

Jan M. KOZŁOWSKI
(Warszawa, UW)

„...**WITH PRISCILLA HIS WIFE”.**
QUINTUS IN MARTYRIUM POLYCARPI 4, 1
AS A TYPUS OF MONTANUS IN THE LIGHT OF THE
REFERENCE TO ACTS OF THE APOSTLES 18, 2

Polycarp, a disciple of John the Apostle and a bishop of Smyrna, died burnt at the stake during a persecution which took place in Smyrna between 155 and 157 CE¹. *Martyrium Polycarpi* (MPol), a document which recounts this martyr's death, was written probably in 176-177 CE, during the „second wave” of persecutions under the rule of Marcus Aurelius (161-180 CE)², in the time of vehement propagation of Montanism, a prophetic and ecstatic Christian movement.

1. The concept of „martyrdom in accordance with the Gospel” and the antいexample of Quintus in MPol 4, 1. The fundamental aim of the MPol is a presentation, on the example of Polycarp, of the concept of „martyrdom in accordance with the Gospel” (τὸ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μαρτύριον)³. According to this concept, one should flee the persecutors by following Jesus' example (Matt 12, 15) and the commandment (Matt 10, 23). God himself will reveal to his chosen ones if a martyr's death is prepared for them. Such an attitude, besides a glorious martyrdom, yields another fruit: Polycarp is the one who, through his martyrdom „in accordance with the Gospel”, ended the persecution (MPol 1, 1). An important element of the concept of „martyrdom in accordance with the Gospel” is the introduction of a self-denunciator Quintus, a would-be martyr, on the example of whom the reader learns about what the

¹ Appendix MPol 21 identifies the governor with Statius Quadratus, who was proconsul of Asia in 156/157 or 155/156 CE; this dating is also supported by the mention in MPol 12, 2 of Philip the Asiarch, who is identified by the appendix MPol 21 with Philip of Tralles, who held the office of Asiarch, which could be held more than once (cf. P. Herz, *Asiarchen und Archiereia, zum Provinzialkult der Provinz Asia, „Tyche. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte”* 7:1992, 93-115) in the years 149-153; see also J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers II/1*, Peabody MA 1989², 628-635.

² Cf. J.M. Kozłowski, *Datowanie „Martyrium Polycarpi” w świetle zależności od „De morte Peregrini” i „Fugitivi” Lukiana z Samostat, „Studia Źródłoznawcze”* 7 (2008) 64-85.

³ We follow the edition of B. Dehandschutter, *An Updated Edition of the Martyrdom of Polycarp*, in: *Polycarpiana. Studies on Martyrdom and Persecution in Early Christianity. Collected Essays*, ed. J. Leemans, Leuven 2007, 3-27.

„martyrdom in accordance with the Gospel” does not consist of. The passage reads as follows:

„Εἰς δὲ ὄνόματι Κοίντος, Φρύξ, προσφάτως ἐληλυθὼς ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας, οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ παραβιασάμενος ἔαυτόν τε καὶ τινας προσελθεῖν ἐκόντας. τοῦτον ὁ ἀνθύπατος πολλὰ ἐκλιπαρήσας ἔπεισεν ὄμόσαι καὶ ἐπιθύσαι. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐπαινοῦμεν τοὺς προσιόντας ἔαυτοῖς, ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οὕτως διδάσκει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον”⁴.

Quintus came to Smyrna to give himself up and to die a martyr’s death. However, at the sight of the animals, he got scared, he swore by the Caesar’s Genius and offered a sacrifice. Quintus is, in the context of the concept of „martyrdom in accordance with the Gospel”, a paradigmatic opposite of Polycarp, his negative counterpart⁵.

2. The reference to Acts 18, 2. The words that introduce Quintus in MPol 4, 1 draw a striking similarity to those in Acts 18, 2, which present Aquila, who came to Corinth with his wife Priscilla after Emperor Claudius commanded all the Jews to leave Rome. Here is the juxtaposition of these passages:

„τινα Ἰουδαίον ὄνόματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει, προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας (Acts 18, 2)”⁶.

„εἰς δὲ ὄνόματι Κοίντος, Φρύξ, προσφάτως ἐληλυθὼς ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας (MPol 4, 1)”⁷.

The similarity between MPol 4, 1 and Acts 18, 2 was noted by scholars dealing with MPol⁸. If we accept that the author of MPol intentionally referred to Acts

⁴ *Martyrium Polycarpi* 4, ed. H. Musurillo: *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, 4-5: „There was a Phrygian named Quintus who had lately come from Phrygia, and when he saw the wild animals he turned cowardly. Now he was the one who had given himself up and had forced some others to give themselves up voluntarily. With him the governor used many arguments and persuaded him to swear by the Caesar’s Genius and offer sacrifice. This is the reason, brothers, that we do not approve of those who come forward of themselves: this is not the teaching of the Gospel” (all the passages of MPol we give in translation of H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford 1972, 2-21; in some cases however, when we consider it necessary because of editorial differences [see note 3] as well as for better understanding of the original text, we slightly change Musurillo’s translation).

⁵ Cf. J. Den Boeft – J. Bremer, *Notiunculae Martyrologicae* 5, VigCh 49 (1995) 147; B. Dehandschutter, *Le martyre de Polycarpe et le développement de la conception du martyre au deuxième siècle*, StPatr 17/2 (1982) 662-663; S. Ronchey, *Indagine sul Martirio di san Policarpo*, Roma 1990, 52.

⁶ *Acts* 18, 2: „...a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, lately came from Italy”.

⁷ *Martyrium Polycarpi* 4, 1: „a Phrygian named Quintus who had lately come from Phrygia”.

⁸ Cf. e.g. B. Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi, Een literair-kritische studie*, BETL 52, Leuven 1979, 244: „προσφάτως ἐληλυθὼς ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας heeft een bijna woordelijk parallel

18, 2 in this place⁹ and wanted the reader of MPol to have before his eyes also the Acts 18, 2 while reading this passage, the first question we may ask is: why did he do so? Is it only a reference whose meaning is exhausted in the neutral imitation of the form of the *Acts of the Apostles*¹⁰, or rather are we dealing with a reference that is crucial to correctly interpreting the figure of Quintus?

Opting for the second answer, in the present article we would like to propose an interpretation of this reference, which on the one hand takes into account the polemical context in which Quintus appears, and on the other the formal-literal context of the Acts 18, 2.

3. Montanism and its conflict with the Catholic Church. Around 157 CE, Montanus (Μοντανός), a Christian prophet, began his public activity in Phrygia and headed a prophetic movement called the New Prophecy (Νέα Προφητεία). The term „Montanism” itself was coined much later and for the first time it appears as late as in the IV century, in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem¹¹. Montanists were called „Phrygians” or „Cataphrygians” (οἱ κατὰ τὴν Φρυγίαν) by their opponents¹².

Montanus did not act alone, but he was accompanied by two prophetesses: Priscilla (Πρίσκιλλα) and Maximilla (Μαξίμιλλα), whose position was not

in *Hnd* 18, 2: προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας”; A.P. Orbán, *Atti e Passioni dei Martiri*, Milano 1987, 11: „προσφάτως ... Φρυγίας cfr. Act. Ap. 18, 2”.

⁹ In the entire ancient literature (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*) we find no passage that would be lexically closer to Acts 18, 2 than MPol 4, 1. An example of how the same thought can be exactly expressed using completely different words is the paraphrase of MPol in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, where in the place that corresponds to MPol 4, 1 we read: „Φρύγα τινὰ τὸ γένος, Κόιντον τοῦνομα, νεωστὶ ἐκ τῆς Φρυγίας ἐπιστάντα (4, 15, 7)”.

¹⁰ To what extent MPol is imbued with the language and terminology of *The Septuagint* and *The New Testament* was demonstrated by: M.L Guillaumin, *En marge du „Martyre de Polycarpe”: le discernement des allusions scripturaires*, in: *Forma Futuri. Studi in onore del Cardinale M. Pellegrino*, Torino 1975, 462-469; Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi*, p. 233-258; V. Sacher, *Bible et hagiographie*, Bern 1986, 27 and 31; *Acts of the Apostles* must have been known very well by the MPol author's contemporaries. Irenaeus of Lyon, a disciple of Polycarp, in his *Adversus haereses* written in the last quarter of second century, quotes it profusely (e.g. *Adv. haer.* III 12).

¹¹ Cf. *Catecheses* 16, 8, PG 33, 928A; „οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας, καὶ Μοντανός”.

¹² Cf. G. Buschmann, *Martyrium Polycarpi 4 und der Montanismus*, VigCh 49 (1995) 110: „Die folgenden Zeugnisse haben Gewicht: *Martyrium Pionii* 11, 2: ἡ αἵρεσις ἡ τῶν Φρύγων, Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* IV 13, 93, 1: Φρύγες; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* X 25: οἱ Φρύγες und VIII 19: Φρύγες τὸ γένος, Origenes, *In Mithraeum hom.* 28: propter Phrygiae falsos prophetas, Eusebius, HE V 18, 1: τῆς δὲ κατὰ Φρύγας καλούμενης αἱρέσεως”; see ibidem, p. 134, n. 47: „vgl. Epiphanius, *Panarion* 48, 12, 1ff (Φρύγες)/Serapion Eusebius, HE V 19, 2: νέα προφητεία”; A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten. Eine religionsgeographische Untersuchung*, Berlin – New York 1980, p. 11, n. 4: „the name most common among refuters of the sect was a descriptive but also detracting one based on the place of its origin in Phrygia: ἡ κατὰ Φρύγας αἱρέσις. Phrygians were considered stupid, boorish, and cowardly, and their name was almost a synonym for these negative qualities”.

much weaker than that of Montanus himself. The New Prophecy found many followers. The three prophets, who announced the arrival of the heavenly New Jerusalem in a Phrygian village of Pepuza, in ecstatic visions called their followers to practice fasting and intensive prayer. Montanists were also characterized by a particularly enthusiastic attitude towards martyrdom¹³.

The Catholic Church saw danger in the quick spread of Montanism, especially in the context of the formation of a monarchic episcopacy, and already in the 170s Montanists were excommunicated in Asia Minor (we will return to this event further in the paper). Also, the enthusiastic attitude of Montanists towards martyrdom posed a problem. Such an way of behaving aroused contempt¹⁴ in pagans and, as it seems, provoked them to even greater aggression¹⁵, which contributed to further persecutions¹⁶. A rich polemic literature arose, fragments of which have been preserved in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*¹⁷. Montanism was attacked *per fas et nefas* in accordance with the principles of the art of eristic of that time.

4. Martyrium Polycarpi as an antimontanist text and the antiexample of Quintus. *Martyrium Polycarpi* is a writing that constitutes a part of the second-century antimontanist polemic. The presentation of Polycarp as a bishop, a distinguished martyr and a true prophet (MPol 16, 2) that behaves in a lucid and unecstatic manner during prophesying (MPol 5, 2), his designation as Χριστοῦ κοινονός, and the reference to the normative authority of the Gospel (in the context of the controversy connected with the authoritative utterances of the three prophets) suggest the antimontanist character of the *Martyrium Polycarpi*¹⁸. In the whole document, the passage of the most explicit antimontanist character is MPol 4, 1. The self-denunciator Quintus is called there directly: Φρύξ... ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας. That in this context Φρύξ should be interpreted as „a Montanist” was in our opinion convincingly demonstrated

¹³ See Tertullianus, *De fuga in persecutione* 9, 4; about Montanists' *Martyriumssucht* wrote G. Buschmann (*Martyrium Polycarpi* 4, p. 106-109).

¹⁴ E.g. Lucianus Samosatensis, *De morte Peregrini* 14; Marcus Aurelius, *Meditationes* 11, 3, Tertullianus, *Ad Scapulam* 5, 1.

¹⁵ Cf. G.E.M. De Ste. Croix, *Why were the early Christians persecuted?*, „Past and Present” 26 (1963) 23.

¹⁶ Cf. ibidem, p. 21-22; R.L. Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, San Francisco 1986, 421.

¹⁷ Cf. R.E. Heine, *The Montanist oracles and testimonia*, Macon 1989, 12-27.

¹⁸ Cf. Buschmann, *Martyrium Polycarpi* 4, p. 105-145; idem, Χριστοῦ κοινονός (*MartPol* 6, 2), *das Martyrium und der ungeklärte κοινονός – Titel der Montanisten*, ZNW 86 (1995) 243-264; idem, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*, KAV 6, Göttingen 1998, 37, 40, 52-57, 59-62, 64, 68, 70, 72, 74, 79, 84-88, 94, 101, 104, 116, 119-129, 131, 136, 139, 148, 151, 156, 158, 165, 199, 215, 218, 244, 264, 269, 311, 319-322, 332, 336, 351, 369.

by G. Buschmann¹⁹. We consider this to be the reason why the author of MPol 4, 1 referred to Acts 18, 2.

5. Προσφάτως ἐληλυθώς as a hint to interpreting the reference to Acts 18, 2. As it has been observed by G. Buschmann²⁰, already the expression προσφάτως ἐληλυθώς taken from *Acts of the Apostles* can be connected with the antimontanist character of the passage in question. Heretics and schismatics were criticised for „novelty” and „recency” in the early days of Christianity²¹; the same accusations were made by Pagans against Christians in general²². Early opponents of Montanism accused the New Prophecy of „recency”, strikingly often using the adjective πρόσφατος²³. Buschmann’s observation, if we accept it as probable, reveals to us a fact of importance for the further interpretation of this reference: the words describing the arrival of the Jew Aquila in Corinth became a matrix into which the figure of Quintus was fitted. In consequence, the formal and neutral content of Acts 18, 2 receives in MPol 4, 1 a new pejorative meaning.

6. The whole passage of Acts 18, 2. According to our proposition, the weight of the formal reference to the first verse of Acts 18, 2 would lie upon words to which MPol does not refer textually and which in the Acts 18, 2 directly follow those quoted. The whole passage of the Acts 18, 2 is as follows:

„καὶ εύρων τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὄνοματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει,
προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας | καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐ-

¹⁹ Cf. Buschmann, *Martyrium Polycarpi* 4, p. 105-145; idem *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*, p. 122-124; that Φρύξ should be interpreted as a „speaking” term which remains in connection with the fact that Quintus „turned cowardly” (ἐδειλύσεν), indicated J.B. Lightfoot (*The Apostolic Fathers, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp*, II/3, Peabody. Massachusetts 1989², 369: „Φρύξ. Thus illustrating the proverbial cowardice of the Phrygians; comp. Tertullianus, *De anima* 20, 3, CCL 2, 812: *Comici Phrygas timidos illudunt*”.

²⁰ Cf. Buschmann, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*, p. 122: „Auch die betonte Feststellung, dass Quintos ‘kurzlich erst’ (προσφάτως) aus Phrygien gekommen ist, deutet daraufhin, dass es sich um einen Schismatiker handelt”.

²¹ Cf. K. Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus. Untersuchungen zu I Clemens 1-7*, BHT 35, Tübingen 1966, 152, n. 1: „Daß Häretiker und Schismatiker nicht zu den ‘Alten’ in der Kirche gehören, bzw. erst ‘neulich’ aufgetreten sind, ist [...] allgemeine frähkatholische Ansicht”.

²² Cf. e.g. Suetonius, *Vitae Caesarum. Nero* 16, 2: „Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis nouae ac maleficae”.

²³ In Anonymus (probably a bishop of a town of Phrygian Pentapolis, who wrote not long after 193 CE) we read with reference to phenomenon of Montanism: ή τοίνυν ἔνστασις αὐτῶν καὶ πρόσφατος τοῦ ἀποσχίσματος αἵρεσις πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (Eusebius, HE V 16, 6) and with reference to Montaist teaching: τὸν προσφάτους λόγους (HE V 16, 10); about 205 CE an Anatolian bishop Apollonius writes on Montanus: ἀλλὰ τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ πρόσφατος διδάσκαλος (HE V 18, 2).

τοῦ διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης, προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς”²⁴.

7. Καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ. A reader who will have noticed the literal reference to Acts 18, 2 in MPol 4, 1 will also immediately recognize the moment in which this reference ends. Words that are not quoted are: ...καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ („with his wife Priscilla”). In the historical context in which MPol was written – especially that in the case of Quintus we are dealing with a Montanist or, rather, with a typus of Montanus himself – there can only be one association. Apart from the wife of Aquila, we know only one famous Priscilla in the Christianity of the first two centuries: the prophetess that accompanied Montanus, who, according to some scholars, was even more important than Montanus²⁵.

In the context of the polemic carried on *per fas et nefas* against Montanism, there must have appeared charges that stigmatized the alleged iniquity and unchastity of the relationship between the prophet and the prophetesses. We possess, as it seems, traces of such critique; bishop Apollonius, who wrote against Montanism about 205 CE²⁶ and is quoted in Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*, utters the following words against Montanus and Priscilla:

„οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ διδάξας λύσεις γάμων [...] δείκνυμεν οὖν αὐτὰς πρώτας τὸς προφήτιδας ταύτας, ἀφ̄ ὅν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπληρώθησαν, τοὺς ἄνδρας καταλιπούσας. πῶς οὖν ἐψεύδοντο Πρίσκιλλαν παρθένον ἀποκαλοῦντες;”²⁷.

We may see that Montanus was the object of attack not only for the breaking of marriage ties, but also for the „seduction” of Maximilla and Priscilla. The assertion that Priscilla was a virgin was also questioned.

Thus, in the light of the reference to Acts 18, 2, we may interpret the figure of Quintus not only as a Montanist but also, simultaneously, as a typus of Montanus himself, who would be charged here with having a sexual relationship with the prophetess Priscilla. The explicit identity of Quintus as a typus

²⁴ *Acts* 18, 2: „And he found a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave Rome. And he went to see them”.

²⁵ Cf. A. Jensen, *Prisca-Maximilla-Montanus: Who was the Founder of Montanism?*, StPatr 26 (1993) 149.

²⁶ Cf. W. Tabbernee, *Fake prophecy and polluted sacraments. Ecclesiastical and imperial reactions to Montanism*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 84, Leiden – Boston 2007, 48.

²⁷ Eusebius, HE V 18, 2-3, transl. K. Lake: Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* (I), Loeb Classical Library 153, London – New York 1965, 487: „It is he who taught the annulment of marriage [...] we prove that these first prophetesses themselves deserted their husbands from the moment that they were filled with the spirit. What a lie it is then to call Priscilla a virgin!” (all the passages of HE we give in translation of K. Lake).

of Montanus may be also suggested by the article „ὁ” in the phrase referring to Quintus: οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ παραβιασάμενος..., in which the article suggests that the author of MPol wanted for that reader associate Quintus's behavior with the attitude of a specific person²⁸. In MPol 12, 2 with the words οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ τῆς ἀσεβείας διδάσκαλος the pagan mob determines Polycarp's identity.

8. Excommunication of Montanists by Claudius Apolinarius in the 170s. Montanist associations could also be raised by words that specify the reason of Aquila's arrival to Corinth: διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρί ζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης²⁹.

In the 170s CE, at the time when MPol was written, the bishop of Phrygian Hierapolis (modern-day Pammukale), a town closely connected with the earliest activity of the followers of the New Prophecy³⁰, was Claudius Apolinarius (Κλαύδιος Ἀπολινάριος)³¹. According to Eusebius, he was the most fervent enemy of Montanism in the 170s CE³². Eusebius says that in the time when Montanism was just beginning to spread he wrote a treatise (*γράμματα*) against it³³. We can develop the sense of its content. We know that Serapion, the bishop of Antioch (c. 199-211 CE) sent it to his two friends Carcius and Pontius in order to show them that τῆς ψευδοῦς ταύτης τάξεως τῆς ἐπικαλουμένης νέας προφητείας ἐβδέλυκται ἡ ἐνέργεια παρὰ πάσῃ τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ἀδελφότητι³⁴. In a lengthy reasoning³⁵, W. Tabbernee proves that Apolinarius' *γράμματα* were nothing more than „a letter setting out the findings of an ecclesiastical meeting (a synod or, at least, a local church gathering) held at Hierapolis during the 170s to deal with issues arising out of the spread of the New Prophecy (...), communicating the anti-Montanist decision of that

²⁸ Cf. Buschmann, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*, p. 123.

²⁹ Acts 18, 2: „...because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave Rome. And he went to see them”.

³⁰ Cf. Ch. Trevett, *Montanism*, in: *The early Christian world*, vol. II, ed. P.F. Esler, London – New York 2000, 936: „the area of its earliest influence must have been within reasonable distance of Otrous, Cumanae, Hierapolis, Apamea and Hieropolis”.

³¹ Cf. Eusebius, HE IV 26, 1; V 19, 2.

³² Cf. ibidem V 16, 1, transl. Lake, p. 470-472: „Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὴν λεγομένην κατὰ Φρύγας αἴρεσιν ὅπλον ισχυρὸν καὶ ἀκαταγώνιστον ἐπὶ τῆς Ἱεραπόλεως τὸν Ἀπολινάριον [...] ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπέρμαχος ἀνίστη δύναμις”; see Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, p. 15.

³³ Cf. Eusebius, HE IV 27, transl. Lake, p. 394: „συνέγραψε κατὰ τῆς τῶν Φρυγῶν αἱρέσεως, μετ’ οὐ πολὺν καινοτομηθείσης χρόνον, τότε γε μὴν ὥσπερ ἐκφύειν ἀρχομένης, ἔτι τοῦ Μοντανοῦ ἄμα τοῖς αὐτοῦ ψευδοπροφήτισιν ἀρχὰς τῆς παρεκτροπῆς ποιουμένου”; see Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, p. 16: „Significantly, Eusebius considers Apolinarius to have written against the New Prophecy while it was still in its formative stages”.

³⁴ Eusebius, HE V 19, 2, transl. Lake, p. 493-495: „And in order that you may know this, that the working of the so-called new prophecy of this false order is abominated in the whole of Christendom throughout the world”.

³⁵ Cf. Tabbernee, *Fake Prophecy*, p. 16-20.

synod, signed not only by Apolinarius but also by other bishops, presbyters, and ‘lay’ dignitaries (e.g. ‘confessors’ and ‘martyrs’) present”³⁶. Tabbernee’s opinion is confirmed by the author of *Synodicon Vetus* (IX century), who, most probably based on other sources than Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*³⁷, writes:

„σύνοδος θεὰ καὶ τοπικὴ ἐν Ἱεραπόλει τῆς Ἀσίας συναθροισθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ἀπολιναρίου τοῦ ταύτης ὀσιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου, καὶ ἐτέρων εἴκοσι καὶ ἔξ ἐπισκόπων, ἀποκηρύξασα τε καὶ ἐκκόψασα Μοντανὸν Μαξιμίλλαν τοὺς ψευδοπροφήτας (5)”³⁸.

Thus, in the words διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ρώμης³⁹, we can see a hidden history of the excommunication of Montanists from the Catholic community in Asia by a congregation of bishops headed by Claudius Apolinarius. Such an interpretation of Acts 18, 2 is all the more probable that a lot of Montanist practices show striking Jewish characteristics⁴⁰.

9. Conclusion. According to our interpretation, the author of MPol, a representative of the Catholic orthodoxy, saw in the words describing the arrival of Aquila to Corinth in Acts 18, 2 a matrix and a formal parallel to the fate of the heresiarch Montanus who was exiled from Hierapolis by Claudius Apolinarius, and who, according to his sworn enemies, maintained a sexual relationship with his two prophetess. The author of MPol used this passage to introduce the antiexample of Quintus in MPol 4, 1, presenting him not only as a Montanist, but as a typus of the heresiarch himself, who, among others, preached the glory of voluntary martyrdom, which the concept of the „martyrdom in accordance with the Gospel” seeks to challenge.

³⁶ Ibidem, p. 19-20.

³⁷ In the text of *Ecclesiastical History* in vain to search the number of 26 bishops gathered in Hierapolis.

³⁸ *The Synodicon Vetus* 5. Text, translation, and notes by J. Duffy – J. Parker, Washington DC 1979, 7: „A divine and sacred local synod was convened at Hierapolis in Asia by that city’s most saintly Bishop Apollinarius and twenty-six other bishops. It denounced and excommunicated the false prophets Montanus and Maximilla”.

³⁹ *Acts* 18, 2: „because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave Rome”.

⁴⁰ Cf. J.M. Ford, *Was Montanism a Jewish-Christian heresy?*, JEH 17 (1966) 145-158.

„....Z ŻONĄ PRYSCYLLĄ” – KWINTUS W *MARTYRIUM POLYCARPI* 4, 1
JAKO TYP HEREZJARCHY MONTANA W ŚWIETLE NAWIĄZANIA
DO *DZIEJÓW APOSTOLSKICH* 18, 2

(Streszczenie)

Martyrium Polycarpi 4, 1 opowiada o samowydaniu się w ręce pogańskich prześladowców niedoszlego męczennika Kwintusa, który na widok zwierząt załamał się i złożył pogańską ofiarę. Od dawna uczeni dostrzegali, że słowa, za pomocą których autor *Martyrium Polycarpi* wprowadził postać Kwintusa, stanowią prawdopodobne nawiązanie do *Dziejów Apostolskich* 18, 2, gdzie wprowadzona zostaje postać żyda Akwili. Niniejszy artykuł jest propozycją takiej interpretacji tego nawiązania, która z jednej strony potwierdza opinię wielu uczonych (wśród nich G. Buchmanna), że Kwintus jest w *Martyrium Polycarpi* 4, 1 przedstawiony jako montanista, z drugiej zaś sugeruje, iż w postaci Kwintusa mamy ponadto do czynienia z typem samego herezjarchy Montana.

