

A NEW CHRISTIAN APOLOGY.

BY RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D., D.THEOL., ETC.

CURATOR OF MANUSCRIPTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.

ALL students of early Christian literature are familiar with the recovery in modern times of the lost *Apology of Aristides*, an oration which was presented to or recited before one of the Roman emperors by an Athenian philosopher, probably on one of the Imperial visits to the East. It will be remembered that the discovery was almost of the nature of a romance, for after a fragment of the lost book had been published by the Armenian fathers at Venice, and the Syriac translation of the original had been found by myself on Mount Sinai, the Greek text itself, slightly modified, was found embedded in the Christian novel which passes under the name of the history of Barlaam and Joasaph: this discovery, due to Dr. Armitage Robinson, raised research into the region of romance in more senses than one.

Since then portions of the original Greek text, not borrowed by a novel writer, but detached from the *Apology* itself, have been coming to light among the papyri which have been exhumed from the ruins of Oxyrhyncus, where so much of the remains of Christian and of Pagan literature has been found. And so the romance in research continues and the unexpected persists in happening. But it will be admitted that the highest point touched in this particular quest and recovery was the identification of the major part of the lost book in the pages of *Barlaam and Joasaph*. Our first flight took us to Venice, our second to Sinai, the last to St. Saba. As one discovery commonly leads to another it will be profitable to recall some of the main features of the composition of that story. The place of its production, as we have suggested above, was probably the Monastery of St. Saba, not far from Jerusalem in one direction, nor from the Dead Sea in another. The author was, on the same supposition, the famous saint and

great Christian philosopher, known as John of Damascus. John of Damascus, then, in the eighth century, is, very nearly, the first religious novelist ; and if we make exceptions of those stories of Peter and Paul which go under the name of the *Clementine Recognitions*, we may call *Barlaam and Joasaph* the first Christian romance. From one point of view it might equally be called a Buddhist novel, for the young hero, whose spiritual adventures are recited, makes a Great Renunciation in the Buddhist manner, is himself described as an Indian prince, and quotes folk-tales for which there are Indian parallels. He is converted to the Christian faith by a monk from far-away Egypt, disguised as a pedlar, who under the pretence of showing the young prince a priceless pearl which he possesses, offers him the Pearl of the Faith, and persuades him to its acceptance. The natural result of the conversion of the prince is an upheaval in the palace ; fruitless attempts are made to win him back to paganism, equally fruitless efforts to raise a hue-and-cry and capture the monk pedlar, who has now slipped away, and gone off to his original hermitage. The way in which the *Apology of Aristides* is introduced is very ingenious. An agent is found by the officials of the palace, whose personal appearance closely resembles that of the lost monk Barlaam ; his name is Nachor, and he is instructed to defend the action of the young prince, and the faith which he has embraced, before the wise men and philosophers of the Court, the king himself and the young prince being present ; he is to make such a poor exposition of the Christian faith that the young prince will be ashamed of his teacher, and will disown him and his teaching. As it happened, however, the royal proselyte detected at once that the pseudo-monk Nachor was not his friend Barlaam, and sent him a private message that unless he performed the part of Defender of the Faith adequately, he would himself tear out his heart and his tongue. Under this pressure, what could Nachor do but change his prepared discourse, and recite a more convincing composition, to wit, the whole of the *Apology of Aristides*, with confusion to the assembly of Pagan philosophers, justification of the young prince, and ultimate conversion of the whole Kingdom to the allegiance of Christ ? And it is all so beautifully told that the tale went forth into all lands, and the monk Barlaam and his princely convert Joasaph passed into the calendars of all churches. We have it, at last, in the modern form, in the Loeb Library, translated by Woodward and

Mattingly, Greek and English side by side, the latter an excellent reproduction of the Greek.

A close examination of the story shows that the *Apology of Aristides* was in the mind of the writer from the start, that it is the nucleus of the whole romance, round which the dramatic action is developed. If we keep this in mind we shall now be able to ask ourselves some very interesting questions.

We have pointed out that our literary artist in the Convent of St. Saba had on his shelves one of the great Christian Defences, and made great artistic use of it. But this suggests at once the possibility that some other Apology might be similarly used. For example, there was an almost contemporary Apology, presented, perhaps, to the very same Emperor by Quadratus, the Bishop of Athens. Why should not St. John of Damascus, or some other literary genius of his school, have written another novel with Quadratus or some similar Apology for its nucleus, and so repeat (or it may be anticipate) the success which occurred with Aristides? And why should not some others of the many fictitious canonizations of the Church be traced to a similar literary origin to that of St. Barlaam and St. Joasaph?

We begin our quest by observing a curious collocation in the calendar in the neighbourhood of Barlaam and Joasaph. These two saints are, of course, revered together, for who would make two celebrations where there was such a fellowship between them as the novel records? (One might almost as well disjoin Cosmas from his twin-brother Damian.) The day of their celebration is the 27th November. If we imagine ourselves to be sufficiently pious to revere all saints to whom the Church introduces us, we might recall that before we reach SS. Barlaam and Joasaph, on a preceding day (say the 24th November or the 25th, for calendars vary slightly), we should have celebrated the Festival of St. Catherine of Mt. Sinai. We should not omit to notice in the same conjunction that John of Damascus is honoured at the same time of year. The Basilian Menology says 29 November (the ordinary Synaxarist says 4 December). The sequence of the festivals (25, 27, and 29 November), leads naturally to the supposition that they belong to the Calendar of St. Saba, and may be regarded as a special contribution of that monastery to the Menology or monthly register of the Saints. But how does Catherine come into the same boat with John of Damascus

and his protégés St. Barlaam and St. Joasaph? We propose to show that the story of her martyrdom is drawn upon the same lines as that of Barlaam and Joasaph. We shall find the saint engaged in the defence of the Faith before an Imperial audience and a ring of philosophic opponents, whom she confutes by the very same method as was employed in the other romance; she borrows or imitates one of the lost Christian Apologies, and it becomes in her hands an irresistible weapon.

Let us then briefly follow the story of St. Catherine, as it is told by Symeon the Metaphrast (see Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, tom. 116), or in actual MSS. preserved on Mt. Sinai and elsewhere, and let us see if we can dissect out the *Apology* whose existence we suspect.

Catherine, then, is known as Αἰκατερίνα (*Æcaterina*) among the Greeks, which becomes by a common vocal equivalence Ἐκατερίνα (*Ecaterina*) as in the name of the Russian town of Ekaterinoslav. The monogram of the Convent as it appears on their flag or on the monastic possessions is always AIK which the monks explain as an abbreviation of Ἁγία Κατερίνα, in the same way as the *Holy Wisdom* of Constantinople becomes *Aya Sophia*. But this is obviously wrong,¹ and we may content ourselves for the present by saying that her name is *AI Katerina*, or *Ekaterina*, and that it has nothing to do with καθαρός, and has no mirror in itself of her pure soul.² Catherine, then, lived in Alexandria in the days of the impious Emperor Maxentius. The editors of her story say, correct this to Maximin, for the latter had lordship of the East, and the former of the West. The saint is thus assigned by tradition to the beginning of the fourth century. Maximin comes to Alexandria and issues a proclamation for a great sacrificial display in honour of the immortal gods. Catherine would have no part in the pagan orgy, but sent to the Emperor to say that she desired an interview with him, which being conceded she began at once to denounce idolatry, and to quote good authors in support of her position. It looks as if we had drifted at once into the *Apology* that we are in search of. She begins by taking what is called the Euhemerist position, so named after the Greek philosopher

¹ The same explanation in Raynolds, *De Romanæ eccl. Idol.*, lib. i., c. v. 28.

² The *Legenda Aurea* has another explanation: "Katherina dicitur a catha quod est universum et ruina, quasi universalis ruina!"

Euhemerus, who maintained that the gods were only dead men glorified. She quotes Diodore, and then Seruch¹ who is said to be spoken of *by one of your own historians*, and then Plutarch. The impression made upon the Emperor is overwhelming. As he cannot answer her himself he summons a congress of some fifty pagan doctors to confute her. Their chief spokesman undertakes the task of counsel for Olympus, and intimates to the Emperor that he may expect some sport from the confutation of the little woman.

He quotes a line or two from Homer and Orpheus, and the saint picks up the offered thread and gives adverse testimonies to idolatry from those same writers and others. Apparently we are now in the *Apology* again. The saint puts successively into the witness box, Homer, Orpheus, Sophocles, the Sibyl, Apollo (apparently from a Sibylline oracle), and Plato. The orator on the other side is confounded. None of his companions ventures to assist him.

They confess their faith in Christ and go willingly to a martyr's bonfire which the angry tyrant kindles for them. This takes place on the 17th November. The tyrant then tries to win over Catherine by blandishments, for she is of royal blood and affirms herself to be the daughter of the Emperor who preceded him.² When his caresses and allurements and offers of marriage are of no avail, he tries torture, which is equally futile, and finally throws her into prison to await a second trial.

Meanwhile the Empress Augusta, who had heard what had happened, desired a personal interview with Catherine, and persuades the field-marshal Porphyro to take her to the prison. She is convinced by the saint of the Christian faith and verity. Catherine remains in ward for twelve days, fed miraculously by a dove, and visited

¹ So in the LXX. in Hebrew Serug. We note in passing that Serug, who here comes on the scene, is the father of Nahor whose name is given to the defender of the faith in the *Apology of Aristides*. Again we suspect a common tradition of authorship.

² In Cod. Paris, 3809A, she is said to be 'filia Costhi regis, quæ post mortem patris remansit in palatio cum parentibus suis. Who is Costhius? Is it an abbreviation? Or is it Chosroes? The metrical life of St. Catherine printed by Halliwell says:—

“ Hur name ys clepydd Kateryn
The kyngys doghtur of *Constantyne*
Of Alysandur, as seythe the Latyne.”

celestially by Christ himself, whose spiritual bride she had determined to be. Meanwhile, the prefect of the city, whose name is said to be Chrysadem,¹ had devised a machine with many wheels, and emitting a horrible noise, into which the martyr was to be cast. She escapes miraculously from the new and noisy motor-car, and the enraged Emperor turns his wrath upon his wife Augusta, whom he consigns to horrible torture. Her martyrdom is followed by that of Catherine, who is led out of the city to be executed, after a brief space allowed her for prayer and for intercession on behalf of 'all this foolish people : let them take example, pattern, lead them to Thy light.'

Her head was removed, and then two concluding marvels ; the spectators saw milk flowing instead of blood (they are said by physiologists to be closely related), and a band of angels appeared who took the body of the saint and carried it away to Mount Sinai.

So ends the tale : the last sentence about Mount Sinai is at the first glance an addition, the germ of a new legend, which will presently result in the discovery of the body on the Holy Mountain, and its deposition in the Chapel of the Burning Bush in the Sinai Convent, where the faithful are still privileged to approach the shrine, and on high occasions to behold the exquisitely jewelled hand and headgear of the patroness of the Convent.

But we must not too hastily assume that the reference to Mount Sinai is an addition to be dissected away. There is another explanation for it. The concluding prayer of the saint was an appeal that her body might never be found ; and how does this consist with a translation to Mount Sinai ? The answer is that the prayer requires a fulfilment in the manner of Moses, 'whose sepulchre no man knoweth' ; and Moses naturally suggested Sinai. The contradiction which lies on the surface of the narration disappears when we look beneath it. The finding of the body is a misunderstanding ; the body was there that it might *not* be found.

The story of the tortures inflicted on the saint and the Empress is conventional hagiology ; it does not rank with the rest of the tale ; and we come back to the extracts from the lost *Apology* (is it *Quadratus* ?) upon which we have stumbled, and try to reduce them into order and where necessary to furnish them with explanations.

We begin, then, with Diodore. The saint says that your Majesty

¹ The Latin texts suggest Chursates.

(ὁ βασιλεὺς, as in the opening of the *Apology of Aristides*) ought at least to have recognised the folly of idolatry, by noting what Diodore, one of your own wise men, says as to the origin of the so-called immortal gods. He tells us that the gods are men and were called immortal for benefits which they had conferred. They had proper names and ruled over cities and countries. Ignorant men called them divine and revered them as immortal.

Catherine is quoting freely from Diodore's *History*,¹ Bk. I., c. 13, the very same passages which are transcribed by Eusebius in his *Preparatio Evangelica* (Bk. II., c. 1). We observe that she is frankly *Euhemerist*, a dangerous doctrine at first sight for one who worships the Crucified Man as the True God. She quotes Diodore because Diodore quotes Euhemerus. If, however, Diodore quotes Euhemerus, it is because Euhemerus quotes from Hecataeus of Abdera. An extract from a recent writer will explain what we mean. Drachmann, in his just issued work on *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*, tells us " Euhemerus published his theological views in the shape of a book of travel, which was, however, wholly fiction. He relates how he came to an island Panchaia, in the Indian Ocean, and in a temple there found a lengthy inscription in which Uranos, Kronos, Zeus, and other gods recorded their exploits. The substance of the tale was that the gods had once been men, great kings and rulers, who had bestowed on their peoples all sorts of improvements in civilisation and had thus got themselves worshipped as gods. . . . *Euhemerus had an immediate precursor in the slightly earlier Hecataeus of Abdera*, who had set forth a similar theory, with the difference, however, that he took the view that all excellent men became real gods. . . . At Rome in the second century Ennius translated his works into Latin,

¹ We may compare *Acta Catherinæ*, c. 4: φησὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, ἀνθρώπους δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι λέγων, καὶ δι' εὐεργεσίας τινὰς ἀθανάτους ὀνομασθῆναι, ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἰδίας αὐτοῦς ὀνομάτων ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίας, καὶ τινων ἄρξαι χωρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων· Ἀγνοία δὲ πλανηθέντας φησὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεοὺς δὲ αὐτοὺς καλέσαι καὶ ἀθανασίας περιβαλεῖν ἀξιώματι with Diod. i. 13, ap. Euseb., *Præp. Ev.*, ii. 1: Τοὺς δὲ θεοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὲν ὑπάρξαι θνητοὺς, διὰ δὲ σύνεσιν καὶ κοινὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν τυχεῖν τῆς ἀθανασίας· ὧν ἐνίους καὶ βασιλεῖς γενέσθαι· μεθερμηνευομένων δὲ αὐτῶν τινὰς μὲν ὁμωνύμους ὑπάρχειν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τινὰς δὲ ἰδίαν ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίαν. Diodore quotes Euhemerus to the same effect in Euseb., *Præp. Ev.*, ii. 2, p. 59.

and as late as the time of Augustus *an author such as Diodorus*, in his popular history of the world, *served up Euhemerism as the best scientific explanation of the origin of religion.*"¹ Catherine, then, is a disciple of Hecataëus, at two removes.

Catherine then proceeds from Diodore and his Euhemerism to quote an anonymous historian of your own, i.e. a Pagan historian, who affirms that Serug is the first inventor of the Greek religious system. At first sight again, this is perplexing. What Greek historian ever wrote about Serug? We cannot find it in Josephus nor in Eusebius, and indeed neither of these could adequately be described as one of your Greek wise men who wrote history.² Bearing in mind, however, that Catherine has struck the note of Euhemerism, and recalling that the real founder of Euhemerism is Hecataëus of Abdera, and that Hecataëus wrote a history of Israel and of Egypt, including the life and times of Abraham, we may fairly say that it is probable that the reference to Serug (who is Abraham's greatgrandfather) and his incipient idolatry, is due to Hecataëus. The quotation which Catherine makes shows conclusively the hand of the Euhemerist. Whenever, says she, any man had done a notable deed, it was the custom to honour him with statues; ancestors, too, who deserved commemoration were also turned into immortal gods, and received honours and sacrifices. We shall presently come across another trace of the use of Hecataëus.

Catherine then introduces 'another of your wise men' to the imperial consideration. This time it is Plutarch. Does he not say that the worship of images is an error? She then challenges the Emperor to acknowledge Christ as the True God, who gave him his Empire and his life itself. He it is who is the eternal and immortal God, who became man in the last time on our account, endured the Cross and death to raise us from the death of disobedience.

¹ Eng. Trans., p. 111.

² John Malala (Bk. II., p. 53), to whom we shall have to give closer attention presently, says that it was Serug, of the tribe of Japhet (a mistake for Shem), who was the author of idolatrous Hellenism, *according to Eusebius*: but the editors of Malala and of Eusebius point out that Malala must have made a mistake. He has a similar wrong reference in Bk. III., where, in the opening sentences, Abraham talks like a Euhemerist to his father Terah, who makes images which are *ἀγάλματα ἀνθρώπων τεθνηκότων*, and when he has finished the discourse, he smashes Terah's statuary, *as Eusebius tells us*. Evidently another bit of Hecataëus: for Eusebius read *Euhemerus*.

After an interlude, in which the wise men of the Court are brought forward as defenders of Hellenism, to make through their chief spokesman certain futile references to Homer and Orpheus, Catherine proceeds. She brushes Homer and Orpheus on one side, and appeals to your wise Sophocles, who tells us that 'there is one God, the Maker of heaven and earth and seas. We mortals have in error erected to them statues of wood and stone, of gold and ivory : we think it piety to offer them sacrifices and to hold solemn assemblies in their honour.'

It is easy to restore this supposed extract of Sophocles into regular metrical form ; when we do so we find that we have nine lines of Greek verse, which are quoted by Justin (or someone who passes under his name), in his *Cohortatio ad Gentiles* (c. 18), and again in the *De Monarchia* (c. 2) : by Clement of Alexandria in the *Protrepticon* (p. 63), and in the fifth book of the *Stromateis* (p. 717) : by Eusebius in the thirteenth book of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* (p. 680D), and others. They all refer to Sophocles as the author ; but we observe (i) that they are all quoting common matter, that is, from a common source ; (ii) that the source is Euhemerist in origin, for the worship of gods many as distinct from that of the One God is said to be an error of mortal men, who erect their statues and decree their festivals ; (iii) Eusebius, who knows more than the rest, tells us that the quotation is from Hecataëus, the historian who wrote on Abraham and on Egypt ; (iv) so does Clement of Alexandria, from whom Eusebius may have derived his information.

We may reasonably infer that all these authorities reduce to Hecataëus, whatever may become of Sophocles. And, as we have already noticed, Hecataëus is the spiritual father of Euhemerus, whose method Catherine is following so closely.

Her next appeal is to the Sibyl, the wisest among women. Does she not speak of one who is to come to this earth free from error and able to relieve men from incurable ills ; one that shall meet with envy and with scorn and be hanged in derision ? Does not this convince thee, Emperor ? She adds to the wisdom of the Sibyl the truthfulness of Apollo, an oracle of whom she proceeds to quote. It tells of one who is mortal and immortal, God and man ; one that suffers all things, including the Cross, one that knows how to weep and one that can feed five thousand ; my Christ, says the supposed Apollo,

the God who was outstretched on the tree, and raised again to His primal heaven.

Catherine having finished her quotations from supposed pagan teachers, poets and prophets, makes a rapid summary of the Christian religion, its Founder's true nature, His sufferings and His resurrection, the descent of the Spirit, the mission of the Apostles, etc. She ends with the Evangelical appeal, 'Come unto Me.' You have heard Plato's testimony ; Orpheus' lyre, which moves inanimate things, has sounded in your ears : the truthful Apollo has spoken to you by oracle. All ground of unbelief has been cut away.

So ends the apologetic matter which Catherine brings forward. It requires careful study, for it is clear that there is method in its collection ; it is not the haphazard quotation of hostile matter, such as we commonly find in martyrologies. The Euhemerist thread which we find running through the composition deserves special notice ; one can imagine how forcible such an appeal would be to an Emperor like Hadrian who actually decreed divine honours to his favourite Antinous.¹

Now let us leave for awhile the suggestion of Euhemerism in the supposed embedded *Apology*, and pass on to the question of the relation of the document which records the Passion of Catherine to the romance of *Barlaam and Joasaph*. It will be remembered that we pointed out a suspicious collocation of festivals in the Greek Calendar in the sequence of Catherine, Barlaam and Joasaph, and John of Damascus. When we read the *Acts of S. Catherine* side by side with *Barlaam and Joasaph*, we arrive at the surprising result that a great part of the Catherine story is reproduced, with slight variation, in the story of the Indian prince and his teacher—and a careful examination will show that Catherine is the earlier story of the two, which has been reproduced in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. This, then, is our second proposition, following on the first (viz., that Catherine Euhemerises) ;

The story of Catherine has affected, as regards many passages, the narration in *Barlaam and Joasaph*.

Take, for example, the opening of the *Acta*, where we have, first

¹ The question will arise whether Euhemerism is not involved in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, where we are advised to be very much aware of things offered to idols, *because it is a worship of dead gods*.

of all, the arrival of the impious Emperor (Maxentius or Maximin, or whoever he may be) in Alexandria, and the decree for a universal festival and sacrifices in honour of the immortal gods. Official letters are sent all over the country-side, and as a result one might see the populace streaming into Alexandria, fearful of the punishment attached to the neglect of the imperial injunction, and bringing with them, each man according to his ability and his good-will to the gods, sheep and oxen or lesser animals for sacrifice. They were stirred to emulation by the Emperor himself, who contributed 130 oxen to the sacrifices, and who hastened to the temple, followed by Senators and officials, high and low, rich and poor. The city resounded with the lowings of the victims and the air was polluted by the reek of their burning.

Now turn to the story of *Barlaam and Joasaph*: we shall find that when the young prince is born, the long-desired heir to King Abenner, a universal sacrifice to the gods is decreed in thanksgiving for the birth of the prince.

The King sends everywhere to gather the multitude to the birthday festival, and one might see them streaming together, animated by fear of the King, bringing suitable offerings according to each man's ability and his goodwill toward the King. They were stirred to emulation by the example of the King himself, who had contributed oxen very many and very fat to the ceremonies.

Evidently this has been adapted from the *Acts of Catherine*. We notice in the next place, that when we come to the last stages of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* story, when Theudas the magician unfolds his scheme for the temptation and overthrow of the young prince, a general sacrifice is again appointed. Royal letters are sent everywhere to summon the multitude, and again you might see them streaming palace-wards with offerings of sheep and goats and other cattle. The King makes for the temple, taking with him 120 oxen for sacrifice; the whole city re-echoes to the lowing of the beasts, the very air was polluted with the reek of the sacrifices.

It is evident that the author of the *Romance* has drawn upon the *Acts* in two separate situations where a royal sacrifice is called for: the second of the situations is quite artificial, for there was not the least reason for a thanksgiving to the gods, when they had just suffered a notable defeat in the recitation of the *Apology of Aristides*: the two accounts taken together use up almost every word in the *Acta*,

with which the author of the *Romance* was perfectly familiar. This, then, is our first instance of the employment of the *Catherine* story in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. The parallelisms will be more conspicuous if we now set down the Greek texts, and underline where correspondence is particularly close.

(*Acta Catherinæ*, chap. 2.) Τούτων τῶν γραμμάτων πανταχοῦ διαπεφοιτηκότων, ἣν ἰδεῖν συρρέοντα πλήθη πρὸς αὐτὸν φόβῳ τῶν ἀπειλῶν, τῶν μὲν πρόβατα καὶ βόας ἐπαγομένων, τῶν δὲ καὶ ὀρνίθων γένη ποικίλα, ὥστε οὐδεὶς εὐτελὴς ἦν [? ὃς οὐκ ἐκομίζετο θυσίαν] ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν παρασκευὴν πάντες ἐγίνοντο τῆς θυσίας· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ πλουσίους μεγάλα ζῶα πρὸς τὴν τελετὴν ὥριστο ἄγειν, μικρὰ δὲ τοὺς πένητας, ὡς ἐκάστῳ ἧ τε χεῖρ εὐποροίη, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐνοια ἔχοι. Μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡρέθιζε πρὸς φιλοτιμίαν ὁ βασιλεὺς ταύρους καταθύσαι φέρων αὐτὸς ἑκατὸν καὶ τριάκοντα. Πάντων τοίνυν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παρ' αὐτὸν συνεληλυθότων ὑπερήσθη τῇ πολυπληθείᾳ τοῦ τε λαοῦ καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν, καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον, ὡς μηδὲ καιρὸν ἕτερον ἀναμεῖναι, ἀλλ' αὐτίκα τε ἀναστῆναι, καὶ τάχει χωρῆσαι πρὸς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ καὶ ἤδη τὴν θυσίαν διατελέσαι. Ἐτρεχον δὲ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ γένος ἅπαν καὶ ἡλικία πᾶσα, οἱ τε τῆς βουλῆς ἦσαν καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει, καὶ οἱ τῶν εὐτελῶν καὶ ἀσῆμων, τὰ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν ἕκαστος ἐπικομιζόμενοι. Ὡς στενοχωρεῖσθαι μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἐκεῖ συρρέοντων αὐτὴν τε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν ναόν, περιχεῖσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων βοῆς τὴν κύκλῳ περιχωρον, τῇ δὲ τῶν θυσιῶν κνίσσῃ καὶ αὐτὸν μολύνεσθαι τὸν ἀέρα.

(*B. et J.*, p. 18, col. 877.) Πανταχοῦ διέπεμπε συναγαγεῖν τὰ πλήθη εἰς τὰ τούτου γενέθλια. Καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν πάντας συρρέοντας τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐπαγομένους τε τὰ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν εὐτρεπισμένα, ὡς ἐκάστῳ ἧ χεῖρ εὐπορεῖ καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα εὐνοια εἶχε. Μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡρέθιζε πρὸς φιλοτιμίαν αὐτός, ταύρους καταθύσαι φέρων ὅτι πλείστους καὶ εὐμεγέθεις, καὶ οὕτω πάνδημον ἑορτὴν τελέσας, πάντας ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο δώροις οἱ τε τῆς βουλῆς ἦσαν καὶ τῶν ἐν τέλει, καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸ στρατιωτικόν, οἱ τε τῶν εὐτελῶν καὶ ἀσῆμων.

(*B. et J.*, p. 265, col. 1136.) *Ενθεν τοι καὶ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν πανταχοῦ διαπεφοιτηκότων τοῦ συνελθεῖν πάντας ἐν τῇ μυσαρᾷ πανηγύρει αὐτῶν, ἣν ἰδεῖν συρρέοντα τὰ πλήθη, πρόβατά τε καὶ βόας καὶ διάφορα γένη ζῶων ἀγόμενα. Πάντων τοίνυν συνεληλυθότων, ἀναστὰς ὁ βασιλεὺς μετὰ τοῦ ἀπατεῶνος Θεωδᾶ πρὸς τὸν ναὸν ἐχώρει, ταύρους καταθῦσαι φέρων ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι καὶ ζῶα πολλά. Καὶ ἐτέλουν τὴν ἐπάρατον αὐτῶν ἑορτήν, ὡς περιηχεῖσθαι μὲν τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ζῶων φωνῆς, τῇ δὲ τῶν θυσιῶν κίσση καὶ αὐτὸν μολύνεσθαι τὸν ἀέρα.

Our next example shall be taken from the address of Catherine to the Emperor, which we suppose to be part of an incorporated Apology for the Christian Faith. We drew attention above to the passage, supposed from Hecatæus (or his follower Euhemerus), in which an allusion was made to Serug as the first to introduce the Hellenic gods and sacrifices. As Serug is the ancestor of Nahor in the book of Genesis, and Nahor is the name given to the false monk in *Barlaam and Joasaph* who recites the *Apology of Aristides*, it is natural to enquire whether there are any traces of Serug in *Barlaam and Joasaph*, as well as in the *Acta*: and we shall find that the text of Catherine has been again bodily transferred to the *Romance*. The parallel passages are as follows:—

(*Acta Catherinæ*, chap. 4.) Καὶ ἄλλος δὲ σοφὸς παρ' ὑμῖν πάλιν τῶν ἱστορίαν γραψάντων τὸν Σεροῦχ ἐκείνουν ἔφησε πρῶτον τὰ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἐξευρεῖν. Τοὺς γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πάλαι χρόνοις ἡ ἀνδρίας ἡ φιλίας, εἴτε τινὸς ἐτέρας ἀρετῆς, ἔργον μνήμης ἄξιον καὶ σπουδῆς ἐπιδειξαμένους ἀνδριᾷσι λέγεται καὶ στήλαις τιμῆσαι. Οἱ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν τῶν προγόνων ἀγνοήσαντες γνώμην, καὶ ὅτι μνήμης ἕνεκα μόνον αὐτούς, ὡς ἐπαίνετόν τι πρᾶγμα πεποιηκότας, ἐτίμησαν, καὶ ἀνδριάντας αὐτοῖς καὶ στήλας ἀνέστησαν, ὡς ἀθανάτοις θεοῖς τοῖς ὁμοιοπαθέσιν ἀνθρώποις καὶ φθαρτοῖς προσετέθησαν καὶ θυσίας αὐτοῖς καὶ τιμὰς καὶ πανηγύρεις ἐπενοήσαντο.

(*B. et J.*, p. 297, col. 1168.) Καταρχὰς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Σεροῦχ ἐκεῖνος ιστόρηται τὰ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἐξευρεῖν. Τοὺς γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πάλαι χρόνοις ἡ ἀνδρείας ἡ φιλίας, ἡ τινος ἐτέρας ἀνδραγαθίας,

ἔργον μνήμης ἄξιον ἐπιδειξαμένους ἀνδριᾷσι λέγεται καὶ στηλαῖς τιμῆσαι. Οἱ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν τῶν προγόνων ἀγνοήσαντες γνώμην, καὶ ὅτι μνήμης ἕνεκα μόνον τοῖς ἐπαίνετόν τι ποιήσασιν ἀνδριάντας καὶ στηλας ἀνέστησαν, κατὰ μικρὸν πλανώμενοι τῇ τοῦ ἀρχικάκου δαίμονος ἐνεργείᾳ, ὥς ἀθανάτοις θεοῖς τοῖς ὁμοιοπαθέσι καὶ φθαρτοῖς ἀνθρώποις προσετέθησαν, καὶ θυσίας αὐτοῖς καὶ σπονδὰς ἐπενοήσαντο.

Here the dependence of Barlaam and Joasaph upon Catherine is complete. As we have shown, it is one of the Euhemerist passages, and Catherine is the Euhemerizer. But let us see how the passage is introduced in *B. and J.* We are told that such of the poets as had somewhat escaped from the prevalent madness, had said truthfully enough that the so-called gods were men, and that it was in error that men called them gods, on account of their having ruled over countries and cities, or done some trifling service to men ; but this is the passage from Diodore, which precedes in the *Acta* ; Diodore has disappeared in the quotation, but, as we have shown, he was rightly referred to in the *Acta*. Here are the passages for comparison :—

(*Acta Catherinæ*, chap. 4.) Ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ιδίας αὐτοὺς ὀνομάτων ἐσχηκέναι προσηγορίας καὶ τινων ἄρξαι χωρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων· ἀγνοία δὲ πλανηθέντας φησὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεοὺς αὐτοὺς καλέσαι.

(*B. et J.*, p. 297, col. 1168.) Εἶπον . . . ὅτι οἱ λεγόμενοι θεοὶ ἀνθρωποι ἦσαν, καὶ διὰ τὸ τινας μὲν αὐτῶν ἄρξαι χωρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων, τινὰς δὲ ἄλλο τι οὐδαμινὸν κατὰ τὸν βίον ποιῆσαι, πλανηθέντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεοὺς αὐτοὺς καλέσαι.

Another very interesting case of repeated matter in the two legends occurs in the parallel scenes where, on the one hand, Catherine confutes and converts the fifty rhetoricians and their spokesman, and on the other hand, Nahor refutes, unwillingly at first, the principal pagan orator and his companions. In the former case we are told that an immense crowd gathered to hear the debate and note the sequel. The chief of the court orators begins in an insolent and hectoring manner to address Catherine ; ‘Are you,’ says he, ‘the woman who so shamelessly and impudently insults the gods ? Are you not aware that the greatest of our poets give them their divine honours, and who

are you to have the audacity to wag your tongue against them ?' All of this is repeated almost *verbatim et literatim* when the leader of the rhetoricians in B. and J. challenges Nahor to state his case. We may compare :—

(*Acta Catherinæ*, chap. 9.) Εἰς τῶν ῥητόρων, ὁ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πάντων διαφορώτατος, εἶπεν . . . συνείλκετο δὲ καὶ πλήθος ἄθροον εἰς θεὸν τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐπιδραμόντες, ὥστε μαθεῖν ὁπότερον μέρος τὴν νικῶσαν ἀποίσεται.

(*B. et J.*, p. 238, col. 1105.) Συνελθόντων δὲ ἀπείρων λαῶν εἰς θεὸν τοῦ ἀγῶνος ὥστε μαθεῖν ὁπότερον μέρος τὴν νίκην ἀποίσεται λέγει τῷ Ναχώρ εἰς τῶν ῥητόρων, ὁ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πάντων διαφορώτατος.

(*Acta Catherinæ*, chap. 9.)

Σὺ εἶ, φησὶν, ἡ ἀναισχύντως οὕτω καὶ ἱταμῶς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ἡμῶν ἐξυβρίζουσα ;

(*B. et J.*, ut supra.)

Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἀναισχύντως οὕτως καὶ ἱταμῶς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ἡμῶν ἐξυβρίζων Βαρλααμ ;

(*Acta Catherinæ*, chap. 9.) Τῶν μεγάλων ποιητῶν, φησὶ θεοὺς ὑψηλοὺς ἐκείνους ὀνομαζόντων, πῶς αὐτὴ γλῶσσαν κατ' αὐτοὺς κινεῖς, καὶ ὅλως ἀποθρασύνεσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμᾷς ;

(*B. et J.*, ut supra.) Τῶν μεγάλων, φησὶ, καὶ θαυμασίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ πᾶσαν σοφίας ἐπιστήμην ἐξευρηκότων θεοὺς ὑψηλοὺς καὶ ἀθανάτους ἐκείνους ὀνομαζόντων . . . πῶς αὐτὸς γλῶσσαν κατ' αὐτοὺς κινεῖς καὶ ὅλως ἀποθρασύνεσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα τολμᾷς ;

The observation of the dependence of *Barlaam and Joasaphat* upon the *Acta* removes some difficulties in the interpretation of the former. For example, when Theudas the magician has been finally crushed by the arguments of the young prince, we are told that he was thunderstruck and unable to speak. When at length he recovered his speech and confessed his defeat, the populace who stood by shouted out, 'Great is the God of the Christians.' Unfortunately, for the intelligent reader, the interview was a private one ; no one was present

except the king, the young prince, and Theudas. It was a careless transference of two passages in the *Acta*; chap. 13 :

τούτοις καταπλαγέντα τὸν ῥήτορα καὶ αὐτὴν ἐπισχεθέντα τὴν γλῶτταν,

and chap. 19 : ὥστε καὶ κράζειν τινὰς τῶν παρεστώτων ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τούτῳ θεάματι, Μέγας ὁ θεὸς τῶν χριστιανῶν,

with which cf. *B. et J.* (p. 299, col. 1169.) οἶα βροντῆς ἤχῳ καταπλαγεῖς, ἀφωνία συνέχετο,

(p. 300, col. 1171.) Μέγας οὖν τὸ ὄντι ὁ τῶν χριστιανῶν θεός.

We might easily extend the argument of the foregoing pages, but enough has been said to establish the connection between the *Acts of Catherine* and the story of *Barlaam and Joasaph*. St. John of Damascus had the *Acta* among the sources for his novel, and it is well within the bounds of possibility that he is the author of both works, so similar in their conception and so full of parallel situations. Catherine has acquired chronological dignity ; she cannot be later than the eighth century as a literary phenomenon. We have added one more source to the crowd of writers from whom *Barlaam and Joasaph* is plagiarised : but this brings us to our next point, viz., the sources of Catherine herself, for it is clear that she is as much the 'picker up of learning's crumbs' as John of Damascus himself.

Our third direction of research is indicated by the observation that there is common matter between the *Passion of St. Catherine* and the *Chronography of John Malala*.

We have already had occasion to observe that John Malala has the same reference as Catherine to Serug as the author of Greek beliefs (regarding the gods). And we shall find on examining the passage carefully that he supplements it by a reference to *Diodore*, very nearly as Catherine does. This is very curious, and suggests that Malala and Catherine have been drawing from a common source. Here is the passage from Malala for comparison with the Acts of Catherine.

(*John Malala*, ii., 53.) Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀνωτέρῳ προγεγραμμένοις [χρόνοις] ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς τοῦ Ἰαφέθ [1. Σήθ] ἐγεννήθη ὁ Σερούχ, ὅστις ἐνήρξατο πρῶτος τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ δόγματος διὰ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας, καθὼς Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου συνεγράψατο, διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάλαι γενομένους πολεμιστάς, ἡγεμόνας, ἢ πράξαντάς τι ἀνδρείον, ἢ ἀρετῆς ἐν τῷ βίῳ τοῦ μνημονεύεσθαι εἶναι ἄξιον, μάλιστα τοὺς ποιήσαντας διὰ δυνάμεώς τινος μυστήρια, ὡς

ὄντας αὐτῶν προπάτορας ἀνδριᾶσι στηλῶν ἐτίμησαν, καὶ πάντες ὡς εὐεργέτας εἰς θεὸν προσεκύνουν, καὶ ἐθυσίαζον αὐτοὺς τιμῶντες, ὅτι ἀγαθὸν εὐρηκότες, ἢ διὰ τέχνης ἢ διὰ κτίσματος ἢ διὰ σοφίας ἢ δι' ἄλλης οἷας δήποτε ἀρετῆς ἐλθόντας, οὐστινας ἀπεθέωσαν, καθὼς Ῥηγῖνος ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγραψατο 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, περὶ ὧν ἐν ταῖς συγγραφαῖς αὐτοῦ λέγει καὶ ὁ Διόδωρος ὁ σοφώτατος ταῦτα, ὅτι ἄνθρωποι γεγόνασιν οἱ θεοί, οὐστινας οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὡς νομίζοντες δι' εὐεργεσίαν ἀθανάτους προσηγόρευον· τινὰς δὲ καὶ ὀνομάτων προσηγορίας ἐσχηκέναι καὶ κρατήσαντας χώρας· τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀγνοοῖα πλησθέντες.

There can be no doubt as to an underlying connection between Malala and Catherine; they both quote Serug (i.e. ultimately Hecatæus) and Diodore (who is again Hecatæus), and their quotations are closely coincident as regards the language employed.¹

Let us look a little further into Malala's *Chronography* for coincidences with *Catherine*:—²

The *Acta Catherinæ* relate how a debate was arranged between the saint and the orators and rhetoricians of the Court. They begin the debate by quoting from Homer and Orpheus, and Catherine retaliates, and quotes Orphic verses on her own account. At first sight this seems to militate against our theory of an involved Christian Apology; when, however, we turn to Malala we find the same matter treated in consecutive form, without the intrusion of the contentious orator on the other side, and the Orphic verses are given again as in Catherine. We give the parallels; it will be seen at a glance that Malala is not quoting directly from Catherine, but from some common source which Catherine has broken up and abbreviated.

¹ For the dependence upon Hecatæus we may compare the passage in Ps. Aristæas (another follower of Hecatæus) where it is said: (c. 135) "they make effigies of stone and wood, and assert that they are images of those who discovered something useful for their life, and these they worship, although their senselessness is obvious": (tr. *St. John Thackeray*, p. 31).

² These coincidences were first pointed out by Bidez in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. xi. (1902).

John Malala, l. iv. p. 72 ff.

ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ χρόνῳ ἦν Ὀρφεὺς
ὁ Θραῦξ, ὁ λυρικός Ὀδρυσαῖος,
ὁ σοφώτατος καὶ περιβόητος
ποιήτης· ὅστις ἐξέθετο θεογονίαν
καὶ κόσμου κτίσιν καὶ ἀνθρώπου
πλαστουργίαν, εἰρηκῶς ἐν τῇ
ἀρχῇ τοῦ συντάγματος αὐτοῦ ὅτι
ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμήσεως
οὐκ ἐξέθετό τί ποτε περὶ Θεοῦ
ἢ τῆς κόσμου κτίσεως, ἀλλ'
εἶπεν ὅτι αἰτησαμένου διὰ
ἰδίας αὐτοῦ εὐχῆς μαθεῖν
παρὰ τοῦ Φοῖβον Τιτᾶνος
Ἑλίου τὴν θεογονίαν καὶ τὴν
τοῦ κόσμου κτίσιν καὶ τὶς
ἐποίησεν αὐτήν·
ἐμφέρεται γὰρ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ
ἐκθέσει διὰ ποιητικῶν
στίχων οὕτως·

Acta Catherinæ.

ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ ὁ περίβλεπτος Ὀρφεὺς
ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ θεογονίᾳ

οὕτω πως εὐχαριστῶν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι

Then follow the Orphic verses, which must be restored to their poetical form :—

ὦ ἄναξ, Λητοῦς υἱέ, ἐκατήβολε
Φοῖβε κραταιέ, | πανδερκές,
θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσω |
'Ἡέλιε χρυσεαῖσιν ἀειρόμενε
πτερύγεσσιν, | δωδεκάτην δὴ
τῇνδε παρὰ σείο ἔκλυον ὁμφήν, |
σεῖο φαμένου, σέ δ' αὐτόν,
ἐκήβολε, μάρτυρα θεῖην. |

ὦ ἄνα, Λητοῦς υἱέ, ἐκατήβολε
Φοῖβε, κραταιέ, πανδερκές, θνητοῖσι
καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσω, 'Ἡέλιε
χρυσεαῖσιν ἀειρόμενε πτερύγεσσιν.

These verses, to which we shall return presently, are said by Malala to be derived by him from Timotheus the Chronographer ; and the intention of their quotation is said by Timothy to be the demonstration that the world was made by the Trinity. Accordingly Malala says :—

ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐξέθετο ὁ σοφώτατος Τιμόθεος χρονογράφος, λέγων
τὸν αὐτὸν Ὀρφέα πρὸ τοσούτων χρόνων εἰπόντα τριάδα ὁμοού-
σιον δημιουργῆσαι τὰ πάντα.

Now notice that Catherine follows the same line of quotation as Malala does ; for a little lower down Malala is quoting Orpheus again : and so does Catherine.

Malala, ut sap : p. 75.

περὶ δὲ τοῦ ταλαιπώρου γένους
τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ αὐτὸς Ὀρφεὺς
ἐξέθετο ποιητικῶς στίχους
πολλοὺς ὧν μέρος εἰσὶν
οὔτοι·
Θῆρές τε οἰωνοὶ τε βροτῶν τ'
ἀλιτήρια φύλα | ἄχθεα γῆς,
εἶδωλα τετυγμένα, μὴ διὰ
μηδὲν | εἰδότες, οὔτε κακοῖο
προσερχομένοιο νοῆσαι |
φράδμονες, οὔτε ποῖον μαλ'
ἀποστρέψαι κακότητος | οὔτε
ἀγαθοῦ παρεόντος ἐπιστρέψαι
καὶ εἶρξαι | ἰδριες, ἀλλὰ μάτην
ἀδαήμονες, ἀπρονόητοι, |
ἔμπειροι.

Acta Catherinæ.

ὁ μουσικὸς δὲ πάλιν Ὀρφεὺς
πολλὴν ὑμῶν τῶν αὐτοῦς (sc. τοὺς
θεοὺς) σεβομένων καὶ οὗτος
ἄνοιαν καὶ παραπληξίαν κατα-
γινώσκει, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ἡ
βίβλῳ περὶ τε αὐτῶν, ὡς ἔφη,
τῶν θεῶν τῆς γοῆς καὶ τῆς
τοῦ κόσμου συνέγραψε κτίσεως,
οὕτω πως καὶ περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας
ματαιότητος καὶ τῆς ἀμαθίας
ὑποσημῆνας, οὔτε κακοῖς
προσερχομένοις νοῆσαι, οὔτε
ποῖς (l. πῶς) μάλα προτρέψαι
κακότητος ἔχουσιν.

A comparison of the two passages, Malala-Timotheus and Catherine shows that the latter has broken up a long Orphic quotation, dropping part of the verses, and putting the opening sentences into the mouth of her rhetorical antagonist, with a different meaning from what they had in the Orphic writer.

Now for another surprise. When we proceed to rectify the verses which we have been transcribing, and to put them into a correct classical dress, we call to our aid the great Bentley, whose letter to Mill (an amazing, and occasionally amusing, piece of erudition) is printed at the end of the Bonn edition of Malala ; Bentley restores the verses of Malala as follows :—

ᾠ ἄνα, Λητοῦς υἱ', ἐκατήβολε Φοῖβε κραταίε,
Πανδερκές, θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσω,
Ἥελιε, χρυσέαισιν ἀειρόμενε πτερύγεσσιν,
Δωδεκάτην δὴ τήνδε παρὰ σέο ἔκλυον ὁμφήν,
Σεῦ φαμένου, σὲ δέ γ' αὐτὸν, ἐκήβολε, μάρτυρα θείην

* * * * *

Θῆρες τ' οἰωνοὶ τε βροτῶν τ' ἀλιτήρια φύλα,
Ἀχθεα γῆς εἶδωλα τετυγμένα, μηδαμὰ μηδὲν
Εἰδότες, οὔτε κακοῖο προσερχομένοιο νοῆσαι
Φράδμονες, οὔτ' ἀποθεν μαλ' ἀποστρέψαι κακότητος,
Οὔτ' ἀγαθοῦ παρεόντος ἐπιστρέψαι τε καὶ εἶρξαι
Ἰδριες, ἀλλὰ μάτην ἀδάημονες, ἀπρονόητοι.

When the verses had been restored to their pristine elegance, Bentley goes on to say that the oracles found in Malala's *Chronography* (and, we may add, in the *Acts of S. Catherine*) are capable of elucidation from an Oxford MS., containing *χρησμοὶ καὶ θεολογίαι Ἑλλήνων φιλοσόφων*. The title betrays the intention; they are oracles which can be read in a Christian sense.

Now comes the surprise: the twelfth and thirteenth of these oracles are those which Catherine refers respectively to the Sibyl and Apollo; only in the book of oracles, the Sibyl is replaced by Plato, the actual title being *τοῦ αὐτοῦ* (sc. *Πλάτωνος*) *περὶ Χριστοῦ* and *χρησμός τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δοθεὶς ἐν Δελφοῖς περὶ Χριστοῦ*.

The sequence of the Oracles in the *Acta* suggests that either Catherine, or the source from which she has transcribed, had access to a collection of Sibylline predictions; it does not, however, appear why the name of Plato should have become attached to one of the supposed oracles.

We are now in a position to move forward in two directions. First we can assist our great Aristarchus to put the verses straight. Second, since we have shown that Malala has access to some of the same sources as Catherine, we can detect some further coincidences between the two writers. Third, we can use the Oxford collection of oracles to suggest to us that the passage of Plato, which preceded Oracle 12 (which is headed *τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ Χριστοῦ*) may have stood in Catherine's text.

First, with regard to Bentley. He edits as follows from the MS.:—

(No. 11.) Πλάτωνος.

Γενετὸς οὐδεὶς ἱκανὸς γνώμης ἰδεῖν αἰσθητήριον· φύσις γὰρ μόνου θεοῦ ὡς αἰτίου τοῦ παντός γυμνὴν ψυχὴν δυναμένου (l. *δυναμένη*) ἰδεῖν.

Εἷς γὰρ αἴτιος τοῦ παντός, εἷς καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἄλλ' οἶος (l. ἄλλος) ὁ εἷς, καὶ ποτε οὗτος ὁ εἷς οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ, αἰδῖος γὰρ ὁ εἷς καὶ συναἰδῖος.

(No. 12.) Τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ Χριστοῦ.

Ὅψέ ποτέ τις ἐπὶ τὴν πολυσχεδῆ (cop. πολυσχιδῆ) ταύτην ἐλάσει γῆν· καὶ δίχα σφάλματος σάρξ γενήσεται, ἀκαμάτοις θεότητος ὅροις ἀνιάτων παθῶν λύσει φθοράν, καὶ τούτῳ φθόνος γενήσεται ἐξ ἀπίστου λαοῦ καὶ πρὸς ὕψος κρεμασθήσεται ὡς

θανατοι καταδίκως (l. θανάτω κατάδικος) πάντα πράσας (l. πράξας sive δράσας) πείσεται [corr. πράως].

(No. 13.) Χρησμός τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δοθεὶς ἐν Δελφοῖς περὶ Χριστοῦ.

Εἷς με βιάζεται οὐράνιον φῶς, καὶ ὁ παθὼν θεός
ἐστίν, καὶ οὐ θεότης ἔπαθεν αὐτή, ἄμφω γὰρ
βροτόσωμος καὶ ἄβροτος ἤδη καὶ ἀνὴρ,
πάντα φέρων παρὰ πατρὸς ἔχων τε τῆς μητρὸς ἅπαντα,
πατρὸς μὲν ἔχων ζῶων ἄλκει, μητρὸς δὲ θνητῆς σταυρὸν
τάφον ὕβριν ἀνιήτου καὶ ὑπὸ βλεφάρων ποτε χεύῃ τὰ,
δάκρυα θερμὰ ὁ πέντε χιλιάδας ἐκ πέντε πυρῶν κορέσας
τὸ γὰρ θέλεν ἄβροτος ἄλκει. Χριστὸς ὁ ἐμὸς θεός ἐστιν
ἐν ξύλῳ τανυσθεὶς θάνειν· ὃς ἐκ ταφῆς εἰς πολλῶν ὄλκων

Miris modis haec perturbata sunt ; magnam tamen partem in versus suos nullo negotio redigi possunt in hunc modum :—

εἷς με βιάζεται οὐρανιον φῶς
καὶ ὁ παθὼν θεός ἐστι, καὶ οὐ θεότης πάθει αὐτή.
ἄμφω γὰρ βροτοσώμος ἔην ἡδ' ἄβροτος αὐτός,
. θεὸς ἡδὲ καὶ ἀνὴρ·
πάντα φέρων παρὰ πατρός, ἔχων τῆς μητρὸς ἅπαντα,
ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν ἔχων ζωὴν ἄλκει
μητρὸς δὲ θνητῆς σταυρὸν, τάφον, ὕβριν, ἀνίην.
τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ποτὲ χεύατο δάκρυα θερμά.

Perhaps we can finish the passage with the aid of the Sibylline books : (cf. Sib. i. 358 ; vii. 275) :—

Ἐκ δ' ἄρτων ἅμα πέντε καὶ ἰχθύος εἰναλίοιο
χιλιάδας κορέσας, τὸ γὰρ θέλεν ἄβροτος ἄλκει·
Χριστὸς ἐμὸς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς δ' ἐς ξύλον ἐξετανύσθη,
ὃς θάνειν, ἐκ δὲ ταφῆς ἀναλύσας, εἰς πόλον ὤρτο.

Now let us see if we can find any further proofs of the consanguinity of the traditions of Malala and the *Acta Catherinæ*. In Catherine's first appeal to the Emperor, she invokes the testimony of Plutarch to support her Euhemerist views. Her language is as follows :—

Τούτοις δὲ καὶ ὁ σοφὸς ὑμῶν Πλούταρχος ὁ
Χαιρωνεὺς ἐπιμέμφεται, πλάνην ἀγαλμάτων
αὐτοὺς παρεισάγειν λέγων, οἷς χρὴ πεισθῆναι
καὶ σέ, βασιλεῦ.

Where did Catherine get this about Plutarch and his views with regard to idol worship? We turn to Malala, Bk. ii. p. 56, and find as follows :—

Οὓστινας μεμφόμενος ὁ Χερρονήσιος (l. Χαιρωνεύς)
Πλούταρχος . . . ὡς πλάνην ἀγαλμάτων τινὲς
εἰσάγουσιν· αὐτὸς δέ, φησί, τοὺς κατ' οὐρανὸν
φωστῆρας θεοποιεῖν ἔδοξε, τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν
σελήνην παρεισάγων, ὡς ἡ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων θεολογία
ἔχει.

The passage is a little clearer in Malala's follower Cedrenus :—

Οἷς τισι μέμφεται ὁ Χερρονήσιος Πλούταρχος,
ὡς πλάνην ἀγαλμάτων τινῶν εἰσάγουσι τοὺς κατ'
οὐρανὸν φωστῆρας θεοποιούμενοι, τὸν ἥλιον καὶ
τὴν σελήνην ὡς ἡ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων θεογονία περιέχει·
αὐτοὺς γάρ, λέγει κτέ.

Malala ends his allusion to Plutarch by the observation that Porphyrius in his *Philosophical Chronography* has praised Plutarch :—

τὸν δὲ Πλούταρχον τὸν Χερρονήσιον Πορφύριος
ἐν τῇ φιλοσόφῳ αὐτοῦ χρονογραφίᾳ ἔδοξασε.

From which it is easy to infer that Malala is not quoting Plutarch at first hand, but that he has picked up the reference to Plutarch out of some earlier chronographer. Catherine depends, ultimately, on the same authority.

We can now exhibit the relation between Catherine and her authorities in a tabular form (see opposite page).

It can hardly escape the notice of the reader that, in tracing even imperfectly, the sources of the *Acts of St. Catherine's Martyrdom*, we have incidentally detected the origin of her name. This has long been a perplexity to the faithful. One school regarded it as a diminutive form of καθαρός, the Greek word for 'pure'; another, to retain the vocalic prefix which the saint bears in the Greek tradition, made her to be derived from Hecate. Our investigation suggests that it is

Acta Catharinæ.	B. and J.	Malala : Chron.	Oracles of the Greeks.
c. 2. Emperor's Banquet and sacrifice.	c. II. p. 19. c. XXIX. p. 265.		
c. 4. Diodore (from Hecataëus).	c. XXXII. p. 297.	Bk. ii. p. 54.	
c. 4. Serug (i.e. Hecataëus).	c. XXXII. p. 297.	Bk. ii. p. 53. Bk. ii. p. 54.	
c. 4. Plutarch.			
c. 8. (Insolence of Orator).	c. XXIV. p. 238.		
c. 9. Orpheus, Hymn to Apollo.		Bk. iv. p. 72 ff.	
c. 10. Orpheus, Theogonia (from Hecataëus).		Bk. iv. p. 75.	
c. 10. Sophocles (from Hecataëus).		Bk. ii. p. 40.	
c. 11. Sibyl.			Oracle 12. (as Plato). Oracle 13.
c. 11. Apollo.			
c. 12. (Summary of the Christian faith).	c. II. p. 15, and c. XXIV. p. 10.		
c. 13. Collapse of Orator.	c. XXXII. p. 299.		
c. 19. (Cry of people).	c. XXXII. p. 300.		

an artificial creation from Hecataëus, the favourite author in the *Acta*. This does not surprise us when we know that she is herself a literary fiction. We had something like it in the story of Barlaam and Joasaph ; here the central scene is the one where the fictitious Barlaam comes to curse and remains to bless ; the story-teller lets the cat out of the bag, when he compares Naḥor to the namesake of his (*qua* Balaam or, as we call him, Barlaam) in the book of Numbers. There is nothing surprising in this artificial creation of names. For example, given Serug, in the history of Hecataëus, as a primitive idolator, it was easy to borrow Naḥor from the same source. Catherine, then, is a fictitious name, because her story is a romance. We may now draw the following practical conclusions :—

The author of Barlaam and Joasaph has imitated and repeated matter in the *Acta Catharinæ*, with which *Acts* he is well acquainted, and of which he is probably the author.

John Malala has used a common authority with the *Acta Catherinæ*: this is either a Christian *Apology* or some authority (chronographical or otherwise) used by a Christian Apologist; but Malala does not use the *Acts* directly.

Both the *Acta Catherinæ* and Malala have access to a collection of oracles (more or less fictitious and made in the interests of Christian propaganda). No less than five of the sixteen Oxford Oracles are in the text of Malala.

It is not quite clear whether this collection has influenced the missing Christian *Apology*.

Was this *Apology* that of Quadratus?

Against this there are certain objections which present themselves: (i) the *Apology* quotes Plutarch; now Plutarch died about A.D. 120. It is not impossible that he should be referred to, say, in A.D. 125; but it has an air of improbability: (ii) while the use of Sibylline and Ps.-Sibylline matter, oracles, etc., is easily established for the second century in the Christian defences of the Faith, it remains to be proved whether such obvious fictions as occur in the *Acts of Catherine* were current at the beginning of the century: (iii) there is no trace of the solitary quotation which Eusebius preserves for us from Quadratus, about the miracles of our Lord, and the survival of some of those who were healed till the time of the writer. It must be admitted, however, that this was not a suitable passage for Catherine to employ, and it is not suggested that the whole of the *Apology* has been recovered. So far, then, as the enquiry has gone, the authorship of Quadratus has not been established. It looks, as far as the argument has gone, like some later *Apology* of the second century.

What shall we now say with regard to St. Catherine, and the *Acts of her Martyrdom*? We have shown that these Acts are a companion volume to the story of *Barlaam and Joasaph*, which was once canonical as well as edifying (the MSS. call it *ιστορία ψυχωφελής*) but is now removed from the Calendars of the Western Church, however it may linger in the East.¹ If *Barlaam and Joasaph* are now recognised as capable of classification with *Robinson Crusoe* (for this also is *ιστορία ψυχωφελής*), are we not bound to put the *Martyrdom of St. Catherine* on the same shelf with them, and under

¹ The Syrian Churches never accepted it, but it passed from the Greek into the Armenian and Georgian.

a similar classification ? When the *Acts of the Martyrdom* are removed from the category of historical works into that of fiction, what will become of Catherine herself ? Will it not be said that the emphasis must now be laid on the bones and not on the book ? We have, in fact, shown that the book, in so far as it creates or transmits a tradition, knows nothing of the bones. It tells us that Catherine prayed that her body might not be found, and that the Lord answered her prayer. So if the bones are there, and we have seen them ourselves, it is a case which to the author of the *Acta* must come under the formula that

‘Those prayers are most answered that seem most denied !’ When Charles Hardwick of St. Catherine’s College, Cambridge, undertook in 1849 to investigate the evidence for the existence of the patron saint of the College, he was able to sum up the evidence as follows : ¹

“It is possible that further notices of St. Catherine may yet be discovered, enabling us to speak more positively as to her origin, or at least tending to abate the suspicions, which our present stock of information is calculated to excite.”

To this very judicious remark there can be no exception, so long as we bear in mind that the *Acta* are not any longer to be quoted as history, and that the name of Ecaterina must not any longer be attached to the bones in the Convent reliquary, except on the hypothesis that it was ‘another lady of the same name.’

The value of the *Passion of St. Catherine* does not consist in its historical references but in the documents which the writer of the legends has incorporated. In this respect their value is greatly increased by our investigation. Criticism which began by regarding the Catherine documents with grave suspicion, as may be seen from the early Bollandist writers, such as Papebroch, and the early ecclesiastical historians, such as Tillemont, will end by disintegrating the documents and separating the good metal from the worthless strata in which it is embedded. The good metal is the lost Christian Apology, as in the case of *Barlaam and Joasaph*, though I scarcely like to regard as base metal such a beautiful work of art as the Barlaam romance, which has supreme value whether the leading characters in it ever existed or not.

¹ *An Historical Inquiry touching St. Catherine of Alexandria*, Camb. Antiq. Soc., 1849.

Let us see, then, whether we can get a rough idea of the document which the Catherine story employs. The opening sentences, as I suppose, are not yet identified ; we begin with a row of stars, and then plunge into the Euhemerist argument as follows :—

* * * * *

Your Majesty should have recognised from your own Greek literature (οἰκοθεν) the fallaciousness of your sacrificial ceremonies, performed to images of mere men, as if they were gods, and you should have cast away from you the folly and shame of Greek religion. A perverse spirit has bewitched you and made you blind to obvious truth. In any case you should have been persuaded by one of your own wise men, I mean Diodore, to recognise the real origin of your gods, and not, with absolute unreason, to prefer the indecency of regarding as gods the images of men who came to a wretched end of life. For does he not say that the gods were men, and were called immortal for certain benefits which they had conferred ? And he records, too, that they were addressed by personal names, and that they had rule over countries and cities. Deceived by their own ignorance, he says, men came to call them divine, and to invest them with the credentials of immortality.

Then there is another of your wise Greek historians who tells us that one Serug was the inventor of the Greek worship. For it is said that, in early times, when men had exhibited any deed of courage or of friendship or virtue (what you will) they honoured them with statues and monuments. Men, however, of later generations, who had forgotten the intentions of their ancestors, who had only assigned these honours on the ground of the performance of commendable actions, for which they had erected the aforesaid statues and monuments, now assigned these to men corruptible and of like passions with themselves as to immortal gods, and devised for them sacrifice and solemn assembly.

And your wise Plutarch (of Cheronea), heaps blame on these men, and says that it was they who brought in the error of image worship, and divinised the luminaries of the heaven. Your majesty, too, should have been influenced by these writers, not foreigners, but men of your own household. Be persuaded by them, and acknowledge the one true God, who bestowed on thee this royal rule, yea ! and life itself. He it is who at the last became Man for our sakes, and

elected for Himself the death of the Cross, that he might raise us up from the death of disobedience.

(Let us come in the next place to the testimony which the poets give to the one God who created all things and is over all.) First of all there is Orpheus the musician, who set forth in his poetry a theogony, a story of creation and of the making of man. (Did he not teach, as we Christians do, that there was one God, and that there was *Æther* and *Chaos*?) In his verses addressed to *Apollo* he claims to be inspired by the God, who sees all things, and he expounds the vanity of the human estate in the following lines :—

Far-shining *Phoebus*, *Leto's* son and lord,
All-seeing Light, o'er gods and men supreme,
Thou solar ray, uplift on golden wings,
Now for the twelfth time do I hear Thy call,
Receive Thy message whispered in my ear,
And take Thee for a witness to my lyre.
Of beasts and birds, of sinful tribes of men
I make my song, men that afflict the earth,
Mere ghosts that have no knowledge to avert
Approaching ill, nor skilled when good is near,
But ever roving with an idle heart,
Unknowing, unforeseeing and unblest.

(And what Orpheus says of an all-seeing God of Light is confirmed by some verses of *Sophocles* to the following effect) :

(The verses from the supposed *Sophocles*, quoted to establish the Christian doctrine of Monarchy, as they call it, present no difficulty as regards antiquity. We have shown that they came from *Hecataeus* ; but apart from the third century, B.C., to which this identification assigns them, their Christian attestation is so widespread that it would be difficult to find an earlier patch of Greek poetry in the Christian propaganda.

The case is more difficult with the supposed extracts from the *Sibyl* and the *Oracle of Apollo*. They require a separate treatment in an appendix. The *Sibyl* is a Christian Sibyl, and the supposed *Oracle* also contains some verses from a similar source. When Catherine has finished her quotations, she resumes her confession of faith as follows) :

Co-infinite Lord is He with His Father, co-eternal, the beginning

and root and fount of all blessings ; He brought all created things into existence, He adorns and rules and sustains them, with His own hand He fashioned our race, and marked out for us the pathway of salvation. When He saw that we were tripped up by transgression, and had cast from us obedience, the main point of salvation, though He was of the very nature of the Father, He became for our sake a man like myself, holding converse with man, going up and down in the earth to instruct, to admonish, to teach, and to do and undertake everything on our behalf. Further, He accepted death on behalf of His ungrateful servants, and that death was one of utter dishonour. He was spit upon and beaten, the Creator enduring the lot of the convict. All these things happened for us men, that the prior condemnation might be reversed, and the tyranny of sin abolished, and the gates of heaven, which we had closed against ourselves, might once more be opened to us. Nor did He stay with this, but He rose again on the third day, and ascended to the heaven from whence He had come, bestowing on us the unspeakable gift of the Holy Spirit, and sent forth His disciples to proclaim the 'Spirit's' commandments. . . .

By these thou shouldest have been persuaded, and come to recognise in Him the true God, and to be associated with Him who says 'Come unto me, ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and I will refresh you.' But if these words thou dost not hear, there are those which are spoken by your own gods and poets ; surely thou hast heard the words of Plato the wise, and the music of Orpheus whose lyre, so they say, could move inanimate things ; to thee speaks also the noble and pure Apollo ; expressly and against their will these confess Him to be God, and somewhat of truth has been exhibited by them ; so that all excuse has been taken from the godless if they turned out to be fools, with eyes that did not see, and ears that did not understand.

At this point our Apologist ends. Occasionally it seems as if the martyrologist has expanded the words of the Apologist ; but the treatment of the theme that Jesus Christ is the True God is not very different from that in the *Apology of Aristides* : here also we have an involved Confession of Faith, which ends, as in Aristides, with the Mission of the Apostles to bring the whole world to Christ. The reference to the re-opening of the gates of heaven, which has a familiar

parallel in the *Te Deum*, is not unlike the advice which Aristides gives to the Emperor, to pray that the 'gates of light may be opened' to him.

This concluding appeal of Catherine has been worked over in *Barlaam and Joasaph*, in the passage where Joasaph expounds his new faith to his irate and unbelieving father, as the following extract will show :—

(*B. et J.*, p. 210, col. 1077.) Οὐ τῷ ῥήματι παρήχθη τὸ πᾶν
 ἐκ μὴ ὄντων . . . καὶ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους δημιουργός, ἄνθρωπος
 ἐγένετο δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἐλθὼν ἐκ Παρθένου ἁγίας τοῖς
ἀνθρώποις συναναστρέφετο, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀγνωμόνων οἰ-
κετῶν ὁ Δεσπότης θάνατον κατεδέξατο, καὶ θάνατον τὸν διὰ
 σταυροῦ, ὅπως λυθῇ τῆς ἀπαρτίας ἢ τυραννίς, ὅπως ἡ προτέρα
 καταδίκη ἀναιρεθῇ, ὅπως ἀνοιγῶσι πάλιν ἡμῖν αἱ οὐρανοῦ πύλαι.

Cf. also *B. et J.* (pp. 14, 15, col. 873).

Further consideration of the sources of the *Acta* may be deferred : among the questions that will come up for solution, we shall have not only the problem of the date and origin of the Sibylline verses that are quoted, but the more important issue as to whether Catherine's *Apoloogy* has not influenced the treatise of Theophilus to Autolycus, in the latter part of the second century ; but, for a first statement, the foregoing pages may suffice.