Dr Conybeare in his last letter to me had thought of sending back for his MS, in order still further to illustrate and perhaps in detail to modify it, but it has been agreed, with Mrs Conybeare's consent, to print it practically as it stood. We can now never have his completed work, but he has clearly stated the problem and done a very great deal towards indicating the solution. Is it too much to hope that some younger scholar will now prepare himself to step into the gap by becoming acquainted with the early Armenian authors, whose works alone supply us with the material for writing this unknown chapter in the history of the text of the New Testament?

However learned such a successor may become, he will never have a more passionate love of truth or a kinder heart than F. C. Conybeare.

F.C.B.]

THE PASSION OF ST CATHARINE AND THE ROMANCE OF BARLAAM AND JOASAPH.

THE legend of St Catharine of Alexandria, with her wheel—more properly her wheels—and her dove, has enjoyed a wide popularity alike in the East and in the West. In the East her name is Ecaterine (Αἰκατερίνα), a form of which no satisfactory explanation has been offered. The Latin texts of her passion have not yet been critically examined; but they are only secondary and are not likely to throw much light on the developement of the story. It is otherwise with the Greek texts. Three of these were published by the Abbé Viteau in 1897, drawn from manuscripts at Paris, Rome, and elsewhere. A fourth text, the most highly developed of all, we already had in the great tenth-century collection which passes under the name of Symeon Metaphrastes (Migne *P. G.* 116, col. 275 ff). The first of M. Viteau's texts is a rude composition, written in very faulty Greek: though it tells of the wise speeches by which the saint confounded her adversaries, it makes no attempt to reproduce them. The second text fills this obvious gap by introducing grotesquely fanciful orations, full of quite imaginary Greek words, such as *σφιρμιγγιλιορύθμιστον*. The third, which seems to have no relation to the second, undertakes the same task in a highly intelligent manner, drawing arguments against heathenism from early sources. Finally we have the text contained in the collection of the Metaphrast, which presents us with a literary revision of the third of M. Viteau's texts.

It is evident that we have in this abundance of materials an exceptional opportunity of studying the methods of the Greek hagiographers.

But Dr Rendel Harris has recently given to this passion a new interest of a more important kind.[1] He has pointed out—as it would seem for the first time—that the text offered us by the Metaphrast, be its date what it may, has been very freely used in the composition of the famous romance of Barlaam and Joasaph. But he has gone further still, and has convinced himself that, just as the author of that romance has embodied a large part of the Apology of Aristides, putting it into the mouth of the rhetorician Nachor, so the passion of St Catharine has preserved to us another early Apology, albeit in a more fragmentary condition, in the speeches in which this learned and philosophic martyr makes her defence of Christianity: he thinks it even possible that the same hand, that of St John of Damascus, may be responsible for so similar a proceeding in the two instances. This is indeed a daring hypothesis; but, whether we accept it or not, we must be grateful to its originator for the mass of materials which he has collected in support of it.

We may begin our examination of the questions thus raised with the speech which, in the Metaphrast's form of the passion, is addressed by St Catharine to the emperor Maxentius on the occasion of the great sacrifice which he had ordered. 'You ought to have known of yourself', she says, 'that it is to the images of perishable men that you are offering sacrifices, as if they were really gods. But since the demon has blinded you, so that you cannot see this plain truth, you should listen to your wise Diodorus and learn what your gods are, and not go on in this absurd and improper way, nor treat as gods the images of men who have come to a wretched death.'

Φησὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρώπους τε τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι λέγων καὶ δι' εὐεργεσίας τινὰς ἀθανάτους ὀνομασθῆναι. ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἰδίας αὐτοὺς ὀνομάτων ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίας, καί τινων ἄρξαι χωρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων. ἀγνοίᾳ δὲ πλανηθέντας φησὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεούς τε αὐτοὺς καλέσαι καὶ ἀθανασίας περιβαλεῖν ἀξιώματι.

The passage referred to is Diodorus Siculus *Bibliotheca Historica* i 13. It is important to note its context. In treating of the nature of the gods, Diodorus has begun with Egypt, of which he has given a somewhat full description. He deals first with elemental deities, sun, moon, and so forth; ending this section with the words (i 12) *Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ θεῶν καὶ γένεσιν ἀΐδιον ἐσχηκότων τοσαῦτα λέγουσιν Αἰγύπτιοι.* Then comes the passage which concerns us:—

13. *Ἄλλους δ' ἐκ τούτων ἐπιγείους γενέσθαι φασίν, ὑπάρξαντας μὲν θνητούς, διὰ δὲ σύνεσιν καὶ κοινὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν τετυχηκότας τῆς ἀθανασίας. ὧν ἐνίους καὶ βασιλεῖς γεγονέναι κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον. μεθερμηνυο-*

[1] *A New Christian Apology:* Manchester University Press, 1923.

μένων δ' αὐτῶν, τινὰς μὲν ὁμωνύμους ὑπάρχειν τοῖς οὐρανίοις, τινὰς δ' ἰδίαν ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίαν, Ἥλιόν τε καὶ Κρόνον καὶ Ῥέαν, ἔτι δὲ Δία τὸν ὑπό τινων Ἄμμωνα προσαγορευόμενον.

This is the passage which, in a form so mutilated as to be almost unintelligible, has been put into the mouth of St Catharine. It will be instructive to trace the stages of this mutilation.

Eusebius, in dealing with the Egyptian deities in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* (ii 1), refers to the exhaustive work of Diodorus, and says that it will be best to give his own words. Accordingly, after citing a couple of sentences on the life-giving properties of the Nile, which caused Egypt to be the first home of the human race, he proceeds to quote from § 13 as follows:—

Τοὺς δὲ θεοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὲν ὑπάρξαι θνητούς, διὰ δὲ σύνεσιν καὶ κοινὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν τυχεῖν τῆς ἀθανασίας· ὧν ἐνίους καὶ βασιλεῖς γενέσθαι. μεθερμηνευομένων δὲ αὐτῶν τινὰς μὲν ὁμωνύμους ὑπάρχειν τοῖς οὐρανίοις, τινὰς δὲ ἰδίαν ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίαν, Ἥλιόν τε καὶ Κρόνον (κτλ.).

In thus abbreviating his author, Eusebius has unwittingly misrepresented him. According to Diodorus it was the belief of the Egyptians that the heavenly and immortal gods had descendants on earth—that is the force of ἐκ τούτων—who were mortal to begin with, but for their wisdom and good services achieved immortality. But Eusebius, by omitting the reference to these heavenly and immortal gods, has made Diodorus say that the Egyptians held that the gods were mortal men to begin with, who for their wisdom and services achieved immortality. In the remainder of the passage he has only omitted the express mention of Egypt.

It is clearly from this abbreviated statement in Eusebius that St Catharine's quotation as given above is ultimately drawn. She herself departs yet further from the original, and makes Diodorus—not the Egyptians—declare that the gods are mortal men and for certain services have been styled immortal. Then by the omission of a clause the sentence which follows is rendered meaningless: 'and he relates that they have obtained appellations (ὀνομάτων προσηγορίας) of their own, and ruled over certain regions and cities'. Further she makes Diodorus say that 'men, being led astray by ignorance, called them gods and invested them with the honour of immortality'.

We shall presently see that there is more than one intermediate stage between the unconscious misrepresentation of Diodorus by Eusebius and this almost unintelligible caricature of his words. But at this point we will pause for a moment to read a brief passage from *Barlaam and Joasaph* (Boissonade, p. 297; Migne *P. G.* 116, col. 1168):—

Ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ποιητῶν ὅσοι μικρόν τι δεδύνηνται τῆς πολλῆς ἀνανεῦσαι μανίας εἶπον τὸ ἀληθέστερον, ὅτι οἱ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι ἦσαν, καὶ διὰ τὸ τινὰς μὲν αὐτῶν ἄρξαι χωρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων, τινὰς δὲ ἄλλο τι οὐδαμινὸν κατὰ τὸν βίον ποιῆσαι, πλανηθέντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεοὺς αὐτοὺς καλέσαι.

These are words which the author of the romance has put into the mouth of Joasaph, when he is arguing against the magician Theudas. Though nothing is said about Diodorus, and no actual words of his are quoted, we cannot escape the conviction that the writer is here drawing upon the speech of St Catharine. The underlined words are sufficient to prove this: he has even taken over the construction of the accusative with the infinitive regardless of syntax. The word οὐδαμινόν, which comes in a clause where he is paraphrasing the language of his source, is one which he has already used more than once in the earlier part of his story (p. 255, col. 1124; p. 277, col. 1148).

We must now return to the Diodorus passage and note another stage in its mutilation before it reached St Catharine. The literary career of John Malālas stretches well into the sixth century: his great chronological compilation comes down certainly to 565, and not improbably to 573 (Krumbacher *Byz. Lit.*, ed. 2, p. 331). His text is preserved in a single manuscript and is notoriously corrupt: his sources have been the subject of much controversy. On p. 54 (ed. Dindorf), after giving an account of Serug, of which we shall have to speak later, he writes as follows:—

Περὶ ὧν ἐν ταῖς συγγραφαῖς αὐτοῦ λέγει καὶ ὁ Διόδωρος ὁ σοφώτατος ταῦτα· ὅτι ἄνθρωποι γεγόνασιν οἱ θεοί, οὕστινας οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὡς νομίζοντες δι' εὐεργεσίαν ἀθανάτους προσηγόρευον· τινὰς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ὀνομάτων προσηγορίας ἐσχηκέναι καὶ κρατήσαντας χώρας. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀγνοίᾳ πλησθέντες.

Dom H. Bourier, one of the latest students of the sources of Malālas, suspects that this has come from the chronographer Timotheus, whom he places in the sixth century a little earlier than Malālas himself. Whatever the source may have been, it is clear that it had the same misrepresentation of Diodorus which we found in Eusebius. It is also clear that we are here pointed to an intermediate stage between Eusebius and St Catharine: this is shewn by the omission both in *Mal.* and in *Cath.* of the statement that 'some had the same names as the heavenly deities', which renders the next clause unintelligible, and also by the pleonastic expansion ὀνομάτων προσηγορίας.

If now we turn to the third of M. Viteau's texts of the passion, we shall find that it is much closer than the Metaphrast's text to the language of Malālas: it is not indeed taken from Malālas's very corrupt

text as it has come down to us, but either from a purer form of his text or from the source which he was here using. It is worth while to set out together the two texts, which we may call *Cath. V* and *Cath. M.*

Cath. V (p. 45).	*Cath. M* (c. 4).
Ὅστις οὕτως ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ συγγραφαῖς λέγει περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι ἄνθρωποι γεγόνασιν οἱ θεοί, καὶ δι' εὐεργεσίας τινὰς ἀθανάτους αὐτοὺς οἱ ἄνθρωποι προσηγόρευσαν.	Φησὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρώπους τε τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι λέγων καὶ δι' εὐεργεσίας τινὰς ἀθανάτους ὀνομασθῆναι.
ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἰδίας ἐσχηκέναι ὀνομάτων προσηγορίας αὐτούς, ἄρξαντας καὶ χωρῶν τινῶν.	ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἰδίας αὐτοὺς ὀνομάτων ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίας, καί τινων ἄρξαι χωρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων.
τοῦτο δὲ πεποιήκασιν ἀγνοίᾳ πλανηθέντες, φησίν.	ἀγνοίᾳ δὲ πλανηθέντας φησὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεούς τε αὐτοὺς καλέσαι καὶ ἀθανασίας περιβαλεῖν ἀξιώματι.

The portions underlined are correspondences with *Mal.* which have been lost in *Cath. M.* The dotted lines, on the other hand, indicate correspondences of *B. and J.* with *Cath. M* as against *Cath. V.*

The parallel between the language of *B. and J.* and that of *Cath. M* in the Diodorus passage is so slight that it would have been hazardous to base any conclusion upon it as to the literary relation between the two documents, if it were not the fact that the passage about Serug which immediately follows has been borrowed with hardly any change at all by the author of the romance. As Dr Rendel Harris has printed both texts in full at this point, underlining the words they have in common, it is needless to repeat the process here. But it will be a useful complement to what he has given us, if we compare M. Viteau's third text with the somewhat longer passage of Malālas which, as we said above, immediately precedes the Diodorus passage.

Mal. (ii 53).	*Cath. V* (p. 45).
Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνωτέρω προγεγραμμένοις ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς τοῦ Ἰαφὲθ [*l.* Σὴθ] ἐγεννήθη ὁ Σερούχ, ὅστις ἐνήρξατο πρῶτος τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ δόγματος διὰ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας, καθὼς Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου συνεγράψατο,	Οὕτω γὰρ καί τις ἄλλος τούτων σοφῶν ἱστόρων ἔφησεν ὡς ὁ Σεροὺχ ἐκεῖνος πρῶτος ἐξεύρηται τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ συνιστῶν
διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάλαι γενομένους πολεμιστάς, ἡγεμόνας, ἢ πράξαντάς τι ἀνδρεῖον ἢ ἀρετῆς ἐν τῷ βίῳ τοῦ μνημονεύεσθαι εἶναι ἄξιον,	διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάλαι γενομένους ἢ πολεμιστὰς ἤ τι πράξαντας ἀνδρείας ἢ ἀρετῆς ἐν τῷ βίῳ, ὡς μνημονεύεσθαι ἄξιον,

Mal. (ii 53).	*Cath. V* (p. 45).
μάλιστα τοὺς ποιήσαντας διὰ δυνάμεώς τινος μυστήρια, ὡς ὄντας αὐτῶν προπάτορας ἀνδριᾶσι στηλῶν ἐτίμησαν,	ἀνδριᾶσι τιμῆσαι στηλῶν·
καὶ πάντας ὡς εὐεργέτας εἰς θεὸν προσεκυνοῦν, καὶ ἐθυσίαζον αὐτοὺς τιμῶντες, ὅτι ἀγαθὸν εὑρηκότας, ἢ διὰ τέχνης ἢ διὰ κτίσματος ἢ διὰ σοφίας ἢ δι' ἄλλης οἱασδήποτε ἀρετῆς ἐλθόντας, οὕστινας ἀπεθέωσαν, καθὼς Ῥηγῖνος ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο τῶν ἀποθεωθέντων ὀνόματα.	
οἱ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἄνθρωποι, ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν τῶν προγόνων γνώμην, ὅτι ὡς προπάτορας καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐπινοητὰς ἐτίμησαν μνήμης καὶ μόνης χάριν, ὡς θεοὺς ἐπουρανίους ἐτίμων καὶ ἐθυσίαζον αὐτοῖς, οὐχ ὡς γενομένους ἀνθρώπους θνητοὺς καὶ ὁμοιοπαθεῖς.	οὓς οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα ἄνθρωποι, τὴν τῶν προγόνων ἀγνοοῦντες γνώμην, ὅτι μνήμης καὶ μόνον χάριν ὡς προπάτορας καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἐπινοητὰς ἐτίμησαν, ὡς θεοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐθυσίαζον, καὶ οὐχ ὡς γενομένοις ἀνθρώποις θνητοῖς καὶ ὁμοιοπαθέσιν αὐτοῖς.
Περὶ ὧν ἐν ταῖς συγγραφαῖς αὐτοῦ λέγει καὶ ὁ Διόδωρος . . .	Οἷς καὶ ὁ Χειρονήσιος Πλούταρχος . . .

It will suffice to note a single passage to illustrate the way in which the language of *Cath. V* has been modified in *Cath. M*, and these modifications have been carried over into *B. and J.*

Cath. M. ἢ ἀνδρίας ἢ φιλίας, εἴτε τινὸς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς ἔργον μνήμης ἄξιον καὶ σπουδῆς ἐπιδειξαμένους ἀνδριᾶσι λέγεται καὶ στηλαῖς τιμῆσαι.

B. and J. ἢ ἀνδρείας ἢ φιλίας ἤ τινος ἄλλης ἀνδραγαθίας ἔργον μνήμης ἄξιον ἐπιδειξαμένους ἀνδριᾶσι λέγεται καὶ στηλαῖς τιμῆσαι.

The source of Malālas is here again a matter of controversy. It is certainly not Eusebius; but, as in the other places where he cites Eusebius as his authority, he may have been using some enlarged form of the *Chronicle* which is not now extant.

The sources of the first fourteen books of Malālas are discussed in two Programmes by Dom Hermann Bourier (Augsburg, 1899, 1900). He thinks that Malālas wrote practically nothing of his own, but merely compiled out of a very few sources, nearly all the authorities whom he names being cited at second-hand. Edwin Petzig reviews Bourier in *Byz. Zeitschr.* x (1901), pp. 255 ff, 598 ff. He rejects his main theory as to paucity of sources.

The Serug passage as given by Malālas is parallel to but by no means the same as that found in Leo Grammaticus 18 f. Gelzer (*Sext. Jul. Africanus und die Byz. Chronographie* i 85) thinks that the latter

must have come from a Chronicle based on Eusebius and just earlier than the time of Epiphanius, i. e. before 375. Bourier holds that Timotheus is here again the source of Malālas.[1]

The earliest Greek authority for the Serug tradition seems to be not Eusebius, as Malālas would have it; nor Eustathius of Antioch (†360), for the *Comm. in Hexameron* is spurious; but perhaps Epiphanius (†403), who says in the preface to his *Adv. Haereses* (Migne *P. G.* 14, col. 138): καὶ ἤρξατο εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἡ εἰδωλολατρεία τε καὶ ὁ Ἑλληνισμός, ὡς ἡ ἐλθοῦσα εἰς ἡμᾶς γνῶσις περιέχει (Petau's note here is misleading). Professor Burkitt tells me that in *Jubilees* (= 'Leptogenesis') xi 6 f it is stated that idolatry began in the days of Serug, and also that Serug himself was an idolater: but this part of *Jubilees* is only extant in Ethiopic.

The mistake of 'Japhet' for 'Shem' appears first in Malālas[2]: it may have come to him from his unknown authority; for he himself has Serug's descent right at an earlier point (p. 16), where he is following the LXX account as given in Euseb. *Chron.*

We may now bring together the principal points of our enquiry.

(1) Whatever may be the element of historical fact in the legend of St Catharine we cannot at present trace her story back beyond the ignorant and ill-written passion which M. Viteau has printed from *cod. Palatin.* 4 in the Vatican Library, a manuscript ascribed to 'saec. x–xi'. The passion is here entitled Μαρτύριον τῆς ἁγίας Αἰκατερίνας τῆς ἐκβιργιλίου καὶ ῥήτορος (*poetae et oratricis*, as M. Viteau renders it). Though her knowledge of rhetoric, philosophy, and poetry is highly extolled, no evidence of it is given in the meagre speeches put into her mouth.

(2) This obvious defect was supplied in two later recensions. One of these has been found by M. Viteau in six MSS, the earliest being assigned to the tenth century. The speeches here inserted are bombastic and grotesque. This recension may be neglected.

(3) Of the other recension yet more MSS are to be found, but again none seems to be earlier than the tenth century. Here we have the work of a writer of some learning, who presents the saint with two quite reasonable discourses. In the first of these arguments are introduced from Diodorus Siculus and some other historian, and from Plutarch: while in the second, replying to a rhetorician who has quoted from Homer and Orpheus, the saint quotes not only from these poets, but also from Sophocles and Plato, and from Apollo himself, 'bard and god'.

[1] It is to be noted that the Orphic verses quoted by St Catharine are also in Malālas, and are there said to be derived from the chronographer Timotheus.

[2] It is found also in Suidas (end of the tenth century).

(4) Finally we have a literary revision of this clever piece of work in the text preserved to us by the Metaphrast.

(5) This latest text of the passion has been very freely used by the writer of the romance of Barlaam and Joasaph, who has not only adopted considerable portions of St Catharine's speeches, but has again and again taken over details of the narrative in framing his own story.

(6) Of the passages cited by the writer of the third recension not less than five have been drawn either from the great chronological compilation of John Malālas, or from some similar compilation (possibly that of Timotheus) which lay behind his work. The two attributed to Plato and Apollo are found in the Oxford collection of *χρησμοὶ καὶ θεολογίαι* printed by Bentley in his notes on Malālas.[1]

Some literary questions of considerable importance are raised by the facts thus newly brought to light. The romance of Barlaam and Joasaph has commonly been attributed to St John of Damascus (†*c.* 757). But Krumbacher (*Byz. Litteraturgesch.* ed. 2 [1897], p. 888) has declared that it can no longer be assigned to his authorship. He places it a full century earlier, and regards it as the work of a Greek monk, writing in Palestine, probably at the monastery of St Sabas, in the first half of the seventh century. Will it be possible to maintain this position now that it has been shewn that the author has made copious use of the final recension of the passion of St Catharine which is preserved to us in the collection of the Metaphrast, and that the previous recension of that passion, which introduced the citations from Diodorus and others, was indebted to John Malālas or one of his predecessors who wrote probably not earlier than the sixth century? This is a question for our modern students of Byzantine literature. The answer can only come from those who can speak with authority on the materials and methods of the Metaphrast.

The hypothesis which Dr Rendel Harris has so attractively put before us—that the speeches assigned to St Catharine contain the *disiecta membra* of a lost Apology of the second century—may not survive discussion. But we cannot close this investigation without once again recognizing the service he has rendered and the stimulus he has given by his discovery of another of the various sources used by the author of the famous Christian romance.

[1] Harris *loc. cit.* p. 20 f. The substitution of the name of the Sibyl for that of Plato is one of the changes made by *Cath. M.* Compare the correction of **Χειρονήσιος** as the description of Plutarch [**Χερονήσιος** *Mal.*] into **Χαιρωνεύς** in *Cath. M.*

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.