

## THE QUEST FOR QUADRATUS.

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

CURATOR OF MANUSCRIPTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.

SOME time ago, we drew attention to the fact that the story of the *Passion or Martyrdom of Saint Catherine of Alexandria*, as it is related in Greek documents (preserved in Mount Sinai and elsewhere), and printed in the Greek Patrology among the Lives of the Saints which are ascribed to Symeon Metaphrastes, contains a piece of apologetic matter which had clearly been copied, by the writer of the *Acts of the Martyrdom*, from some very early Christian author. We suggested, also, that this borrowed matter might possibly be part of a lost *Apology for the Christian Faith*, known to have been presented, early in the second century, by Quadratus, Bishop of Athens, to the Emperor Hadrian. Finally, we pointed out that in the *Acts of Catherine* with its embedded *Apology*, we have a literary parallel to the story of *Barlaam and Joasaph*, whose nucleus and centre of crystallization is the incorporated *Apology* which an Athenian philosopher, named Aristides, had presented to the same Emperor, and we concluded by offering evidence for our belief that the books are by the same author, and that the prior document of the pair was the *Martyrdom of Catherine*.

Our present purpose is to continue, if not to conclude, the evidence for these assumptions.

In the case of *Barlaam and Joasaph* the identification in the body of the romance was rendered easy, by the fact that Aristides had been discovered in a Syriac translation in the Library in Mount Sinai, which told us definitely whose *Apology* it was ; but in the case of the *Catherine* document we had no such assistance ; the dissection had to be done in the dark, or in a very subdued light, and it was left to further investigation to settle whether the recovered author was

Quadratus or not. We had no reason to doubt that a document which was of the nature of an *Apology* was in the Catherine text : but it had not been employed with the same simplicity of transference and completeness of incorporation as in the case of Barlaam and Joasaph with Aristides. We can see this pretty clearly if we put the *Catherine Apology* under the critical microscope.

Its argument is seen to be on quite a different plane from that of Aristides. It would not be unfair to that philosopher to say, that, although he clearly identifies himself with the Stoic school of thought, so that his opening chapter reads like a summary of a Stoic lecture, his chief interest was the indictment of the Morals of Olympus, an indictment which serves as a foil for an exquisite picture which he presents of the simplicity, purity, and benevolence of the early Christian believers.

In the case of the *Catherine Apology* the writer has a different method to pursue ; he is a destructive critic of the Euhemerist order ; the gods, as Euhemerus said, are dead men deified, and the proof can be made from the Pagan literature and the Greek historians, as the writer of the *Martyrdom* undertakes to show. It was a dangerous method to adopt ; for in Greek circles, Euhemerism was commonly equated with Atheism, and Atheism was one of the popular cries against the Christians, as, for example, when the mob shouted, " Down with the Atheists ! " at the trial of Polycarp ; but in imperial circles, also, and in the second century, when there was a line of deified emperors to look back upon, and another line to look forward to, it required no small courage for a Christian controversialist to take up the Euhemerist position. When we look more closely into the matter, we see that the Apologist, whoever he was, did not altogether neglect the method which Aristides found so attractive. He had something to say about the *Chronique Scandaleuse* of the Greek Mythology, and the author of the *Catherine Acts* has slurred it over. We will give an instance of what we mean.

In c. 10 the *Acta* have side-thrusts at Zeus, who is described as a liar and a trickster (σχόλιον), a knave and a deceiver (πανούργον, ἀπατεῶνα), and these charges are to be proved from Homer, but the passages from the poet are not given, and we are left to imagine the breach of the truce with the Greeks, which Zeus takes a hand in, and similar matters. Evidently the text has been abbreviated. This is

followed by the scandalous story of the way in which three of the great Olympians plotted the capture and imprisonment of Zeus himself, to whom Thetis comes with information of the plot and assistance against it. The writer says that the scheme was engineered by 'Hera, Poseidon, and Athena.' The order of the words shows that the *Iliad* is quoted, for here is the line

"Ἡρῆ τ' ἡδὲ Ποσειδάων καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.

*Il.* i. 399 :

but, as quotation, it has dropped out from the text which again becomes suspect of abbreviation. The whole passage will be found quoted in Ps. Justin, *Cohort.* 2, probably from our lost *Apology*.

A more striking case is the omission of Platonic matter from the argument ; although, when the story of the oratorical skill of Catherine comes to its end, in a not unworthy passage, the Emperor is told that he has heard what Plato has to say, and has come under the charm of Orpheus, whom even lifeless things obey. Orpheus is in the text, perhaps abbreviated, but Plato is absent ; but, as we shall see presently, he must have stood there, for he is actually referred to ; and, indeed, in some passages of the *Republic*, for instance, he talks like a Christian Apologist so as to invite quotation. We infer, then, that the Catherine text is, as regards the Apologetic matter which it has incorporated, incomplete and abbreviated. We are now going in search of the missing matter.

In the *Lives of the Saints* as edited in Latin by Surius, and in Greek and Latin in the same volume of the *Greek Patrology* (tom. 116) from which we took our text of *St. Catherine's Martyrdom*, there will be found a long story of the *Martyrdom of Saint Eustratius and his Companions*. It is, indeed, a long-winded story, some sixty columns of text, relating the trial and torture of a group of martyrs from Cappadocia and Cilicia, with all the extravagance that monastic imagination can attach to official and imperial cruelty. Most of it is sheer waste of time to read, but the attention is arrested here and there, and problems are suggested similar to those which we met in the Catherine legend. The text is one of those that are grouped under the name of Symeon Metaphrastes, but here again we have to ask the question whether Symeon the Translator really had anything to do with

it. Perhaps, as in the other case, the Greek may be wholly or in part original.

The opening paragraphs of the *Acts of Eustratius* are very like the introduction to the *Acts of Catherine*. Here also, we begin with a statement that in the days of certain persecuting emperors (this time it is Diocletian and Maximin), the whole Roman Empire had lapsed into paganism and was enthusiastic, under imperial pressure, for the cult of idols, and the suppression of the Christian Faith. Those who did not fall into line with the Imperial edicts were to be punished in their goods and in their persons. There is a rough parallelism, as we have said, with the *Acts of Catherine*; it may be conventional, and it may be accidental.

As we run our eyes over the story, we stumble upon a block of Apologetic matter, and at the same time upon a quotation from Aeschylus. The martyr Eustratius begins to expound the Christian Faith to the Governor before whom he is brought; if we omit certain interjections on the part of the Governor, in the style of a Platonic dialogue, we have before us a long continuous exposition of Christianity; first, why it is not possible to accept the classical presentation of the Pagan Deities; second, what is the Christian Doctrine of the Creation, the Fall and the Redemption. Under the former head, the Apologist is emphasising that 'Plato was of us.' We have then a portion of an Apology, and it is a Greek Apology. That it is original Greek, at all events in this part of the *Martyrdom*, was apparent from the Aeschylean quotation. It runs as follows: 'We are not to say with Aeschylus,

θεὸς μὲν αἰτίαν φύει βρότοις  
ὅτ' ἂν κακῶσαι δῶμα παμπήδην θέλῃ.

This is a fragment from the lost play of the *Niobe*, and a reference to Nauck's *Fragments of the Tragic Poets* will tell us that it is found in Plato, *Republic*, ii. p. 380 a, in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* xiii. p. 643 (from Plato), in Plutarch, *De audiendis poetis*, c. 17, p. 17, and *de comm. sens.* c. 14, p. 465, as well as in Stobaeus. Nauck does not know that the passage occurs in the *Acts of Eustratius*; but it is no matter, for on looking closer at our text, we shall see that the Aeschylus fragment is only there, because the writer is quoting Plato's *Republic*, and, it is hardly necessary to add, quoting in the

original Greek. The Metaphrast has disappeared. We must now examine the way in which Plato is brought upon the scene. The method of introduction is as follows.

The governor is trying to persuade Eustratius to sacrifice, and the martyr asks ironically whether it is to the big or little gods that he is to sacrifice. The governor says sternly, 'To God and the gods.' (The Latin version explains that this means Zeus, Apollo and Poseidon. The same group is implied in the Armenian text, as Mr. Conybeare informed me.) The martyr then asks the judge for the inspired authorities upon whom he bases his command. The governor says 'Upon Plato, Aristotle, Hermes and the rest of the wise ; if you had been acquainted with them, Eustratius, you would have revered their memories, as being marvellous and pious men.' The martyr explains that he was brought up in the school of the Muses, under the direction of an erudite father ; he suggests that we begin with Plato and see what he thought about Zeus and the rest of the gods. The governor says : 'In the *Timaeus*, Plato tells us that he went down to the Piraeus, to pray to the goddess.' It is the opening sentence of the *Republic* : "I went down to the Piraeus yesterday, with Glaucon the son of Ariston, that I might offer a prayer to the goddess, etc." (The governor has here got into a confusion ; he quotes *Timaeus* for the *Republic* and Plato for Socrates.) The martyr picks up the allusion. Plato, he says, condemns your Zeus. "Since you have begun at the Piraeus and the *Republic* listen to what Plato says in his second book ;" he then quotes a long passage, the Greek of which in the Patrology needs a little correction, and which runs as follows in Jowett's translation : we underline what Eustratius has appropriated :

*"God, if he be good, is not the author of all things, as the many assert, but is the cause of a few things only, and not of most things that occur to men. For few are the goods of human life, and many are the evils, and the good is to be attributed to God alone ; of the evils the cause is to be sought elsewhere, and not in him."*

That appears to me to be most true, he said. *Then we must not listen to Homer or to any other poet who is guilty of the folly of saying that two casks*

*'Lie at the threshold of Zeus, full of lots, one of good, the other of evil lots,'*  
and that he to whom Zeus gives a mixture of the two

‘ Sometimes meets with evil fortune, at other times with good ’ ;  
but that he to whom is given the cup of unmingled ill,

‘ Him wild hunger drives over the Divine earth.’

and again,

‘ *Zeus, who is the dispenser of good and evil to us.*’ And if anyone asserts that the violation of oaths and treaties of which Pandarus was the real author, was brought about by Athene and Zeus, or that the strife and conflict of the gods was instigated by Themis and Zeus, he shall not have our approval ; neither will we allow our young men to hear the words of Aeschylus, that

‘ *God plants guilt among men when he desires utterly to destroy a house.*’

And if a poet writes of the sufferings of Niobe, in which these iambic verses occur, etc.

that God, being good, is the author of evil to anyone, is to be strenuously denied, and *not allowed to be sung or said* in any well ordered common-wealth *by old or young.*”

It will be seen that Eustratius is trying to turn the enemy’s guns upon himself : he is doing what Catherine did with Diodore, Hecataeus and the rest of ‘ your historians and philosophers ; ’ ‘ your Diodore,’ says she, ‘ who is our Diodore,’ and so on. Perhaps the coincidence in method may take us further. Let us see how Eustratius proceeds with his argument : he tells us that “ Plato will not hold it lawful in his ideal city to say that a god is a parricide, as Zeus whom you worship was of his own father Kronos, when he cast him forth from Heaven and broke him to pieces ; nor shall we allow that he, Zeus, became a swan, that he might work craftily with, and corrupt a mortal maid. But over and above these incidents Plato is angry with your god, because overcome by grief and womanish madness (*read ἀνία for μανία*, womanish distress), he, Zeus, your own god (think of it, Judge) bewails the death of Sarpedon. Is it not so ? Are not all these mythical statements in your literature ? And if Plato himself, your wise author, refused to believe such an one to be a god, and forbid any one in pursuit of virtue to imitate such, why do you deject us to such actions as they were detected in, and force us to the worship of such characters ? ”

It will be seen that Eustratius is still harping on the same string : it is Plato’s opinion of Zeus, of Zeus as parricide, of Zeus as the

metamorphosed lover, of Zeus as the wailing and bereaved friend. He is taking this catalogue of Olympian weaknesses from Plato. This time it is the third book of the *Republic* (iii. p. 388) that furnishes parallel matter : as for example—"Still more earnestly will we beg of him (Homer) not to introduce the gods lamenting, and saying,

Alas ! my misery ! alas that I bore the bravest to my sorrow !

But if he must introduce the gods, at any rate let him not dare so completely to misrepresent the greatest of the gods, as to make him say—

' O heavens ! with my eyes I behold a dear friend of mine driven round and round the city, and my heart is sorrowful ! '

Or again—

' Woe is me that I am fated to have Sarpedon, dearest of men to me, subdued at the hands of Patroclus the son of Menoetius.' "

If we look at the *Cohortatio* ascribed to Justin, which we have shown to be so closely related to the *Acts of Catherine* and their sources, we shall find the same quotations as above.

But where is Leda, and the Swan ? It is interesting to note that Plato in the second book of the *Republic*, after the passages quoted above, goes on to discuss the possibility of a change of form on the part of the gods ; can a 'god turn wizard, and work fantasy on us with varied forms ?' He, of course, answers the question in the negative ; such a change could only be from the better to the worse, and of that the Best is incapable.

Returning to Eustratius, we find that he now leaves this part of his theme, and proceeds to discuss (1) the nature of God, (2) the story of the Creation, the Fall, and the Redemption. He still keeps his eye on Greek philosophy and on Greek literature ; for instance, when we come to Creation, the theme is introduced by Hesiod, who appears, leading in Erebus and Chaos, to make parallels with the Tohu and Bohu of Moses, and we note again the accent of the phrase ; it is, '*your* poet Hesiod.' We have now left Plato far behind, and the parallels which Plato brings to Christian thought ; we read on page after page, until at last the Apologetic matter ends abruptly in the following significant manner : the martyr says to his judge—

' These things I have briefly gone over with you, that, being persuaded by your own wise Plato, and having learnt the truth from me, you may abandon Zeus the parricide, your god, that empassioned

swan, the one that weeps and wails excessive over the death of his children.' Here is the Greek of the passage :

Ταῦτα τοίνυν ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ διεξήλθον, ἵνα καὶ τῷ σοφῷ σου Πλάτῳ πεισθεῖς καὶ παρ' ἐμοῦ τάληθῇ διδαχθεῖς, ἀποτάξῃ τῷ πατρολοίῳ Διὶ τῷ θεῷ σου, τῷ ἐπαφροδίτῳ κύκνῳ, τῷ πολλὰ κλαίουτι ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ τῶν τέκνων αὐτοῦ.

This passage evidently belongs much earlier in the text ; it is a *membrum disjectum* ; it should come where we left Plato frowning on parricide and metamorphosis and divine wailing. Suppose that we say that, in the sources of Eustratius, Plato was treated continuously, and not divided into a thought and a subsequent reminiscence.

Very good ; but this appended matter is of the first importance as to its language. 'Your wise Plato' (so in c. 22 ad fin : 'Plato, your wise author,' ὁ σοφὸς ὑμῶν συγγραφεύς) 'persuaded by Plato' : we compare the opening of the *Catherine Apology*, where the emperor is exhorted to be 'persuaded by your wise Diodore,'

Τῷ παρ' ὑμῶν σοφῷ Διοδώρῳ πεισθέντα,

and again 'the wise historians of yours, be persuaded by them, your Majesty, etc.' : and 'the wise Plato and Orpheus.' The conclusion is obvious ; the two apologies are by the same hand ; and as we have pointed out that the *Catherine* legend was truncated by the omission of the matter taken from Plato, we may now fill up the lacuna by inserting in the lost *Apology* which they both make use of, the Platonic section which we isolated from the text of Eustratius.

Are we now any nearer to answering the question whether the *Apology* of which we find the fragments is that of Quadratus ? Can we decide that question either in the positive or negative ?

One suggestion comes to the mind, that perhaps the Martyr Kodratios whose Armenian Acts were edited by Conybeare many years since (*Monuments of Early Christianity*, 1894) may be a disguise of Quadratus, in which case we might expect to find fragments, at least, of his *Apology* in his assumed *Martyrdom*. The suggestion, however, does not appear to be fruitful : there are some hints of an apologetic character, and a favourite quotation from Homer about the rule of the many (πολυκοιρανίη) not being good, but nothing that can be of use to us.

It will be profitable to us now to retrace our steps and examine more closely the relation between the *Acts of Catherine* (AC) and the story of *Barlaam and Joasaph* (BJ).

If we turn to the third chapter of BJ, we shall find the story of how King Abenner cast the horoscope of his new-born son, by the art of five and fifty selected astrologers. The story runs thus :

"Now on his son's birth-day feast there came unto the King some five and fifty chosen men, schooled in the star-lore of the Chaldaeans : (συνήλθον πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ἐξ ἐπιλογῆς ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντηκοντάπεντε κτέ). These the King called into his presence (καὶ τούτους ἐγγυτάτω παραστησάμενος) and asked them, severally, to tell him the future of the new-born babe."

Now suppose we turn to the *Acts of Catherine*, we shall find that the emperor, in order to confute the saint, issues a proclamation to all the wise people of his realm to come to his assistance with their rhetorical skill, under the promise of adequate rewards attending their success. We are then told (AC. c. 7) that 'when these letters had gone forth into all his kingdom, in a brief space of time there came together to him fifty picked rhetoricians, acute of understanding, and very strong in speech ; and these Maxentius brought into the closest relation with himself, in order that he might by familiarities the more whet them for the conflict : (συνήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐπιλογῆς τὸν ἀριθμὸν πεντήκοντα ῥήτορες, ὅξεις τε νοῆσαι καὶ εἰπεῖν ἱκανώτατοι· καὶ τούτους ἐγγυτάτω παραστησάμενος ὁ Μαξέντιος κτέ). It will be seen at a glance, that the two accounts are not independent : the fifty-five astrologers are related to the fifty orators. One group is answerable for the other.

Continuing our perusal of the passage in BJ we see that, among the fifty-five astrologers (in the Latin text attached to the Greek of Boissonade the number is given as *fifty*, which may be right and if so, the numerical agreement with Catherine is exact), one has the pre-eminence over the rest, and instead of making the stars tell big things of the new-born king, such as the wizards were expected to tell, he plays the part of Barlaam and predicts that the child will become a Christian : (εἷς δὲ τῶν ἀστρολόγων, ὁ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πάντων διαφορώτατος, εἶπεν) ; "one of the astrologers, the most learned of all his fellows spoke thus."

Turning to the *Acts of Catherine* (AC. c. 8) we find that when

the rhetoricians meet the King, "one of them, the most learned of all his fellows," explained that, however intelligent Catherine may be, she will hardly be able to meet a trained orator: (εἷς τῶν ῥητόρων, ὁ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πάντων διαφορώτατος, εἶπεν). The expression is precisely that which is used of the leading astrologer.

This astrologer, then, spake thus, like Balaam of old (ὥσπερ ὁ πάλαι Βαλαάμ) "not that his star-lore told him true, but because God *signifieth the truth* by the mouth of his enemies *that all excuse may be taken from the ungodly* (τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας παραδεικνύντος, ὥστε πᾶσαν τοῖς ἀσεβέσι πρόφασιν περιαιρεθῆναι). Now turn to the conclusion of Catherine's address in which she is quoting from a lost Christian Apology (AC. c. 12); she has been taking testimony from Apollo the noble and pure and from Orpheus the inspired; these have confessed the unity of God, and have "*signified something of truth, so that all excuse has been taken from the ungodly*," (καί τι καὶ [l. δι'] αὐτῶν παρεδεδιχθη τῆς ἀληθείας· ὥστε πᾶσαν ἀσεβέσι πρόφασιν περιαιρεθῆναι).

The writer of the romance goes on to explain how the King designed to isolate his son from all possible Christian influences, in a palace from which the ills of life were artificially expelled. He planned this because, in his defiance of destiny and divine intent, "seeing he did not see, and hearing, he did not understand," (βλέπων γὰρ οὐχ ἑώρα, καὶ ἀκούων οὐ συνίει). This is the concluding sentence in Catherine's Apology, following immediately on the words about the godless who are without excuse; (βλέποντες οὐχ ἑώρων, καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐ συνίεσαν). The author of the Romance has separated the sentences, by the interjection of the regulations made for the isolation of the young prince. The separation marks him out as a secondary product.

Now let us look at the matter of the parallelism between the fifty-five astrologers and the fifty orators, each group having a distinguished spokesman. As we are now outside any quoted *Apology* and in the area belonging to the novelist, we have to ask whether the astrologers or the orators come first in the evolution of the tales. When we come to the part of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* story where the Christian religion is to be defended by the false Nachor, making use of the *Apology of Aristides*, we find that the preliminary proceedings

consist in the summoning by royal proclamation of a group of orators, exactly in the manner of the Catherine story. Moreover they are introduced in the same manner as in the *Acta*. We have only to compare such passages as the following : BJ (c. 26, p. 237).

"There were gathered together innumerable multitudes, come to view the contest and see which side should carry off the victory. Then one of the orators, the most eminent of all his fellows, said unto Nachor, '*Art thou that Barlaam, which hath so shamelessly and audaciously blasphemed our gods*'": (ὁ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πάντων διαφορώτατος κτε) AC (c. 8 and c. 9). "*One of the orators, the most eminent of all his fellows, said . . . A dense crowd had been gathered on the run to view the contest and see which side should carry off the victory. . . . Then proudly spake that high-born orator, 'Art thou the woman, who hath so shamelessly and audaciously blasphemed our gods ?'*" : (ὁ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ πάντων διαφορώτατος . . . εἰς θεὸν τοῦ ἀγῶνος . . . σὺ εἶ ἡ ἀναισχύντως κτε). The comparison of these passages shows clearly the equivalence of the fifty-five selected astrologers in BJ and the fifty selected orators in AC. Here again we have the feature of a duplicated story in BJ, for the *orators* turn up as a group on the day of the great debate. The author of the Romance has used his material twice, with variations, and the material is the *Acts of Catherine*. He turned Catherine's orators into astrologers for his opening chapters, and then put them aside for this further use at a later point in the story. He followed Catherine closely in her use of a Christian Apology ; whether he has made other extracts beyond those in AC is a question for further enquiry. In any case the dependence of BJ upon AC is clearly made out. If the two works should turn out to be by the same hand, then AC is the 'prentice hand.'

The unity of the authorship acquires high probability if we reflect that BJ has used AC much in the same way as he has done with Aristides. We know now, since we have acquired the actual text of Aristides, that it was in the mind of the author of this great romance from the very start,<sup>1</sup> and his thought was constantly eddying round it, even when there was no special incentive to quotation or reminiscence. For instance when he is sketching the religious history of mankind and comes to the Patriarch Abraham, he introduces him as one who had

<sup>1</sup> Cf. c. i., c. vii., etc.

“considered heaven, earth and sea, the sun, moon and the like and marvelled at their harmonious ordering.” This is the opening sentence of Aristides, and Abraham a good Stoic. What he does with Abraham in c. 7, he does with the Christian theology in the first chapter, and elsewhere. As we have said his thought eddies round the *Apology*, of which he picks up sentences and phrases, long before the great debate begins, in which the *Apology* is incorporated.

It is clear also, that there is a similar eddy round the *Acts of Catherine*, which are in evidence all through BJ, as we have shown above, in scattered expressions and broken sentences. This peculiarity of method carries with it the common authorship; for the *Acts of Catherine* are such an inconspicuous document compared with the *Apology of Aristides*, that it is in the highest degree improbable that the author of BJ should have it at his finger-tips and so assiduously transcribe it, unless he had paternal affection for it. We shall say, then, that BJ and AC are by a common author, and that the priority in point of time lies with the *Acts of Catherine*.

The recognition of a possible common authorship brings us to the question which we started out to resolve; for if BJ and AC are both by the same hand, and each incorporates, more or less completely, a lost Christian Apology, the chances are that the two Apologies involved are a pair. Now the companion of Aristides is certainly Quadratus.

In order to verify the accuracy of this conclusion we should naturally test the apologetic matter in AC for antiquity. Is it second century material and is it of the early part of the second century? It is here that the difficult part of the research begins. How, for example, are we to know that an allusion to Plato or Homer or Sophocles is early? In the case of the supposed extract from Sophocles we were able to trace it back to the writings of Hecataeus, and to show that all the Christian writers who quote the supposed Sophocles were borrowing from one another; we could not, however, be quite certain that the Apologist in AC was the first link in the chain.

In the same way we were able to show that there was common matter between AC and the treatise which Theophilus addressed to his friend Autolycus: that Theophilus adopts the method of Euhemerus just as Catherine's Apologist does, and makes a similar

appeal to 'your own poets and historians.' The coincidence in method may take us into the second century and put AC, as far as its apologetic matter is concerned, before the year 181 A.D., the date of Theophilus' work.

Let us see, in the next place, whether Justin Martyr has any common ideas with the Apologist of AC, and, if so, whether he may have been indebted to him either for the matter or the form.

Justin has his own way in defending the Christian Faith ; he likes to prove everything by the prophets, and when he finds himself on common ground with pagan writers or philosophers, to prove that these have really pilfered from Moses or Isaiah ; it is a method which appealed to chronology, and became very popular. When he has to deal with the corrupt practices or beliefs of the Gentile world, he explains that such viciousness of thought or action is the work of the foul demons. For instance in c. 25 of his *Apology* he explains that the Christian believer has abandoned the Olympians and found the true God. He (the Christian) has no more stories to tell about Antiope or Ganymedes ; *he does not need release for his god by the help of Thetis through him of the hundred hands*, nor compensate Thetis for her care by allowing Achilles to massacre Greeks on the grand scale.

The latter part of the paragraph is recognised by the commentators as a reference to Homer, in the beginning of the second book of the Iliad : we have only to compare Justin. i. *Ap.* 25 :

οὐδὲ μεριμνῶντα διὰ τοῦτο τὸν τῆς Θέτιδος Ἀχιλλέα διὰ τὴν παλλακίδα Βρισηίδα ὀλέσαι πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

and Homer, *Il.* ii. 2 ff. :

Δία δ' οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος.  
'Αλλ' ὅγε μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα, ὥς Ἀχιλλῆα  
Τιμήσῃ, ὀλέσῃ δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

The reference to Zeus obtaining help from Thetis is left obscure : we have, however, shown above that Justin's difficulty is Catherine's also, and that it is the story in the first book of the Iliad that is troubling them, where Hera, Poseidon and Pallas Athene are plotting to put Zeus in bonds. We repeat the parallels for the sake of convenience : Justin, i. *Ap.* 25 :

οὐδὲ λυθῆναι βοηθείας τυχόντα διὰ Θετίδος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκατόν-  
χειρος ἐκείνου.

and Homer, *Il.* i. 399 ff. :

‘Οππότε μιν ξυνδῆσαι Ὀλύμπιοι ἤβελον ἄλλοι,  
“Ἦρῃ τε ἡδὲ Ποσειδάων καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.  
Ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν γ’ ἐλθοῦσα, θεὰ, ὑπελύσας δεσμῶν,  
“Ὡχ’ ἐκατόγχειρον καλέσας’ ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,  
“Ὅν Βριάρεων καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δέ τε πάντες  
Ἀιγαίων’.

The reference in Justin is, as we have said, obscure. It was an unlikely passage of Homer to refer to ; as far as we know it is alluded to only in this passage of Justin, in the *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*, ascribed, no doubt wrongly, to Justin, and in the *Apology of Catherine*. Knowing how these early Christian writers borrow quotations from one another, it is natural to suggest that Justin is not working directly from Homer, but from the apologetic matter in the *Acts of Catherine*. In that case the apologist would almost certainly be Quadratus himself, for we have no other lost Christian Apologist of an earlier date.

It may be objected that it was possible that the Homeric quotation might have been borrowed in the reverse order, or that both authors might have extracted it independently.

If we look back at the passage which we took from the *Acts of Eustratius* and restored to the *Catherine Apology*, we shall find the saint discoursing upon the creation of the world as follows :

ἄρξομαι κατὰ τὸν σὸν ποιήτην Ἡσίοδον· ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν Ἐρεβος  
καὶ Χάος, τούτεστι ζόφος καὶ βύθος ὑδάτων.

His object is to show that the Greek poet has the same story to tell as Moses, in the first chapter of Genesis. Justin picks up a similar thread when commenting on the creation : “ we know,” says he, “ that the so-called Erebus of the poets was first spoken of by Moses.” We notice the characteristic language of Catherine, ‘*your poet* Hesiod,’ in the *Acts of Eustratius*. Further than this we cannot press the argument at present. It is sufficient to have shown that the Apologetic matter in the *Acts of Catherine* is second century material and may very well be anterior to Justin Martyr.