PHILADELPHIA AND MONTANISM.¹

BY W. M. CALDER, M.A.

LECTURER IN CHRISTIAN EPIGRAPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

1.

ALL serious discussion of the problems of Early-Christian Epigraphv must begin with a reference to Constantine. For it was after the victory of Constantine in A.D. 312, or rather, if we are thinking of the Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, after the final defeat of Licinus in A.D. 323, that Christianity became, for the first time, a legal religion. During the preceding two and a half centuries, the life of every individual member of the Church was forfeit; *non licet esse vos*. This, of course, is an accurate statement only of the legal position; in practice, the Christians generally went unmolested. It was only when 'the panic of a populace, or the bigotry of a magistrate, or the malice of some influential personage'—above all, when the deliberate policy of an individual emperor—'awoke it into activity,'² that persecution fell on the Church. Over long periods, and in many districts where the Christians were in a majority or commanded influence, the individual Christian was not interfered with so long as his conduct did not challenge attention. But the machinery of persecution was always at the disposal of those who could show good cause why it should be set in motion. And,

¹ My best thanks are due to my friend Professor A. S. Peake, who has not only helped me with much searching criticism of the original draft of the Rylands Library lecture (13 December, 1922) which formed the basis of this paper, but allowed me to read and to profit by his unpublished Ellerton Prize Essay on Montanism (1890). He has, however, no responsibility for the views put forward in these pages. My obligations, on the archaeological side to Ramsay, Cumont, Anderson, and Mendel, and on the literary side to Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers* will be obvious to all who are acquainted with recent work in this field.

the machinery once set in motion, the law had to take its course. That the Church paid the full price of adherence to its faith, the numberless martyrdoms of those centuries testify. But the *Acta Martyrum* present a very one-sided picture of the relations of the early Christians with the Roman State. If the bolder spirits, when challenged—or even on challenge given—were ready to go to the stake or to the arena for their principles, both they and the great majority usually took pains to avoid the challenge. And so we find that Constantine's legalisation of Christianity led to an immediate change of character in the commonest class of public monuments used by the early Christians, the tombstones which they prepared for their own graves or erected over the graves of their dead. In the Christian epitaphs of the pre-Constantinian period,¹ we find a universal avoidance of any overt avowal of Christianity which would attract the notice of, or give a handle to, the hostile pagan. Indeed, the vast majority of the Christian epitaphs of this period are undistinguishable among the mass of pagan epitaphs. The principle laid down in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (§ 4): 'For this cause, therefore, brethren, we praise not those who deliver themselves up, since the Gospel doth not so teach us' gives pithy expression to the practice of pre-Constantinian Christians all over the Roman Empire, as we find it exemplified in their epitaphs. After Christianity was declared legal, open profession of religion became fashionable, and the various formulae and symbols used on Christian tombstones in the post-Nicene period have formed the subject of much study.

It is well known that pre-Constantinian Christian epitaphs, recognisable as Christian, are found in considerable numbers only in two places, in the Roman Catacombs and in Asia Minor, especially in Phrygia. In the Catacombs, History and Archaeology, working hand in hand, have traced Christian burials as far back as the end of the first century; in Phrygia, inscriptions identifiable as Christian begin to appear at the end of the second century. The New Testament, the Letters of Ignatius, the story of Polycarp and the history of Phrygian Montanism bear witness to the numerous Asian Christians who died and were buried long before this date; the epitaphs of many of these

¹ I speak of those which were dedicated openly for all to see. In this respect, as in many others, the epitaphs of the Roman Catacombs form a class by themselves.
FIG. 1.—SKETCH-MAP TO ILLUSTRATE EARLY MONTANIST HISTORY.
Christians are in our hands; but we cannot recognise them. Sepulchral custom changes slowly, and it was only gradually that the Asian Christians adopted the use of formulae which differed from those used by their pagan neighbours. In the third century, criteria by which we can distinguish Christian from pagan epitaphs begin to emerge. The character of these criteria is of interest as illustrating the attitude of the early Christians in Phrygia to pagan society and to the Roman government, and their discovery is sufficiently recent to merit a brief notice.

In the eighties and nineties of last century, mainly through the enterprise of Ramsay and his English and American companions, and of the French School at Athens, Phrygia was for the first time exhaustively explored, and a rich harvest of Roman Imperial inscriptions was gathered in, the great majority being, of course, epitaphs. Interest in the early Christianity of this region was aroused by Ramsay's discovery, in 1881, at Hieropolis in the Phrygian Pentapolis, of an inscription dated A.D. 216, which begins with the words:

'Citizen of a select city, I have, while still living, made this tomb, that my body may here have a resting-place before the eyes of men.'

When this inscription was published, Mm. Di Rossi and Duchesne at once recognised that it had been copied from the epitaph of St. Abercius of 'Hierapolis' preserved in the Life of the Saint, which opens with the same words, that it proved that epitaph to be genuine, and that it was itself Christian. In 1883 Ramsay and Sterrett were fortunate enough to find, also at Hieropolis, a fragment of the very epitaph which had been preserved in the Life of Avircius Marcellus. As Avircius was still living in A.D. 192, when the anti-Montanist tractate preserved in Eusebius was addressed to him, and as his epitaph had been set up and copied in another epitaph before A.D. 216, the date of the dedication of his monument is fixed with certainty within a few years of A.D. 200. Here was a starting-point for the chronological arrangement of the early-Christian inscriptions of

1 Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics, p. 720.
2 Ramsay, op. cit., p. 722. In l. 5, I read πάντη ὀρόσωντας, for reasons to be stated in the article referred to below, p. 321 note 4.
3 H.E., V., 16, 3.
Phrygia; a series of dated monuments marked out further stages along the road; and Ramsay and Duchesne, working independently and both following the methods of classification which had been so successfully applied by Di Rossi and Le Blant to the Christian Epigraphy of Italy and of Gaul, came to practically identical conclusions as to the criteria by which Christian inscriptions in Phrygia are to be identified and classified. The result has been to throw a flood of light on the primitive Christianity of this region, and to arouse interest in the Christian archaeology of Asia Minor generally.

Some of the criteria discovered by Ramsay and Duchesne are relevant to the purpose I have in view in this lecture, and it is necessary to describe them briefly. The Phrygians, as is well known, attached the greatest importance to the housing and tendance of the dead, for the sepulchre played a central part in their religion. The grave was popularly known as the 'house' of the dead, and elaborate precautions were taken to safeguard the dead in the rightful possession of their property. Hence the custom grew up, apparently under legal sanction, of prescribing penalties for any infringement of the rights of the owners of the tomb; these penalties were made payable to the Roman Fiscus, or to a city or corporation or to any individual who should prosecute or give information leading to a prosecution. Epitaphs drafted in this form had the character of testamentary dispositions, and copies of them were preserved in the city archives. The stock formula is: 'If anyone disturbs this grave or buries an alien corpse in it, he shall pay a fine of so much to so and so'.

But another, and more archaic type of formula used for the protection of tombs simply invoked the wrath of Heaven on the wrongdoer. Such devotiones are very common on the pagan tombstones of Asia Minor; they were used almost to the exclusion of the 'fine-formulae' in the country districts (where, in the later third century, they were often expressed in the Phrygian language), and they also appear frequently in city epitaphs. They invoke the wrath either of the gods in general, or of a particular group of gods, or of the gods or god of the locality. Examples of such devotiones are: (The violator of the
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1 Ramsay, J.H.S., 1883, p. 400; Duchesne, Rev. Quest. Hist., 1883, p. 25.
2 See, e.g., the inscription of Thyatira discussed below, p. 347.
3 See No. 13 below.
from these examples, for a reason which will appear presently, I have separated two instances of a grammatical construction which is very rare in pagan use: έστι αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἑλλών (= Ἑλλῶν) κε Σελήνην (Lycia) and (ἐκτείσει τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Τερμησσέων (δηνάρια) μί) καὶ έσται αὐτῷ καὶ πρὸς τῶν κατοικομένων, 'he shall have to deal also with the spirits of the dead' (Pisidia).

A formula closely resembling the two last, έσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, occurs over and over again on third-century inscriptions of central Phrygia. It is obvious that none of the pagan devotiones I have quoted, which themselves are typical of a very large number of similar formulae, could be used by a Christian; it is equally obvious that the formula έσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν could give no possible offence to a pagan, who would see in it a reference to the god of the locality, whom he himself was wont to honour simply as θεός in dedications. If this central Phrygian formula stood alone, it would be hazardous to treat it as Christian rather than as pagan; but when we find it varied as έσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ζώντα θεόν in an inscription of Eumeneia we begin to wonder whether we are not in touch with Christian sentiment. This suspicion is raised to a certainty by still another variation of the formula έσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν * ; the last symbol, for the Christians, was the monogram of Jesus Christ, although it was easy for the unsuspecting or indifferent pagan to confuse it with an abbreviation of χριστιαναί which was in pagan use. Still

1 I take those examples from Stemler's list in Griech. Grabinschr. Kleinasiens, p. 70 f., where references are given.
2 Stemler, op. cit., p. 71.
3 Lanckoronski, Städtc Pamphyliens und Pisidiens, II., p. 218, no. 170.
4 Ramsay, Cities and Bishops, p. 514.
6 Lanckoronski, op. cit., II., p. 219, no. 173, where the testator ἐσπευσάτω ἐπὶ τοῦ * ὁτι... (there follow regulations for the use of a tomb).
further variations of this formula emphasise its Christian character even more strongly; although probably not one of them is so exclusively Christian that it could not be used by a pious pagan: e.g. ἔσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν ἀθάνατον θεόν, πρὸς τὸν κρυπτὸν θεόν, πρὸς τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ, etc. A second formula, which takes the place of the Central Phrygian formula further to the east, is δῶσει λόγον θεῷ 'he shall account to God'; at Philomelium this formula is used with the addition τῷ μέλλοντι κρείνειν ἔως και νεκρούς, whose Christian character is guaranteed by an inscription of Iconium. The case for treating these formulæ as a sign of Christianity is already strong; but when we further observe that many of the inscriptions using them betray Christian influence in their use of family names, and that none of these inscriptions show any trace of pagan religious feeling, we are entitled to claim a verdict. In short, the Christian origin of a large series of third-century epitaphs in central Phrygia is definitely established; in the chain of reasoning which led Ramsay and Duchesne to the identification of these epitaphs, no weak link has been revealed by subsequent discovery, and the results secured by them form a solid foundation for further work.

I have thought it worth while to describe the discovery and identification of these Christian monuments at some length, because only by doing so could I indicate how slight are the marks which differentiate them from pagan monuments, and how unlikely they are to have challenged the hostility or even the attention of contemporary pagans. This character was not undesigned. The Christian of set purpose avoided any open expression which would attract the notice of a potential accuser. Such conduct on the side of the Christians finds its counterpart in the normal attitude of the Roman government, as expressed in Trajan's letter to Pliny: 'They (the Christians) are not to be sought out; but if accused and convicted they must be punished, unless they recant. Anonymous accusations, however, cannot be entertained.' Clearly the Roman government did not, as a rule, desire massacres of Christians; the Christians, on their part, took pains not to give offence.

1 See Ramsay, op. cit., p. 514 ff.
2 Published by the writer in Rev. de Phil., 1912, p. 68: ἀσχημοσύνη ἔρεις τοῦ δοκίμου ἐν ζωτασ καὶ νεκροῦς. Cf. the inscription of Thyatira, p. 347 below.
Ramsay\(^1\) and Cumont\(^2\) have commented on a characteristic of the early-Christian inscriptions of Phrygia which distinguishes them from contemporary inscriptions in the West—the absence of a distinctive symbolism. The decoration and imagery used on these monuments resembled those used in pagan epitaphs, with the difference that pagan cult emblems tended to be suppressed on the Christian slabs. It was, generally speaking, only a few decades after the Council of Nicaea that symbols like the cross were used in Asia Minor.

The inscriptions which I have been describing extend continuously, and in bulk, over the portion of Phrygia which lay between the two great roads leading from the west coast to the interior, the Hermus Valley and Maeander Valley routes. This area has been very exhaustively explored, and it is clear that most of it was largely Christian in the third century. The social picture which the inscriptions present, as Ramsay has pointed out,\(^3\) is one of orderly development, and of good feeling and accommodation between the Christians and their pagan neighbours. We find Christians holding municipal office, and thus entering into relations with the Roman government and the Roman state religion which must have required careful adjustment between the claims of patriotism and those of conscience. At the end of the third century, this district suffered severely in the persecution initiated by Diocletian, whose policy aimed at the extirpation of Christianity, and who attacked the Church in its strongest positions. But throughout the third century—as the ecclesiastical historians have pointed out—persecution weighed but lightly on Phrygia; during those long periods when the government was friendly or indifferent, and the initiative in persecution, if taken at all, was taken by individuals, the Christians of Phrygia enjoyed a *pax ecclesiae* of their own. These facts, their previous immunity from persecution and their wholesale suffering under Diocletian and his associates bear witness both to their spirit of accommodation and to their numbers and influence.

The district with which we are concerned lay along, and immediately north of, the Maeander Valley route which led from Ephesus past Hierapolis, Laodicea and Colossae to Southern Galatia. It was along this route that St. Paul had planted his churches; and the

\(^1\) *Cities and Bishoprics*, p. 489,
\(^2\) *Mélanges d’Arch., etc.*, 1895, p. 256.
\(^3\) For what follows, cf. *Cities and Bishoprics*, p. 502 ff.
source of the Christianity of Central Phrygia has never been doubtful. Ramsay long ago concluded, and no one has disputed the correctness of his conclusion, that Central Phrygia, which lies just east and northeast of Laodicea, Hierapolis and Colossae, was christianised from the Pauline churches in these cities. The 'concealed' type of epitaph, with all that it implies in respect of the Christian attitude to pagan society, was used by the early Christians of Central Phrygia right up to the Hermus Valley road throughout the third century. It is found sporadically to the north and east of this region, where the formula δώσει λόγον θεῷ prevailed over the Central Phrygian ἐσται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

We now turn our attention to a very different type of Christian tombstone, the known examples of which belong to the second half of the third century and perhaps run over into the first two decades of the fourth. A number of these monuments have been found in the Tembris Valley,¹ which lies some thirty miles north of the region we have been describing, and isolated examples have come to light at Traianopolis,² on the Hermus Valley route, near Thyatira³ in Lydia, and possibly at Apamea⁴ in Central Phrygia. These monuments stand in sharp contrast to those of Central Phrygia, and are, indeed, unexampled in the whole Roman world. It should be borne in mind that Phrygian tombstones were set up openly, for all to see, and were not dedicated in underground caverns like the tablets in the Roman Catacombs. The words of Avircius Marcellus, Ἐφανείρως σώματος εἴθα θέσω⁵ apply to all Phrygian epitaphs, orthodox as well as sectarian.

But not even the Roman Catacombs can show a series of third-century epitaphs, which were dedicated by 'Christians to Christians,' and which state the fact boldly for all to read. There are features in these tombstones which would surprise us were they not accompanied by this bold avowal of Christianity. Two of them⁶ contain the Christian title πρεσβύτερος. 'In other parts of Phrygia,' says the discoverer of the first of these, 'this would indicate a post-Constantine date, but that criterion does not apply to this district; where people openly call themselves Christians, there could be no reason for avoiding the mention of a Christian office. This conclusion is supported

¹ Nos. 2-12 below. ² No. 1 below. ³ No. 13 below. ⁴ No. 14 below. ⁵ See p. 312 above. ⁶ Nos. 8 and 12 below.
by the style of the lettering, which seems to me clearly to belong to
the third century (or, at least, to the early years of the fourth).”¹

The use of Christian titles is not absolutely unexampled elsewhere in
pre-Constantinian inscriptions; an inscription of Eumeneia mentioning
an ἐπίσκοπος is almost certainly of the third century;”² but as
titles like ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος were used by pagans in a
different sense, their open use by Christians, rare as it was, was not
a serious deviation from their normal sepulchral practice. But the
second of the two inscriptions referred to, which is also pre-Constan-
tinian, casts aside all concealment and proclaims that the sons of the
dedicator are Χρηστιανοὶ πρεσβύτεροι. Two of the ‘Christians
to Christians’ monuments,” again, have a cross carved over the in-
scription. It is a noteworthy fact that even in the West, where sym-
bolism developed early and freely, the sign of the cross was late in
making its appearance on Christian tombstones. In the early days of
Jewish Christianity, the avoidance of this σκάνδαλον is intelligible;
but it was long before even the Gentile Christians adopted the cross
as a sepulchral symbol. In Asia Minor, apart from two or three ex-
ceptional cases, it appears first about A.D. 350, and soon became
almost universal.”³ But neither the open use of Christian titles nor the
open use of the cross, significant as both are as features of this group
of epitaphs, would by themselves indicate more than a rather extreme
example of the ‘concealed’ type.”⁴

² Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics, pp. 501, 521; Cumont, Milanges
d’Arch., etc., 1895, p. 264. For Isaurian practice, cf. Miss Ramsay in
³ Nos. 9, 10 below.
⁴ See my note in J.R.S., 1920, p. 56, where the list of exceptions
should be completed (so far as I know them) by references to the Tembris
Valley examples and to the monument published by Miss Ramsay in Studies
in E. Rom. Prov., p. 36, where the crosses form an inconspicuous part of
the decoration. On the tombstone published, ibid., p. 83, I suspect the
cross to be a later addition, as in a monument published in J.H.S., 1913, p.
104, where a few strokes of the chisel and the carving of a cross converted a
Phrygian curse-formula into a Christian tombstone. Cf. also J.H.S., 1911,
p. 169, No. x.
⁵ The cross, indeed, occurs on an epitaph from the Tembris Valley
(Studies in E. Rom. Prov., p. 217, No. 16), which appears to belong to
the third century, and does not exhibit the formula ‘Christians to Chris-
tians.’ A fourth example (op. cit., p. 143), is of very doubtful Christianity,
But the carving of the formula ‘Christians to Christians’ openly on gravestones contradicts, as we have seen, the universal practice of the Church in the period before Constantine. The Christians who dedicated these tombstones were evidently in fundamental disagreement with their co-religionaries of Central Phrygia, and, we may add, of the Roman Empire generally, on the question of profession. How are we to explain this divergence of opinion and of practice?

These inscriptions have attracted much attention, and the theory which Ramsay put forward in 1888,¹ to account for their character has been widely followed. Ramsay showed that the earliest Christian missions in Asia Minor radiated from three centres, all of Apostolic foundation: Ephesus and the Churches of Asia, the Churches of South Galatia, and the Churches of Bithynia and Pontus. In Northern Phrygia he detected the meeting-place of two streams of Christian influence. The ‘concealed’ epitaphs belonged to the Christianity which spread from Ephesus and Laodicea over Central Phrygia. The ‘open profession’ epitaphs of Northern Phrygia were produced by the influence of a more rigid type of Christianity which originated in Bithynia, and followed the great road which leads from the Bosporus into the interior of Asia Minor, and reaches the plateau in Northern Phrygia. A further explanation of the freedom of profession in the Tembris Valley was sought in the remoteness of this district from large cities, which screened it from the attention of Roman government officials.

This supplementary hypothesis has been effectively demolished by Ramsay’s further work. In Studies in the Eastern Roman Provinces, p. 188 ff., Anderson adduces new evidence confirming an earlier theory of Ramsay’s that the territory on which several at least of these epitaphs were dedicated belonged to a Roman Imperial Estate. And in the same work, p. 305 ff., Ramsay has shown that the coloni on the Imperial Estates of a large part of Central Asia Minor were organised in a pagan religious association which had its headquarters near Pisidian Antioch, and whose monuments show it to have been definitely anti-Christian. Further, an entry on the lists of sub-

and is probably, in any case, post-Constantinian. The cross occasionally appears on pagan monuments; an Anatolian example in Mendel, Catalogue du Musée de Brousse, p. 160. ¹Expositor, 1888, pp. 241 ff, 401 ff.
scribes to the funds of this association shows that it included *coloni* from Tataion or Tottaion, the second of the two chief places on the Tembris Valley Estate.¹ Roman officials of high standing were no doubt seldom seen in this region, but the inference that the 'open profession' monuments were set up in safe and unobserved seclusion will not bear examination. It is now clear that the anti-Christian brotherhoods on the Imperial Estates played no inconsiderable part in the persecutions of the later third century, and it was at least as unsafe to proclaim oneself a Christian on those Estates as it was in one of the greater cities. Anderson has pointed out that the monuments of this very region preserve traces of the artificial revival of pagan cult which was part of the policy of the persecuting Emperors in the later third century.²

The hypothesis of Bithynian influence at an earlier period is not impossible in itself; but it is equally unsatisfactory as an explanation of the Tembris Valley epitaphs. To make it fit the facts, it would be necessary to show that early Bithynian Christianity was of a specially uncompromising character, and that this character lasted on in its North-Phrygian offshoot. There is, however, no reason to believe that the Christianity of Bithynia differed from that of Southern Asia. If the evidence of an outsider can be trusted, Pliny's letter to Trajan on the Christians appears to indicate the same mixture of bold and faint, and the same desire on the part of the Christians to reach a *modus vivendi*,³ as we should expect to find in a non-Christian account of similar proceedings in Asia.

Ramsay, indeed, was at one time disposed to account for the Tembris Valley epitaphs by the only hypothesis which appears to me to fit all the facts, the hypothesis that they are the epitaphs of a community of Montanists.⁴ Those who are familiar with the Montanist writings of Tertullian will readily admit that there is at least a *prima facie* case for this view. Tertullian, after he went over to Montanism, wrote two treatises on the duty of Christians in regard to the profession of their faith, and leaves us in no doubt as to the Montanist attitude

on this question. It was the duty of a Christian to proclaim his faith openly in all circumstances, and risk the consequences. What Tertullian had preached, the peasants of the Tembris Valley practiced. So long as we treat these epitaphs as orthodox, we are at a loss to explain why they should differ so radically from all known orthodox epitaphs. The theory that they were dedicated in circumstances of special security has broken down. Regarded as the monuments of a sect which looked on profession as a duty not to be evaded, and martyrdom as a prize to be coveted, they begin to be intelligible. On one of them, the dedicator describes himself as a 'great soldier'; *miles Christi* was almost a technical term in Montanist phraseology; and in its Montanist sense of 'soldier of Christ' we may concede his right to the title.

But our case for assigning these epitaphs to a community of Montanists will become stronger if we can make it appear probable that a Montanist community existed in this rustic and backward part of Phrygia. That such a community did exist is made highly probable by evidence collected by Anderson which bears on the Christianity of this region at a later date. In the fourth century, Novatianism was very strong in this neighbourhood: in the year A.D. 368 the neighbouring city of Kotiaïon, the Metropolis of the Tembris Valley, had a Novatian bishop, and the Novatian Synod of Pazon was held in the same year at a point a little to the east of the Tembris Valley, near the source of the Sangarius. Now Harnack has observed that the earlier Montanists in other parts of Asia Minor appear as Novatians in the fourth century, a view to which I had been independently led by a study of the fourth-century Christianity of Eastern Phrygia in the light of a set of new heretical inscriptions. To argue back from Novatianism in the fourth century to Montanism in the third is not a violent proceeding, and we should at least not run counter to the archaeological evidence if we assumed this development in the Christianity of the Tembris Valley.

But a safer basis for argument will be a topographical study of the Montanist movement itself, and here we shall be in a position to argue

---

1 No. 12 below.  
3 *Expansion of Christianity*, II., p. 356.  
4 They will be published in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, now in the press.
forwards as well as backwards. We have examined the character of the Christianity which spread over Central Phrygia in the third century, and we have observed that it spread from the Pauline Churches in the south. Here, what we may call (using the term for the present in a purely geographical sense), *Laodicean* Christianity was already firmly established when the inscriptions begin to tell their tale about A.D. 200, and in the inscriptions of this district, with one doubtful exception, we find no trace of the influence of Montanist tenets. But this is the very region in which ecclesiastical tradition and the evidence of epigraphy place the storm-centre of the great Montanist controversy, which convulsed the Asian Church in the third quarter of the second century, and whose echoes continue to reverberate throughout Asia Minor till about A.D. 200. The local names recorded in connection with the Montanist controversy in Phrygia all belong to the strip of country lying along and between the roads which mounted to the plateau from Laodicea and from Philadelphia respectively; and the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, the most remarkable of all early Christian epitaphs, sets before us, 'in the brief and clear-cut terms of a last will and testament,' the opinions of an anti-Montanist leader of this district who had lived through the controversy.

The origin and even the nature of the original Phrygian Montanism are wrapped in obscurity. According to the most probable view, the prophet Montanus appeared in A.D. 157 and the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla about the same time or a little later. The activity of these three fills the third quarter of the second century. To penetrate behind Tertullian, who went over to Montanism early in the third century and became the great expositor of the new prophecy, to the original Montanism of Montanus and his companions, is an adventure which has tempted many famous historians of dogma. That collections of Montanist 'prophecies' were in circulation is certain, and it is also certain that these were accessible to Tertullian, probably in the original Greek. But Tertullian's quotations from these 'prophetic books,' together with Montanist sayings preserved in the controversial writings of opponents, amount in all to twenty brief sentences. Amid such poverty of ascertained fact, it is not surprising that the

---

1 See on No. 14 below.
3 Collected, *ibid.*, p. 197 ff.
PHILADELPHIA AND MONTANISM

historians of dogma present the enquirer into the character of Phrygian Montanism with a bewildering wealth of opinion. The layman must avoid controversial issues, and operate only with agreed facts. All, or most, recent authorities are agreed that Phrygian Montanism, with its doctrine of the Paraclete and its belief in the approach of a Great Persecution followed by the Second Advent, its claim that the age of Apostolic revelation had not ended or the fountains of prophecy run dry, its appeal to the revelation of its own prophets as the completion of Old Testament and New Testament revelation, its rigorist discipline, stern attitude to the lapsed, and insistence on the duty of profession even at the risk of martyrdom—all are agreed that in these respects Phrygian Montanism represented tendencies which were widely prevalent in the Church as a whole. It is equally clear that an organised group holding such opinions was bound to come into conflict with a Church which, on the one hand, was beginning to regard the Canon of the New Testament as closed, and on the other hand, lay under the necessity of devising a rule of life which would ensure its survival and growth in the midst of a pagan society and under a hostile pagan government. Can the student of Phrygian antiquities suggest reasons why such a group should have appeared, and the schism should have been precipitated in Phrygia? The following pages are an attempt to give a partial answer to this question. The answer is partial because it must confine itself to a study of certain aspects of the local history, topography and archaeology of early Christianity in Asia. With questions of doctrine we can have no concern.

Let us glance once more at the local facts recorded in connection with the earliest Montanist movement. Christianity, as is well known, moved at first along the great highways of the Roman Empire, and only after a time attacked the regions lying off these routes. We find the Montanist controversy affecting the cities of Central Phrygia between A.D. 157 and 200. After A.D. 200, when the inscriptions begin to tell their story, we find Central Phrygia solidly orthodox. Towards the middle of the third century, and from then to its close, we find evidence of Montanist communities in Northern Phrygia and along the Lydian border. May we assume as a working hypothesis that the Montanist type of Christianity, like the South-Asian type, was launched into Central Phrygia from some point on a great route, that it competed
with the South-Asian type for the evangelisation of Central Phrygia, that it was eventually worsted and driven northwards into the rustic and backward region of the Tembris? If this hypothesis leads to fruitful results, it will have been proved to contain some element of truth.

Eusebius tells us that Montanus appeared in 'Ardabau'—clearly a corrupt form of a local name—on the borders of Phrygia and Mysia. This description, taken by itself, would apply to any point on the notoriously vague borderland of Phrygia and Mysia from Philadelphia to Dorylaeum. The next local names recorded—Pepouza and Eumeneia—make it highly probable that 'Ardabau' lay in the neighbourhood of Philadelphia; and it is a very attractive suggestion of Ramsay's that the name was Kardaba, which would make it identical with Kallatoba near Philadelphia. The places known to early Montanist history, Pepouza (east of Philadelphia, where the Montanists awaited the descent of the New Jerusalem), Eumeneia, Otrous and Hieropolis—all lie in the region between the Philadelphia and Laodicean roads to the plateau. Let us therefore begin with Philadelphia, examining the early Christian records of the Philadelphia region, and see whether they throw any light on our problem. The earliest reference to Philadelphean Christianity is in the Apocalypse, which was written towards the end of the first century. Ignatius, between A.D. 110 and A.D. 118, passed through the city, communed with the members of its Church, and wrote them a letter from Troas. A group of martyrs from Philadelphia suffered with Polycarp at Smyrna in A.D. 155, as we learn from the letter sent by the Church in Smyrna to the Church in Philomelium at the time of the martyrdom. At some unknown date between A.D. 100 and A.D. 150 we must place the activity of the Philadelphian prophetess Ammia whose prophecy, as the Anonymous in Eusebius informs us, was accepted by the orthodox party in the Montanist controversy as of equal validity with that of the canonical Agabus and the daughters of Philip. This list, I believe, exhausts the literary record of Phila-

1 H.E., V., 16, 7. κώμη τῆς εἶναι λέγεται ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν Φρυγίαν Μυσία, καλομείη 'Αρδαβαίον τοῖνομα.
2 Cities and Bishoprics, p. 573, where a site S. or S.E. of Philadelphia is suggested for 'Ardabau'.
3 H.E., V., 17, 2, 3, 4.
delphian Christianity down to the middle of the second century. Philadelphia has yielded few inscriptions; its earliest Christian inscriptions belong to the fifth century.¹

We begin with the Letter to the Church in Philadelphia in the Apocalypse. Philadelphia was one of 'the Seven Churches of Asia,' whatever these words imply. That these Churches held some sort of precedence or representative character among the churches of the province Asia, and that they were individually well known to the author of the Apocalypse, admits of no doubt. They may very well, as Ramsay has suggested,² have been centres of distribution in the postal system maintained by the early Church—certainly no more probable explanation has been offered of the choice of these seven Churches as the recipients of the Letters. It is, in any case, a fact that two of these Churches, those of Philadelphia and Laodicea, lay farthest along the two great routes of Christian expansion in the province Asia, and lay closest of all the Seven Churches to the Central Phrygian district which we have found to have been in fact evangelised, and to have formed the scene of the Montanist mission, during the second century. Now let us see what the author of the Apocalypse thought of the Christianity of Philadelphia and of Laodicea respectively. I quote from the Laodicean Letter first. It is important to remember that these Letters were written specially to the Churches named in their superscriptions.

And to the angel of the church in Laodicea write: . . . I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spew thee out of my mouth. Behold thou sayest, I am rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art the wretched one and miserable and poor and blind and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold refined by fire, that thou mayest become rich; and white garments, that thou mayest clothe thyself, and that the shame of thy nakedness be not made manifest; and eyesalve to anoint thine eyes, that thou mayest see. As many as I

¹ Grégoire, Recueil etc., Nos. 341 ter—347.
² Letters to the Seven Churches, p. 185 ff.
love, I reprove and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent.

Such is the tenour of the Letter addressed by the Author of the Apocalypse to the Church which was, in the next century, to extend its teaching over Central Phrygia.

And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: . . .

I know thy works (behold, I have set before thee a door opened, which none can shut), that thou hast a little power, and didst keep my word, and didst not deny my name. Behold, I give of the synagogue of Satan, of them that say they are Jews, and they are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee. Because thou didst keep the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of trial, that hour which is to come upon the whole world, to try them that dwell upon the earth. I come quickly: hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. He that overcometh, I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go out thence no more: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and mine own new name.

It is well known that the Montanist sect drew its inspiration from the Apocalypse, and it has been suggested that Montanist reverence for this Book was a main reason for its tardy admission to the Canon of the Eastern Church. We have found reason to believe that Montanism originated in the neighbourhood of Philadelphia; can we establish a relation between Montanism and the Philadelphian Letter? To appreciate the standpoint from which the Author of the Apocalypse addressed the Asian Churches, we must bear in mind his attitude to pagan society and to the Roman government. However the symbolism of the Apocalypse is to be interpreted in detail, the attitude of the Author is manifestly one of fierce opposition, which denounces pagan religion and the Roman state in almost savage language, and meets persecution with defiance. In the light of this attitude, we must interpret the 'lukewarmness' of the wealthy Laodicean Church; 'lukewarmness,' in such a situation and for such a writer, must con-
note, in part at least, a disposition to compromise with pagan society. On the other hand, the Philadelphian Church is warmly commended for its steadfastness under trial, no doubt in circumstances similar to those under which the Church in Pergamon is praised: 'thou holdest fast my name, and didst not deny my faith, even in the days of Antipas my witness, my faithful one, who was killed among you, where Satan dwelleth.' For the Author of these Letters, acquainted as he was with the Churches which he addressed, there was a fundamental difference in character between the Christianity of Philadelphia and that of Laodicea.

The links between the Philadelphian Letter itself and Montanist doctrine are sufficiently obvious. Without laying undue stress on the 'door set before' Philadelphia, which is clearly to be interpreted as the route of missionary enterprise leading up into Phrygia opposite the gates of the city, we may note that the commendation 'thou hast not denied my name' is addressed to the Church in whose orbit we find, at a later date, the birthplace of a sect which showed that they could deserve this commendation in circumstances of extreme danger. Still more significant is the preliminary announcement to the Philadelphians of the Great Persecution and the descent of the New Jerusalem, of which a fuller announcement is made later in the Apocalypse. A belief in the literalness of this prophecy was, as we have seen, the foundation of the Montanist faith; and a section of the sect actually expected the New Jerusalem to descend at Pepouza, not far east of Philadelphia. If the Philadelphian Letter shows that, at the end of the first century, Philadelphian Christianity was similar in an important respect to that of the sect which afterwards originated there, it is equally clear that, when Montanism was formulated in the middle of the second century, this Philadelphian movement was certain to regard the Philadelphian Letter as its charter and its marching orders.

We have glanced at the methods of compromise and accommodation by which the Christianity of Laodicea and the other South-Asian churches gained a footing in central Phrygia. With such methods the Author of the Apocalypse would himself have had little sympathy; may we regard the Montanist mission as a Philadelphian protest against

1 So Ramsay, op. cit., p. 404 ff. followed by Charles in the International Critical Commentary ad loc. and (cautiously) by Peake in The Revelation of John, p. 250.
such methods? This would of course not be the whole truth about Montanism, but it would be a significant part of it. In the Orthodox-Montanist struggle in Central Phrygia we should then recognise a clash between two schools of missionary enterprise, one attacking Central Phrygia along the Maeander Valley route, the other operating along the Philadelphian road. The northern school 'dreamed dreams and saw visions,' preached the approaching end of the world, insisted on the austerest discipline and open profession, and hurled defiance in the face of paganism. The southern school realised that the Church must live in the world, and tried to give practical expression to the view that Christianity must be the 'leaven in the lump.' In the issue, as ecclesiastical history and the local inscriptions record, the southern school triumphed. But the heresy known as 'the Phrygian' was not driven out of Phrygia. Worsted in the hellenised and educated cities of Central Phrygia, it found a more permanent footing in the heart of the old Phrygian kingdom, where Phrygian custom and mentality were as yet little affected by Greek civilisation. The evidence of Didymus and Jerome makes it highly probable that Montanus himself had been a priest of Cybele before his conversion to Christianity; and in the manner, as distinct from the content, of Montanist prophecy, there was undoubtedly an element which appealed to a population which had been devoted for centuries to the orgiastic cult of Phrygia.

A recent historian thus summarises the contemporary controversy regarding the manner of Montanist prophecy—a subject which Epiphanius could still treat as a living issue in A.D. 375. 'It was agreed by churchmen and Montanists alike that "prophecy was a gift which should continue in the whole Church to the end of time." But, according to her conception of prophecy, the Church held it an objection to Montanism in limine that the Montanist prophets spoke either in ecstasy or in parecstasy, i.e. in false kind of ecstasy that was stimulated or artificially induced. There seems to have been some division of opinion among Catholics as to the mode in which inspiration should operate: nor to this day has the Church any theory on that point; she is only committed to belief in the fact that "the Holy Ghost . . . spake by the prophets." Miltiades, for instance, maintained that

1 *De Trin.*, III., 41, 3.
ecstasy was wholly to be condemned, and that if one speak in ecstasy he is no true prophet. This test would seem to be in accordance with the distinction observable in Holy Scripture between prophecy and divination. The prophets, whether of the Old or the New Covenant, remained conscious under inspiration; and "the spirits of the prophets" were, as St. Paul reminded the Corinthians, "subject to the prophets." Balaam, on the other hand, who prophesied in a trance, was a "soothsayer." But Tertullian defended trance and urged in reply that St. Peter on the Mount of Transfiguration spoke as in a trance "not knowing what he said," and certainly St. Paul, when caught up into Paradise, had revelations made to him under conditions of trance. The Church, therefore, fell back upon the contention that what was wrong was frenzy: and Montanism was no true prophecy but heathen divination.¹

The association of frenzy with divination (μανία with μαντική) is as old as Plato,² and the two were inseparable in the pagan cult of Phrygia. In this respect Montanism was "racy of Phrygian soil," and this very quality in Montanist prophecy, while it would be certain to arouse criticism in the educated churches of the Central Phrygian cities, would recommend it to the old-fashioned Phrygians of the northern district. This is not the only case in which we find Christianity accommodating itself to the inherited prejudices of Anatolian paganism.³

This reconstruction of its local history would appear then to offer some account of the vogue which Montanism had in Phrygia after its formal condemnation by the Church, as well as to explain the distribution of the contemporary Christian monuments. Let us now turn to the sub-apostolic records of Philadelphian Christianity, and see whether they have any light to throw on our subject.

The Anonymous quoted by Eusebius (H.E., V., 17), mentions a prophetess Ammia of Philadelphia, whom the Montanists claimed as a forerunner of their prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla; her date cannot be fixed with certainty, but must fall between the years A.D. 100 and A.D. 150. The name Ammia, common in early Christian inscriptions

² Phaedrus, 244 b, c, cf. Bonwetsch, p. 67.  
³ Cf. The story of Glycerius the Deacon, as told by Ramsay, Church in Rom. Empire, p. 443 ff.
of Phrygia, is widely spread in Asia Minor, and, no doubt, belonged to the old Anatolian language. It is significant that the prophecy of Ammia was accepted as valid both by the Montanists and by the orthodox party: her activity evidently belongs to a period before the open schism took place. We would fain know more of this obscure figure, who stands so close to the parting of the ways leading to Pepouza and to Nicaea. The bearing on our problem of her origin in Philadelphia is obvious.

In his letter to the Church in Philadelphia, written between A.D. 110 and A.D. 118, Ignatius refers to his visit to that Church as he passed through Asia Minor on his way from Syria to martyrdom in Rome. This letter is one of a series written to five churches in Asia, those of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, to which must be added a letter to the Bishop of Smyrna, Polycarp. The main burden of this group of letters is the writer’s desire for martyrdom, his exhortations to unity and submission to the bishops, and his warnings against the heresy of Docetism, which asserted that the events of Christ’s life on earth had taken place in appearance only. This heresy was probably Judaic, and Ignatius’ attitude in reply is summed up in a sentence written to the Smyrneans (§ 4) εἰ γὰρ τὸ δοκεῖν τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπράξθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, κἀγὼ τὸ δοκεῖν δὲ- δεμαυ. ‘For if these things were done by our Lord in semblance, then am I also a prisoner in semblance.’ Lightfoot thus describes the purport of the Philadelphia letter.¹ ‘The main burden is the heresy which troubled the Philadelphia Church. It had awakened his anxiety during his own sojourn there, and the later reports of Philo and Agathopus had aggravated his alarm. What the nature of this heresy was, the tenour of his letter plainly indicates. He is attacking a form of Docetic Judaism, but more directly from its Judaic than from its Docetic side. The Docetism is tacitly reproved in the opening salutation, where he congratulates the Philadelphians as “rejoicing in the Passion of our Lord without wavering,” and “steadfast in the conviction of His Resurrection,” and salutes them “in the blood of Jesus Christ which is eternal and abiding joy.” There are, perhaps, also allusions to it, when speaking of the Eucharist he refers to the “one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ” (§ 4), and when he describes himself as “taking refuge in the Gospel as the flesh of Jesus” (§ 5). But the

¹ Apostolic Fathers, II., 2, p. 242.
Judaism is openly attacked, etc.' This treatment of the Philadelphian letter is hardly satisfactory. When we compare the phrases singled out by Lightfoot as anti-Docetic with the language in which Ignatius attacks Docetism in the letters to Ephesus, Tralles, and Smyrna, we can only reflect that his reproof in this case is tacit indeed. It is difficult to imagine a letter written by Ignatius under any circumstances which would not contain language similar to the above phrases; a robust realism is of the essence of his creed. On the other hand, his Philadelphian letter does appear to refer to a serious dispute, in which he himself had taken part, regarding the relative validity of Old Testament prophecy and New Testament revelation. It was fashionable at one time to look for the seeds of the Montanist prophecy in Judaism; would it be presumptuous to suggest to the historians of dogma that the letter of Ignatius to the Philadelphians should be re-examined in the light of what has been said above of the connection of Philadelphia with the origin of Montanism? Ignatius had talked with the Philadelphian Christians; without exaggerating the importance of single phrases, it may be pointed out that in his letter to them he uses a variation of the Montanist metaphor of the lyre (§ 1), that he likens those who, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, 'speak not concerning Jesus Christ' to στήλαι καὶ τάφοι νεκρῶν, ἐφ' οἷς γέγραπται μόνον δύναμις ἄνθρωπον (§ 6), and that in reply to Judaic opponents he uses language which would later have served as a reply to Montanus—ἐξαίρετον δὲ τι ἔξει to εὐαγγελιον, τὴν παροιμίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἀνάστασιν. οἱ γὰρ ἀγαπητοὶ προφῆται κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν· τὸ δὲ εὐαγγελιον ἀ π ρ η τ ὑ σ ṿ, ἐ σ τὴν θρησκείαν τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀναστάσεως (§ 9). If this was true in retrospect, why not in prospect? With the intransigence of Philadelphian Christianity,

1 In the letter to the Romans (A.F., II., 2, p. 185) Lightfoot found no trace of anti-Docetic polemic, in that to Polycarp (ibid., p. 329) only 'a passing allusion expressed in general terms.' In this respect both may fairly be compared with the Philadelphian letter. To the Romans (§ 6) he wrote: ἐκείνων ὃσοι, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα, ἐκείνων θελοῦν, τῶν [δὲ ἡμᾶς] ἀναστάντα, καὶ ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μεμηκτὴν εἰς τῶν πάθους τοῦ Θεοῦ μου. To Polycarp he wrote (§ 3): τῶν ἁραπατόν, τῶν δὲ ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν, . . . τῶν ἄπαθῆς, τῶν δὲ ἡμᾶς παθήτων, τῶν κατὰ πάντα τρότον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνατα. If the argument from isolated phrases is to be pressed, the letters to the Romans and to Polycarp have as much or as little claim to be called anti-Docetic as the letter to the Philadelphians.
Ignatius would be the last to quarrel; his letter may, perhaps, indicate that some Philadelphians held views on the subject of prophecy which were carrying them from the paths of orthodoxy.

Argument from this letter, however, must not be pressed too far. Lightfoot makes it a plea for the genuineness of the seven letters of Ignatius that they contain no reference to Montanism, as it was formulated in the second half of the second century. He deals in particular with Ignatius’ letter to the Philadelphians, and notes that in his message to the city of the prophetess Ammia Ignatius makes no reference to the ‘new dispensation’ or to the Paraclete or to the New Jerusalem or to the two opposing views of the prophet’s inspiration.1 The absence of any reference to the controversies of A.D. 157 to 200 and later is a telling argument for the genuineness of the ‘middle recension’; conversely, the Philadelphian letter must be taken as evidence, none the less convincing because negative, that the ‘Phrygian’ movement, as we know it in the later second century, had not taken shape in the reign of Trajan. We are entitled to see in the Philadelphian letter of Ignatius traces of a difference of opinion regarding the function of ‘prophets.’ It would, however, be beating the air to speculate on the steps by which this difference of opinion may have developed, at a later date, into one of the issues in dispute between the orthodox and Montanist parties. If our view of the pre-history of Montanism is correct, such development may be regarded as highly probable.

In A.D. 155 or 156, a year or two before the traditional date of the appearance of Montanus, Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom in Smyrna. Shortly after the martyrdom, the Church in Smyrna sent a letter to the Church in Philomelium, in Phrygia, describing the martyrdom and the events which led up to it. We are concerned here with the general character of this document, of which we possess the authentic original version, and with two incidental references which it contains. Of its bona fides there can be no question; it describes the martyrdom as the writers believed it to have happened. It contains a sub-tone of controversy or justification, in which some critics have detected a mark of later date. But such a document may be both contemporary and tendentious; the Smyrnæan letter is both.

1 Apostolic Fathers, II., 1, p. 383.
Its keynote is given in an early sentence: σχέδων γὰρ πάντα τὰ προάγοντα ἐγενετο, ἵνα ἡμῖν ὁ Κύριος ἀνωθὲν ἐπιδείξῃ τὸ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μαρτύριον—"For nearly all the events leading up to it came to pass that the Lord might show us once more an example of martyrdom which is conformable to the Gospel." This character of Polycarp's martyrdom is insisted on and illustrated throughout the letter, both by direct inference from his conduct and experiences, and by contrast with the conduct of Quintus, who 'had forced himself and some others to come forward of their own free will. This man the pro-consul by much entreaty persuaded to swear the oath and to offer incense. For this cause, therefore, brethren, we praise not those who deliver themselves up, since the Gospel doth not so teach us.' It is needless to quote the individual passages in which it is pointed out over and over again that the martyrdom of Polycarp conformed to the Gospel model; they meet the eye of every reader of the letter.

Why this insistence? It has been argued by high authorities that it is merely a sign of fervour and enthusiasm, called forth by the glorious martyrdom of a Christian hero.¹ But for one passage in the letter, a case might be made for this view; that passage is fatal to it.

Quintus, who challenged martyrdom and then, 'seeing the beasts, turned coward' (ιδὼν τὰ θηρία ἐδειλιασεν) is described as Ἐρυξ προσφάτως ἐληλυθὼς ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας, 'a Phrygian newly arrived from Phrygia.' Lightfoot's note is as follows:—

¹ Such I take to be the view of M. H. Delehaye (Les Passions des Martyrs, p. 19). The eminent Bollandist scholar does not discuss the meaning of Ἐρυξ as applied to Quintus.
fraternal message to the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, use 'Scottish' in the sense of 'stingy'? Of such tone is the calculated insult which Lightfoot makes the Asian Church of Smyrna address to the Phrygian Church of Philomelium.

It is clear that in this context the word 'Phrygian' must mean something of which both the writers and the recipients of the letter disapproved, but which did not apply to the recipients. The only meaning of Φρύγες which fulfils these conditions is 'Montanist.' The Montanists were regularly referred to as οἱ Φρύγες, and their heresy was ἡ κατὰ Φρύγας αἰρετική. The Martyrdom of Polycarp accordingly contains the earliest direct reference to Montanism. On our view of the origin and character of the movement, no anachronism is involved in dating 'Montanism' before the traditional date of the appearance of Montanus.¹

It would be going too far to describe the Martyrdom of Polycarp as an anti-Montanist tractate; in a sense this beautiful document rises above controversy. But the issue raised by Montanism is clearly present to the minds of the writers. To challenge martyrdom is wrong, because the Gospel, solicitous for the safety of the brethern,² teaches otherwise; it is also dangerous, because it may lead to a moral collapse. Better, like Polycarp, withdraw and try to avoid arrest; if it is the will of God that arrest cannot be avoided, then a good Catholic can die as bravely as any Phrygian fanatic of them all. We have already found occasion to describe the orthodox Phrygian attitude on the question of profession, in the words of the Smyrnean comment on the lapse of Quintus—διὰ τοῦτο οὖν, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐπανοίμεν τοὺς προδίδοντας ἑαυτούς, ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οὕτως διδάσκει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

In the light of this bias in the minds of the writers, we must review the slight and incidental notices contained in the Martyrdom con-

¹Keim (Aus dem Urchristenthum, p. 155 f.) took Quintus to be a Montanist, and used this as an argument for dating the martyrdom of Polycarp in A.D. 166, as Montanism had not come to the fore in A.D. 155-6, the date fixed by Waddington. Lightfoot (A.F., II., 1, p. 676 f.) had no difficulty in demolishing Keim's chronology; but he himself did not allow for the possibility that there were 'Phrygians' before Montanus. See also Bonwetsch, op. cit., p. 143 f.

²§ 1. περιέρχεσθαι γὰρ ἐπάρ παραδοθή, ὡς καὶ ὁ Κύριος, ἡν μιμηται καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοῦ γεγομέθα, μὴ μόνον σκοπεοῦστε τό καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τό κατὰ τόυς πέλας; ἀγάπης γὰρ ἐλθόθοι καὶ βεβαιας ἐστίν μὴ μόνον ἑαυτοῦ θέλειν σῴζεσθαι ἀλλὰ καὶ πίντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς.
cerning the companions of Polycarp. On Germanicus, of whom it is said (§ 3) that he showed signal steadfastness and strengthened others by his example, Lightfoot observes that 'The day of Germanicus in the Latin Martyrologies is 19 January, though they place the martyrdom of the companions of S. Polycarp, whom they make ten or eleven in number, on the same day with his, 26 January. The Greek Calendar contains no mention of Germanicus.' It is therefore doubtful whether Germanicus is or is not to be regarded as one of the martyrs from Philadelphia mentioned in §19 of the Martyrdom. The language in which they are referred to is significant and characteristic: Τοιαύτα τὰ κατὰ τὸν μακάριον Πολύκαρπον, δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀπὸ Φιλαδελφίας δωδέκατος ἐν Σμύρνῃ μαρτυρήσας μόνος ὑπὸ πάντων [μᾶλλον] μημονεύεται, ὥστε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔθνων ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ λαλεῖσθαι, οὐ μόνον διδάσκαλος γενόμενος ἐπίστημος, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυς ἔξωχος, οὐ τὸ μαρτύριον πάντες ἐπιθυμοῦσιν μιμεῖσθαι, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Χριστοῦ γενόμενον—' So it befel the blessed Polycarp, who having with those from Philadelphia suffered martyrdom in Smyrna—twelve in all—is especially remembered more than the others by all men, so that he is talked of even by the heathen in every place; for he showed himself not only a notable teacher, but also a distinguished martyr, whose martyrdom all desire to imitate, seeing that it was after the pattern of the Gospel.' On this Lightfoot writes: 'The most natural interpretation here is that all eleven were Philadelphians, but σὺν τοῖς κ.τ.λ. may perhaps mean “with eleven others including those from Philadelphia.” Of those eleven others one only, Germanicus, is mentioned in this letter by name.'

Quintus, whose courage failed him, is openly branded as a 'Montanist'; what was the position of these Philadelphian martyrs, who were steadfast to the end, but whose achievement is less talked of than that of Polycarp, 'whose martyrdom all desire to imitate, seeing that it was after the pattern of the Gospel'? Had they, like Quintus, given themselves up, or had they, like Polycarp, sought to avoid arrest? To this question no certain answer can ever be given; there is perhaps a slight balance of probability on the side of the view that these Philadelphians belonged to the Philadelphian school which insisted on open profession.

The main interest, to us, of the Martyrdom of Polycarp is its clear evidence that the chief practical issue raised by the Montanists
had been raised in a very acute form, in the Province Asia, before the appearance of Montanus. In view of the bias of the writers, it is interesting to note that the word καθολικὴ is applied to the Church of Smyrna in the best MSS. of the Martyrdom (§16), for the first time in Christian literature, in its later technical sense of 'Catholic' as opposed to 'heretical' (earlier the word meant 'universal' as opposed to 'local'). Lightfoot, with his customary caution, preferred the reading ἅγια, which has also MS. support. It seems probable, however, that καθολικὴ is the original reading, and that it is used in conscious reference to the incipient Phrygian schism.

Such, so far as an archaeologist may judge, appear to be the main outlines of early Montanist history in Phrygia. I print these disjointed notes in the hope that some Church historian, conscious, as I am, of their inadequacy and the lacunae which they contain, may familiarise himself with the archaeology and ancient topography of Phrygia, and write a coherent account of that unpitying Phrygian sect.

II.

A. The 'Christians to Christians' Inscriptions.

Three of the 'Christians to Christians' inscriptions, one from Traianopolis (No. 1) and two from the Tembris Valley (Nos. 6 and 7) were known to Cumont when he drew up his catalogue of the Christian Inscriptions of Asia Minor published in Mélanges d' Arch. etc., 1895. Ramsay had already, in the Expositor for 1888, p. 250 ff., discussed a number of additional examples, in English translations. The Greek text of Nos. 2-9 and 11 was published by Anderson in Stud. in the E. Rom. Prov. (1906), p. 183 ff. Anderson's discussion of these inscriptions, and of the pagan environment in which they were dedicated, remains the foundation of all study of the subject. After they had been copied by Anderson, two of the monuments (Nos. 8 and 9) were removed to the museum at Brussa, and M. Mendel, who republished them in the Catalogue du Musée de Brussel (1908) was able, in the favourable conditions of museum study, to make some slight improvements in the text, which have been adopted in the following pages. M. Mendel's minute description of the form of the monuments and of the decoration is valuable. He also published two inscriptions unknown to Anderson (Nos. 10
and 12). I have not seen the discussions of these and other inscriptions in the following series by Pargoire and Mirbeau, quoted by M. Mendel. No. 13, from the neighbourhood of Thyatira, published by Keil and von Premerstein in 1908, must clearly be classed with the Tembris Valley inscriptions. Of more doubtful connection with this group are Nos. 13 and 14, for reasons which will be stated below. The writer has not seen any of these inscriptions. The following notes are supplementary to those of Ramsay, Anderson and Mendel.


Traianopolis lay on the main road from Philadelphia to the plateau of Asia Minor. Temenothyrae, the home of the stonecutter (?), lay eight miles to the west.


The date, although partly restored, is certain. Probably Alexander is the husband’s name, and the name of a third grandchild has been omitted before it.


Αὐρ. Ζωτικῶς Μαρκίωνος τοῖς ἑαυτῷ γονέων ἐκ ζών Μαρκί(ων)υ κε Αππη κε ἀδελφῷ Ἀρτέμια μνήμης χάριν. Χρειστιανοὶ Χρειστιανοῖς.

Anderson notes that ‘the ungrammatical use of the plural in the closing formula indicates that the formula had already become stereotyped.’ Inferences as to date based on the use of the name of the famous heretic Marcion are fallacious.

4. Abia. Anderson, op. cit., p. 215, No. 13. ‘Above the inscription is a relief representing two lions, each with a paw on an ox, in the conventional style common in North Phrygia.’
The letter X is engraved twice at the beginning of Χρηστειάνοι (see the facsimile loc. cit.); probably the first X is a disguised cross.


The words γλυκουτάτῳ ἄνδρι are carved in smaller letters between the first and second lines of the inscription. These words, with the name Δόμνη, disturb the syntax of the inscription. Probably there was originally an uncut space at the end of the second line, which was subsequently utilised by Domna to commemorate her husband (perhaps the son Aurelius Alexander). The name Rufina occurs in a third-century inscription of Laodicea Combusta, published in Class. Rev., 1923, p. 56, where reasons are given for classing it as Christian.


Anderson observes that the more fully developed Christian nomenclature in this and the preceding inscription indicates a date later in the third century than Nos. 2-4. The nominative form Ζωτικής (probably indicating confusion, helped by itacism, between feminines in -η and in -ις) is common at this period: cf. Αππης in No. 10 alongside of Αππη in No. 12, Τατιανης in No. 12.

7. Altyn Tash (Soa) in the Tembris Valley. C.I.G., 3857 p; Anderson, op. cit., p. 217 f., No. 17. On a bōmos finished off at the top as a stone with pointed pediment, in which are represented a spindle and distaff; the main field is occupied by reliefs representing a bird perched on a vine (above) and a team of oxen with plough
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(below).’ The inscription is cut on the raised border above and below. See Anderson’s sketch loc. cit.


Ἐνθάδε γῆ κατέχι Σωσθ[έ]νην ἀνδρα ποιητῶν καὶ κάλλι καὶ με[γὲ]θι κὲ σωφροσύνη δὲ μάλιστα, τὸν πάσης ἄρετής καὶ ἐν ἀνδρεσί κύδος ἔχοντα· τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἔθανον, λύπησα δὲ πάντας, καὶ πενθεροῦς λύπησα, ψυχήν δὲ ἐμάρα[ν]α γυνηκὸς μετὰ ἥς τ[ρί]α ἐτης συνέζησα, ἀπὸ ἥς ἐν τέκνων ἔσχον· ὅ[ι] δὲ γοινὸς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐνθάδε κίνητι 'Αλέξανδρος πρεσβύτερος μετ[ὰ] τῆς συνβίου 'Αππης κα[ὶ]

10 τῆς θυγατρῶς Κυριλλῆς καὶ τῆς ἐγγόνης Δόμ[υ]-

της τῶς συντέκνοις Σω-

σβάς καὶ Δόμνη καὶ Πο-

θένη γαυβρῷ γλυκυτά-

15 τῷ ἐποίησαν χάριν, X-

ρηστιανοὶ Xρηστιανο[τ].

Τὸν θεὸν σοι ἀναγ[νο-

νὸς μὴ ἀδικαίσις.

In 1. 12, συντέκνοις (συνυτέκνοις) means ‘adopted children brought up together with the children of the adopters’ (Anderson). On the open use of πρεσβύτερος, see above p. 318.

This metrical epitaph is of a more banal character than Nos. 9 and 12; here the phrase τὸν πάσης ἄρετής καὶ ἐν ἀνδρεσί κύδος ἔχοντα is borrowed directly from pagan models, without adaptation to Christian ideas.

On the phrase τὸν θεὸν σ(ὐ) ἀναγνοὺς μὴ ἀδικ(ή)σ(ε)ς, which recurs in No. 12, and is characteristic of the Tembris Valley inscriptions (there is one outlying example at Pisidian Antioch), see Anderson,
This phrase is clearly the Montanist equivalent of the Central Phrygian ἑσταί αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεόν and the East Phrygian δῶσει λόγον θεῷ, and I suspect it to be based on Rev., 6, 6.


The name of the deceased is not given, unless we read 'Ακατάφρονι in line 3; but Acataphron, although a likely enough Christian formation (cf. Amerimnos, Acholios, Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics, p. 493) appears to be unknown. 'Ακατάφρονι(τον) for ... φρόνητον is read by Anderson and Mendel. The meaning appears to be 'God vouchsafed thee grace abounding, and (granted) that thou shouldst be wept by thy father and mother as well as by thy wife Nona'.

In line 3, I take ἵνη to be the itacistic equivalent of εἶναι (cf. κή for καί below); σοῦ in line 4 is σοῦ. In lines 7 and 8 'the description of the pastoral office, ἀρχων πατρίδος λαοῦ is a variation of λαοῦ προστάμενος [in another Tembris Valley inscription, Stud.
Fig. 2. Montanist Epitaph mentioning Baptism and Confirmation
in the E. Rom. Prov., p. 125]. Προϊστάμενος or προεστώς and ἡγούμενος are the terms regularly used in the early centuries to describe the office of leader of a Christian community. The virtue of "kindly hospitality to strangers" (εὐξενίη) was emphasised by the early Church (Anderson).

References to the Sacraments, so common in Christian inscriptions of the West, are very rare in the epigraphy of Asia Minor. In Phrygia I can remember only two instances, the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, which refers to baptism and to the Eucharist, and an epitaph of Laodicea Combusta found at Suverek, which runs: Αὐ. Λουπικηνδος νεοφώτιστος Φιλαγρίου μη(τρι) Καλλήστη, on which its editor remarks 'Aur. Lupicenus was a newly baptised Christian; the epithet was in common use in the third and fourth centuries. Was Philagrius his father, or the bishop who baptised him? Previous editors have missed the clear reference to baptism in the first line of the present inscription—τοῦ φιλοχρήστοραν αὐθεις ἐν μεγάροις φανόντα. Anderson read μεγά[λ]οισι and suggested the meaning 'appeared again among the mighty (beatified dead). But why 'again'? Mendel, who notes that the readings αὐθεις and μεγάροισι are certain, adds that the dead man 'élevé dans les palais humains, réapparait—après sa mort—dans les palais divins.' These renderings mistake the plain sense of ἐν μεγάροισι φαν(έ)ντα. This and similar phrases (e.g. ἐν ἀνθρώποισι φανέντα No. 12, line 2) are regularly used in late epitaphs with the meaning 'having appeared on earth,' 'having been born'; in this very epitaph, line 5, the phrase οἱ σ' έτεκαν μεγάροισων fixes the meaning of the first line. The meaning of αὐθεις now becomes clear, and the line means 'Him who was born again in love of Christ': I take φιλοχρήστοραν to be active, like φιλόχριστος, the title applied to the Byzantine Emperors: e.g. Grégoire, Recueil etc., No. 219 (A.D. 538). This being so, it is probable that the reference in line 2 is equally precise, and that τοῦ πάσης ἀρε(τῆς) μεμήνενων, which is a common tag in pagan epitaphs, here refers to confirmation. Baptism and confirmation

1 Le Blant, Manuel, p. 171; Marucchi, Christian Epigraphy, pp. 103-135.

2 Callander in Stud. in the E. Rom. Prov., p. 175. This inscription was recopied by us in 1910. It is roughly engraved on a small stele; in a circle at the top, there was probably a cross (now defaced). It dates from the later fourth century.
are both referred to on a Christian inscription of Italy quoted by Marucchi, op. cit., p. 111:—

‘Nuper praecario signatus munere Christi
qui quondam dura genitorum morte direptus
suscepit gratos meliore sorte parentes.’

It is easy to read too much into these rude epitaphs; but it is bad method to treat them as meaningless collections of poetical tags borrowed from paganism.

In the penalty-clause, Mendel reads ἐπὶ τὰ ὀστεά γυμνῶει, noting that in the last word ε is not certain. Anderson, deserting his copy, (ΤΤΤΜΩΣ1) suggested ἔρημωσι; I can, however, feel no doubt that the writer was trying to express the Greek ἔπιετα ὀστεὰ γυμνῶει (or ἔπειτα (τὰ) ὀστεά). In the apodosis, he has tried to say ‘he shall endure the eternal punishment which is to come.’ Cf. διὰ μίας ὥρας τὴν αἰώνιον κόλασιν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι, said of Polycarp and his companions: Mart. Polyc., § 2. The last word, ἔργον, is common in later Christian inscriptions in the sense of 'tomb.'

10. Ai Kuruk. Mendel, op. cit., p. 80, No. 81. See fig. 3.

Ἀπειτῆς ἀνδρὶ Ὀροφίμῳ τῷ κῇ Κράσῳ γλυκυτάτῳ κῇ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶ(ν) Ὀροφίμος κῇ Νικόμαχος κῇ Δόμνα κῇ Ἀπειτῆς πατρὶ κῇ μητρὶ ζώσῃ. Χριστιανοὶ Χριστιανô.


... ω [τ]ῶ ἐ[α]υτῶν σουγενὶ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων
ἐποίησαν, Χριστιανοὶ Χριστιανô.

'The simplicity of the style of this fragment and the character of the lettering point to the third century' (Anderson).


ἡμυμώσι for γυμνῶσ(ε)ι may be either an engraver’s error or a peculiarity of local pronunciation. The meaning is ‘none of my family or kin, nor (after they are dead: ἔπειτα) any alien is to uncover my bones and dig up my corpse on pain of eternal punishment.’ B. Keil (Hermes, XLIII., p. 530) suggested ἔπειτα ὀστεὰ [ἀτι]μῶσι, which is too far from the copy.
FIG. 3. MÖNIANDI EPIALPH SHOWING CROSS
(a) Ἐνθάδε γη κατέχι Δόμνον μέγαν ἱστρατι[ώ]την τὸν πάσης ἀρετῆς κε ἐν ἀνθρώπους φανέντα, τὸν τὰ τοσάντα καμόντα κε ἐνδοξότατον μέγαν ἱστρατιώτην · ἕξήκουτα ἐτῶν ἔθανον, ζήσας ἐπιτίμως ·
5 Κύριλλά μου σύνβιος ἦν, μετὰ ἧς ἐξήσα ἐπιτίμως · Κύριλλον τέκνον Ἰχνον, πάμμουσον ἐνδοξότατον μέγαν ἄνδρα · τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἔθανον, λύπησα δὲ παντάς · τέκνα Κύριλλον ἀφροθανῆ, ὃν κή τὸ ὀνόμα λέξω · Χρύσος κε Ἀλέξανδρος · ἀ-
10 δελφὴ Δόμνου Κύριλλα ἐνθάδε κήτη · Δόμνον ἵοι Χρηστιανοὶ πρεσβύτεροι λαού πρεστάμενου νόμω δίκεα φρονοῦντες ἄνδρες ἀριστῆς μεγαλῆτο-
15 ρεῖ · Ἐνθάδε Δόμνου Χρύσος καὶ ἡ σύνβιος αὐτοῦ Τατιανῆς, κε τὰ τέκνα (α)ὐτῶν Κύριλλος κε Ζωτικός κε Πατρίκις κε Δόμνα κε Μάρκελλα, — Ἀλέξανδρος κε ἡ σύνβιος
20 αὐτοῦ Ἀπτη κε τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν Ἀλέξανδρος κε Τρόφιμος κε Δόμνος κε Δόμνα κε Κύριλλα κε Νόμνα κε Ἀντιοχίς κε Σωφρονίς κε Ἀλέξανδρία κε Τροφίμινη, νύφη Μάρκελλα κε
25 τὰ ἔγγονα αὐτῶν ἐτὶ ζωντες τοῖς ἐαυ[τῶν γονεῖ]σιν γλυκυτάτοις, Χρηστιανὸι Χρηστιανοῖς, ἐτὶ ζώντἑσ ἐποίησαν. τὸν θεὸν σοὶ ἀναγνώσεις μὴ ἀδικήσῃς.
30 [ . . . Ἐλατύπ]ος ἐτευκά.
(b) On the right-hand border:—
Ἀρίστων ἀνυψίδος ἐνθάδε κήτη κε Ἀλέξανδρος κε Τροφίμινη κε Μάρκελλα θυγάτηρ κε Ἀλέξανδρία ἐνθάδε κήτη · νύφη Κυριακῆς Χρύσου.

The stemma of this Christian family is given by Mendel, p. 179. In the appendix to his Militia Christi (1905) Harnack has
assembled a series of texts, drawn from the Christian literature of the first three centuries, bearing on the Christian attitude to service in the Roman army, and on the use of military terminology as applied to the Christian life. The general attitude of Christians was one of disapproval of military service; on the other hand, there were undoubtedly many Christians in the Roman army towards the close of the third century, as the legislation of the Great Persecution and the Martyrologies clearly show. The Montanist attitude to military service is notorious; Tertullian, himself a soldier's son, condemned it utterly, and proclaimed that the only military service a Christian could undertake was the Militia Christi: 'non enim nos et milites sumus? eo quidem maioris disciplinae, quanto tanti imperatoris' (De exhort., 12). This accords with the normal Montanist attitude to the Roman State, and it surprises us, at first sight, to find a Montanist proclaiming himself a soldier on his tombstone. But the very language of the epitaph warns us that Domnus was not a soldier in the secular sense; the exultant phrases μέγαν ἵστρατιώτην and ενδοξόσατον μέγαν ἵστρατιώτην sound extravagant on this view. The word ἵστρατιώτης is clearly used here in the Montanist sense. The line τὸν τὰ τοσαῦτα καμόντα καὶ ενδοξόσατον μέγαν ἵστρατιώτην reminds one irresistibly of the language of the Acta Martyrum, but hardly affords justification for claiming Domnus as a martyr.

The similarity of this inscription to the first two lines of No. 9, in which we have found a direct reference to baptism and confirmation, suggests that here too we should see a reference, expressed in more commonplace language, to formal initiation into the Christian life. For Χρηστιανοὶ πρεσβύτεροι λαοῦ πρεστάμενοι cf. above, p. 318, and Anderson's note quoted on p. 340 f.; the phrase νόμω δικ(αί)α φρονοῦντες recurs in a Christian inscription of Zemme, in the Tembris Valley, Petrie in Stud. in the E. Rom. Prov., p. 126.

The stone is broken on the left side, and unfortunately the date of this inscription has been lost. But, from a study of the lettering and the text, we can fix the date within comparatively narrow limits. Messrs. Keil and von Premerstein regard the lettering as not later than the middle of the third century; and they also point out that the name Aurelius (Aurelia) as used in this inscription, dates after A.D. 212, when Caracalla (by the constitutio Antoniniana) awarded Roman citizenship to all the free inhabitants of the Empire, and enormous numbers of new citizens adopted his name ‘Aurelius’ as a sort of praenomen. They are certainly right in dating this inscription between A.D. 212 and the reign of Decius, and it is probably the earliest inscription on our list. But their further conclusion that the open avowal of Christianity ‘könnte auf eine Epoche vorübergehender Toleranz hinweisen, wie sie tatsächlich vor der Verfolgung des Decius (249-60) unter den Kaisern Caracalla, Elagabal und namentlich Severus Alexander herrschte’ is based on a misapprehension of the character of the North Phrygian inscriptions, most of which certainly belong to the dangerous period A.D. 249-313. The true explanation of the open use of the title ‘Christian’ in this inscription is to be found in a passage in Epiphanius (Haer. LI., 33) in which he is discussing the heresy of the Alogi. These heretics, he says, made it an argument for rejecting the Apocalypse that the Book contains a letter to the Church in Thyatira, where no Church existed. Epiphanius’ retort that a Church exists in Thyatira now and that, therefore, St. John is a true prophet is treated by Petau (ad. loc.) with the respect due to such high an authority: ‘sed haec Epiphanii responsio nisi ἀντιλεκτικῶς et ad hominem, ut uulgo loquuntur, accipiamus, haud satis probabilis uidetur. Ac longe melius est negare Ioannis tempore nullam Thyatiris ecclesiam exstistisse; quod impudenter haereticī mentiti sunt.’ But the same pious and learned critic makes needless difficulties out of the sequel: ἐνοικησάντων γὰρ τοῦτων (sc. τῶν Ἀλόγων) ἐκέισε καὶ τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας, δίκην λύκων ἀρπαξάντων τὰς διανοίας τῶν ἀκεραίων πιστῶν, μετήμενοι τὴν πᾶσαν πόλιν εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν αἱρέσιν, οἵ τε ἀρνούμενοι τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ λόγου τοῦτου εἰς ἀνατροπὴν καὶ ἐκέινου καιρῷ ἐστρατεύοντο. Νῦν δὲ διὰ τοῦ κύριον ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ, μετὰ χρόνου ἐκ-
The blundering Father appears in this passage to confuse the Alogi with the Montanists; but Petau surely missed the plain sense of the passage when he took ἐκατόν δεκαδύο ἔτη as intended to cover the time between A.D. 375, when Epiphanius was writing, and the date of the composition of the Apocalypse. What Epiphanius means is that 112 years before he wrote (i.e. in A.D. 263) the Church of Thyatira had turned Montanist, but that now, in A.D. 375, it was again orthodox. This statement is so manifestly in accord with what we have learned regarding the religious situation in Northern Phrygia and on the Lydian border at this very period, that it must be accepted, even if Epiphanius goes on to say that the lapse of Thyatira was fated to occur ninety-three years after the resurrection of the Saviour, which is simple nonsense. Two facts speak for themselves: Epiphanius states that the Church in Thyatira was entirely Montanist in A.D. 263; and a third-century Christian inscription found near Thyatira makes open profession of Christianity. I may add that I noticed the Thyatira inscription only after the above lecture was written and delivered.

To the indications of date pointed out by Messrs. Keil and von Premerstein it may be added that the provision for a fine to be paid to the κατοικία points to an early period, when the pagan forms were being strictly followed. In South-western and Central Phrygia the formula ἡσταὶ αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν appears to have been developed about the middle of the third century; among the inscriptions in Ramsay’s Cities and Bishoprics, it appears on the following dated monuments: No. 372 (A.D. 249); No. 448 (A.D. 253); No. 449 (A.D. 256); No. 388 (A.D. 259); Nos. 375 and 652 (A.D. 260); No. 365 (A.D. 264), and it appears on many undated inscriptions which fall in the period A.D. 250-300. Ramsay observes (p. 516) that the prescription of a double penalty, civil and religious, probably belongs to the years A.D. 220-50, although only one dated example of the double penalty has been found (No. 385; A.D. 254). We may add that the earliest dated inscription in Ramsay’s collection No. 656 (A.D. 216), and its elder brother, the tombstone of Avircius Marcellus (No. 657; ca. A.D. 200), both prescribe only a fine. This is exactly what our study of early Christian sepulchral practice has led
us to expect; of the two methods in pagan use, the fine and the _devotio_, the former could be used by Christians, without violation of principle, from the earliest period; the latter had to be avoided until a _devotio_ of Christian type had been evolved. The fine-formula on the Thyatiran inscription is accordingly an additional mark of early date, and strengthens our case for placing it first in the series of ‘open profession’ epitaphs.

These remarks form an appropriate introduction to the text of another inscription of Thyatira, published by Conze and Schuchhardt in *Ath. Mitt.*, XXIV., p. 237 (= *C.I.G.*, 3518, from an imperfect impression) to which no reference is made in the first fascicule of Grégoire’s *Recueil*. This inscription is an epitaph; the formula of dedication is unfortunately lost, and we are deprived of the help of the nomenclature in fixing the date. The copy in *Ath. Mitt.* is set up in type, which is unreliable as a guide; but the type used suggests second or third-century lettering. The significant part for our purpose is the penalty-clause, which runs as follows:  

\[ εἰ δὲ τὰς ἐνάντιαν ποιήσει τούτων, τὸν κρείνοντα ζωντας καὶ νεκροὺς θεὸν κεχωλωμένον ἐχοιτο καὶ τὴν ἱδίαν σωμαῖνα καὶ ὑποκείσεται τῇ Θεατηρησίων τόλμη προστείμω (ἐνυρίσιοι) βῆ. ταύτης τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς ἀντίγραφον ἐτέθη εἰς τὸ ἀρχεῖον Ἀντωνίου Αἰλιανοῦ, καθὼς προγέγραπται ἐπὶ τόπων.

The formula (θεόν) κεχωλωμένων τόχοιτο or (θεοῦς) κεχωλωμένως ἐχοιτο was very common in pagan _devotiones_, but I do not think that the idea expressed in τὸν κρείνοντα ζωντας καὶ νεκροὺς θεόν, which is found in indubitably Christian epitaphs (see my note in *Rev. de Phil.*, 1912, p. 68 f.), can be paralleled from a pagan inscription. The addition of τὴν ἱδίαν σωμαῖνα is not conclusive in itself—Menander had written βρότος ἅπασιν ἡ σωμαῖνα θεός—but its combination with a Christian formula guarantees its Christian character in this text. The double formula prescribing a civil as well as a religious penalty is, as we have seen, characteristic of Christian inscriptions of the early third century. I venture to think that few epigraphists, who compare this inscription with the pagan and the Christian inscriptions from the neighbouring Phrygian cities published in Ramsay’s *Cities and Bishoprics*, will feel any doubt that it must be classed as Christian. It witnesses to the presence of the ‘disguised’ type of Christian burial at Thyatira in the early third century.

Αὔρ. Πράκλος Ζωτικοῦ ἐποίησα τὸ ἠρῶν ἐμαυτῷ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ μον Μελτίνη Ἑρεμσιανῶν.

Ramsay (p. 491) notes that this inscription stands above ground 'not far from the public road leading from Apamea S., not much more than a mile from the city, and probably in its original position.' Its date is unfortunately quite uncertain. The dated examples, and other considerations, fix the period to which the North Phrygian inscriptions belong; this isolated example from Central Phrygia cannot be quoted with confidence as pre-Constantinian. The combination of the praenomen Aurelius with the Greek formula of affiliation suggests a date not later than the early fourth century; within this limit there is room for a post-Constantinian date. If it belongs to the third century, the inscription is an isolated example of Montanist custom in an orthodox environment.


Αὔρ. Ἀρτέμων Λυξάνουτος τρίς Δομετίου τῷ πατρὶ Αὔρ. Λυξάνουτι τρίς Δομετίου βουλευτῇ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ Αὔρ. Δόμηῃ Εὐρήμου[ς Λ]κωνίῳ οἴ νυοι αὐτοῦ Αὔρ. Ζωτικὸς καὶ Λυξάνων [κ]αὶ Αὔρ. Ἀρτέμων ἔ(γ)γονος [ἐ]ποίησαν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ υστέρα Αὔρ. Ἀμμία Ναυσήνῃ β’ Ρ(ό)δωνος Αὔρ. Λυξάνουτι Ζουλακίῳ βουλευτῇ δῖς Δομετίου καὶ τῇ γυναῖκι αὐτοῦ[ν] τῇ πρώτῃ Αὔρ. Δόμηῃ Δούλου Δυσγένου Χρηστιανοῦ τοῖς γυναικάτοις γυνίσιω μνήμης χάριν.

Sterrett notes that the reading Χρηστωπανοῦ is certain; Ramsay read Χρηστιανοῦ (*loc. cit.*). These conflicting statements, expressed briefly and dogmatically, suggest a preference for Χρηστωπανοῦ, on the principle *potior lectio difficilior*; and I have asked Sir W. M. Ramsay to state whether he re-examined the stone with particular reference to Sterrett's reading. He replies: 'I went to Senirghent expressly to verify Χρηστωπανοῦ and found that ω had been corrected to ι. This is clear and certain. ι is clearer and deeper than original ω and obliterates the middle bar of the original.' The reading Χρηστιανοῦ must therefore be accepted as the final intention of the engraver. But his initial 'mistake' suggests a doubt whether the name Χρηστωπανοῦ, mentioned by Sterrett, was not intended.
The difficulty of taking Ἱροσυνᾶς here in the sense of 'Christian' is obvious. An epitaph in which the grandfather of one of the dead is singled out as a Christian is not only unique; it comes near to being absurd. It is true that some of the names in this family tree suggest Christian nomenclature; Artemon, Auxanon, Domna, Zotikos, and Ammia are all common Christian names in this region. But the argument from nomenclature must be applied with great caution. It is true that as time went on a distinctive Christian nomenclature was developed; but in the third and fourth centuries 'Christian names' are common in many districts simply because these districts became almost solidly Christian, and the local family names appear over and over again on Christian tombs. For example, the above inscriptions from the Tembris Valley suggest that certain names which occur over and over again were favoured by Christians. An inscription from the same valley (Souter, in *Class. Rev.*, 1896, p. 420; Petrie, in *Stud. in E. Rom. Prov.*, p. 126), an epitaph based on the Homeric 'Midas' epigram, to a child Proklos who was 'slain by Poseidon's own trident by the streams of Tembrogius,' and clearly pagan, was dedicated by a family consisting of Menandros, Appes, Trophimus, Menandros, Kyrilla, Domna and Tatianes: and these names are as typical of pagan as of Christian inscriptions in this neighbourhood. In view of such facts, it is better to preserve a healthy scepticism regarding the Apollonia inscription, and I have refrained from basing any argument on it. It belongs, like No. 14, to the third or early fourth century.


It has been pointed out above, p. 316, that a distinctive symbolism hardly appears on the pre-Constantinian Christian monuments of Asia Minor. The Christians purchased their tombs from the same workshops as their pagan neighbours; at most the Christian stones show a tendency to avoid pagan religious symbolism, except where it could be given a Christian meaning, as in the case of the fish (scarce in Phrygia but common in Isauria) and the vine. But this was only

---

1 It may be noted that the fact that Aurelius Auxanon Zoulakios was twice married would forbid us to class him as a Montanist, even if the inscription were Christian.

a tendency; a startling exception is No. 4, which is engraved on a monument decorated with a pair of lions, the characteristic emblem of Cybele. The general form of the Tembris valley monuments, pagan and Christian, has been described by Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 193 ff.; and Crowfoot, *A.B.S.A.*, 1897-8, p. 79 ff., and Ramsay, *Expositor*, 1905, p. 209 ff. and 294 ff. have discussed points of detail. I add a brief note on the three monuments illustrated here (Figs. 2, 3, 4).

Fig. 2 shows decoration which is in several respects an interesting anticipation of later Christian design. The rosettes at the top are very characteristic of fourth-century Christian monuments, and have been explained by Ramsay as symbolic representations of the stars of the Apocalypse. The vine decoration on the borders is also interesting: the vine, often associated with the cross in a manner suggesting a reference to *John* 15, 5, is a favourite Christian device. Here the vine tendril appears to rise, on either side, out of a vessel which Mendel has explained as a vase; a more probable interpretation, I think, is that these vessels represent the cups used in the Eucharist. The crosses at the top of this monument and of fig. 3 have been discussed above, p. 318.

The vine recurs in fig. 3, which also represents the stock agricultural motives of teams of oxen, and a pruning-hook, along with a spindle and distaff. This monument, and that represented on fig. 4, contain examples of a device which Ramsay has interpreted at different times as a book (here no doubt a bible) and as the *tabellae* of a contract, symbolising the Covenant (see the references given by Anderson, p. 203).

C. The Use of the Title Χριστιανός or Χρηστιανός in Epitaphs.

The unique character of the 'Christians to Christians' inscriptions will be more fully appreciated as the result of an enquiry into the use of the title 'Christian' in Christian epitaphs. Examples of this use are exceedingly rare. The above inscriptions (Nos. 14 and 15 being of doubtful date, and No. 15 of doubtful Christianity) exhaust the list of pre-Constantinian examples in Asia Minor. In pagan inscriptions of Asia Minor belonging to the same period the title is used certainly once and probably twice. It occurs (unfortunately only the letters

1 See my note in *Rev. de Phil.*, 1922, p. 122 f.
στιανοῦς are preserved on the stone) in the well-known anti-Christian petition of Arycadna in Lycia (C.I.L., III., suppl. 2, 12132) dated A.D. 311. And it almost certainly occurs, in the form Ἱρηστίανῶν, in a fragmentary inscription of Didyma (C.I.G., 28834), which Grégoire (Mélanges Holleaux, 1913) has very ingeniously restored as a record of the consultation by Galerius of the oracle of Apollo in A.D. 303, when he was inciting Diocletian to persecute the Christians. The form Ἱρηστίανῶν is doubtless used in contumeliam (see below) and this form, not Ἱρπτστίανῶν which all editors adopt, should be restored in the Arycadna petition. In post-Constantinian epigraphy, when it became both safe and fashionable to profess the Christian religion on tombstones, the use of the title ‘Christian’ was even rarer.

Waddington (on Le Bas, No. 783 = No. 7 above) quotes texts which show that the spelling of the title had not been definitely fixed in popular use in the pre-Constantinian period. Tertullian wrote (Apol. adv. gent., 3) ‘sed et cum perperam christianus pronuntiatur a uobis, nam nec nominis certa est notitia apud uos, de suavitate et benignitate compositum est’; and so Suetonius had written (Claud. 25) ‘Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.’ Even in the early part of the fourth century Lactantius could write (IV., 7, 5, p. 444) ‘sed exponenda huius nominis ratio est propter ignorantiam errorem, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.’ The word ‘ignorantium’ indicates that the error complained of was at least shared by the Christians, and Blass has more recently collected abundant evidence (Hermes, XXX., p. 465 ff.) that the spelling ‘Chrestianus’ was in common use not only among pagans (who naturally substituted a word known to them for the unfamiliar Χριστός) but also among Christians in the pre-Constantinian period and later.

He points out that Ἱρηστίανῶς is the common form in the early Christian inscriptions of Syracuse and that Ἱρηστός is the spelling of the name of Christ on an Egyptian magic papyrus and on an amulet (cf. φιλοχρήστορα in No. 9). It is interesting that the same form

1 M. Grégoire (Recueil etc., add. et corr.) warns us that M. Roussel reads Ἱρηστίανῶν in this inscription, thus eliminating the mention of the Christians. I agree with Leclercq (Cabrol, Dict., IV., p. 812) in preferring Grégoire’s restoration as at any rate nearer the truth.
is used in the well-known Marcionite inscription of Lebaba, dated A.D. 318 (Le Bas-Waddington, No. 2558); on a Gnostic inscription of Rome (C.I.G. 9595a) the name of Christ is unfortunately written in abbreviation.¹

While we should allow for the possibility of itacistic error in the inscriptions of the Tembris Valley, the form Χρηστιανός is so common that we must regard its use as deliberate. The variation between Χριστιανός and Χρειστιανός in our inscriptions is a detail of orthography.

The correct spelling Χριστιανός occurs in No. 1, dated A.D. 279, and No. 11, which also contains the correct form, has been marked as an early inscription by Anderson (it should probably be dated A.D. 250-275). On the other hand, Nos. 2 (A.D. 249) and 13, which are among the earliest inscriptions on our list, have the form Χρειστιανός. No. 3 has also an early appearance; the dates of Nos. 5 and 14, which also give this form, are doubtful. We are warned against classing all the inscriptions which have the spelling Χρειστιανός along with Nos. 2 and 13 by the epitaph of Eugenius (J.R.S., 1920, p. 44) dated ca. A.D. 340, which also uses this form; indeed it occurs sporadically till much later. It occurs on an inscription of Mylasa (Grégoire, Recueil etc., No. 239 ter: Παρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου καὶ Ἔδ[πλ]ου Χρειστο[ανοῦ], which probably belongs to the latter half of the fourth century. Even the name of Christ is similarly spelt (Χρειστός) on the well-known ἄνγελος inscription of Melos (Grégoire, No. 209) which probably dates between A.D. 325 and 350, and it was a possible spelling as late as the eleventh century: cf. Χρειστοῦ on an inscription of A.D. 1058 (Grégoire, No. 336).

The form Χρηστιανός, complained of by Tertullian and Lactantius, is the commonest form in the Tembris Valley, and is specially characteristic of the inscriptions which betray the lowest level of education. It occurs in no dated Christian inscription; if it is to be read in the Didyma fragment, where it would naturally convey a suggestion of contempt, it is attested in pagan use about A.D. 300. It, too, lasted on in Christian use, as, for example, in the following unpublished inscription of the fifth century.

¹ There is an undoubted reference to this spelling of the name in line 16 of the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus: οἶνον χρηστῶν ἔχωςα.
Ak Ören (Anzoulada); Ramsay and Calder, 1910. On a small round pillar; above the inscription, a cross in a circle.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ενθάδει} \\
\text{Τεκιρφνη} \\
\text{Ρητιγανη} \\
\text{Επηθυνού}
\end{align*}\]

This inscription belongs to a Christian town in the Lycaonian Steppe, west of Lake Tatta (whose ancient name we recovered from an unpublished boundary-stone) where Ramsay and the writer copied a number of Christian epitaphs in 1910. We found no inscription here which can be dated earlier than about A.D. 400, and the present inscription may confidently be placed in the fifth century. Ramsay (Luke the Physician, p. 337) has dated the earliest use of the opening formula Ενθάδε κείται (copied from Latin hic iacet) late in the fourth century; the use of this formula here, together with the equally late use of the single names, dates this occurrence of Χριστιανός after A.D. 400. A similar inference, as we have seen above (p. 318), is to be drawn from the open use of the cross.

The form Χριστιανός occurs twice in our pre-Constantinian Phrygian inscriptions (Nos. 1 and 11); elsewhere I know this form, in an epitaph, only at Corycus in Cilicia (C.I.G., 9172) ca. A.D. 400. Its use as applied to the Emperors at Ephesus, etc. (Grégoire, Nos. 114 bis and 114 ter) is different.

In the above list, which I have attempted to make exhaustive, out of 19 Anatolian epitaphs of the first five centuries, in which the dead are described as Christians, 13 are pre-Constantinian, 4 are post-Constantinian, and 2 are doubtful. These figures, better than any words,

1 I.e. the inscriptions of Mylasa, Anzoulada, and Corycus, and the epitaph of Eugenius (of Laodicea Combusta). The last is strictly not a case in point; Eugenius does not describe himself as a Christian, but tells how he maintained his faith (τῆν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστιν φυλάσσων) in the Great Persecution.

2 Nos. 14 and 15.
emphasize the unique position occupied by the Tembris Valley epitaphs in Early-Christian Epigraphy, and their peculiar significance as historical documents.

**ADDENDUM.**

Holl's *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, vol. II. (1922), reached me after the above article was in type. Professor Holl (p. 307) comes to substantially the same conclusion as that stated on p. 346 above, regarding the 112 years mentioned by Epiphanius, whom I have quoted from Oehler's text. His alteration of the following words to ἔστιν <ἐκεῖ> ἡ ἐκκλησία καὶ αὐξεῖ, <ei> καὶ ἄλλοι τινες ἐκεῖσε τυχχάνουσι, implying that the recovery of Thyatira for Orthodoxy was not complete, seems to me more ingenious than necessary; the MS. text means 'and there are other (Orthodox) churches in that region,' a perfectly satisfactory sense. On the other hand, Professor Holl gives a new and convincing explanation of the 93 years which have baffled earlier commentators; assuming a lacuna in the text before ἐπὶ ἐνευκοντα τρισίν ἔτεσιν he takes the 93 years to date back from A.D. 263-4, which would agree very closely with the date, A.D. 171-2, which Eusebius gives for the rise of Montanism. It is now generally recognised that the dates given by Epiphanius (A.D. 157) and by Eusebius for the rise of Montanism refer to two different events in Montanist history, and it is a very happy suggestion of Professor Holl's that (according to Epiphanius) Thyatira was Montanist from A.D. 171-2 till A.D. 263-4, and that the reaction to Orthodoxy then set in. This conclusion supports, and is supported by, the archaeological argument stated above.