep Christian significance. His comment thereafter is illustrative of his treatment as a whole:

All three attitudes closely intertwined are exhibited likewise by Ebionism in its various forms of development.⁶²

"Ebionism" is the panacea of parallels to all things Montanist! As representative of the first attitude he instances the Essenes,⁶³ James the Just whose example of

παρθενία was, according to Epiphanius,⁶⁴ admired by the Ebionites though not in general followed, the Judaeo-Christian party at Corinth,⁶⁵ and the Gospel of the Egyptians.⁶⁶ The first three of these are all pre-Ebionite and the fourth, though perhaps relevant, is primarily a work of pantheistic Gnosticism.⁶⁷ But if there are examples of continence on the Judaizing wing of the Church to set alongside the Montanists Priscilla⁶⁸ and Proculus⁶⁹ there are also examples on the opposite wing - the Marcionites⁷⁰ and probably Paul himself.⁷¹ Wherever the flesh was seen as the seat of evil passions or the product of an evil power continence could be thought an effective way of subjugating it to the Spirit. The Ebionites held no monopoly of such an attitude.

With regard to the second attitude to marriage Schwegler finds the Clementines closest to the Montanist position. We know that Tertullian strongly defends the Montanist practice of monogamy,⁷² though he himself seems to have preferred total continence.⁷³ The Clementines, however, positively encouraged marriage for young and old alike as an antidote to moral danger.⁷⁴ They abhorred adultery, viewing it as a far worse sin than murder, believing it would lead offenders to the eternal fire.⁷⁵ Like Tertullian they closely linked adultery with idolatry.⁷⁶

With regard to the third possible attitude to marriage, the Clementines speak of the Church as the bride of Christ;⁷⁷ so does Tertullian.⁷⁸ The Clementines speak of each congregation as it were in a bridal relationship with its bishop,⁷⁹ and each Christian similarly with the true Prophet.⁸⁰ Tertullian likens the relationship of the Christian to the Holy Spirit to the married state.⁸¹ Both

Tertullian and the Clementines see monogamy as a reflection of the oneness of God,⁸² and the former sees it also as a reflection of the spiritual bond between Christ and the Church.⁸³ The Clementines go further when they see in marriage a reflection of duality within the Godhead, a duality between God and His wisdom.⁸⁴

Schwegler believes the proscription of marriage of the "earlier Ebionism" gave way to the more positive approach of the Clementines as the idea of the imminent End of the world fell into the background and the idea of a Catholic Church came to the fore. Between the Clementine theory of marriage and the principles of the earlier Ebionism came Montanism steering as it were a middle course.⁸⁵ And he is right for, despite all the parallels he has produced, Tertullian is considerably less enthusiastic about marriage than the Clementines. Never do we hear him urging all and sundry to marry lest they be tempted to immorality. He sees virginity as praiseworthy and continence a means to salvation.⁸⁶ So here again differences between the Montanists and the Ebionites are clearly visible and no dependence can be demonstrated from the evidence.

Religion is Doing.

The proposition that shouts at us from Montanist asceticism is, according to Schwegler:

Die Religion ist Handeln.⁸⁷

The New Prophecy sets forth commandments to be obeyed. From Tertullian we learn of the Montanists' laws of monogamy, and of stricter observance of stations, and of xerophagies.

Montanists appear to have been expected to give generously in support of their movement, and offerings were systematically collected.⁸⁸ Tertullian thinks of Christ's teaching as a nova lex.⁸⁹ Indeed Schwegler suggests it was the antinomianism of Marcion that he felt to be the subversion of the fundamentals of the Faith. In fact he believes that for Tertullian justification by faith was merely an inessential accompaniment (unwesentliches Accidens) of righteousness by works.⁹⁰ This is surely an overstatement, for one with so intimate a knowledge of the Pauline writings and so profound a respect for the Apostle to the Gentiles could only subconsciously substitute law for grace,⁹¹ though this indeed is what seems to have happened.

The Ebionites certainly attached great importance to the Jewish Law. Indeed in one place at least we find the Clementines speaking of Moses and Christ as virtually equivalent teachers of the truth, and saying that so long as a person obeys one or the other that is all that matters.⁹² But they also reveal a critical attitude to the Law, claiming it has been corrupted.⁹³ Like Tertullian the Clementines believed that at the Creation itself God had set forth a primeval law⁹⁴ later to be renewed.

But though Montanism and Ebionism both emphasise the importance of obeying Divine Law this concept is to be found in most religious systems. Directly or indirectly both of these movements were influenced by the Jewish Law. That in itself is enough to account for similarities. The actual law in each case revered as of primary importance is different. The Ebionites took their stand on the purified Mosaic Law, the Montanists on the Gospel as interpreted by the pronounce-

ments of the Paraclete.

Chiliasm

Schwegler points out that the Chiliasm of the Montanist eschatology was merely part of general Church teaching in the second century.⁹⁵ The whole concept, including the grossest material elements, were the legacy of Judaism to the Church. Schwegler does not mention Pepuza. And he is forced to admit that, quite contrary to our expectations, the Clementines do not in their eschatology bear the stamp of Judaism. They speak of a future world⁹⁶ but never of a New Jerusalem or of a thousand-year reign on earth for the faithful. Perhaps, he suggests, these Ebionites were just more realistic than the Catholic Church and joined the Roman presbyter Gaius and the Marcionites in their opposition to gross chiliastic theories. Obviously this omission goes a long way to disproving dependence of any sort between Montanism and the Ebionites of the Clementines. And this is only confirmed by a consideration of their teachings about the after-life. The Clementines are closest to the Essenes with their doctrine of bodyless immortality,⁹⁷ though they do speak of a resurrection of the dead when the bodies of the just shall be changed into light so that they may be able to see God.⁹⁸ Schwegler declares,⁹⁹ however, that the Ebionite view is more clearly visible in 2 Clem. 9 where the author, combating docetic Ebionites, declares we shall in the flesh face the Last Judgement. Clearly Jewish Christianity gave rise to various views whereas Tertullian insists on the resurrection of the flesh and rests his confidence on the prophecy of the Paraclete.¹⁰⁰

Angelology

An emphasis on the importance of angels is, according to Schwegler,¹⁰¹ another trait showing the connection between Ebionism and Montanism. It was one of the favourite doctrines of the Essenes,¹⁰² and from there it passed to the Ebionites.¹⁰³ On the other side, though Tertullian's angelology does not go beyond what is found in the Scriptures, he does mention conversation with angels in connection with ecstatic trance.¹⁰⁴ Further it is reported in the Libellus Synodicus¹⁰⁵ (late ninth century) that at a synod under Sotas of Anchialus Montanus was condemned as a heretic because he taught (amongst other things) that there were 878 aeons. Finally, at the Council of Laodicea (fourth century), where several of the canons are aimed against Montanist doctrines,¹⁰⁶ the thirty-fifth canon pronounces anathema on those who have forsaken the Church of God, call on angels (ἄγγέλους ὀνομαζέειν) and conduct services, thus devoting themselves to the teaching of idolatry.

But what does this evidence amount to? The thirty-fifth canon of Laodicea could well be aimed against the continuation of a sort of Jewish Gnosticism such as Paul combatted in the first century, rather than against Montanism. The authenticity of the synods referred to in the Libellus Synodicus is far from certain,¹⁰⁷ especially in this case when no earlier source tells us of Montanus' angelology. Indeed from Tertullian's evidence we can only conclude that Montanist angelology was merely that of the Catholic Church, whereas the Ebionites of the Clementines followed the Essenes in this matter.

Schwegler's analysis of the relationship between Montanism and Ebionism began with a section setting out the parallels between the charismatic teachings and practices at Corinth, that Paul combated in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and what we know of Montanism.¹⁰⁸ There is no need to analyse his evidence in detail. Certainly there are parallels, but the Corinthian situation was pre-Ebionite, and there is no certainty at all, as Schwegler presupposes, that the Judaizers and the excessive charismatics were one and the same party in the Corinthian church. The evidence afforded for his main argument is therefore nil.

In conclusion one can only say that Schwegler totally fails to establish a close link between Montanism and Ebionism. In view of the fact that he rounds off his analysis with a section¹⁰⁹ entitled "Polemik der Pseudoclementinen gegen das montanische System" in which he highlights the contrasting attitudes of the two movements to ecstatic prophecy, Christological and Trinitarian doctrine, and perhaps prophetesses, one may be pardoned for concluding that Schwegler finds it hard to convince himself!

Critics were not slow to point to fallacies in his case. Georgii¹¹⁰ in his extensive review blamed him for disregarding the Greek and oriental background of Montanism in an age when the influence of Jewish Christianity had waned. Réville¹¹¹ pointed out that far from sharing the Ebionites' bitter hostility to the Apostle Paul the Montanists were in certain respects quite close to the Pauline school. The great F.C. Baur¹¹² merely contented himself with observing that Schwegler had lost sight of the wood for the trees - despite all his analogies Schwegler had never explained why just those

components of Jewish Christianity that we find in Montanism, prophecy, ecstasy, ascetic vigour and chiliastic zeal, should have come together to form the new movement.

Schwegler's theory thus never emerged into the twentieth century. Cumulative criticism crushed it long before. His case flew in the face of the facts. Yet subsequent historians of Montanism are indebted to this writer, for he was the first in the modern era to make the movement the subject of an extensive discussion. His analysis failed, but his example has provoked a number of scholars to try to find a better solution.

B - A Reaction against Gnosticism

It is easy for the student of early Church history to study each of the heresies in isolation and to forget that they interlock to form one complete tapestry of the life of the early Church. The exact relationships between them, however, are sometimes open to conjecture. In the last century Neander spoke of Montanism's two-sided polemic:

Opposing itself, on the one hand, to the introduction of foreign speculations by the Gnosis, it wished to protect the pure Christian doctrine from all such corruptions; while, on the other hand, it resisted a petrified, traditional element, which, leaving no room for any progressive and vital development of the church, desired to confine everything in fixed and unalterable forms.¹

The relationship of Montanism to the orthodox Church will be examined further in the next section, but the contrast between Montanism and Gnosticism has been stressed again more recently by H.M. Gwatkin:

In the same sense as Gnosticism is Christianity perverted by learning and speculation, Montanism is Christianity perverted by fear of learning and speculation. While the one refines away the Gospel into a philosophy,² the other debases it into a coarse revivalism.

And again:

In principle Montanism is the exact reverse of Gnosticism. Just as the Gnostics referred everything to man, so the Montanists referred everything to God...On one theory man does what he pleases, and God is forgotten: on the other, God does what he wills, and man is no more than a pen in his hand.³

But Neander and Gwatkin are making rather different points. While Gwatkin sees Montanism as the antithesis to Gnosticism he does not necessarily imply that the latter in any sense brought about the appearance of the former. He merely sees one as ultra-intellectual, the other as a simple

man's faith. Neander on the other hand by speaking of "polemic" implies Montanism was in part a conscious reaction to Gnosticism. We shall consider these two suggestions individually, but first it is necessary to attempt a definition of Gnosticism.

In general terms R. McL. Wilson speaks of Gnosticism as an assimilation of Christianity and contemporary thought which for a time threatened to deprive the Christian element of its identity and distinctive character.⁴

Contemporary thought appears to have been a complex amalgum of different elements:⁵ from the Greek philosophical schools came the Platonic dualism between the ideal world above and the corruptible world of matter below, the Stoic view that this world is animated by sparks of divine Reason (Λόγος), and the Neo-Pythagorean emphasis on asceticism and a mystic doctrine of numbers; from Babylon came astrology; from Egypt and elsewhere the esoteric language of the Mystery Cults and the use of magic; from the Jews the conception of a vindictive national god who posed as world creator and ruler. Whether or not various blends of these elements alone can be considered to constitute pre-Christian or extra-Christian Gnosticism is irrelevant to our present discussion. The movements which Irenaeus, Hippolytus and other patristic writers set before us in their anti-heretical works were those that employed Christian terminology and concepts, and thus might lure the faithful unawares from the truth of the Gospel. The word "Gnostic" (Γνωστικός) is first mentioned in connection with the Carpocratans⁶ and the Naassenes,⁷ but has been taken as a generic term to describe all the movements offering salvation through γνῶσις, not knowledge in general but an esoteric knowledge, "essentially

self-knowledge, recognition of the divine element which constitutes the true self," says R.M. Grant.⁸ "By gnosis," says G. Van Groningen, "man is able to know and control his existence and free it from slavery."⁹ By gnosis he can scorn the world and its conventions, the product of inferior powers. By gnosis he can rise unscathed at death through the spheres of all the lesser powers to the realm of the Ultimate Divinity.

The Antithesis to Gnosticism

There is much to suggest that Gwatkin's claim is right. Gnosticism relied on the creative speculation of the human mind. Not only did the founders of the various Gnostic schools devise a cosmological myth, their intelligent disciples felt free to modify it, indeed Irenaeus says of the Valentinians:

daily each one of them generates something new, as he is able. For none is perfect, unless he have borne fruit of some great fictions among them.¹⁰

And he confesses himself unable to keep up with them.¹¹

This is borne out by the markedly different accounts he and Hippolytus can give of supposedly the same Gnostic system.¹²

Ordinary Christians who would not follow them in their labyrinth of speculation were scoffed at by the Valentinians as simpletons.¹³

In contrast to the Gnostic myth-mongering Montanus claimed to be merely a passive instrument in the hand of the Almighty:

Behold man is like a lyre...¹⁴

Indeed some of the Gnostics seem to have been half-conscious that their speculation ran contrary to the spirit of the

Christian Gospel and sought to disguise it, for Tertullian says of the Valentinians:

Whenever they have hit upon a novelty they forthwith call their presumption a revelation (revelatio), their own perverse ingenuity a spiritual gift (charisma).¹⁵

And Mark the Valentinian sorcerer both claimed to prophesy himself and sought to make certain women into prophetesses.¹⁶ Incipient Gnosticism in Asia Minor had done the same.¹⁷

The Montanists on the other hand appear to have wished to retain the doctrinal teaching of the Church intact,¹⁸ introducing new teaching only in the realm of discipline.¹⁹ In both cases they merely sought to obey the revelation they had received and not to tamper with it.²⁰ Time and again throughout his works Tertullian appeals to the authority of the Scriptures and seeks to uphold their unity and integrity.²¹ And it is the literal rather than any allegorical meaning of Scriptural texts that he generally prefers.²² The Gnostics, however, merely seized upon the Scriptures as vehicles for their own mythology. They were not concerned with the historical setting of divine revelation.²³ They were not interested in preserving the connection between various passages, and by violent treatment succeeded in manufacturing - to use Irenaeus' quaint imagery - the crude picture of a dog or fox from an exquisite picture of a king.²⁴

The Gnostics though using key terminology from Christianity such as "Father", "Word", "Truth", "Life" and "Saviour" largely emptied them of their Christian meaning.²⁵ The teaching they set forth wrought fundamental changes in the apostolic doctrines though they might claim apostolic authority via a secret succession from an apostle.²⁶ Thus the creator of this

world or Demiurge was viewed almost invariably as a malicious or ignorant power who claimed, "I am Father and God and above me there is none,"²⁷ and had to be rudely awakened to the fact that he was far inferior to the First Power or Father of All. The Law and the Prophets, being attributed to the Demiurge and his confederates,²⁸ were likewise accorded diminished authority. In Christology the Gnostics were either docetic,²⁹ or more generally adoptionist³⁰ - holding that the divine Christ descended on the human Jesus at his baptism and departed before the passion. In both cases the Gnostic contempt for matter is evident. For the same reason the Gnostics disclaimed belief in the resurrection of the body, seeing as their chief goal in life escape from the body to the divine realm above,³¹ and, except for Cerinthus³² with his strongly Jewish bias, the thought of a chiliasm on earth finds no place in their eschatology. In Hippolytus' account of the Valentinian system the term "New Jerusalem" appears, but it is variously applied to the formless offspring of the aeon Wisdom from which ultimately this world was made,³³ and to the Ogdoad where form was conferred on it.³⁴ The Montanists, however, strongly maintained the belief in the resurrection of the body,³⁵ and a chiliasm in the New Jerusalem on earth.³⁶

With regard to Montanist baptism, Basil, towards the end of the fourth century, alleges that the Pepuzians baptized *εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Μοντανὸν ἢ Πρίσκιλλαν*,³⁷ but this is probably no more than rumour, for he is forced to admit that Dionysius the Great had not felt it necessary to rebaptize Cataphrygians, and neither Eusebius' sources nor Tertullian nor yet Epiphanius give any indication of Montanist

baptismal peculiarities. Even Firmilian, who tells us that a council at Iconium declared Cataphrygian baptism invalid merely says:

If we ask which Christ they proclaim, they will reply that they proclaim him who was to send the Spirit which has spoken through Montanus and Prisca. But, realizing that it was not the Spirit of Truth but of error that was in them, we know that those who defend their false prophecy against the faith of Christ, cannot have Christ. And the same with all the other heretics: if they have split from the Church of God they have no power or grace.³⁸

The reason for the invalidity of Montanist baptism is that it is administered outside the Church.

We have no details of the baptismal practices of many of the Gnostic sects, but Irenaeus presents us with a bewildering array of Valentinian rites.³⁹ As with their cosmological myths innovation appears to have run rife. They regarded the Church's baptism as merely affording the remission of sins, but their own rites, which they called redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις), they believed to bring perfection. Some conducted some sort of spiritual marriage for their initiates, others simply brought the candidates to water and baptized them with some such invocation as:

In(to) the name of the unknown Father of all things, into Truth, the mother of all, into him who descended on Jesus, into union, into redemption, into communion of the powers.⁴⁰

Others to be more impressive used Hebrew invocations. And in some rites at least responses were made by the initiate and by bystanders. Some used oil and water, others anointed with balsam, others rejected all physical means as unworthy and considered redemption to be wrought through gnosis alone. Yet others reserved their "redemption" until the candidate was near death and at the same time taught him utterances to enable him to pass unscathed through the spheres of the lesser

powers up to the Pleroma. Thus in sacrament as in word it seems the Gnostics radically transformed what the Montanists passively accepted.

With regard to asceticism it seems the Paraclete pronounced and the disciple obeyed. The Montanists, fully recognising the Pauline antithesis between the Spirit of God and the flesh, the seat of temptations to sin,⁴¹ sought in the name of the Spirit (Paraclete) to curb the appetites of the body. Thus the Montanist fasts and xerophagies were designed to prevent gluttony, and monogamy to check sexual indulgence.⁴² With the Gnostics, however, asceticism and debauchery seem to have flowed from a common philosophical presupposition, namely that matter is essentially evil and alien to the true self. Thus Saturninus⁴³ could forbid marriage and some of his disciples were vegetarians, while Simonians,⁴⁴ Basilidians,⁴⁵ Carpocratans,⁴⁶ and Valentinians⁴⁷ in their scorn for matter and the moral laws enacted by its rulers felt free to live amorally. They commonly practised magic, ate food sacrificed to idols, took part in pagan festivals and even watched the spectacles of the arena.⁴⁸

On the subject of martyrdom the Paraclete had pronounced:

Do not desire to die in your beds, through abortions, or from mild fevers, but in martyrdom that he who has suffered for you may be glorified.⁴⁹

And therefore for Tertullian flight from persecution was no longer at all acceptable,⁵⁰ and even the Anonymous had to admit that Montanists had gone to gaol for the faith.⁵¹

In the case of the Gnostics we have very limited information. Tertullian tells us that the Valentinians⁵² avoided martyrdom, and the same impression is conveyed by Heracleon's commentary on Lk. 12.8: the "multitudes" (i.e. Catholic Christians)

consider the only true form of confessing Christ is in public before the authorities, but this is in fact only secondary to confessing him by one's faith and conduct.⁵³ It seems very likely that the other Gnostic sects likewise shunned martyrdom,⁵⁴ especially those who let no inhibitions prevent them from enjoying the pleasures of this world.

It is perhaps surprising that in two movements as different as Montanism and Valentinian Gnosticism a common terminology should have been used. They referred to themselves as "pneumatici" while Catholic Christians they scorned as "psychici".⁵⁵ But the resemblance is superficial though both are based no doubt on the Pauline distinction.⁵⁶ The Montanists called themselves pneumatici because they felt they alone gave pre-eminence to the authority of the Spirit (pneuma) in the Church by recognising the New Prophecy as genuine.⁵⁷ They were strongly moral and ascetic. The Valentinians, however, believed themselves pneumatici by virtue of their having within them a spiritual spark of Achamoth, the offspring of the divine aeon Wisdom.⁵⁸ Possessing this spark they could not lose it and therefore they could afford to be indifferent to morality and asceticism.⁵⁹

Both Gnostics and Montanists added their own books to the apostolic writings,⁶⁰ but whereas the former were works of creative imagination in the guise of philosophy, the latter in the first place appear to have been merely the recorded utterances of the Paraclete. Yet Gwatkin has overstressed the passivity of the Montanists, for Themiso produced a "catholic epistle",⁶¹ Proculus wrote against the heretics,⁶² and Tertullian was of course a prolific writer, some of his greatest works coming from his Montanist period.

If the speculative was conspicuously absent from Montanism it is a considerable overstatement to describe the movement as "Christianity perverted by fear of learning" and "a coarse revivalism". In his pre-Montanist days Tertullian had allowed that Christian youth could legitimately attend pagan schools,⁶³ and we have no indication that later he withdrew from this position. Phrygia may have been proverbial as a backward area of the Roman Empire,⁶⁴ but there is no indication that Montanists actually opposed education. Presumably they formed part of the literacy movement of the Christian mission, which appears to have spread the knowledge of Greek throughout Phrygia in the second and third centuries.⁶⁵

A Polemic against Gnosticism

A high proportion of the New Testament writings appear to have been addressed to the Church in Asia Minor. Among the Paulines there were Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy⁶⁶ and Philemon, and then also 1 Peter and the Johannine literature.⁶⁷ In these writings we find ample evidence of some of the traits that later appeared in the fully-fledged Gnostic systems of the second century.

In the middle of the first century the Apostle Paul, writing to combat Judaizers at work among the Galatian churches, not only accepts the doctrine that the Law was ordained by angels⁶⁸ but believes that non-Christians are under the power of planetary spirits (στοιχεῖα).⁶⁹ But writing to the Colossians perhaps a decade later he denounces the philosophy and "empty deceit" which have been associated with the στοιχεῖα,⁷⁰ and which enjoin dietary and other ascetic

rules. He stresses time and again the inferiority of all spiritual powers to Christ,⁷² who is the image of the invisible God, and in whom the whole fullness (πλήρωμα) of deity dwells. In his sustained attack on the heretics (Col. 2) Paul reveals that circumcision and the observance of Sabbath were part of their error. The clear implication is that the false teachers were either greatly influenced by Judaism or were in fact Jews. Remembering that early Jewish immigrants to Asia Minor came from Babylon,⁷³ it is not difficult to believe that they had assimilated some of the astrological beliefs of that country and had brought them with them to their new home. Further, Timothy at Ephesus is warned against teachers who have turned to myths and genealogies.⁷⁴ As genealogies were something of a Jewish fetish and are here bracketed with myths, it may well be that the myth-makers were deviant Jews.⁷⁵ This seems to be confirmed by the adjacent statement that certain people (the same as before?) who have wandered into vain discussion posed as teachers of the Law.⁷⁶ It seems likely that it was these same dissidents who propagated what they falsely called knowledge (γνώσις).⁷⁷

From the turn of the century we have further evidence from the Johannine literature. It appears that false "apostles" have been expelled from the church of Ephesus,⁷⁸ being guilty of Christological errors, namely denial that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and that Jesus had really come in the flesh and had not only been baptized but crucified as well.⁷⁹ Now Irenaeus tells us of the antagonism between the Apostle John and the heretic Cerinthus,⁸⁰ and elsewhere he describes the latter's system of thought.⁸¹ Cerinthus believed Jesus was a mere man, the natural son of Joseph and

Mary, but at his baptism the impassible, spiritual Christ descended on him, giving him power to work miracles, and ascended from him before the passion. It seems probable then that Cerinthus was one of those the Apostle had in mind when writing 1 John.

Now the Apocalypse gives some interesting information about the church of Thyatira.⁸² There were connected with the church a prophetess "Jezebel" who incited Christians to practise immorality and to eat food that had been sacrificed to idols, and others it seems (perhaps her disciples) who practised "the deep things of Satan" (τὰ βάθη αὐτοῦ Σατανᾶ). According to Irenaeus these traits were characteristic of various Gnostic sects,⁸³ and there may therefore have been some connection.

The Fourth Gospel itself, deceptively close in some ways to Gnostic (and indeed Essenic) thought, effectively challenged Gnostic speculation by its insistence that the Word became flesh⁸⁴ and by its concern to relate events in human history when speaking of Christ's ministry, death and resurrection.

The Pauline and Johannine literature would therefore seem to be grappling with a milieu of incipient Gnosticism in Asia Minor.⁸⁵ Now it is particularly the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse which were later associated with the Montanist movement.⁸⁶ And so it was the Montanists who inherited the anti-Gnostic standpoint of these writings. Further, as has been seen above, the Montanists themselves took up positions diametrically opposite to the Gnostics on matters of key importance. And indeed it seems that Gnostic schools continued to flourish in Asia Minor into

the Montanist era for, after Cerinthus, the Naassenes must have been active there, being closely associated with the Attis cult,⁸⁷ and Mark the Valentinian sorcerer pursued his nefarious activities there, succeeding even in seducing the wife of an Asian deacon.⁸⁸ And there may have been others.⁸⁹

Nevertheless no specifically Montanist anti-Gnostic polemic survives. Tertullian in writing Adversus Valentinianos never invokes the Paraclete. Indeed the only clue that this work comes from his Montanist period is his reference to Proculus noster⁹⁰ as one of the anti-heretical writers to whom he is indebted. And it is therefore doubtful whether it was his Montanism that led Proculus himself to write against the Gnostics. Indeed Baur confidently declares, "Polemic against the Gnostics was not the affair of the Montanists."⁹¹ And he is probably right, for the two movements did not engage. They moved on different planes. While Gnostic mythology was the product of speculative educated minds Montanism sprang from the Phrygian countryside and concerned itself with practical piety.

C An Authentic Renewal Movement

To reverse the verdicts of history is a challenge few historians can resist. The Church's condemnation of Montanism has proved no exception. The preponderance of German scholars who have made a special study of the movement in the modern era, and the author of apparently the sole monograph on the movement in English, have sought to exonerate it from the charge of heresy.

A Ritschl, in Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche (1 Auf. 1850, and again 2 Auf. 1857) claimed Montanism was merely a party within the Church which wished to reassert moral rigorism in an age of increasing laxity. J. De Soyres, in his Montanism and the Primitive Church (1878), declared the movement, "a simple reaction towards the primitive simplicity of Christianity, with a claim to the fulfilment of distinct promises from Christ to His Spiritual Church".¹ G.N. Bonwetsch, in Die Geschichte des Montanismus (1881), emphasised the genuinely prophetic and eschatological nature of the movement. W. Schepelern, in Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte (1929), claimed that Montanism was at first entirely orthodox but later perhaps influenced by the native cult. Finally K. Aland in his "Bermerkungen zum Montanismus und zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie" (1953),² declared the movement a legitimate growth from the Church in Asia Minor, illegitimate only in the extent of its agitation against the framework of the Church.

In considering whether or not Montanism was authentically Christian we shall examine in turn some of its most significant

features.

The New Revelation

De Soyres sees the basic question here to be whether or not the Church up to the time of Montanism accepted as legitimate the gift of prophecy and visions to its members.³ He considers the question scarcely in need of discussion, the answer being that numerous Church Fathers attest the continuance of the charismata, and even Miltiades, the early opponent of the New Prophecy, tacitly concedes the point.⁴

Undoubtedly Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla claimed to be Christian prophets. Eusebius' Anonymous tells us that those who rejected them were denounced by the Montanists as "murderers of the prophets",⁵ and Tertullian speaks of the gospel declared by the "holy prophetess Prisca",⁶ when quoting one of her utterances. And it is likely that they sought to trace a prophetic succession between the Apostolic Era and themselves, for Miltiades seems to be alluding to a Montanist apologetic when he says:

But they cannot show that any prophet, either of those in the Old Testament or of those in the New, was inspired in this way (i.e. in ecstasy); they can boast neither of Agabus, nor of Judas, nor of Silas, nor of the daughters of Philip, nor of Ammia in Philadelphia, nor of Quadratus, nor of any others who do not belong to them...For if the Montanist women succeeded to Quadratus and Ammia in Philadelphia in the prophetic gift, let them show who among them succeeded the followers of Montanus and the women.⁷

And it may be in the course of such an apologetic that Proclus refers to the four prophetess daughters of Philip buried at Hierapolis in Asia, in his debate with Gaius of Rome.⁸ But the Montanist prophets were not thereby placed on a par with their predecessors. They were regarded by their followers as

the "new prophets",⁹ the fulfilment par excellence of the Joel prophecy,¹⁰ with a message of universal not merely local significance,¹¹ and against which all other teaching should be measured.¹²

When we turn to the actual utterances of Montanus it is a little surprising to find scant reference to the Holy Spirit. Indeed Epiphanius declares that while Jesus claimed to be merely the Son, Montanus asserted that he was the Father! And he quotes the two utterances:

"I am the Lord God Almighty dwelling in man," and

"It is neither angel nor messenger but I the Lord God, the Father, who has come."¹³

These stress that the immanent God was present in Montanus at least as truly as He had been in the Old Testament prophets. The utterance preserved by Didymus declares in effect that where one member of the triune God is present there the others are also:

"I am the Father and the Son and the Paraclete".¹⁴

Epiphanius preserves the first two sayings to illustrate Montanus' presumptuousness, Didymus the third to show his doctrinal unorthodoxy.

In general, however, the spirit in Montanus must have declared itself to be "the Paraclete", for, although Tertullian uses also the terms "the Spirit" and "the New Prophecy", he usually alludes to the new authority as "the Paraclete".¹⁵ And this term covers also it seems the two prophetesses, for he can quote an oracle that "the Paraclete says by the mouth of Prisca".¹⁶ But though Tertullian sometimes refers to "the Spirit" when speaking of the power behind the Montanist pioneers,¹⁷ and "the Paraclete" when

referring to ordinary believers,¹⁸ it seems that in so doing he is straying from the clear-cut claims of Montanist pneumatology. According to Pseudo-Tertullian the Phrygians claimed that the Holy Spirit but not the Paraclete was in the Apostles,¹⁹ and this view appears in a refined form in the fourth-century Dialogue, where the Montanist declares that the Apostles received the ἄρραβών of the Spirit but Montanus the πλήρωμα of the Paraclete.²⁰

The emergence of a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete would have been possible in a part of the Church familiar with the Fourth Gospel but unfamiliar with Acts, and this could well have been the case in second-century Phrygia.²¹ Even if Acts had penetrated that region we know that Phrygia was generally regarded as a backward area,²² and the standard of Christian catechesis in a village such as Ardabav where Montanus was converted may have been so poor that the fulfilment of the promises of the Paraclete in Jn. 14-16 by the events related in Acts 2 was not adequately stressed or even realized. Once a distinction between the roles (or even degrees of activity) of Holy Spirit and the Paraclete had been drawn Tertullian, convinced of the legitimacy of the New Prophecy on other grounds (i.e. doctrine and asceticism), could provide a rationale for the novelty of the Paraclete's teaching. Did not Christ promise the Spirit of Truth would lead into all truth? This inevitably entailed novelty.²³ In fact His coming constituted the final stage of God's successive eras of revelation.²⁴

But to understand the Montanist claim is not to exonerate it. To accept it is to deny that with Pentecost the era of the Paraclete had fully arrived.²⁵

The Mode of Revelation: Ecstasy

That the prophetic state in which Montanus and his two prophetesses delivered their utterances was one of ecstasy would seem indisputable. It is attested both by the Montanists and their opponents. The Anonymous²⁶ speaks of Montanus' falling into a state of *παρεκστάσις*, by which he appears to mean an intensified or false ecstasy,²⁷ and in this excited state he spoke and made strange sounds (*λαλεῖν καὶ ξυνοφωνεῖν*). His prophetesses acted similarly.²⁸ And Tertullian declares that *ecstasis*, which is *amentia*, is the true prophetic state,²⁹ though he admits that this is a contentious point between his party and the "psychics".³⁰ Montanist ecstatic trance can therefore have been neither merely a slanderous fabrication of the opponents of the movement³¹ nor yet the normal mode of Christian prophecy. Bonwetsch³² admits this believing the roots of Montanist ecstasy lay outside the Church. De Soyres, Schepelern and Aland, however, maintain its Christian provenance. While Aland points to precedents in the ecstasies of the apostles Peter and Paul and a parallel in the New Testament phenomenon of glossolalia (so also Schepelern³⁴), De Soyres³⁵ refers us to the statements of Justin and Athenagoras which attribute ecstasy to the Old Testament prophets. Both De Soyres and Schepelern mention that several of the Apologists also apply the metaphor of a musical instrument to the Old Testament prophets.

The whole debate from the earliest days to the present has been bedevilled by a fundamental confusion. The word *ἔκστασις* (*ἐκ + ἵστημι*) designates literally a state

of being "put out(side)" or "standing out(side)". Psychologically it could be used of mere astonishment³⁶ or of the following two types of trance phenomena:

(1) Visions and Out-of-the-Body Experiences. While the senses of the body are curtailed the soul alive and active participates in another world. Such were the experiences of Peter when he saw the sheet let down from heaven,³⁷ and of Paul when he received his commission to evangelize the Gentiles.³⁸ Paul clearly had an out-of-the-body experience when he was caught up to the third heaven.³⁹ In such a trance the mental powers of the subject are far from extinguished, for he can subsequently recall what has happened and communicate it to others. It is this type of ecstasy that Tertullian attributes to the soul during sleep.⁴⁰

(2) Possession. The senses of the body are curtailed and the soul expelled, its consciousness completely extinguished. Another psychical entity enters the body and controls its speech and other organs. The subject is consequently ἐκφρων, "out of his mind" during the trance, and afterwards has no recollection of what has been said or done. This was the characteristic state of the pagan prophet.⁴¹ This is also the normal experience of a medium at a séance.⁴²

As the ecstasies of Peter and Paul belong to category 1 so also does the ecstasy attributed by Justin to the prophet Zechariah, for he is speaking of Zechariah's vision of the high-priest Joshua.⁴³

Of course it serves the apologetic purpose of Tertullian well to scramble together both types of ecstasy so that category 2 can be passed off as though it were the same as category 1. Thus in Adv. Marc. 4.22.4-5 commenting on

Luke's gloss, "not knowing what he said" that follows Peter's words, "It is well that we are here..." (Lk. 9.33) on the Mount of Transfiguration, Tertullian asks whether the apostle was just ignorant when he spoke -

Or was it on the principle which we maintain in the cause of the new prophecy, that to grace ecstasy or rapture is incident? For when a man is wrapt in the Spirit, especially when he beholds the glory of God, or when God speaks through him, he necessarily loses his sensation, because he is overshadowed with the power of God - a point concerning which there is a question between us and the carnally-minded (psychics).⁴⁴

He thus successfully blurs the distinction between a state in which a person loses consciousness of the physical world while still retaining his mental faculties during a vision of God which he can afterwards relate to others (category 1), and a state in which he loses consciousness altogether when another's voice speaks through his vocal organs (category 2).

In reality Montanist ecstatic prophecy clearly belonged to category 2. A voice spoke through Montanus' lips claiming to be the Lord God Almighty⁴⁵ or the Paraclete, while at the same time Montanus himself was like a passive lyre, like a man asleep, like one whose nature had been changed.⁴⁶ Indeed it seems that when Montanist apologetic could not convince its critics that ecstatic prophecy was normal within the Judaeo-Christian tradition it resorted to saying:

οὐχ ἄρρωστα τὰ πρῶτα χαρίσματα τοῖς ἐσχάτοις.⁴⁷

But if so it could no longer legitimize itself from precedent.

Now it is true that Athenagoras, like Philo⁴⁸ in the previous century, appears to assimilate Old Testament prophecy to category 2 when he writes of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah and the other prophets who -

in the ecstasy of their thoughts, as the divine Spirit

moved them, uttered what they had been inspired to say, the Spirit making use of them as a flautist might blow into a flute.⁴⁹

But his polemical aim is clear. He wishes to emphasise that unlike the philosophers and poets, who can rise no higher than their own limited intellects, the prophets' words were divinely inspired. He thus desires to minimize the human initiative of the prophets. The same is true of the Apologists' other uses of the metaphor of the musical instrument for the Old Testament prophets. This has been clearly recognised by Bonwetsch⁵⁰ and De Labriolle.⁵¹ We have little reason then to believe that Athenagoras and the others really believed the great prophets of the Old Testament behaved like men possessed, merely that their terminology was influenced by the Hellenistic milieu in which they lived, and the danger of such usage was not evident until the Montanist controversy brought it to the fore.⁵²

One further point remains to be considered, namely the suggestion that Montanist ecstatic prophecy finds a parallel in the New Testament phenomenon of glossolalia. De Labriolle⁵³ and others before him found this suggestion attractive. Certainly both phenomena were supernormal, both unintelligible it seems to the subject. Yet whereas in a Montanist prophetic trance the subject lost consciousness there is no reason to believe this was true of the glossolalic at all. Conscious cooperation would have been necessary to comply with the Pauline instructions about orderly worship.⁵⁴ Further, whereas through the ecstatic prophet Another is always said to speak,⁵⁵ in glossolalia the subject himself may be said to speak to God.⁵⁶ Thus the parallel breaks down.

In conclusion, the test of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of ecstatic phenomena within Christianity is whether or not the subject maintains control of his mental faculties throughout the experience. This is the point that Epiphanius labours to prove in his extended discussion of ecstasy,⁵⁷ which may be combating some of the arguments of Tertullian's lost work De ecstasi. But as Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla stand out in all the Patristic sources as the special instruments of the Paraclete, and it is to them alone that oracular utterances are attributed,⁵⁸ it may well have been they alone among the early Montanists who prophesied in ecstatic trance. The ecstasy of Tertullian's charismatic sister⁵⁹ is by contrast visionary not prophetic.

Trinitarianism

Undoubtedly, as most scholars have recognised, the main branch of Montanism was doctrinally orthodox. Epiphanius declares that the movement as a whole held the same Trinitarian doctrine as the Catholic Church.⁶⁰ Firmilian of Cappadocia likewise confirms their orthodoxy with regard to the Father and the Son.⁶¹ But Hippolytus declares that some of them were Noëtian⁶² and Pseudo-Tertullian tells us that these were the Aeschinists as distinct from the Proclists (in Rome).⁶³ The unorthodox faction thus appears to have arisen in Rome where Noëtus was active, not in Asia Minor where the Monarchian Praxeas became a bitter critic of the movement.⁶⁴ Tertullian uses the fact that the Montanists adhered closely to the "Rule of Faith" as a crucial factor in his defence of the divine origin of their new disciplines.⁶⁵ Now it is true that orthodox Trinitarian doctrine had not yet crystallized

as at Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381). In the first half of the third century Rome was debating monarchianism, and Origen propounding what was later recognised as a form of subordinationism within the Trinity. At such a time Tertullian too appeared to innovate when, on the authority of the Paraclete, he introduced the words *οἰκονομία* for the arrangement of the Trinity, and *προβολή* for the issuing forth of the Son and Spirit, and he himself coined the word trinitas. But his innovation was in the direction of the ultimate orthodox settlement. Tertullian's key work here is Adversus Praxean. In it he quotes the Montanist saying:

For God sent forth the Word as the root the fruit,
the spring the river, and the sun its ray,⁶⁶

and, from the emphasis placed by Montanism on the third person of the Trinity, he extends his reasoning about the Father and the Son further to include the Holy Spirit:

This is he (the Son) who meanwhile has poured forth the gift which he has received from the Father, the Holy Spirit, the third name of the deity and the third sequence of the majesty, the preacher of one monarchy and also the interpreter of the economy for those who admit the words of his new prophecy, and the leader into all the truth which is in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit according to the Christian mystery.⁶⁷

The fact that Tertullian specifically attributes his terminology to the Paraclete shows that Ritschl⁶⁸ is quite wrong in trying to drive a wedge here between Montanism in Asia Minor and Africa. Montanism can in fact claim some credit for the formulation of orthodox Christian doctrine and, in so far as the formulae of Nicea and Constantinople represent the spirit of New Testament Christianity, the New Prophecy may be seen here as a renewal movement.

Eschatology

In their expectation of the imminent End of the world, the descent of New Jerusalem, and a chiliasm (millennium) on earth, the Montanists were not alone. This view was widespread in the second century and was, as Aland has pointed out,⁶⁹ particularly associated with the Asia Minor school of theologians,⁷⁰ which was closely connected with the Apocalypse.

Now Tertullian in his pre-Montanist days speaks of Christians earnestly desiring God's kingdom to come and this age to end.⁷¹ In his dissertation to his wife he shows that the expectation of the imminent End leaves little point in begetting children.⁷² In fact he is not entirely consistent for, in his Apology, he declares that Christians pray for long life for emperors and security for the empire, indeed for the delay of the expected End,⁷³ but to say the reverse would scarcely have commended Christianity to his intended readers!

In some quarters, however, eschatological hopes had begun to grow dim. In Rome as early as the first half of the second century Hermes envisaged that there was yet time for those who had fallen away to repent and rejoin the Church,⁷⁴ and Hippolytus less than a century later believed the End was some two hundred and fifty years away.⁷⁵

Montanism sought to recall the whole Church to the urgent anticipation of the earliest era. If the coming of the Paraclete not only fulfilled Christ's promises in the Fourth Gospel but also Joel 2.28f⁷⁶ then clearly the "last days" had arrived. An image of New Jerusalem had been suspended from the heavens betokening the imminent descent of the city itself.⁷⁷ Maximilla cried that after her there

would be no further prophets but the $\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$.⁷⁸

Though this was not Ritschl's view,⁷⁹ Baur⁸⁰ and numerous subsequent writers have stressed that the sharpened eschatology of the Montanists provided the incentive for their stringent ascetic programme. Kraft⁸¹ refers to the military ring of the Latin word statio applied by Christians to their Wednesday and Friday fasts, stressing that its original purpose was eschatological - a fulfilment of the command to "watch and pray"⁸² in preparation for the End. But, as Tertullian makes no attempt in De jejuniis to defend Montanist stations on the grounds of their eschatological significance, one cannot assume it provided their incentive nor yet that the imminence of the End was the motive power for Montanist asceticism in general.

One further point, at a time when, under the influence of Greek philosophy, belief in the resurrection of the body was wavering in the Church the Paraclete strongly reaffirmed this doctrine.⁸³ Here again the New Prophecy rightly or wrongly revived primitive Christian belief, and showed its solidarity with the Asia Minor school.⁸⁴

Asceticism

Ritschl's view⁸⁵ that in the legislation of the Paraclete nothing new was set up is not correct. Certainly Tertullian believed in monogamy before he became a Montanist,⁸⁶ and, as De Soyres points out,⁸⁷ Theophilus⁸⁸ implies that this represented a general feeling in the Church, and Athenagoras⁸⁹ himself calls second marriage adultery, but the Montanist practices regarding stations and xerophagies were plainly innovations.⁹⁰ Moreover, when Tertullian calls the Paraclete

the restitutor potius quam institutor of monogamy⁹¹ he finds his precedents chiefly from the Old Testament and has to overcome the teaching of Paul.⁹²

Montanist asceticism scarcely reflects authentic spiritual renewal for here indeed nova prophetia is none other than novissima lex.⁹³ That thereafter the Church progressively evolved a legalism of its own merely marks its own drift from the freedom of the Spirit.

Penance

It is perhaps hard to realize today the dramatic difference in a person's life that Christian baptism was expected to make according to the early Church. The child of God with his past sins washed away should henceforth no longer sin.⁹⁴ Indeed this was the trait of a false teacher.⁹⁵ Realism, however, forced the Apostles to admit that Christians did continue to sin, and they advised confession as a means to forgiveness.⁹⁶ Yet there was one class of sins that could not simply be absolved - the ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον.⁹⁷ The first to suggest that even this might find pardon through the Church was Hermas, though he insisted that only one lapse could be forgiven.⁹⁸ That the Church followed his lead is evident from the writings of pre-Montanist Tertullian, of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen. Public confession and humiliation were generally necessary in the process of ἐξομολόγησις.⁹⁹

While the "Pontifex Maximus" against whose edict Tertullian wrote his De pudicitia¹⁰⁰ sought to liberalize the rigoristic approach to post-baptismal sin the Paraclete's stand was totally uncompromising:

The Church has power to forgive sins but I will not do so lest they commit yet more.¹⁰¹

While the Montanist stand has a certain human logic, it runs totally contrary to the example of Christ in his dealings with the woman taken in adultery,¹⁰² (an incident Tertullian would dismiss as the exercise of Christ's unique prerogative as the Son of God).¹⁰³ Yet the rigoristic view does indeed have some basis in the teaching of both John¹⁰⁴ and Paul.¹⁰⁵

Martyrdom

As De Soyres rightly says¹⁰⁶ all parties in the Church regarded martyrdom as the crowning glory of the Christian life. Had not Jesus warned His disciples to expect persecution and even death for His name's sake?¹⁰⁷ To die for Him was to participate in His glory. But here two different views emerged within the Church. There were those who accepted martyrdom as the necessary concomitant of the Christian mission, yet believed it was wrong to provoke the authorities more than necessary. They were ready, if it seemed in the better interests of the Church, to take to flight to avoid arrest. They appealed to Mt. 10.23. There were others who openly courted martyrdom. It was for them an act which earned a special measure of divine favour. It was to the latter group that the Montanists belonged. The Paraclete actively incited them to take this stand:

Do not desire to die in your beds, through abortions or from mild fevers, but in martyrdom, that He who has suffered for you may be glorified.¹⁰⁸

And it may well have been the influence of the Montanists that led to the public parade of Christians in 185 begging for martyrdom from Arrius Antonius, Proconsul of Asia.¹⁰⁹

Tertullian clearly reveals the motivation for such a

stand when he declares, "The sole key to unlock Paradise is your own life's blood."¹¹⁰ Only the souls of martyrs were believed to go direct to Paradise at death, the souls of all other Christians going to Hades to receive rewards and punishments appropriate to the life lived on earth, and to await the Last Day.¹¹¹

The Montanists could claim no doubt the precedent of Ignatius and even the aspiration of Paul himself.¹¹² But here the Apostle showed himself inconsistent, for he is scarcely justified by faith who must repeat the death to share in the resurrection of Jesus. In contrast the writer of the Martyrdom of Polycarp rightly declares, "We do not commend those who surrender themselves, for not such is the teaching of the Gospel."¹¹³

Ecclesiology

The earliest Montanists desired to remain within the Catholic Church. They cried, "You must receive the charismata",¹¹⁴ and Maximilla protested that she had been driven as a wolf from the sheep when she had sought to spread her message.¹¹⁵ According to the Anonymous it was when it encountered opposition (no doubt especially from the bishops) that the false spirit of the Montanist prophets retaliated by teaching its supporters to blaspheme the Catholic Church,¹¹⁶ and Apollonius tells us the same of Themiso's pretentious letter.¹¹⁷ But we do not know whether the Phrygians themselves formulated any real doctrine of the Church, or whether this was left to Tertullian. The division of believers into πνευματικοί who acknowledged and ψυχικοί who rejected the New Prophecy may have come from them as

Clement of Alexandria knows of it.¹¹⁸

Tertullian in his more virulent Montanist works made full use of the πνευματικοί (Lat. spirituales)/ ψυχικοί terminology, but though his party in Carthage clearly separated from the Catholic Church,¹¹⁹ he did not go so far as to deny that psychics were rightfully Christians who had received the Holy Spirit at baptism.¹²⁰ He separated from them because he believed the body to which they belonged was being mal-administered. Bigamists among them were not being rejected as adulterers.¹²¹ Indeed in the edict of the "Pontifex Maximus" the mortal sins of adultery and fornication, which God alone could forgive, were being pardoned.¹²² Rather reluctantly Tertullian admits that those who have the power of God - such as the Apostles and prophets for instance - have the right of God to forgive even mortal sins,¹²³ and thus the Church, the heir of the Apostles, also has the right. But what is this Church? It is the body which is led by the Spirit:

For the very church itself is, properly and principally, the Spirit Himself, in whom is the Trinity of the One Divinity - Father, Son and Holy Spirit. (The Spirit) combines that church which the Lord has made to consist in "three". and thus, from that time forward, every number (of persons) who may have combined together into this faith is accounted "a church", from the Author and Consecrator (of the church). And accordingly "the church", it is true, will forgive sins: but (it will be) the church of the Spirit, by means of a spiritual man; not the church which consists of a number of bishops. For the right and arbitrament is the Lord's, not the servant's; God's Himself, not the priest's.¹²⁴

Now the Spirit himself in the persons of the new prophets has declined to exercise his right to forgive sins, lest he encourage further sin,¹²⁵ and those who do not recognise his speaking in the new prophets (notably the bishops) do not follow him through the Apostles either, for the Paraclete's

teaching gives the true interpretation of the Apostles.¹²⁶
 But if Tertullian's argument strips the official ministry of the Church of its authority he is undeterred and propounds instead the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.¹²⁷

Now indeed this doctrine of the Church as Tertullian propounds it appears to be close to primitive Christianity. Paul himself makes being led by the Spirit the hallmark of the child of God,¹²⁸ and the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers is found both in 1 Peter¹²⁹ and in the Apocalypse.¹³⁰ But was Montanism really a lay protest against the institutionalization of spiritual authority? Scarcely so, for the new movement itself immediately institutionalized spiritual authority in the new prophets, the special agents of the Paraclete, whose word was law. Though we do hear of others exercising the charismatic gifts within the movement¹³¹ their influence was no doubt checked by the authority of Montanism's own official ministry, whose hierarchy by the time of Jerome at least consisted of patriarchs, koinonoi and bishops.¹³²

Ministry and Sacraments

The part played by women in the leadership of the Montanist movement attracted considerably criticism. Clearly Priscilla and Maximilla like Montanus were viewed as special agents of the Paraclete and in this capacity taught publicly.¹³³ They justified their position from such scriptural precedents as Deborah, Miriam and Philip's prophetess daughters,¹³⁴ and from 1 Cor. 11.5 which showed that Paul allowed women to prophesy in public. But Priscilla and Maximilla like Montanus were not content like other Christian prophets to be

of merely local significance, they wished to address the whole Church. This clearly constituted a novelty, and likewise the publication of books of their utterances.¹³⁵

This initial prominence of prophetesses (and later of Quintilla and perhaps others) shows no doubt why the Quintillianists were able to break with the universal practice of the Church and appoint women to the office of presbyter and bishop.¹³⁶ That it should happen in Asia Minor was facilitated by the prominence there of women in public life, an inheritance it seems from an originally matriarchal society.¹³⁷ De Soyres¹³⁸ then has little right to dismiss Epiphanius' evidence because of Tertullian's categorical statement:

It is not permissible for a woman to speak in the church nor teach nor baptize nor offer (the eucharist) nor undertake any other form of priestly ministrations.¹³⁹

and from the fact that the charismatic sister of De an. 9 had to wait till dimissa plebe before she could reveal her new discoveries. On this matter of female ministries Phrygian and African Montanism may well have adopted different standpoints. Of course, however, before magnifying the difference we must remember that Epiphanius is not speaking of the parent Cataphrygian body but only of the Quintillianists.

The distinctive hierarchy of patriarch, and koinonoi above the Montanist bishops would also seem to be applicable only to Asia Minor as, by the time Jerome wrote (late fourth century), African Montanism was scarcely significant. Probably just as the major sees of eastern Christianity gradually evolved into patriarchates, so the Montanist hierarchy had gradually assumed a fixed form. The existence of such a ministry even at a comparatively late date reveals that a fixed authority structure was not felt incompatible with the nature of Montanism. Probably in the early era the

movement merely set up its own three-fold ministry parallel to that of the orthodox Church, placing over all the supreme authority of the special agents of the Paraclete.

In observing Easter, as has been stated above,¹⁴⁰ it is unlikely that at first the Montanists made any changes. Probably the Phrygians were Quartodecimians while the Africans followed the Roman practice. It is unlikely that any innovations were made either in eucharistic or baptismal rites. There is no reason to connect Perpetua's being given cheese to eat in her vision of Paradise¹⁴¹ with the later practice of the Artotyrites who used bread and cheese for their eucharist.¹⁴² In Perpetua's vision the martyrs do not share the cheese but merely say "Amen". Perhaps this constituted a special initiation into the Paradisal community.

The stories of the maltreatment or murder of a child as part of a macabre Montanist mystery have been shown above¹⁴³ to be almost certainly no more than groundless slander.

Philaster's report¹⁴⁴ that the Montanists baptized for the dead is late and unconfirmed. De Soyres points out¹⁴⁵ that though Tertullian twice comments on Paul's references to the same practice (1 Cor. 15.29)¹⁴⁶ he does not commend it. How differently he treats the subjects of fasting and monogamy!

According to Hippolytus, the followers of Priscilla and Maximilla observed new feasts, which he distinguishes from xerophagies and raphanophagies,¹⁴⁷ but we do not know what they were. Now the later Quintillianist movement developed its distinctive services in which seven grief-stricken virgins clad in white entered to prophesy.¹⁴⁸ Some eschatological

significance would seem intended.¹⁴⁹ So indeed the Montanists felt quite free to innovate. But with regard to the sacraments we have little reason to believe they either innovated or reintroduced primitive practices but merely continued to observe what they had received.

In conclusion it is very clear that Montanism emerged within the Church of Asia Minor and continued to share many of its features. Its record for doctrinal orthodoxy is impressive. Its eschatological predictions failed, but so did those of the earliest era of the Church. Far from leading the Church in the direction of profligacy it sought rigorously to curb the flesh. It did not see itself as a return to primitive Christianity but rather as a further progression in the life of the Church. Yet certain features of the movement would appear incompatible with its claim to be inspired by the Spiritus veritatis. Its exegesis of the Fourth Gospel with regard to the Paraclete was tortuous. Its ecstatic prophecies were an unwelcome novelty within Christianity. In the name of the Comforter it introduced a harsh and loveless legalism and set up martyrdom as a work par excellence for winning direct entry to Paradise. These are features that should not be lightly brushed aside in seeking an adequate explanation of the second-century movement from Phrygia.

REFERENCES AND NOTESPt. 2 ch. 4A - A Development from Ebionism

1. Er ist nämlich, um das Resultat des Folgenden vorwegzunehmen, in dieselbe Reihe dogmatischer Bestrebungen einzufügen, welche sich in ihren mannigfaltigen Entwicklungsformen von ihrer Wurzel, dem Essäismus, an durch die Parthei der korinthischen Irrlehrer und die Ebioniten des Epiphanius hindurch bis zu den pseudoclementinischen Homileen als ihrem wahrscheinlichen Culminationspunkt verfolgen lässt (pp.90f).
2. Der Montanismus ist Ebionitismus - dieser Grundgedanke der nun anzustellenden vergleichenden Untersuchung ist sofort an seinen einzelnen Zügen nachzuweisen (p.94).
3. Verus Israel, ch.9. I have taken the liberty of rearranging his points, and introducing the terms "Pharisaic", "Gnostic" and "Essenic" applied to Ebionites, cf. J.M. Fuller's treatment "Ebionism and Ebionites", D.C.B. II.
4. Gal. 2.11ff, 3.1ff, 2 Cor. 10-13, Phil. 3.2ff.
5. Justin, Dial. 47.
6. Irenaeus, Adv. haer. 1.26.2, 3.21.1, 5.1.3.
7. Origen, De princ. 4.1.22 (Lat.) cf. in the earliest era the "poor" of Jerusalem, Gal. 2.10, etc.
8. Origen, De princ. 4.1.22 (Gk.), Cont. Cels. 2.1. Tertullian surely betrays his ignorance when he tells us that the Ebionites took their name from their founder Ebion (De praesc. haer. 33, De carn. Christ. 14).
9. Pan. 29, see Simon, Verus Israel, pp.286ff.
10. Pan. 30.2.7.
11. cf. H.L. Ellison, "Ebionites", N.I.D.C.C.
12. cf. J.M. Fuller, "Ebionism and Ebionites", D.C.B.L.
13. cf. Col. 2.8ff, 16ff, though R.M. Grant thinks the Colossians were less Gnostic than the Apostle himself at this stage (Gnosticism & Early Christianity, 2nd ed., p.160).
14. op. cit., pp.89ff.
15. op. cit., pp.99ff giving numerous references.
16. "Der Montanismus...von Dr. F.C.A. Schwegler", Deut. Jahr. Wiss. Kunst (1842), 51.
17. op. cit., pp.142ff, Hom. 17.14,16,18, cf. Hom. 3.13.
18. Alle Offenbarung religiöser Wahrheit Prophetie sey (op. cit., p102).
19. Hom. 2.7ff.
20. Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche, 2 Auf., p.484.
21. op. cit., pp.105ff.
22. De cor. mil. 4, De virg. vel. 1, Hom. 4.11, etc.
23. De virg. vel. 1, De mon. 2.
24. Hom. 11.35.
25. De mon. 14.
26. Hom. 2.38-52, etc.
27. "Études sur Tertullien", Nouv. Rev. Théol. 1 (1858), 79.
28. op. cit., p.112.

29. Epiph. Pan. 30.16.2, Hom. 15.7.
30. Hom. 7.3, 8.20.
31. De an. 41.
32. De jej. 16.
33. Jn. 18.36.
34. Jn. 14.30
35. op. cit., p.117.
36. Rom. 14.2,21.
37. Eus., H.E. 2.23.5.
38. Pan. 30.15.3.
39. Hom. 8.15.
40. De jej. 15.
41. op. cit., p.120.
42. ibid., p.121.
43. Pan. 30.16.1.
44. Hom. 14.1.
45. Pan. 49.2.
46. op. cit., pp.122ff.
47. De cultu feminarum, Adversus Hermogenem, cf. Barnes, Tertullian, pp.42ff.
48. Adv. Marc. 1.14.
49. De cult. fem. 2.3.
50. De pud. 10.
51. legem dei...in artem contemnit (Adv. Herm. 1.2) perhaps by painting idols - so Rigalt and Neander (see A.N.C.L. 15, p.56 ftnt. 2).
52. "It must be admitted, however, that Hermogenes, by describing for matter a condition like his own - irregular, confused, turbulent, of a doubtful and precipitate and fervid impulse - has displayed a specimen of his own art, and painted his own portrait," (ibid. 45.6).
53. De carn. Christ. 9.
54. esp. 52.14-53.3.
55. De carn. Christ. 4,5.
56. op. cit., p.124.
57. A. Grabar in fact goes a stage further. He suggests that the ultimate flowering of Christian iconography in the third century was also due to the influence of Judaism, whose new found interest in art is seen for instance in the murals of the synagogue at Dura-Europos (Christian Iconography: a Study of its Origins, pp.10f, 27.).
58. op. cit., pp.125f.
59. anima - licet carcere corporis pressa (17.5).
60. Josephus, Bell. Jud. 2.8.11 (2.155, Loeb).
61. op. cit., pp.126-33.
62. Alle drei Momente ebenso unvermittelt aneinandergeknüpft, weist auch der Ebionitismus in seinen verschiedenen Entwicklungsformen auf (p.127).
63. γὰρ οὐ παρ' αὐτοῦ σπεροψία, Josephus, Bell. Jud. 2.8.2 (2.120, Loeb).
64. Pan. 30.2.6.
65. whose views Paul may be setting right in 1 Cor. 7.1f.
66. see 2 Clem. 2.
67. cf. R.A. Lipsius, "Gospels: Apocryphal", D.C.B. II, pp.712f.
68. Eus., H.E. 5.18.3.
69. Tert., Adv. Val. 5 (Proculus noster virginis senectae).
70. Tert., Adv. Marc. 1.29.
71. cf. 1 Cor. 7.7, 9.5.
72. De monogamia.
73. cf. Ad. ux. 1.5-7, De exhort. cast. 1.

Pt. 2 ch. 4A

74. Hom. 3.68, Ep. of Clem. to Jas. 7, cf. Epiph., Pan. 3.18.2.
75. Hom. 13.19.
76. Hom. 3.8,28, De pud. 5.
77. Ep. of Clem. to Jas. 4,7.
78. De an. 11, De jej. 3, De mon. 11, De pud. 1.
79. Hom. 3.72, though the Greek could mean that the Church is the bride of Christ: τὸ ὡς δεῖ ὀργάνον δεῖ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου ὡς καλὴν νύμφην διαφύλαξαι.
80. Hom. 3.27. Schwegler speaks here of prophets, but in the light of 3.28.1 he is surely mistaken.
81. De an. 41.
82. De mon. 1, Hom. 13.15.
83. De mon. 5.
84. Hom. 16.12.
85. op. cit., p.133.
86. Ad ux. 1.7 cf. De exhort. cast. 1.
87. op. cit., p.133.
88. Eus., H.E. 5.18.2.
89. De mon. 14.
90. op. cit., p.134.
91. It is true that Tertullian never alludes to the locus classicus for salvation by grace, Eph. 2.5,8. In his pre-Montanist days he can say, "A good deed has God as its debtor" (De paen. 2), and in his Montanist writings an incipient doctrine of purgatory emerges, (De res. mort. 43, De an. 55,58). Nevertheless even in his Montanist days Tertullian can lay great stress on the fact that Christians have been ransomed by the blood of Christ (De fuga 12), and when expounding Galatians and Romans (Adv. Marc. 5.2-4, 13-14) he makes no attempt to circumnavigate the doctrine of justification by faith. No doubt he applies these cardinal doctrines of the Reformation solely to the initial state of grace attained by the Christian through public confession of faith and baptism, and it is for the post-baptismal sins that the Christian must subsequently pray. But Paul too seems to feel men accountable for post-baptismal sin (2 Cor. 5.10, cf. 1 Cor. 9.26f).
92. Hom. 8.5-7.
93. Hom. 2.38-52, etc.
94. Hom. 8.10, Adv. Jud. 2.
95. op. cit., pp.136ff referring to Adv. Marc. 3.24.
96. Hom. 15.7, etc.
97. Hom. 11.11, 19.20, cf. Josephus, Bell. Jud. 2.154-58 (Loeb).
98. Hom. 17.16.
99. op. cit., p.139.
100. De res. mort. 63.
101. op. cit., pp.140f.
102. Josephus, Bell. Jud. 2.8.7 (2.142, Loeb) - among the solemn oaths taken by the new Essene is one promising to preserve the books of the sect and the names of the angels.
103. Hom. 3.36 mentions in juxtaposition the gifts of perception of God and knowledge of the names of angels.
104. De an. 9.
105. see De Lab., Sources no.215.
106. Canons 1,2,8,11.
107. cf. De Lab., Sources, p.CXXXV.

Pt. 2 ch. 4A - B

108. op. cit., pp. 83-88.
109. ibid., pp.141-51.
110. Deut. Jahr. Wiss. Kunst 1842, 45-58, 129-51, 913-27.
111. Nouv. Rev. Théol. 1 (1858), 77-79; Paul encouraged virginity (1 Cor. 7), Ignatius of Antioch was fanatical in his desire for martyrdom, and the author of the apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla, an admirer of Paul (Tert., De bapt. 17), represented the Apostle as encouraging virginity, abstinence, and martyrdom and allowing women to baptize and teach.
112. "Des Wesen des Montanismus nach den nevesten Forschungen", Th. Jahr. 10 (1851), 548.

B - A Reaction against Gnosticism

1. General History, Eng. tr., 2nd ed., II (1851), pp.202f.
2. Early Church History II (1909), p.73.
3. ibid., p.77.
4. The Gnostic Problem, p.vii.
5. See W.C. Van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, ch.3, for a convenient summary.
6. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.25.6.
7. Hippol., Phil. 5.8.29.
8. Gnosticism and Early Christianity, 2nd ed., p.10.
9. First Century Gnosticism, p.49.
10. Adv. haer. 1.18.1.
11. ibid. 1.21.5.
12. There are certain differences in their presentation of the Valentinian system (Adv. haer. 1.11.1, Phil. 6.29.2-36.4) but their accounts of the teaching of Basilides are totally different (Adv. haer. 1.24.3-7, Phil. 7.20.1-27.13).
13. Tert., Adv. Val. 2.
14. Epiph., Pan. 48.4, App.1, no.4.
15. Adv. Val. 4.
16. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.13.3-4.
17. 1 Jn. 4.1ff.
18. Tert., De virg. vel. 1, De mon. 2, see above p.27.
19. De mon. 3.
20. Of course Tertullian does on occasion contravene the Gospel for the teaching of the Paraclete (see De pud. 11, De mon. 14, etc.), but usually he maintains his standpoint as orthodox defender of the Christian faith.
21. cf. the massive argumentation of Adversus Marcionem.
22. See R.P.C. Hanson, "Notes on Tertullian's Interpretation of Scripture", J.T.S., N.S. 12 (1961), 273-77.
23. Compare the Valentinian Gospel of Truth with the canonical gospels. For Gnostic exegesis of Scripture see for example the fragments of Heracleon's commentary on the Fourth Gospel collected by W. Foerster, Gnosis, Eng. tr., ch.9.
24. Adv. haer. 1.8.1.
25. See for example the Ptolemaic pleroma, Iren., Adv. haer. 1.1.1-2.

Pt. 2 ch. 4B

26. Thus for instance Basilides and his son Isidore claimed to have received their teaching from Matthias (Hippol., Phil. 7.20.1).
27. cf. Is. 45.5, uttered in the Orphite myth by Ialdabaoth (Iren., Adv. haer. 1.30.6). This parody of Yahweh came no doubt either from Jews disillusioned by the dashing of nationalistic hopes in the second century A.D. (Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp.33f), or from Gentiles scandalized by Jewish exclusiveness.
28. This was the case with the Orphites (Iren., Adv. haer. 1.30.11). Saturninus however attributed some of the Old Testament prophecies to Satan, adversary of the God of the Jews (ibid. 1.24.2), while Ptolemy elaborately divided up the Old Testament laws between the Demiurge (maker of this world), Moses and the Elders (Ep. to Flora. ap. Epiph., Pan. 33.3-7).
29. Saturninus (Iren., Adv. haer. 1.24.2), Basilides (ibid. 1.24.4).
30. Cerinthus (ibid. 1.26.1), Ptolemy (ibid. 1.7.2), Orphites (ibid. 1.30.12-13).
31. e.g. Carpocrates (ibid. 1.25.4).
32. Eus., H.E. 3.28.1-4.
33. Phil. 6.30.9, 34.4.
34. ibid. 6.32.9.
35. Tert., De res. mort., clearly stating the Paraclete's affirmation of this (63).
36. Tert., Adv. Marc. 3.24.
37. Ep. 188 (Amphilochio) de Canonibus, 1. c.A.D. 375.
38. ap. Cyp. Ep. 75.7, (A.D. 256).
39. Adv. haer. 1.21.1-5.
40. ibid. 1.21.3 (Foerster).
41. Gal. 5.17, Rom. 8.5ff, etc.
42. cf. Tert., De jej. 1, De mon. 1.
43. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.24.2.
44. ibid. 1.23.4.
45. ibid. 1.24.5.
46. ibid. 1.25.3-4.
47. ibid. 1.6.2-3 (Ptolemaic Valentinians), 1.13.5 (Mark the Sorcerer).
48. Of course Irenaeus, our chief source of information, was bitterly opposed to the Gnostics, and intent to discredit them, but no doubt there is some substance in what he reports, for he can speak of the repercussions of Gnostic behaviour upon the Church. Of the Carpocratians he writes: "Seeing what they do, man blaspheme all of us, though we participate with them in nothing - doctrine, practice, daily life. But they lead a luxurious life and have an irreligious outlook; they misuse our name as a cloak for their wickedness." (Adv. haer. 1.25.3, Grant).
49. Tert., De fuga 9, App. 1, no.9.
50. See De fuga in persecutione.
51. Eus., H.E. 5.16.22.
52. Adv. Val. 30.
53. Clem. Alex., Strom. 4.71.1-73.1.
54. According to Tertullian it was at times of persecution of the Church that Gnostics were particularly dangerous, for it was then that they went round seeking to dissuade orthodox Christians from martyrdom (Scorp. 1). Irenaeus

- declares that only a handful of heretics have ever dared brave death for the Name in all the time that has elapsed since the Incarnation (Adv. haer. 4.33.9).
55. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.6.1-2, Tert., De mon. 1.
 56. 1 Cor. 2.14f, qu. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.8.3, cf. Tert., De jej. 3.
 57. Tert., De mon. 1, etc.
 58. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.5.6.
 59. ibid. 1.6.2.
 60. ibid. 1.20.1 (Valentinians), Hippol., Phil. 8.19 (Montanists), etc.
 61. Eus., H.E. 5.18.5.
 62. Tert., Adv. Val. 5.
 63. De idol. 10.
 64. De Lab., Crise, pp.3ff.
 65. cf. Ramsay, Expos. 8 (1888), 245, see above p.53.
 66. We shall assume that these were written by Paul (so J.N.D. Kelly, Comm. on the Past. Eps. (1963), pp.30ff) but even if they were subapostolic writings their information is of interest.
 67. We shall accept Irenaeus' claim that the Apostle John published the Fourth Gospel in Ephesus (Adv. haer. 3.1.1), though aware of the difficulties (see C.K. Barrett, The Gosp. acc. to St. John (1958), pp.83ff).
 68. Gal. 3.19.
 69. 4.3,9. Though stoicheia could mean "elements of teaching" its astrological significance is more suitable here after the reference to beings who are not gods (4.8) and followed immediately by a reference to calendrical observances (4.10).
 70. Col. 2.8.
 71. 2.20-23.
 72. 1.15f, 19, 2.2ff, 9f.
 73. Jos., Ant. 12.3.4.
 74. 1 Tim. 1.4, cf. 4.7, 2 Tim. 4.4.
 75. cf. "Jewish myths" in Tit. 1.14.
 76. 1 Tim. 1.6f.
 77. 1 Tim. 6.20.
 78. Rev. 2.2.
 79. If 1 John was published at Ephesus (see Dodd, The Joh. Eps. (1946), pp. 1xviff) presumably those mentioned in 1 Jn. 1.18f, are the same as those referred to in Rev. 2.2. The christological errors are then shown in 1 Jn. 1.22, 4.1ff, 4.14f. 5.5, 5.6ff.
 80. Adv. haer. 3.3.4.
 81. ibid. 1.26.1.
 82. Rev. 2.20-24.
 83. Nts. 157-60 above.
 84. Jn. 1.14.
 85. "Gnosticism in the proper sense developed alongside Christianity in the course of the first century, and... this was a time of considerable ferment, during which nothing was in any sense final or clear-cut. The fact that so often it is difficult to decide whether some feature is Gnostic or Jewish, and the marked Jewish element in later Gnostic thinking, may suggest that there was a Jewish Gnosticism before there was a Christian." (Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, p.59).
 86. See above pt. 1, ch.2, nt.12.

Pt. 2 ch. 4B - C

87. Hippol., Phil. 5.6.3-11.1.
88. Iren., Adv. haer. 1.13.5.
89. Wilson, Gnostic Problem p.177, mentions the view that the Orphites also belonged to Asia Minor.
90. Adv. Val. 5. Though Tertullian also acknowledges his debt to Justin, Miltiades and Irenaeus it is only for Proculus that he uses the possessive adjective.
91. Th. Jahr. 10 (1851), 550f.

C - An Authentic Renewal Movement.

1. p.107.
2. published in his Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe (1960).
3. op. cit., p.65.
4. Eus., H.E. 5.17.4.
5. ibid., 5.16.2.
6. De exhort. cast. 10.
7. Eus., H.E. 5.17.3-4.
8. ibid. 3.31.4.
9. Tert., De pud. 21, etc., and frequent references also to "nova prophetia", see De Lab., Crise, p.323. "New Prophecy" was obviously a term used by the Asian Montanists too, see Eus., H.E. 5.16.4, 19.2).
Ritschl (Entstehung, 2.Auf., pp.521-23) thinks that the whole idea of a "new revelation" was merely a fabrication of the Montanists to give supernatural authority to their attempt to force their programme of rigorous asceticism upon the Church. He thinks their eschatology of secondary importance. But the genuinely prophetic element of the movement is vindicated by Bonwetsch (Geschichte, p.134), who points out that "prophecy" in the Old Testament was bound up with the idea of foretelling and it would only have been by virtue of its foretelling the future that the New Prophecy would have been called prophecy at all.
10. Pass. Perp. 1, Tert., De res. mort. 63.
11. Δεῖ ἡμᾶς τὴν χάρεισμάτα δέχεσθαι, they cried (Epiph., Pan. 48.1), and hence their mission which quickly spread as far as Rome and North Africa.
12. So Tert., De an. 2: nos...certos nihil recipiendum quod non conspiraret germanae et ipso iam aevo pronatae propheticae paraturae.
13. Pan. 48.11, App. 1, nos. 1,2.
14. De trin. 3.41.1, App. 1, no. 3. For a discussion of the authenticity of this utterance see above pt. 1, ch. 2, nt.13 of this thesis.
15. see De Labriolle's table, Crise, p.323.
16. De res. mort. 11.
17. e.g. De fuga 9.
18. Adv. Prax. 2.
19. Haer. 7.
20. see De Lab., Sources, pp.103.9, 104.3.
21. see above pt. 1, ch. 2, nts.9,12 of this thesis.
22. see De Lab., Crise, pp.3ff.
23. De mon. 2, etc.
24. De virg. vel. 1.

Pt. 2 ch. 4C.

25. cf. Jer., Ep. 41.1.
26. Eus., H.E. 5.16.7.
27. "spurious ecstasy" - Pat. Gk. Lex., ed. Lampe.
28. λαλεῖν ἐκφρένως καὶ ἀκρίως καὶ ἀλλοτριότροπως ὁμοίως τῷ προειρημένῳ (5.16.9).
29. Speaking of the ἐκστάσις which God induced upon Adam (Gen. 2.21, LXX) after which Adam "prophesied" about Christ and the Church (Gen. 2.23f, cf. Eph. 5.31f), Tertullian says: cecidit enim ecstasis super illum, sancti spiritus vis operatrix prophetiae (De an. 11.4); and again: in illum deus amentiam immisit, spiritalem vim, qua constat prophetia (De an. 21.2).
30. Adv. Marc. 4.22.5.
31. cf. H. Kraft, "Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus", Th. Z. 11 (1955), 270f.
32. Geschichte, p.63.
33. K.E., p.137.
34. Montanismus, p.153.
35. Montanism, pp.66f.
36. cf. Lk. 2.47, etc.
37. Acts. 10.10.
38. ibid. 22.17.
39. 2 Cor. 12.2.
40. De an. 45.
41. cf. E.R. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety, p.71, H. Bacht, "Die prophetische Inspiration in der kirchlichen Reflexion der vormontanistischen Zeit", Schol. 19 (1944), 10.
42. Though not invariably so, see Oesterreich, Possession, p.32.
43. Dial. 115: "I have shown that if there was a priest named Joshua in your nation, yet the prophet had not seen him in his revelation, just as he had not seen either the devil or the angel of the Lord by eyesight, and in his waking condition (ἐν καταστάσει ὄν), but in a trance (ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκστάσει) at the time when the revelation was made to him."
44. (Utrumne simplici errore) an ratione, qua defendimus in causa novae prophetiae gratiae exstasin, id est amentiam, convenire? (5) In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam dei conspicit vel cum per ipsum deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina. De quo cum inter nos et psychicos quaestio est.
45. Epiph, Pan. 48.11., App. 1, nos. 1,2.
46. ibid. 48.4, App. 1, no.4; Didymus explicitly declares of the Phrygians, disciples of the mad women:
 φασὶ τοὺς προφήτας, κατεχομένους ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος, μὴ παρακολουθεῖν ἑαυτοῖς παραφερομένοις κατὰ τὸν τῆς προφητείας καιρὸν.
 (Comm. on Acts. 10.10, De Lab., Sources, no.108.)
47. ibid. 48.8.
48. Quis rerum div. heres. 52-53.
49. (οἱ προφήται) κατ' ἐκστάσιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν, κινήσαντες αὐτοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος, ἃ ἐνηργεῖντο, ἐξέφώγησαν συνχρησάμενοι τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡς εἰ κκι αὐλήτης αὐλὸν ἐμπνεῦσαι.
 (Legat. 9, cf.7).

Pt. 2 ch. 4C.

50. Geschichte, pp.64f.
51. Crise, pp.173f.
52. Bacht, Schol. 19 (1944), 18.
53. Crise, pp.170f. Tertullian himself seems to include tongues among the ecstatic phenomena (Adv. Marc. 5.8.12).
54. 1 Cor. 14.27f.
55. "I am the Lord God Almighty..." etc.
56. "For one who speaks in a tongue speaks not to men but to God; for no one understands him, but he utters mysteries in the Spirit" (1 Cor. 14.2).
57. Pan. 48.3-8.
58. The saying of Quintilla (or Priscilla) in Epiph., Pan. 49.1 is in fact merely the report of a vision.
59. De an. 9.
60. Pan. 48.1.
61. ap. Cyp., Ep. 75.19.
62. Phil. 8.19.
63. Haer. 7.
64. Tert., Adv. Prax. 1.
65. De mon. 2, cf. De virg. vel. 1.
66. Adv. Prax. 8.
67. ibid. 30 (Evans).
68. Entstehung, 2. Auf., pp.487ff, cf. Lawler, Eusebiana, pp. 110ff.
69. "Der Montanismus und die kleinasiatische Theologie", Z.N.W. 46 (1955), 113; K.E., pp.139, 141f.
70. Papias (Eus., H.E. 3.39.12), Justin (Dial. 80), Irenaeus (Adv. haer. 5.35-36).
71. De or. 5.
72. Ad. ux. 1.5.
73. Apol. 30,32.
74. Vis. 13.5, etc.
75. Dan. 4.
76. Pass. Perp. 1, Tert., De res. mort. 63.
77. Adv. Marc. 3.24, perhaps the location Pepuza came later, see above p29.
78. Epiph., Pan. 48.2, App. 1, no.12.
79. Entstehung, 2. Auf., pp.521ff.
80. Th. Jahr. 10 (1851), 553ff.
81. Th. Z. 11 (1955), 258.
82. cf. Mt. 24.42, 25.13, 26.41.
83. Tert., De res. mort. 63.
84. see above refs. 69,70.
85. Entstehung, 2. Auf., pp.497ff.
86. Ad. ux. 1.
87. Montanism, p.86.
88. Ad. Aut. 3.15.
89. Legat. 33.
90. Though in De jejuniis Tertullian seeks to show them legitimate innovations.
91. De mon. 4.
92. 1 Cor. 7.39, De mon. 11-14.
93. Ritschl, op. cit., p.493.
94. 1 Jn. 3.9.
95. ibid., 3.8,10.
96. Jas. 5.15f, 1 Jn. 1.8ff.
97. 1 Jn. 5.16f.
98. Mand. 4.1-3.

Pt. 2 ch. 4C.

99. Tert., De paen. 9, etc. For a general survey see H.B. Swete, "Penitential Discipline in the First Three Centuries", J.T.S. 4 (1903), 328-33.
100. see above pt. 1, ch. 1, nt.36 of this thesis.
101. Tert., De pud. 21, App. 1 no.7. This according to Ritschl (op. cit. pp.518f) was the root cause of the conflict between the Montanists and the bishops, a view rightly contested by Bonwetsch, see above nt.9.
102. Jn. 8.1-11 (EVV).
103. cf. De pud. 11, dealing with two other cases from the gospels.
104. 1 Jn. 5.16f.
105. 1 Cor. 5.5 (though exactly what is meant here is not clear).
106. Montanism, p.93.
107. Mk. 13.9ff, etc.
108. Tert., De fuga 9, App. 1 no.9, cf. no.8.
109. Tert., Ad Scap. 5.
110. De an. 55.
111. ibid. 58, cf. De res. mort. 43.
112. "That I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible I may attain the resurrection of the dead." (Phil. 3.10f).
113. Mart. Poly. 4 (Stevenson, New Eusebius, p.19).
114. Epiph., Pan. 48.1.
115. Eus., H.E. 5.16.17.
116. ibid. 5.16.9.
117. ibid. 5.18.5.
118. Strom. 4.13.93.1. (c.210).
119. see above pt. 1, ch.2, nt.79 of this thesis.
120. De pud. 9, saying, however, that mortal sin would deprive them of the Holy Spirit.
121. cf. De mon. 15.
122. De pud. 1, etc.
123. ibid. 21.3-5.
124. Nam et ipsa ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus, in quo est trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Illam ecclesiam congregat quam Dominus in tribus posuit. (17) Atque ita exinde etiam numerus omnis qui in hanc fidem conspiraverint ecclesia ab auctore et consecratore censetur. Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus episcoporum. Domini enim, non famuli est ius et arbitrium; Dei ipsius, non sacerdotis. (ibid. 21.16-17).
125. ibid., 21.7.
126. De pud. 12, substantiated in the subsequent argument.
127. see also De exhort. cast. 7 for a fuller statement of the doctrine.
128. Rom. 8.9,14.
129. 1 Pet. 2.5.
130. Rev. 1.6.
131. cf. Tert., Adv. Marc. 5.8.12 (visions, tongues, prophecy known to Tertullian), De an. 9 (the charismatic sister), Epiph., Pan. 49.2 (seven prophesying virgins).
132. Jer., Ep. 41.3.
133. Hippol., Phil., 8.19, etc.

Pt. 2. ch.4C.

134. Origen, Cat. ad Cor. 14.36; Didymus, De trin. 3.41.3; Dialogue in De Lab., Sources p.105.11-22.
135. Didymus, De trin. 3.41.3, Dial. in De Lab., Sources, p. 106.2-107.32.
136. Epiph., Pan. 49.2, cf. 79.1 (Corrylidians).
137. see above p.75 of this thesis.
138. Montanism, p.97.
139. De virg. vel. 9.
140. p.36, cf. pp.141f.
141. Pass. Perp. 4.
142. Pan. 49.2.
143. pp.75f.
144. Haer. 49.
145. Montanism, p.98.
146. Adv. Marc. 5.10, De res. mort. 48.
147. Phil. 8.19.
148. Epiph., Pan. 49.2.
149. so Kraft, Th. Z. 11 (1955), 257f, Powell, V.C. 29 (1975), 46, etc.

PART 3

CONCLUSION

THE CHARISMATIC PARASITE

Of the interpretations of Montanism examined above none has proved adequate. None has fully accounted for all the evidence. Allusions to the geography and climate of Phrygia to explain the ecstatic phenomena are little more than guess-work. No sociological theory could adequately account for the theological content of the New Prophecy. Most of the arguments put forward connecting the Montanists with the cult of Cybele are fallacious, and no systematic case has yet been presented for a similar connection with the cult of Apollo in Asia Minor, though this might explain a number of pieces of evidence. The cases for a link between Montanism and heterodox Judaism or Ebionism do not bear close scrutiny, Jewish elements in the Phrygian movement being adequately explained as part of the general Jewish heritage of the Church. Though in many ways Montanism was the antithesis of Gnosticism we have no reason to believe that it arose as a polemic against the earlier movement. Explanations of Montanism purely in terms of orthodox Christianity are inevitably obliged to dismiss contrary evidence as fictitious and to attribute to the Holy Spirit a number of false emphases.

It is of course undeniable that Montanism arose within the Church of Asia Minor, that it retained much of its basic Christian outlook, and that it claimed to be authentically Christian. It seems that Epiphanius' "Alogi" rejected the

Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse partially at least because they had been adopted by the Montanists.¹ Clearly the concept of the Paraclete came from the Fourth Gospel and was defended in Montanist apologetic from that source.²

Further, though only a handful of the numerous utterances of the "Paraclete" are extant, one evidently echoes Johannine terminology when referring to Christ as "the Word".³

From the Apocalypse there comes the epithet $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\rho$ for God the Father,⁴ and the teaching of the descent of heavenly Jerusalem and a millennium for the saints on earth.

The New Prophecy recalled eschatological expectation to the intensity of the Apostolic Age and, perhaps equally misguidedly, strongly affirmed belief in the resurrection of the body. To sacramental teaching and practice it does not appear to have brought any innovation. Under its influences Tertullian propounded the doctrine of a Spirit-led Church similar to that of S. Paul, and a Trinitarian doctrine nearer to that of the ultimate settlement of Constantinople (381) and Chalcedon (451) than any of the formulations of his contemporaries. Even much of the Montanist asceticism found echoes within the Catholic Church.

Yet certain features of Montanism cannot be satisfactorily explained in terms of orthodox Christianity. Ecstatic prophecy was clearly a novelty to the Christian tradition and resembled the possession-trances of Apolline and other pagan prophets. Xerophagies were also new and had immediately recognisable affinities with pagan practices. While Tertullian called the latter "Satan's counterfeit" of divine ordinances⁵ in fact it was the Montanist practice which appeared after its pagan counterpart. It is possible also

that the new prophets dressed distinctively following the pattern of pagan cultic officials. Most surprising of all, however, was the extraordinary claim that in Montanus and his prophetesses Christ's promises to send the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, were being fulfilled. At a stroke Pentecost was eclipsed and in the name of nova prophetia there appeared novissima lex.

What then was the source of the error? The Anonymous declares that Montanus, when merely a new convert, passionately desired a position of prominence. Why? Because, say two fourth-century sources, he had previously held a position of status within a pagan cult. Now while Jerome's statement that in effect Montanus had been a priest of Cybele is suspect, since Jerome is prone to polemical exaggeration and he allows no Montanist a chance to affirm or deny the charge, the Orthodox disputant's claim that Montanus had been a priest of Apollo is made in the course of a debate with a Montanist and is therefore more credible. No doubt the cult envisaged was a Hellenized form of the native cult, such as that of Leto and Lairmenos discovered by Ramsay in south-west Phrygia.⁵ The comparative lateness of the Dialogue as a source of information deprives us of certainty, but even our earliest sources give us relatively little information about Montanus, and it is conceivable that if the Christian mission in mid-second century Phrygia was flourishing, the conversion of a cultic official would not be particularly noteworthy.

Whether or not Montanus had been a pagan priest before his conversion he had no doubt been familiar with the pagan religious scene in Asia Minor and brought with him into the

Church his old understanding of prophecy, a predilection for sexual and dietary restrictions,⁶ and some knowledge of administration, which he later applied to the organization of his followers.

But if Montanus was not a genuine Christian prophet, what was the nature of his "inspiration"? Orthodox opponents were divided. Some thought his pronouncements were his own fabrication.⁷ This is also De Labriolle's view.⁸ If so, Montanus' obsession with those mysterious, apparently unfulfilled promises of the Fourth Gospel must have taken him into actual trances when he imagined he had become the passive instrument of the Paraclete.⁹ The more common view, however, appears to have been that in trance Montanus was possessed by an evil spirit.¹⁰ Such an explanation was clearly unacceptable in the age of Bultmannian demythologization, but in the post-Bultmannian era when exorcism has again become a topic of controversy and a subject for serious investigation,¹¹ it may once again find ready acceptance. Obsession might be subjectively persuasive but it is doubtful whether it would convince many observers. Yet Montanism had a considerable following in Phrygia. Then there is the difficulty of transference. How convincingly would obsession have been transferred from one individual to another giving the impression that both were under the control of the same spirit? If this was possible why did only two prophetesses assume the mantle of Montanus? For only Priscilla and Maximilla besides Montanus appear to have been the special agents of the Paraclete.

Even if one's world-view permits the existence of evil psychic entities, it may be contended that, apart from the

evidence of Apollonius, there is little to suggest that the "Paraclete" was evil. Indeed no less a person than John Wesley considered Montanus "one of the holiest men in the second century",¹² and De Soyres, pointing out that the Montanists had passed the tests of doctrinal orthodoxy and moral rectitude, concludes his study of Montanism with the words:

And where the Spirit shews itself in these fruits (love, joy, peace, etc. - Gal. 5.22f), though Popes and Councils may anathematize, the Great Judge will one day reverse their judgement.¹³

But did the Montanists display this fruit? The Anonymous' (admittedly hostile) account of Montanus' ecstasy¹⁴ scarcely suggests that peace was one of its characteristics, and love does not feature prominently in either Tertullian's Montanist writings or indeed in Montanist legislation as a whole.

On the other hand the Apostle Paul declares Satan can pose as an "angel of light",¹⁵ and Hermas warns us that the devil can allow the false prophet to speak some truth to see if he can break the righteous.¹⁶ In the last two centuries the history of the Spiritualist Movement has shown this to be correct. J. Richards tells us that spirits alleged to communicate (as séances) may claim the exalted status of a Plato or a Paul, but their messages are usually trivial and specifically non-Christian.¹⁷ There have been some, however, for example Pheneas, for some years chief mentor of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, who have posed as devoutly Christian. Pheneas, like the Montanist new prophets, promised the imminent dawning of a new age which has never eventuated, and he slated the Church.¹⁸

More interesting still is the appearance in this century of certain syncretistic religious movements which,

arising in economically deprived or educationally backward areas such as Bantu reservations in South Africa or slums in the West Indies, amalgamate perhaps a charismatic form of Christianity with certain animistic beliefs and practices. Claiming to be Christian, their services may involve besides singing, praying, preaching, speaking-in-tongues, etc., animal sacrifices and group ecstatic trance in which the participants may claim to speak as Christian saints, but afterwards are totally unconscious of what they have said or done. Such movements are characterised by food taboos, etc..¹⁹

Montanism, arising in the educationally backward²⁰ countryside of Phrygia, appears to have been the second-century counterpart of these movements, though distinctive in its extravagant claim to fulfil Christ's promises of the Paraclete. How then could such an astute thinker and devout Christian as Tertullian become convinced that the "New Prophecy" was in fact authentic? Three features of the movement strongly attracted him: (i) its apparently charismatic nature, (ii) its doctrinal orthodoxy, and (iii) its ascetic emphasis, as each found an echo in his own Christian standpoint.

(i) Charismatic Christianity

The role of the Holy Spirit in the life of the individual believer and in the Church had always been central to the theology of Tertullian. In the complex rite that constituted baptism in the North African Church c.200, it was the laying on of the bishop's (or his authorised delegate's) hand that called down the Holy Spirit upon the neophyte.²¹ It was then that the peace of God entered his

heart. Thereafter it was the Spirit who must steer him through the perilous reefs of idolatry which beset him on all sides.²² This spirit, whose gentleness was incompatible with impatience within²³ and the violence of the arena without,²⁴ was at the same time the strength which upheld those preparing for martyrdom.²⁵ The whole Church was bound together by virtue of its members' having in common this Spirit, which they had received from their common Lord and Father.²⁶ To these members charismata, gifts of the Spirit, were available and should be requested in prayer by the newly baptized neophyte.²⁷ That by charismata Tertullian meant those phenomena discussed by S. Paul in 1 Cor. 12-14, paramount amongst which was prophecy, is evident from the extended treatment of the Pauline passage in Adv. Marc. 5.8.4-12 written sometime later.

Now that the charismata persisted in the Church right up to early in the second half of the third century has been shown by R.A.N. Kydd in his Ph.D. thesis for the University of St. Andrews.²⁸ Justin in his Dialogue with Trypho claims that it is still possible in his time to see among the Christians women and men who possess the charismata,²⁹ though strictly speaking this evidence is only valid for the time of his actual debate (c.135) not his time of writing (c.160). For the second half of the second century we have the evidence of Irenaeus in Gaul who speaks of prophecy, tongues, healing, exorcism, raising the dead, visions, etc. in the Church of his time.³⁹ In Asia Minor Polycarp³¹ and Melito³² were known as prophets. The fact that they were both also bishops is perhaps an indication that the local ministry of the Church was then assuming the role of the earlier

charismatics as well as maintaining its own administrative and teaching functions. In Syria and Palestine itinerant prophets, however, apparently persisted.³³ Nevertheless, overall it seems, in comparison with the Apostolic Age, the charismata were considerably less in evidence, for the appearance of the Montanist prophets in Phrygia was sufficiently fresh and surprising to be hailed as a new fulfilment of the Joel prophecy.³⁴ Tertullian, with his stress on the importance of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church, and his acquaintance with the charismata in North Africa could not fail to be attracted.

(ii) Doctrinal Orthodoxy

In his general work against the heresies, De praescriptione haereticorum (203), Tertullian, following Irenaeus, sets forth the regula fidei,³⁵ a summary of the Christian faith. Adherence to this regula was a proof of orthodoxy, failure to uphold it a proof of heresy. Now one of the features of the New Prophecy was its maintenance of this rule, for -

the adversary spirit would be apparent from the diversity of his preaching, beginning by adulterating the rule of faith and so (going on to) adulterating the order of discipline.³⁶

while the "Paraclete" began by bearing emphatic witness to Christ and to God the Father in orthodox fashion.

That a monarchian schism existed among the Roman Montanists Tertullian either did not know or would not admit. While Didymus could later quote a Montanist saying he considered clearly Sabellian,³⁷ Tertullian quoted one which to his satisfaction revealed the correct Trinitarian view.³⁸

While Didymus and Jerome sought rather unfairly to discredit Montanus by fastening on him one of the unacceptable doctrinal labels of their own day, Tertullian refused to admit that acknowledgement of the Phrygian Paraclete necessitated a deviation from the Apostolic understanding of the Holy Spirit.

(iii) Asceticism

Tertullian's puritanical outlook from his earliest days as a Christian is evident from the most cursory reading of his works. He deplores Christians attending shows.³⁹ He believes the taint of idolatry renders a large variety of occupations impossible for the Christian.⁴⁰ Christian women should hide their beauty not flaunt it, and certainly not waste time on elaborate hairstyles and clothing.⁴¹ Of course they should be veiled.⁴² Marriage is second best to the single life, though the Christian should not dissolve a marriage relationship,⁴³ but there is certainly no point in begetting children in this evil world when its End is near.⁴⁴ Ad uxorem I clearly shows Tertullian's predilection for monogamy in his pre-Montanist days. He praises martyrdom and only with reluctance contemplates the possibility of flight.⁴⁵ He deplores post-baptismal sin, yet like Hermas he is willing to allow a second chance.⁴⁶ Tertullian's whole emphasis is one of deprecating the flesh and shunning the world. It is therefore small wonder that when he saw in the teaching of the New Prophecy so much that corresponded to his own rigoristic outlook he should see this as authentication of its divine provenance, and hurl at its orthodox opponents:

'It is the spirit of the devil,' you say, O Psychic. And how is it that he enjoins duties which belong to our God, and enjoins them to be offered to none other

than our God? Either contend that the devil works with our God, or else let the Paraclete be held to be Satan.⁴⁷

Accordingly Tertullian allows the Paraclete to close some loop-holes in his own thinking. Monogamy becomes a law and remarriage tantamount to adultery.⁴⁸ Flight from persecution is illegitimate under any circumstances.⁴⁹ Mortal sins can no longer be pardoned by God's representatives on earth.⁵⁰ A greater emphasis on fasting serves to mortify the flesh further.⁵¹ Yet Tertullian is not aware of anything illegitimate in these developments. "Grant that from the time of John the Paraclete had grown mute," he says, "we should have arisen as prophets to ourselves" to enforce asceticism.⁵² He is speaking specifically of dietary abstinence, but he might well have said the same with reference to Montanist legislation in general.

Now the difference between Phrygian and African Montanism has been exaggerated,⁵³ but there were indeed some differences. If the Phrygians like the Church in Asia Minor generally were Quartodecimian Tertullian was not.⁵⁴ When the Quintillianists made Pepuza the site for New Jerusalem⁵⁵ and appointed women among their bishops and presbyters⁵⁶ Tertullian could not have been sympathetic. Finally, despite his spirited defence of the Montanist standpoint in the lost work De ecstasi, Tertullian had not witnessed the actual prophetic ecstasies of Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla, and if he had he might have been more cautious in giving his allegiance to the Phrygian cause.

His position could not be better summarized than in the words of H.B. Swete:

For Tertullian, and probably for many of its adherents both in East and West, Montanism stood for a recognition of the active presence of the Paraclete in the Body of Christ, and for a more spiritual and a more ascetic type of Church life than the official churches seemed to offer.⁵⁷

It seems probable that when the Montanist promises of the End failed to materialise Tertullian and his supporters dis-affiliated themselves from the Phrygian cause.⁵⁸ Though his school gradually dwindled away, the remnant being received back into the Catholic fold in the time of Augustine,⁵⁹ Tertullian's influence on the thought and life particularly of the Western Church persisted through the preservation of his writings.⁶⁰

REFERENCES AND NOTESPt. 3

1. see De Lab., Crise, pp.190ff.
2. see Tertullian's De monogamia, De jejuniis, etc. for frequent echoes of Jn. 14-16, cf. the texts used to defend Montanist "Sabellianism", Didymus, De trin. 3.41.1.
3. Tert., Adv. Prax. 8, App. 1, no.6.
4. Epiph., Pan. 48.11, App. 1., no.1, cf. Rev. 1.8, 4.8, 11.17.
5. see above p.94.
6. Schepelern (Montanismus, pp.95ff, 135ff) speaks of the sexual and dietary taboos of the cults of Asia Minor, but points out that such attitudes were common in the ancient world and were merely part of a general legacy from paganism to the Church as a whole, leading for instance to the demand for a celibate priesthood.
7. In connection with Montanist fasting practices Tertullian writes: (Psychici) dicunt : aut pseudoprophetia est, si spiritalis vox...aut haeresis, si humana praesumptio... (De jej. 11.2).
8. Crise, p.540.
9. J. Lindblom (Prophecy in Ancient Israel, pp.4f) speaks of ecstasy as -
 an abnormal state of consciousness in which one is so intensely absorbed by one single idea or one single feeling, or by a group of ideas or feelings, that the normal stream of psychical life is more or less arrested. The bodily senses cease to function; one becomes impervious to impressions from without; consciousness is exalted above the ordinary level of daily experience; unconscious mental impressions and ideas come to the surface in the form of visions and auditions.
 Clearly he is referring here to visionary ecstasy. Possibly a state resembling possession could also be induced.
10. see above nt.7. This was the view of some of those who actually witnessed Montanus' seizure (Eus., H.E. 5.16.8), cf. Origen (De princ. 2.7.3). Sotas of Anchialus actually tried to exorcise Priscilla but was prevented by her supporters (Eus., H.E. 5.19.3).
11. cf. J. Richards, But Deliver Us from Evil (1974).
12. Works 6, Sermons 2, p.328, qu. De Lab., Crise, p.129, ftnt.2.
13. Montanism, p.133.
14. Eus., H.E. 5.16.
15. 2 Cor. 11.14.
16. Mand. 11.3.
17. op. cit. p.69.
18. see Doyle's Pheneas Speaks (1926). For more details and other parallels from the history of the Spiritualist Movement see App. 2.
19. More detailed information will be given in App. 2. Relevant books on such syncretistic movements include B.G.M. Sundkler, Bantu Prophets in South Africa, 2nd ed.

- (1961), I.M. Lewis, Ecstatic Religion (1971), and W. Sargant, The Mind Possessed (1973).
20. De Lab., Crise, pp.3ff.
 21. De bap. 8,17.
 22. De idol. 24.
 23. De pat. 15.
 24. De spect. 15.
 25. Ad mart. 3.
 26. De paen. 10.
 27. De bap. 20.
 28. Charismata to 320 A.D. : a study of the overt pneumatic experience of the Early Church (1973).
 29. 88, cf.39,82,87.
 30. Adv. haer. 2.31.2, 2.32.4, 5.6.1, qu. Eus., H.E. 5.7.
 31. In the Mart. Poly. 16.2 (qu. Eus., H.E. 4.15.39) he is referred to as δ.δ.ἀσκαλὸς ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς.
 32. Tertullian says that most of the Catholic Christians thought him to be a prophet (Jer., De vir. ill. 24 evidently quoting from De ecstasi). Eusebius describes him as τὸν ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευσάμενον (H.E. 5.24.5), and says he wrote a work entitled Περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν and it seems a treatise of his own prophecy (H.E. 4.26.2).
 33. see Origen's quotation from Celsus (Cont. Cels. 7.9), which has been taken by Ritschl (Entstehung, 2.Auf., p.490) and others to be a description of Montanists. Probably, however, they were orthodox Christian prophets for Origen, though he certainly knew of the Montanists, made no attempt to identify these with them (see De Lab., Crise, pp.99ff).
 34. Pass. Perp. 1, Tert., De res. mort. 63.
 35. De praes. haer. 13.
 36. Adversarius enim spiritus ex diversitate praedicationis appareret, primo regulam adulterans fidei, et ita ordinem adulterans disciplinae. (De mon. 2.3, cf. De virg. vel. 1, Adv. Prax. 2).
 37. De trin. 3.41.1, App. 1, no.3.
 38. Adv. Prax. 8, App. 1, no.6.
 39. De spectaculis. His attitude is shared by other Christian leaders such as Irenaeus (see for instance Adv. haer. 1.6.3, where he expresses horror that Gnostics should feel able to attend shows).
 40. De idolatria.
 41. De cultu feminarum.
 42. De or. 21-22.
 43. Ad ux. 1.3.
 44. ibid. 1.5.
 45. ibid. 1.3.
 46. De paenitentia, cf. Hermas, Mand. 4.1-3.
 47. Spiritus diaboli est, dicis, o psychice. Et quomodo dei nostri officia indicit nec alii offerenda quam deo nostro? (5) Aut contende diabolium cum deo facere nostro aut satanas paracletus habeatur. (De jej. 11.4-5).
 48. De monogamia.
 49. De fuga in persecutione.
 50. De pudicitia.
 51. De jejuniis.
 52. Ut ab Iohanne paracletus obmutuisset, et ipsi nobis

Pt. 3

- prophetae...extitissimus (De jej. 12.2). Lk. 16.16, a text used first in apologetic against the Jews (Tert., Adv. Iud. 8, etc.), was turned by Catholic Christians against the Montanists. It would seem to be a valid argument for before the Christian era Jewish prophets were empowered by the Spirit to address the whole nation. With the Christian Pentecost this role was no longer required for the Spirit was available to all (Rom. 8.9,14, etc.)
53. Several of the supposed differences raised by Lawlor and Gregor Smith have been dealt with in the notes to pt. 1, ch. 2 of this thesis.
54. see above p.36.
55. see above pp.28f.
56. see above p.166.
57. The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church (1912), p.83.
58. Aug., Haer. 86.
59. Praedestinatus, 86.
60. According to Jerome, Cyprian called Tertullian "the master" and read his works daily (De vir. ill. 53). Jerome himself seems to have admired Tertullian and excused his lapse into Montanism as the result of "the envy and insults of the clergy of the church of Rome" (ibid.). In the mid-fifth century Praedestinatus marvels at him, speaking of his opuscula eloquentissima et ferventia in defensione veritatis (86). But the most impressive testimony to Tertullian is the very fact that his works, including most of his violently anti-Catholic writings, have been preserved for posterity.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ITHE EXTANT UTTERANCES OF THE NEW PROPHETS(De Labriolle, Crise, pp.37ff; Aland, K.E., pp.143ff)

1. Montanus (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.11.1 - De Lab., no.1; Aland, no.3).

Ἔτι δὲ προστίθῃσιν ὁ αὐτὸς Μοντανὸς οὕτως λέγων· Ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ καταγινόμενος ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ.

2. Montanus (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.11.9 - De Lab., no.2; Aland, no.4).

Εἶτα πάλιν φησὶ τὸ ἐλεεινὸν ἀνθρωπάριον Μοντανὸς ὅτι· Οὔτε ἄγγελος οὔτε πρέσβυς ἄλλ' ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ἡλθόν.

3. Montanus (Didymus, De trin. 3.41.1 - De Lab., no.3; Aland, no.2).

Μοντανὸς γάρ, φησὶν, εἶπεν· Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ὁ παράκλητος.

(Μοντανιστοῦ κ. Ὀρθοδόξου Διάλεξις in De Lab., Sources, p.97.25 - De Lab., Crise, no.3; Aland, no.1).

Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ἐγὼ ὁ παράκλητος.

(ibid. in De Lab., Sources, p.101.16 - Aland, no.1).

Ἐγὼ εἰμι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα.

(ibid. in De Lab., Sources, p.103.29 - Aland, no.1).

Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα.

4. Montanus (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.4.1 - De Lab., no.5; Aland, no.5).

Εὐθὺς γάρ ὁ Μοντανὸς φησὶν· Ἰδοὺ, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ λύρα κἀγὼ ἐφίπταμαι ὡσεὶ πληκτρον· ὁ ἄνθρωπος κοιμᾶται κἀγὼ γρηγορῶ· ἰδοὺ, κύριός ἐστιν ὁ ἐξιστάων καρδίας ἀνθρώπων καὶ δεσοὺς καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου.

5. Montanus (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.10.3 - De Lab., no.4; Aland, no.6).

Ὁ δὲ Μοντανὸς... λέγει... ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ λεγομένῃ προφητείᾳ· Τί λέγεις τὸν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου τρωζόμενον; λάμψει γὰρ (φησὶν) ὁ δίκαιος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡλίων

- ἑκατοῦταπλασίονα, οἱ δὲ μικροὶ ἐν ἡμῶν σωζόμενοι
 λήψουσιν ἑκατοῦταπλασίονα ὑπὲρ τῆν σελήνην.
6. The "Paraclete" (Tertullian, Adv. Prax. 8.5 - De Lab.,
 no.8; Aland, no.20).
 Protulit enim deus sermonem, quemadmodum etiam paracletus
 docet, sicut radix fruticem et fons fluvium et sol radium.
7. The "Paraclete" (Tertullian, De pud. 21.7 - De Lab., no.9;
 Aland, no.7).
 Hoc ego magis et agnosco et dispono, qui ipsum paracletum
 in prophetis novis habeo dicentem, Potest ecclesia
 donare delictum, sed non faciam, ne et alia delinquant.
8. The "Spirit" (Tertullian, De fuga 9.4 - De Lab., no.6;
 Aland, no.8).
 Spiritum vero si consulas, quid magis sermone illo spiritus
 probat? Namque omnes paene ad martyrium exhorta(n)tur,
 non ad fugam, ut et illius commemoremur: Publicaris,
 inquit, bonum tibi est; qui enim non publicatur in
 hominibus, publicatur in domino. Ne confundaris;
 ivstitia te producit in medium. Quid confunderis
 laudem ferens? Potestas fit, cum conspiceris ab
 hominibus.
9. The "Spirit" (ibid. - De Lab., no.7; Aland, no.9).
 Sic et alibi, Nolite in lectulis nec in aborsibus et
 febribus mollibus optare exire, sed in martyriis, uti
 glorificetur qui est passus pro vobis.
10. Prisca (Tertullian, De res. mort. 11.2 - De Lab., no.16;
 Aland, no.10).
 De quibus luculenter et paracletus per prophetidem
 Priscam, Carnes sunt, et carnem oderunt.
11. Prisca (Tertullian, De exhort. cast. 10.5 - De Lab.,
 no.15; Aland, no.11).
 Item per sanctam prophetidem Priscam ita evangelizatur,
 quod sanctus minister sanctimoniam noverit ministrare.
 Purificantia enim cum cor dat, ait, et visiones vident
 et ponentes faciem deorsum etiam voces audiunt salutares,
 tam manifestas quam et occultas.
12. Maximilla (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.2.4 - De Lab., no.11;
 Aland, no.13).
 Φάσκει γὰρ ἡ λεγομένη παρ' αὐτοῖς Μαξίμιλλα
 ἡ προφήτις ὅτι φησί· Μετ' ἐμὲ προφήτης
 οὐκέτι ἔσται, ἀλλὰ συντέλεια.
13. Maximilla (Eusebius, H.E. 5.16.17 - De Lab., no.12;
 Aland, no. 16).
 Καὶ μὴ λεγέτω ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τῷ κατὰ
 Ἀστέριον Ὀρβανὸν τὸ διὰ Μαξίμιλλης πνεῦμα·
 Διώκομαι ὡς λύκος ἐκ προβάτων· οὐκ εἰμὶ λύκος·
 ῥῆμά εἰμι καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις.
14. Maximilla (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.12.4 - De Lab., no.13;
 Aland, no.14).
 Εὐθεὺς γὰρ αὕτη ἡ Μαξίμιλλα ἡ παρὰ τοῖς
 τοιοῦτοις κατὰ Φρύγας οὕτω καλουμένης -
 ἀκούσατε, ὦ παῖδες Χριστοῦ, τί λέγει· Ἐμοῦ
 μὴ ἀκούσητε, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ ἀκούσατε.

15. Maximilla (Epiphanius, Pan. 48.13.1 - De Lab., no.14; Aland, no.15).

Φάσκει δὲ πάλιν ἡ αὐτὴ Μαξιμίλλα, ἡ τῆς παρακολουθείας γυνῶσις καὶ διδασκαλίκα, ἵνα καὶ χλευαστικῶς εἶπω, ὅτι Ἀπέστειλέ με κύριος τούτου τοῦ πόκου καὶ τῆς συνθήκης καὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αἰρετιστῶν μηνυτῶν ἑρμηνευτῆς, ἡναγκασμένον θέλοντα καὶ μὴ θέλοντα, γνωθεῖν γυνῶσις Θεοῦ.

16. Quintilla or Priscilla (Epiphanius, Pan. 49.1.2-3 - De Lab., no.17; Aland, no.12).

Φασὶ γὰρ οὗτοι οἱ Κουίντιλλιανοὶ εἴτ' οὖν Πρίσκιλλιανοὶ ἐν τῇ Πεπούβῃ ἢ Κουίντιλλαν ἢ Πρίσκιλλαν (οὐκ ἔχω [γὰρ] ἀκριβῶς λέγειν), μίαν δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ὡς προσῆπον ἐν τῇ Πεπούβῃ κεκαθευθηκέναι καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν πρὸς αὐτὴν, ἐληλυθέσαι συνυπνωκέναι τε αὐτὴ τούτω τῷ τρόπῳ, ὡς ἐκείνη, ἀπατωμένη ἔλεγεν· Ἐν ἰδέᾳ, φησί, γυναικός, ἐσχηματισμένος ἐν στολῇ λαμπρῇ ἦλθε πρὸς με Χριστὸς καὶ ἐνέβαλεν ἐν ἐμοὶ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ ἀπέκάλυψέ μοι τούτων τὸν τόπον εἶναι ἁγίου καὶ ὧδε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατιέναι.

17. "Cataphrygians" (Origen, In ep. ad Titum - De Lab., no.19; Aland, no.19).

Cataphryges...obsecrantes falsos prophetas et dicentes, Ne accedas ad me quoniam mundus sum, non enim accepi uxorem, nec est sepulchrum patens guttur meum, sed sum Nazareus dei, non bibens vinum, sicut illi.

De Labriolle regards this last saying as of dubious authenticity. Two further items from his list have been omitted, as he argues convincingly that the first (no.10) is apocryphal, and the second (no.18) refers not to Montanists but to orthodox Christian prophets. Aland's list contains a number of other items, but these merely contain allusions to other sayings of the Paraclete not actual quotations.

APPENDIX 2MODERN PARALLELS TO MONTANIST PHENOMENASpiritualism

The modern Spiritualist Movement in the United States and Europe appears to date from 1848 when the two child mediums Maggie and Katie Fox started imitating rappings they heard in their parents' home in the little town of Hydesville, Wayne County, New York. The first message they claimed to receive was to the effect:

Dear Friends,

You must proclaim these truths to the world. This is the dawning of a new era; and you must not try to conceal it any longer. When you do your duty God will protect you and good spirits will watch over you.¹

Their apparent communication with the spirit-world led to publicity and widespread interest in psychical phenomena. Though ultimately it seems the Foxes were discredited,² well before then others also claimed to have received messages from the spirits, and the movement continued to spread.

For communicating with the "other side" a "sensitive" or "medium" is generally necessary. The simplest means is auditory - the medium goes into a deep trance and begins to speak with a strange voice believed to come from a spirit. In the majority of cases the medium experiences a total loss of consciousness during the time of possession.³

Spirits who reveal themselves through a medium may claim to be merely departed friends or relations of those present at the séance, but some claim a far more exalted status. A spirit may announce himself as Plato or S. Paul, but his messages are it seems generally trivial and often specifically non-Christian.⁴ Emperor, the "control" spirit of Stainton Moses, claimed to be the prophet Malachi,⁵ and Pheneas, of whom Sir Arthur Conan Doyle writes, claimed to have lived in Ur before the time of Abraham.⁶

Sometimes the medium may speak in a prophetic style. A certain Mr. Le Baron was attending an American Spiritualist camp meeting in 1894. At one of midnight séances in the pine woods he felt forced to lie flat on his back and heard another's voice crying through his vocal chords in loud despairing tones, "Oh, my people!" followed by other mutterings in a prophetic vein. Later he began to write and speak sentences such as, "He shall be a leader of the host of the Lord," and "I shall be in thy heart and thou shalt answer to My voice," and make utterances in an unknown tongue.⁷

Though many of the messages communicated through a medium are personal and concern only those people present at the séance, some are more momentous. The claim that a new era is dawning has been a recurrent theme. Pheneas, a most

pious spirit, painted this era as a veritable kingdom of God on earth. On 8th October 1924 for instance he announced:

The daylight seemed a long way off, as if it would never come, and psychic truth never be understood. The ground was so heavy and thick. The feet at every step were weighted. And now the soil is nearly firm, a wonderful light appears in the sky - a dawn, a resurrection. Life, full, rich radiant, takes possession of what was nothing but a skeleton before, and blossoms out into God's own beautiful and wonderful sunshine. Instead of deep gloom it rises radiant in a sunrise which will never set - the sunrise of God's love permeating all humanity upon the earth plane. And God's Will will then be done on earth as it is in heaven...⁸

On 12th January 1925 he spoke of the place of the League of Nations in this new order:

They will automatically fall into the position of a jury, representing the spirit of God's love, sympathy, and tender anxiety for mankind. In the new world, that is.⁹

But strangely enough the new world has failed to materialize.

Spiritualism has usually encountered opposition from the official churches. In retaliation the spirits have denounced the churches. Pheneas himself speaks of their "lamp of theological egotism and power and pride," their pomp and ceremonial, and their misrepresentation of Christ as a judge sentencing a prisoner so that "His guiding Hand to happiness has been twisted by priestcraft till it pointed to Hell."¹⁰

Trance communication, the exalted status of the communicating spirit, the announcement of a new era that never dawned, attacks upon the integrity of the Catholic Church - these were all features of Montanism, which suggests a common source of inspiration. But while Spiritualists recognise that lesser spirits may impersonate greater,¹¹ and to the non-Spiritualist it is obvious that even "Christian" spirits manifested at seances seek to make their adherents dependent on themselves rather than directly on God,¹² these two dangers were not adequately realized by followers of the Phrygian "Paraclete".

The Zionist Churches of South Africa

The Zionists constitute one of the two major streams of Bantu separatist churches that have sprung up in South Africa as a direct result of the colour bar. They are syncretistic Pentecostal churches. Their epithet "Zionist" derives ultimately from the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in Zion founded in 1896 in Zion, Illinois by J.A. Dowie, which sent missionaries to Southern Africa early in this century. Representing an Africanisation of Christianity Zionism has spread rapidly and new sects are constantly springing up. The classic study of the movement as a whole is that of B.G.M. Sundkler, Bantu Prophets in South Africa (2nd ed., 1961). It is only possible here to summarise his information.

Each Zionist church, of which there are many hundreds, is led by an itinerant prophet whose role, Sundkler claims,¹³ combines elements from the tribal roles of both chief and witch-finder (witch-doctor). To be a prophet a man needs to have had a special call and to be known as a great healer. Instead of the witch-doctor's herbs he uses holy water and holy ashes! Western medicine is shunned.

At worship the Zionists are brightly clad, each of their many ranks being represented by some distinctive piece of clothing. Their services are noisy and include testimonies, much singing, glossolalia, dancing to drum music leading to group trance and possession,¹⁴ and sometimes special ceremonies including sacrifices.

The Zionists practice various food taboos chiefly regarding beer, blood and pork as well as tobacco. They also have special fasts and hold special festivals. Dreams, visions and auditions, whether the prophet's or his followers', are highly respected as in the last resort both prophet and people have one and the same authority - uMoya (the Spirit). The Zionist attitude to marriage is not uniform. Menstruating women tend to be regarded as unclean. Some people practise chastity. But the native practice of polygamy has not been fully abolished. A prophet may justify his own polygamy by claiming he is obeying a dream.

In the Zionist churches on the whole women outnumber men. They play an important part in the organisation of church life, and are not barred from holding ultimate authority. One sect known as the Holy Apostle Mission Church of South Africa was founded in 1943 by "Sister Ministress" Lucy S. Mofokeng!

It is the practice for all members of Zionist churches to make regular financial offerings. Sundkler speaks for instance of an annual contribution of £1.0 per member in some churches¹⁵ (though now of course the currency has changed). As many churches are overstaffed ministers may be very poor, but in some cases where a leader is especially revered he may be quite well off. In certain Zionist churches extra monetary contributions are expected from members at festivals.

Many parallels are evident between twentieth-century Zionism and second-century Montanism. Both sprang up in educationally backward areas. Both claim to be led by the Spirit and give the prophet pride of place. Both revere visions, and practice dietary restrictions. Both allow a prominent place to women in their leadership structure, and have a well organised financial system. In both possession - ecstasy is present, though in Montanism this seems to have been restricted to the prophets, while in Zionism it is a group phenomenon engendered by dancing to drum music (more reminiscent of the cult of Cybele).

Now Sundkler has pointed out that a number of attitudes and practices of the Zionists closely resemble those of Zulu animism.¹⁷ Further he relates how on one occasion some Zionists invited some native diviners to a service that they might exorcise them, but when the diviners arrived the Zionists found

themselves powerless even to continue their own worship. The clear implication is that the source of Zionist inspiration was not, as they believed, the Holy Spirit. In fact Sundkler shows that Zionism, despite its claim to be authentic Christianity, is in fact an amalgum of charismatic Christianity and the Zulu native religion. If such a synthesis is possible in the twentieth century similar syncretism was no doubt also possible in the Early Church.

Other Syncretistic Churches

William Sargant in his book The Mind Possessed (1973)¹⁸ tells of religious syncretism in the West Indies. He describes for instance a service he attended in 1964 at a church in the slums of Port of Spain, Trinidad. The sacrifice of a goat and four chickens formed an integral part of the proceedings. The goat was sacrificed to the great god Ogoun (also called "St. Michael") and one of the chickens to Elegba (a name taken straight from the Yoruba religion of Dahomey), who approximates to the Christian concept of the Devil. After the great sacrifice the drums were beaten and dancing began. Some of the worshippers present dressed in white began to go into trance-possession states and claimed to speak as Christian saints - the Virgin Mary, S. Michael, S. Francis and Joseph the Carpenter (all the possessed were women on this occasion). Afterwards, when Sargant questioned those who had been possessed none of them could remember what they had said or done in trance. The members of the church seemed to think the possessing spirits had once been African gods. However they had since been converted and were now Christian saints!

I.M. Lewis in his sociological study Ecstatic Religion (1971) speaks of similar syncretism among the ex-slaves of South America and in the Voodoo cults of Haiti.¹⁹ He points out that possession by apparently Christian saints constitutes a psychological compensation for down-trodden men and women, lifting them to the heights of exaltation. He also speaks of the influence of Christianity on the pagan worship of the god Waka in Ethiopia, which embraces now not only certain Christian saints but also the prophet Muhammad.²⁰

Thus it seems syncretism is possible wherever Christianity is introduced to an alien culture, the resulting amalgum being known as either Christianity or paganism whichever is the more prestigious. Montanism appears to have been one such amalgum where the Christian element predominated.

Many more parallels could no doubt be culled from the pages of Church history, but such an endeavour would be well beyond the scope of this thesis, and unfortunately moulded far too easily by the prejudices of any investigator.²¹

REFERENCES AND NOTESApp. 2.

1. J. Crehan, Spiritualism, p.13, qu. L. Underhill.
2. cf. F. Podmore, Mediums of the 19th Century I, pp.184ff.
3. Oesterreich, Possession, p.32.
4. Richards, But Deliver Us from Evil, p.69.
5. Crehan, op.cit., pp.11f, 18f.
6. Conan Doyle, Pheneas Speaks, p.60.
7. Podmore, op. cit. II, p.304. Clearly Mr. Le Baron was conscious during his experiences.
8. Pheneas Speaks, p.103.
9. ibid., pp.115f.
10. ibid., pp.153f.
11. Crehan, op. cit., pp.19ff, cf. Pheneas Speaks, pp.150,184.
12. cf. Pheneas to the Doyles, "I am the vibrant link between you and God" (op. cit., p.167).
13. Bantu Prophets, p.109.
14. ibid., p.200
15. ibid., p.126.
16. ibid., p.123.
17. see ibid., esp. pp.238ff.
18. chs. 17-18.
19. pp.104ff.
20. ibid., p.155.
21. cf. R.A. Knox, Enthusiasm.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

BIBLIOGRAPHIESI ANCIENT PAGAN WORKS

- APOLLODORUS. Bibliotheca (ed. & tr. J.G. Frazer, Loeb (1921)).
- APULEIUS. Metamorphoses (ed. & tr. W. Adlington rev. S. Gaselee, Loeb (1915)).
- ARISTIDES, AELIUS. Orationes (ed. G. Dindorf (1829)).
- CICERO. Pro Flacco (ed. & tr. L.E. Lord, Loeb (1937)).
- DIODORUS SICULUS. Bibliotheca historia (ed. & tr. C.H. Oldfather et al, Loeb (1933-67)).
- EUSTATHIUS. Dionysius Periegetes (excerpt in Linforth, Corybantic Rites qu. Bernhardt, I).
- HERACLITUS. (in Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker ed. H. Diels, 5. Auf. ed. by W. Kranz (1934-37)).
- HERODIAN. Historiae (ed. & tr. C.R. Whittaker, Loeb (1969-70)).
- HERODOTUS. Historiae (ed. & tr. A.D. Godley, Loeb (1921-24)).
- HOMER. Iliad (ed. & tr. A.T. Murray, Loeb (1924-25)).
- Homeric Hymn to Apollo (in Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns & Homeric, 3rd ed., ed. & tr. H.G. Evelyn-White, Loeb (1936)).
- IAMBlichus. De mysteriis (ed. & Fr. tr. E. des Places, Collection des Universités de France, (1966); also Eng. tr. T. Taylor, 2nd ed. (1895)).
- LUCRETIUS. De rerum natura (ed. & tr. W.H.D. Rouse, Loeb (1947)).
- OVID. Fasti (ed. & tr. J.G. Frazer, Loeb (1931)).
- PLATO. Ion (ed. St.G. Stock (1909)).
- Phaedrus (ed. & tr. H.N. Fowler, Loeb (1926)).
- PLINY, the Younger. Epistola 10.96 (ed. & tr. J. Stevenson, New Eusebius (1968)).
- PLUTARCH. De defectu oraculorum (ed. & Fr. tr. R. Flacelière, Annales de l'Université de Lyon, 3rd ser., Lettres, 14 (1947)).
- De Pythiae oraculis (ibid., 4 (1937)).
- PORPHYRY. Epistola ad Anebonem (ed. A.R. Sodano (1958)).
- SERVIUS, Grammaticus. Aenied (in Vergilii carmina commentarii, ed. G. Thilo & H. Hagen (1881-87)).
- STRABO. Geographica (ed. & tr. H.L. Jones, Loeb (1917-32)).

SUETONIUS. De vita Caesarum. (ed. & tr. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb (1914)).

VARRO. Saturarum Menippearum reliquiae (ed. A. Riese (1865)).

Note: Servius and Eustathius are included because their cited works are concerned with pagan not Christian matters.

II ANCIENT JEWISH WORKS

Damascus Document. (cf. Zadokite Documents, ed. C. Rabin (1954)).

JOSEPHUS. Antiquitates Judaicae (in Opera ed. B. Niese, 2nd ed. (1955); also ed. & tr. H. St. J. Thackeray, et al, Loeb (1926-65)).
- Bellum Iudaicum (ibid.).

Jubilees, Book of, (in Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha II, ed. R.H. Charles, (1913)).

Midrashim (ed. Rabbi H. Freedman & M. Simon (1939)).
Genesis Rabbah.
Numbers Rabbah.
Deuteronomy Rabbah.

Mishnah (ed. A. Sampter et al (1968); also Eng. tr. H. Danby (1933)).
Kila'im.
Ma'aseroth.
Ta'anith.
Nedarim.
Nazir,
Abodah Zarah (Eng. tr. W.A.L. Elmslie, Camb. Texts & Stud. 8.2 (1911)).
Makshirin.
Uktzin.

Passover Hagadah (from MS of Rabbi Shabsi Sofer of Przemslo w pub. B. Spiers (1877), repub. Olive P. (1959) with Eng. tr.).

PHILO IUDAEUS. Quis rerum divinarum heres (in Opera IV, ed. & tr. F.H. Colson & G.H. Whitaker, Loeb (1932)).
- De vita contemplativa (ed. F.C. Conybeare (1895); also Eng. tr. C.D. Yonge, Works, IV, Bohn (1855)).

Talmud, Babylonian (ed. Rabbi I. Epstein (1935-)).
b Berakoth.
b. Shabbath.
b. Moed Katan.
b. Sotah.

III ANCIENT CHRISTIAN (& HERETICAL) WORKS

Acta disputationis S. Achatii (in Acta martyrium selecta, ed. O. von Gebhardt (1902)).

Acta Pauli et Theclae (Eng. tr. in Apology & Acts of Apollonius, ed. F.C. Conybeare (1894)).

AMBROSIASTER. Commentarius in epistolam primam ad Timotheum (Migne, P.L. 17 (1845)).

ARNOBIUS. Adversus nationes (tr. H. Bryce & H. Campbell, A.N.C.L. 19 (1871)).

ATHENAGORAS. Legatio pro Christianis (ed. & tr. W.R. Schoedel (1972)).

Auctarium Aquicintinum (excerptin De Lab., Sources, no.225).

AUGUSTINE, of Hippo. Enarrationes in Psalmos (tr. by J.E. Tweed et al, L.F. (1847-57)).

- Epistolae 221-24 (ed. A. Goldbacher, C.S.E.L. (1911)).

- De haeresibus liber (in C.C. ser Lat. 46 (1969)).

- De unico baptismo contra Petilianum (Migne, P.L. 43 (1861), 595ff).

BASIL, of Caesarea. Epistle 188 (in Letters III ed. & tr. R.J. Deferrari, Loeb (1930)).

CLEMENT, of Alexandria. Protrepticus (tr. W. Wilson, A.N.C.L. 4 (1867)).

- Stromata (tr. W. Wilson, A.N.C.L. 4,12 (1867-69); also excerpt in Gnosis, I, ed. W. Foerster, Eng. tr. (1972)).

Codex Iustinianus (in Corpus Iuris Civilis, II, ed. P. Krueger (1880)

Codex Theodosianus (in Corpus Iuris Romani, II, ed. G. Haenel (1842)).

Cohortatio ad Graecos (tr. M. Dods, A.N.C.L. 2 (1867)).

CYPRIAN. Epistolae (in Opera, ed. G. Hartel, C.S.E.L. 3 (1868-71); also Eng. tr. R.E. Wallis, A.N.C.L. 8 (1868)).

CYRIL, of Jerusalem. Catechesis (Migne, P.G. 33 (1893)).

Dialogue between a Montanist and an Orthodox (in De Lab., Sources, no. 79).

DIDYMUS, of Alexandria. Expositio in Actus Apostolorum (Migne, P.G. 39 (1863)).

- De trinitate (ibid.)

EPIPHANIUS. Panarion (ed. K. Holl, G.C.S. 25,31,37 (1915-33)).

EUSEBIUS, of Caesarea. Chronicon (Armenian version in Chronicon bipartitum ed. & Lat. tr. P.J.B. Aucher (1818); Jerome's version ed. R. Helm, G.C.S. 24,34 (1913-26)).

- EUSEBIUS, of Caesarea. Historia ecclesiastica (ed. & tr. K. Lake & J.E.L. Oulton, Loeb. (1926-32)).
- Praeparatio evangelica (tr. E.H.G. Gifford (1903)).
 - Vita Constantini (ed. I.A. Heikel, G.C.S. (1902)).
- Gospel of Truth (in Gnosis, II, ed. W. Foerster, Eng. tr. (1974)).
- GREGORY, the Great. Epistola II (excerpt in De Lab., Sources, no.198).
- GREGORY, of Nyssa. De deitatis filii et spiritus sancti (Migne, P.G. 46 (1863)).
- HERMAS. Shepherd (tr. G.F. Snyder, Apostolic Fathers, ed. R.M. Grant, 6 (1968)).
- HIPPOLYTUS, of Rome. De Christo et de antichristo (tr. S.D.F. Salmond, A.N.C.L. 9 (1869)).
- In Daniele (tr. S.D.F. Salmond, A.N.C.L. 6 (1868)).
 - Philosophoumena (or Refutatio omnium haeresium) (ed. P. Wendland, G.C.S. 26 (1916); also Eng. tr. J.H. MacMahon, A.N.C.L. 6 (1968); also excerpts in Gnosis, I ed. W. Foerster, Eng. tr. (1972)).
- HONORIUS, of Autun. De haeresibus libellus (excerpt in De. Lab., Sources, no.221).
- IRENAEUS. Adversus haereses (Migne, P.G. 7 (1882); also Eng. tr. J. Keble, L.F. (1872); also excerpts in Gnosticism: an Anthology, ed. & tr. R.M. Grant (1961), and in Gnosis, I, ed. W. Foerster, Eng. tr. (1972)).
- JEROME. Commentarius in epistolam ad Galaticos (Migne, P.L. 26 (1866)).
- Commentarii in Ezechielem (Migne, P.L. 25 (1865)).
 - Commentarii in Oseam (*ibid.*)
 - Dialogus contra Pelagianos (Migne, P.L. 23 (1865)).
 - Epistolae (ed. & Fr. tr. J. Labourt, Collection des Universités de France, (1949-)).
 - De viris illustribus (Migne, P.L. 23 (1865)).
- JUSTIN, Martyr. Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo (in Opera, I, ed. I.C.T. Otto (1847), also Eng. tr. G. Reith, A.N.C.L. 2 (1867)).
- LACTANTIUS. Divinae institutiones adversus Gentes (Migne, P.L. 6 (1844)).
- Libellus Synodicus (excerpt in De Lab., Sources, no. 215).
- Liber Pontificalis (tr. L.R. Loomis (1965)).
- Martyrium S. Polycarpi (in Acts of the Christian Martyrs, ed. & tr. H. Musurillo (1972); also Eng. tr. in New Eusebius, ed. J. Stevenson (1968)).
- MINUCIUS FELIX. Octavius (ed. & tr. G.H. Rendall, Loeb (1931)).
- NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS. Historia ecclesiastica (Migne, P.G. 145-47 (1865,1904)).

- ORIGEN. Catena in S. Pauli epistolas ad Corinthios (excerpt in De Lab., Sources, no.56).
 - Contra Celsum (tr. H. Chadwick (1953)).
 - In epistolam ad Titum (excerpt in De Lab., Sources, no.57).
 - De principiis (tr. F. Crombie, A.N.C.L. 10 (1869)).
- Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis (in Acts of the Christian Martyrs ed. & tr. H. Musurillo (1972)).
- PHILASTER, of Brescia. Liber de haeresibus (Diversarum hereseon liber, ed. F. Marx (1898)).
- PHOTIUS, of Constantinople. Bibliotheca (Migne, P.G. 103-4 (1896-1900)).
- PRAEDESTINATUS (Liber de haeresibus) (excerpts in De Lab., Sources, no.174-75).
- PROCOPIUS, of Caesarea. Historia Arcana (in Opera VI, ed. & tr. H.B. Dewing, Loeb (1935)).
- PRUDENTIUS. Peristephanon (in Carmina, ed. M.P. Cunningham; C.C. ser. Lat. 126 (1966)).
- PSEUDO-CHRYSOSTOM. Sermo in Pascha 7 (or Epistola 7) (Migne, P.G. 59 (1862)).
- PSEUDO-CLEMENT. Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (tr. H.H. Graham in Apostolic Fathers, ed. R.M. Grant, 2 (1965))
 - Epistle of Clement to James (ed. B. Rehm, G.C.S. 42 (1953); also Eng. tr. T. Smith et al, A.N.C.L. 17 (1870)).
 - Homilies (ibid.).
- PSEUDO-TERTULLIAN. Adversus omnes haereses (tr. S. Thelwall, A.N.C.L. 18 (1870)).
- SOZOMEN. Historia ecclesiastica (ed. R. Hussey (1860)).
- TERTULLIAN. Omnia opera (C.C. ser. Lat. 1-2 (1954); also Eng. tr. P. Holmes, & S. Thelwall, A.N.C.L. 7,11,15,18 (1868-70), also Adversus Praxean ed. & tr. E. Evans (1948)).
- THEODORET, of Cyrhus. Epitome (or Haereticarum fabularum compendium) (Migne, P.G. 83 (1864)).
- THEOPHILUS, of Antioch. Ad Autolyicum (tr. M. Dods, A.N.C.L. 3 (1867)).

English translations not to be found above come from the relevant secondary authors or are my own. Biblical quotations are from the Revised Standard Version.

Every student of Montanism is necessarily greatly indebted to P. De Labriolle for his Sources de l'Histoire du Montanisme which brings together so many of the relevant texts and provides a French translation.

IV MODERN WORKS

- ALAND, K. "Bemerkungen zum Montanismus und zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie", in Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe (pp.105-48). Mohn (1960).
- "Der Montanismus und die kleinasiatische Theologie", Z.N.W. 46 (1955), 109-16.
- ANDERSON, J.G.C. "Paganism and Christianity in the Upper Tembris Valley", in Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire (pp.183-227), ed. W.M. Ramsay. Aberdeen U.P. (1906).
- BACHT, H. "Die Prophetische Inspiration in der kirchlichen Reflexion der vormontanistischen Zeit", Scholastik 19 (1944), 1-18.
- BARNES, T.D. "Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum", J.T.S., N.S. 19 (1968), 509-31.
- "Tertullian's Scorpiace", J.T.S., N.S. 20 (1969), 105-32.
 - "The Chronology of Montanism", J.T.S., N.S. 21 (1970), 403-8.
 - Tertullian: a Historical and Literary Study, O.U.P. (1971).
- BARRETT, C.K. The Gospel according to St. John. S.P.C.K. (1955).
- BAUR, F.C. "Das Wesen des Montanismus nach den neuesten Forschungen", Th. Jahr. 10 (1851), 538-98.
- BONWETSCH, G.N. Die Geschichte des Montanismus. Deichert (1881).
- CALDER, W.M. "Philadelphia and Montanism", B.J.R.L. 7 (1922), 309-54.
- "The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies", in Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay (pp.59-91), ed. by W.H. Buckler & W.M. Calder. Manchester U.P. (1923).
 - "Leaves from an Anatolian Notebook", B.J.R.L. 13 (1929), 254-71.
 - "The New Jerusalem of the Montanists", Byzantion 6 (1931), 421-25.
 - "The Epitaph of Avircius Marcellus", J.R.S. 29 (1939), 1-4.
 - "The Eumeneian Formula", in Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler (pp.15-26), ed. by W.M. Calder & J. Keil. Manchester U.P. (1939).
 - "Early-Christian Epitaphs from Phrygia", Anat. Stud. 5 (1955), 25-38.
 - Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua 7 (1956).
- CHAPOT, V. La Province Romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie depuis ses origines jusqu' à la Fin du haut Empire. Bouillon (1904).
- CREHAN, J. Spiritualism. Catholic Truth Society (1967).
- CUMONT, F. Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain. 4e. Geuthner (1929).
- Eng. tr. (1911) from 2nd Fr. ed. (1909).

- DALY, C.B. "The 'Edict of Callistus'", Stud. Pat. 3, T.u.U. 78 (1961), 176-82.
- DAN, Y. "Jewish Ethical Wills", Encyc. Judaica 16 (1971).
- DE LABRIOLLE, P. La Crise Montaniste. Leroux (1913).
- Les Sources de l'Histoire du Montanisme. Leroux (1913).
- DELEHAYE, H. Les Passions des Martyrs et les Genres Littéraires. Bureaux de la Societe des Bollandistes (1921).
- DODD, C.H. The Johannine Epistles. Hodder & Stoughton (1946).
- DODDS, E.R. Pagan and Christian in An Age of Anxiety. C.U.P. (1965).
- The Ancient Concept of Progress : and other Essays on Greek literature and belief. O.U.P. (1973).
- DOYLE, A.C. Pheneas Speaks. Psychic P. (1926).
- ELLISON, H.L. "Ebionites", N.I.D.C.C. (1974).
- ELMSLIE, W.A.L. "The Mishna on Idolatry : 'Aboda Zara'", Camb. Texts & Stud. 8.2 (1911).
- FARNELL, L.R. The Cults of the Greek States, III & IV. Clarendon P. (1907).
- FASCHER, E. Προφήτης. Töpelmann (1927).
- FICKER, G. "Widerlungen eines Montanisten", Z.K.G. 26 (1905), 447-63.
- FOERSTER, W. Gnosis. Eng. tr. ed. by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vol. O.U.P. (1972-74).
- FORD, J.M. "St. Paul the Philogamist", N.T.S. 11 (1964-5), 326-48.
- "Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian Heresy?" J.E.H. 17 (1966), 145-58.
- FREEMAN, G. "Montanism and the Pagan Cults of Phrygia", Dominican Studs. 3 (1950), 297-316.
- FREEMAN-GRENVILLE, G.S.P. "The Date of the Outbreak of Montanism", J.E.H. 5 (1954), 7-15.
- FREND, W.H.C. The Donatist Church. O.U.P. (1952).
- "A third-century Inscription relating to angareia in Phrygia", J.R.S. 46 (1956) 46-56.
- "The Seniores Laici and the Origins of the Church in North Africa", J.T.S., N.S. 12 (1961), 280-84.
- Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. Blackwell (1965).
- "A Note on Jews and Christians in Third-Century North Africa", J.T.S., N.S. 21 (1970), 92-96.
- FULLER, J.M. "Ebionism and Ebionites", D.C.B. II (1880).
- "Tertullianus", D.C.B. IV (1887).
- "Ebionism and Ebionites", D.C.B.L. (1911).

- GEORGII, L. "'Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts' von Dr. F.C.A. Schwegler", Deut. Jahr. Wiss. Kunst (1842), 45-58, 129-51, 913-27.
- GIBSON, E. "Montanist Epitaphs at Uşak", Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studs 16 (1975), 433-42.
- GRABAR, A. Christian Iconography : a Study of its Origins. Routledge & K.P. (1969).
- GRAILLOT, H. Le Culte de Cybele. Fontemoing (1912).
- GRANT, R.M. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. 2nd ed. Columbia U.P. (1966).
- GRÉGOIRE, H. "Épigraphie Chrétienne : I Les inscriptions hérétiques d'Asie Mineure", Byzantion I (1924), 695-710.
 - "Du Nouveau sur le Hiérarchie de la Secte Montaniste", Byzantion 2 (1925), 329-35.
 - "Épigraphie Hérétique...et Hérésie Épigraphique", Byzantion 10 (1935), 247-50.
 - Les Persécutions des l'Empire Romain. Académie Royale de Belgique (1951).
- GWATKIN, H.M. Early Church History to A.D. 313, II. Macmillan (1909).
- HAENCHEN, E. The Acts of the Apostles : a commentary. Blackwell (1971).
- HANSON, R.P.C. "Notes on Tertullian's Interpretation of Scripture", J.T.S., N.S. 12 (1961), 273-77.
- HEFELE, C.J. von A History of the Christian Councils : from the Original Documents. Eng. tr. by W.R. Clark, 2nd ed. T. & T. Clark (1872).
- HILGENFELD, A. Die Glossolalie in der alten Kirche. Leipzig (1850).
- JONES, A.H.M. Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces. O.U.P. (1937).
 - "Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?" J.T.S., N.S. 10 (1959), 280-98.
 - The Later Roman Empire, Blackwell (1964).
- KELLY, J.N.D. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles : 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus. Black (1963).
- KNOX, R.A. Enthusiasm : a Chapter in the History of Religion. O.U.P. (1950).
- KRAFT, H. "Die altkirchliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus", Th. Z. 11 (1955), 249-71.
- KYDD, R.A.N. Charismata to 320 A.D. : a Study of the Overt Pneumatic Experiences of the Early Church. University of St. Andrews, Ph.D. thesis (1973).
- LA PIANA, G. "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century", Harvard Theol. Rev. 18 (1925), 201-77.

- LAWLOR, H.J. "The Heresy of the Phrygians" in Eusebiana, pp.108-3
Clarendon P. (1912).
- LEWIS, I.M. Ecstatic Religion : an Anthropological Study of
Spirit Possession and Shamanism. Pelican (1971),
- LIGHTFOOT, J.B. Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to
Philemon. Macmillan (1892).
- LINDBLOM, J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Blackwell (1962).
- LINFORTH, I.M. "The Corybantic Rites in Plato", Univ. of
California Pubs. in Classical Philology 13 (1946), 121-62.
- LIPSIUS, R.A. "Gospels : Apocryphal", D.C.B. II (1880).
- MAGIE, D. Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third
Century after Christ, 2 vol. Princeton U.P. (1950).
- MILLAR, F. et al The Roman Empire and its Neighbours.
Weidenfeld & Nicholson (1967).
- MILLER, R.D. The Origin and Original Nature of Apollo. Univ.
of Pennsylvania, dissertation (1939).
- MILMAN, H.H. History of Latin Christianity, I. 4th ed.
Murray (1867).
- MOHRMANN, C. "Saint Jérôme et Saint Augustin sur Tertullien",
V.C. 5 (1951), 111-12.
- MONCEAUX, P. Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne, I.
Leroux (1901).
- "Enquête sur l'Épigraphie Chrétienne d'Afrique II :
Inscriptions Juives", Rev. Archéol. 4e ser. 3 (1904), 354-73.
- NEANDER, A. General History of the Christian Religion and
Church, II. Eng. tr. by J. Torrey, rev. by A.J.W. Morrison.
Bohn (1851).
- OESTERREICH, T.K. Possession : Demoniacal and Other among
Primitive Races, in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and Modern
Times. Eng. tr. by D. Ibberson. Kegan Paul (1930).
- PARKE, H.W. & WORMELL, D.E.W. The Delphic Oracle. Blackwell
(1956).
- PODMORE, F. Mediums of the 19th Century. 2 vol. New York:
University Books (1963).
- POWELL, D. "Tertullianists and Cataphrygians", V.C. 29 (1975),
33-54.
- PRESTIGE, G.L. Fathers and Heretics. S.P.C.K. (1940).
- RAMSAY, W.M. "Sepulchral Customs in Ancient Phrygia", J.H.S.
5 (1884), 241-62.
- "Early Christian Monuments in Phrygia. Expositor, 3rd Ser. 8
(1888), 241-67, 401-27; 9 (1889), 141-60, 253-72.
- Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vol. O.U.P. (1895-97).
- "Geographical Conditions determining History and Religion in
Asia Minor", Geographical J. 20 (1902), 257-82.

- RÉVILLE, A. "Études sur Tertullien", Nouv. Rev. Théol. 1 (1858), 49-111.
- RICHARDS, J. But Deliver Us from Evil : an Introduction to the Demonic Dimension in Pastoral Care. Dartman, Longman & Todd (1974).
- RITSCHL, A. Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. Marcus. 1. Auf. (1850), 2. Auf. (1857).
- ROBERTS, R.E. The Theology of Tertullian. Epworth (1924).
- ROSTOVITZ, M.I. The Social & Economic History of the Roman Empire. O.U.P. (1926),
- The Social & Economic History of the Hellenistic World, 3 vol. O.U.P. (1941).
- SALMON, G. "Hippolytus Romanus", D.C.B. III (1882).
- SARGANT, W. The Mind Possessed : a Physiology of Possession, Mysticism and Faith Healing. Heinemann (1973).
- SCHEPELERN, W. Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte. Mohr (1929).
- SCHWEGLER, F.C.A. Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Fues (1841).
- SIDER, R.D. Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian. O.U.P. (1971).
- SIMON, M. Verus Israel : Étude sur les Relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire Romain. Boccard (1948).
- Recherches d'Histoire Judéo-Chrétienne. (École Pratique des Hautes Études, Sorbonne, Études Juives 6). Mouton (1962).
- SMITH, R.G. "Tertullian and Montanism", Theology 46 (1942), 127-36.
- SUNDKLER, B.G.M. Bantu Prophets in South Africa. 2nd ed. O.U.P. (1961).
- SWETE, H.B. "Penitential Discipline in the First Three Centuries" J.T.S. 4 (1903), 321-37.
- The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. Macmillan (1912).
- TELFER, W. "The Date of the Martyrdom of Polycarp", J.T.S., N.S. 3 (1952), 79-83.
- "The Origins of Christianity in Africa", Stud. Pat. 4, T.u.U. 79 (1961), 512-17.
- VAN GRONINGEN, G. First Century Gnosticism : its Origins and Motifs. Brill (1967).
- VAN UNNIK, W.C. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings. Eng. tr. by H.H. Hoskins. S.C.M. (1960).
- VISSER, A.J. "A Bird's-Eye View of Ancient Christian Eschatology", Numen 14 (1967), 4-22.

- WIEDER, N. The Judean Scrolls and Karaism. Horovitz (1962).
- WIESEN, D.S. St. Jerome as a Satirist. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 34). Cornell U.P. (1964).
- WILSON, R. McL. The Gnostic Problem : a Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy. Mowbray (1958).
- Gnosis and the New Testament. Blackwell (1968).