

citations of a document we have called Arm. 1, which the translator had in common with the translators of Aphrahat, of Cyril's *Catecheses*, of Eusebius, of Marutha, and with Agathangelus, Eznik, Lazar of Pharp, with the translators of early documents in the *Letterbook of the Patriarchs*, and with other authors. We have thus a sort of screen between our eyes and Ephrem's text, and neither his translator nor Aphrahat's renders Gospel citations *hac vice* and *de suo*. Both, whenever they recognize a text, quote it from some lost version of the Gospel which they revered much and had at their finger tips.

This is all we can say for certain. At the same time it must be acknowledged that this early version contained several texts which *a priori* we should look for in a diatessaron. Citations of the Diatessaron also seem to come in Eliseus, but some of them are most probably copied from E. Lastly, this well-established, but lost, version must have been the Syriac base of the Armenian Vulgate discerned by Dr Armitage Robinson; and almost certainly a mass of it survives in that Vulgate, the revisers having retained all they could of a version so familiar to the faithful.

In conclusion, I venture to hope that the Armenian scholars of Venice, Vienna, Jerusalem, Édschmiatsin, Paris, and other centres, where there are collections of Armenian codices, will examine them for fresh examples of the lost Syriac base of the Armenian Vulgate. Perhaps it is lurking entire in some of these libraries in the guise of an old lectionary. Some folios of it might also be recovered among the countless Gospel fragments bound up in manuscripts of all kinds. In Valarshapat alone I once counted nearly five thousand such folios all used as fly-sheets. It would be strange if a Gospel document held in such respect, and so widely diffused as late, perhaps, as 750, should have wholly perished; and a few lines of it would at once reveal whether it was a diatessaron or only an archaic form of the Separated Gospels.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

[A pathetic interest attaches to this important article, for Dr Conybeare may be said to have died in the very act of writing it. For many months he had been occupied with the pre-Vulgate quotations of the Armenian Fathers, of whose works he had so singular a knowledge, and I had had some correspondence with him on matters of detail connected with his discoveries. His MS in its revised form had at last been sent off; but we were still corresponding, when I received a telegram announcing his sudden death, in the very plenitude of his intellectual powers. An unfinished letter to me connected with the subject was actually found on his desk.

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

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

F.C.B.]

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

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

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