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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Before Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Aethiop.</td>
<td>Codices aethiopici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp.</td>
<td>compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Ethiopian Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td><em>Ecclesiastical History</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td><em>exempli gratia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMML</td>
<td>Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Éth.</td>
<td>Éthiopien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff.</td>
<td>folia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td>folium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMML</td>
<td>Hill Museum &amp; Manuscript Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td><em>id est</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>Oriental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Biblical Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Book Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jub.</td>
<td>Book of Jubilees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk.</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chron.</td>
<td>1 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Transliteration from Ethiopic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethiopic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Ethiopic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ሁ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
<td>ሺ</td>
<td>አ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሡ</td>
<td>ኲ</td>
<td>ሢ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሣ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
<td>ሤ</td>
<td>ኤ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሥ</td>
<td>እ</td>
<td>ሦ</td>
<td>እ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሧ</td>
<td>ኧ</td>
<td>ረ</td>
<td>ኧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሩ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
<td>ሪ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ራ</td>
<td>አ</td>
<td>ሬ</td>
<td>አ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ር</td>
<td>ኡ</td>
<td>ሮ</td>
<td>ኡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሯ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
<td>ሰ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሱ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
<td>ሲ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሳ</td>
<td>እ</td>
<td>ሴ</td>
<td>እ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ስ</td>
<td>ኦ</td>
<td>ሶ</td>
<td>ኦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሷ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
<td>ሷ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሸ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
<td>ሹ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሺ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
<td>ሺ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሻ</td>
<td>እ</td>
<td>ሻ</td>
<td>እ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሼ</td>
<td>ኦ</td>
<td>ሼ</td>
<td>ኦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሽ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
<td>ሽ</td>
<td>ከ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሾ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
<td>ሾ</td>
<td>ኢ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ሿ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
<td>ሿ</td>
<td>ኣ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ኮ        | ኲ            | ኳ        | ኳ            |
| ኴ        | ኴ            | ኵ        | ኵ            |
| ኶        | ኶            | ኷        | ኷            |
| ኸ        | ኸ            | ኹ        | ከ            |
| ኺ        | ኺ            | ኻ        | ኻ            |
| ኼ        | ኼ            | ኽ        | ኽ            |
| ኾ        | ኾ            | ኿        | ኿            |
| ዀ        | ዀ            | ዁        | ዁            |
| ዂ        | ዂ            | ዃ        | ዃ            |
| ዄ        | ዄ            | ዅ        | ዅ            |
| ዆        | ዆            | ዇        | ዇            |
| ወ        | ወ            | ዉ        | ዉ            |
| ዊ        | ዊ            | ዋ        | ዋ            |
| ዌ        | ዌ            | ው        | ው            |

| ኮ        | ኮ            | ኯ        | ኯ            |
| ኰ        | ኰ            | ኱        | ኱            |
| ኲ        | ኲ            | ኳ        | ኳ            |
| ኴ        | ኴ            | ኵ        | ኵ            |
| ኶        | ኶            | ኷        | ኷            |
| ኸ        | ኸ            | ኹ        | ከ            |
| ኺ        | ኺ            | ኻ        | ኻ            |
| ኼ        | ኼ            | ኽ        | ኽ            |
| ኾ        | ኾ            | ኿        | ኿            |
| ዀ        | ዀ            | ዁        | ዁            |
| ዂ        | ዂ            | ዃ        | ዃ            |
| ዄ        | ዄ            | ዅ        | ዅ            |

| ኮ        | ኮ            | ኯ        | ኯ            |
| ኰ        | ኰ            | ኱        | ኱            |
| ኲ        | ኲ            | ኳ        | ኳ            |
| ኴ        | ኴ            | ኵ        | ኵ            |
| ኶        | ኶            | ኷        | ኷            |
| ኸ        | ኸ            | ኹ        | ከ            |
| ኺ        | ኺ            | ኻ        | ኻ            |
| ኼ        | ኼ            | ኽ        | ኽ            |
| ኾ        | ኾ            | ኿        | ኿            |
| ዀ        | ዀ            | ዁        | ዁            |
| ዂ        | ዂ            | ዃ        | ዃ            |
| ዄ        | ዄ            | ዅ        | ዅ            |

Ethiopic Transliteration

| ኮ        | la           | ኲ            | lu           |
| ኳ        | li           | ኳ            | li           |
| ኴ        | lá           | ኴ            | l            |
| ኵ        | le           | ኵ            | l(ə)         |
| ኶        | lo           | ኶            | lo           |

| ኮ        | ha           | ኲ            | hu           |
| ኳ        | hi           | ኳ            | hi           |
| ኴ        | hä           | ኴ            | he           |
| ኵ        | ša           | ኵ            | h(ə)         |
| ኶        | ža           | ኶            | ho           |
Introduction

The following dissertation under the title *The Textual Tradition of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu: Towards the Critical Edition of the Ethiopic Version* is devoted to the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*, a historiographical text composed by a Coptic bishop named John in the seventh century in Egypt, in the period of the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs. Originally written either in Coptic or in Greek, it was translated into Arabic at an undetermined date. No material traces are left of any of these versions, according to the best of my knowledge. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the text was translated into Ethiopic presumably as a tool in ideological warfare with the Jesuits. Later, the *Chronicle* was translated also in Amharic using the edition of Hermann Zotenberg as a *Vorlage*. Only manuscripts in these two languages are attested so far. There is evidence for six manuscripts in Ethiopic: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éthiopiens 123, ff. 62-138; London, British Library, Or. 818, ff. 48-103; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, d’Abbadie 31, ff. 104-165; Rome, Biblioteca dell’Accademia nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana, fund Conti Rossini 27, pp. 1-120; Collegeville, MN, Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, Ethiopic Manuscript Microfilm Library 7919, ff. 49-98; the existence of the sixth manuscript is highly probable, however, I don’t have any precise data on it; and two manuscripts in the Amharic

---

1 My PhD-Project has been funded by the European Research Council, European Union Seventh Framework Programme IDEAS (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement no. 338756 (TraCES), and by The Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities through a project of the Academy of Hamburg (Beta mašḥāft).

2 This title is commonly used in the Western scholarly tradition. The first catalogue attesting this text was published by Antoine d’Abbadie. He provides the following title: ‘ዮሓንስ፡መደብር፡ Yohannis Madabbar “Extraits historique”’ (Abbadie 1859, 37). William Wright in his catalogue refers to the text as ‘Epitome of General History compiled by Yōhannēs Madabbar’ (Wright 1877, 300). Zotenberg in the catalogue from the same year refers to it as ‘Chronique de Jean Madbbar, évêque de Nikiou’ (Zotenberg 1877a, 223). On the reference to this text used in the Ethiopian tradition, see Chapter 2.1 of the current work.

3 See Chapter 1.3 of the current work.

4 See Chapter 1.4 of the current work.

5 Zotenberg 1883. See Chapter 1.5 of the current work.

6 I can’t exclude the existence of further manuscripts containing the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*. So, this list doesn’t claim for exhaustiveness.

7 This manuscript is paginated. I preserved the pagination, and give references not to folia but to pages.

8 See Chapter 2.1 of the current work.

The text belongs to the genre of universal chronicle, i.e. it tells the history of the world starting from Adam and Eve, till the author’s time. Bernd Radtke writes about the origin of this genre in Christian Arabic literature and on the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* as follows:

Die christliche-arabische Universalgeschichtsschreibung geht, wie die lateinische des Westens und die griechisch-syrische des Ostens, auf Sextus Julius Africanus bzw. seinen Nachfolger Eusebius zurück […] Das gilt auch für die Weltchronik des koptischen Bishops Johann von Nikiu aus dem 7. Jh. Von einer autochtonten ägyptisch-christlichen universalhistorischen Tradition kann somit nicht gesprochen werden.10

The *Chronicle* is divided into one hundred and twenty-two Chapters.11 The text body is prefaced with an Introduction and a Table of Contents with short descriptions of each Chapter,12 followed by a conclusion and a colophon. It seems that the text of the *Chronicle* was abridged, for the short descriptions of Chapters don’t always correspond

---

9 I attached to these manuscripts the following sigla and short labels: A = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éthiopien 123, ff. 62-138 = BnF Éth. 123; B = London, British Library, Or. 818, ff. 48-103 = BL Or. 818; C = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, d’Abbadie 31, ff. 104-165 = BnF Abb. 31; D = Rome, Biblioteca dell’Accademia nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana, fund Conti Rossini 27, pp. 1-120 = Lincei 27; G = Collegeville, MN, Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library 7919, ff. 49-98 = EMML 7919; E = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éthiopien 240 (= Mondon-Vidailhet 53), ff. 2-83 = BnF Éth. 240; and F = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éthiopien 241 (= Mondon-Vidailhet 54), ff. 1-61 = BnF Éth. 241. To the presumably existing sixth manuscript containing the *Chronicle* I attached siglum M (for more information, see Chapter 2.1). I use either short labels or sigla further in the text for references to manuscripts.


11 Charles in his translation introduces Chapter 123 for a short conclusion and colophon at the end which does not correspond to the text division in available manuscripts (Charles 1916, 201; cp. MS A, fol. 138v; MS B fol. 103r-v; MS C, fol 164r-v; MS G, fol. 95r).

12 It might be that this Introduction and the Table of Contents represent the Coptic tradition of extended index titles. The Introduction identifies the author, the purpose and circumstances of composing the text. The Table of Contents correspond to ‘the main feature of the Coptic longer titles (which) is to summarize, more or less faithfully but certainly not concisely, the content of the work to which they are attributed’ (Buzi 2001, 527).
to the content of the main text.\footnote{All these cases are marked in the footnotes in my translation. See, for example, the short description of Chapters 5, 21, 31, 34, 40, 47, and 66 (corresponds to Chapter 67 of the main text).} Despite this, other lacunae are apparent which makes some passages hard to understand. The interpretation of some proper names is also problematic, for they were transliterated either from Greek, or Coptic, first into Arabic and thereafter into Ethiopic and are sometimes helplessly corrupt. The incomprehension by translators and copyists of the realities depicted in the Chronicle aggravates the problems of the text. For example, a wide range of different titles of the late antique Egypt, presumably used by the author, was reduced by the Arabic or Ethiopic translator just to a couple of equivalents.\footnote{Booth 2011, 559.}

The text of the Chronicle is not always organized chronologically, for instance, an account on the nails and Cross of Jesus Christ (Chapter 42)\footnote{Zotenberg 1883, 44; MS A, fol. 72v; MS B, fol. 55v; MS C, fol. 112v; MS D, pp. 13-14; MS G, fol. 52v.} precedes an account on Alexander the Great (Chapter 59).\footnote{Zotenberg 1883, 57-58; MS A, fol. 77rv; MS B, fol. 59r; MS C, fol. 116v; MS D, pp. 23-24; MS G, fol. 55rv.}

**Chronicle as a Historical Source**

The importance of the Chronicle as a historical source can’t be overestimated. While its first part presents a strong relation to other texts\footnote{See Chapter 1.2 of the current work.}, its second part is an account on the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs written down by an eyewitness from the Christian side. Such written documents are scarce, so that even in its imperfect condition, with its apparent lacunae, unclear passages and numerous confusions, the Chronicle remains a historical document of an immense value for the history of Egypt, especially when supplemented with the Arabic sources, hagiographic tradition and papyri.\footnote{However, the earliest accounts of the conquest of Egypt in Arabic date back to the ninth century, which means that a gap of over two hundred years lies between them and the events they recount (see, for example, Sijpesteijn 2007, 438).} Some big events came into light due to the Chronicle, for example the rebellion in Egypt against Phocas.\footnote{Nöldeke 1883, 1366.}

Alfred Joshua Butler writes about the importance of the Chronicle as a historical source as follows:
Indeed it is the acquisition of John’s manuscript by the British Abyssinian expedition which has made it possible to write a history of the Arab conquest of Egypt.\textsuperscript{20}

Gianfranco Fiaccadori in 2008 subscribes to his opinion describing the significance, but also the limitations of the \textit{Chronicle} as a historical source:

However mutilated and confused it is, the \textit{Chronicle} remains the only direct, and therefore independent and reliable, source for the Arab conquest of Egypt and its immediate aftermath, anticipating by almost two centuries the earliest and quite contradictory Muslim accounts, and assuming pride of place over them. The \textit{Chronicle} reveals an unmistakable Christian, or rather Coptic, point of view, especially through its focus on theodicy, in that it views history in terms of divine reward and punishment.\textsuperscript{21}

Despite its high value for the reconstruction of the history of Egypt, the \textit{Chronicle}, if we assume that it was written originally in Coptic,\textsuperscript{22} represents, according to Stephen Emmel, ‘a unique specimen of this genre in this language’.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Study of the Chronicle}

The \textit{Chronicle} remained unknown to the European scholars until the first manuscripts arrived in Europe which happened about the middle of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{24} As soon as the manuscripts were catalogued, they were recognized as important documents (see, for example, the Preface in the catalogue by William Wright).\textsuperscript{25} It seems that for the very first time the \textit{Chronicle} was mentioned in the catalogue by Antoine d’Abbadie in 1859.\textsuperscript{26} However, August Dillmann’s \textit{Lexicon} does not include references to the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu}.\textsuperscript{27} This might be explained by a limited access to the manuscripts from d’Abbadie’s collection. BL Or. 818 arrived in Europe after the \textit{Lexicon} was published and BnF Éth. 123 seems to have been mentioned for the first time in 1877 in the catalogue by Zotenberg.\textsuperscript{28} So, it might be that Dillmann did not possess

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} Butler 1902, ix. I should note here that the manuscript from the collection of Antoine d’Abbadie arrived in Europe in 1849, almost 20 years earlier than the manuscript in the British Museum’s collection (1868). But it seems that manuscripts from his collection were not easily accessible for researches before they were handed over to the Trustees of the Bibliothèque nationale de France in 1902.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Fiaccadori 2009, 214.
\item \textsuperscript{22} See Chapter 1.3 of the current work.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Emmel 2007, 96.
\item \textsuperscript{24} For precise information on each manuscript see Chapter 2.1.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Wright 1877, v.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Abbadie 1859.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Dillmann 1955 (1st edn 1865).
\item \textsuperscript{28} Zotenberg 1877a.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
information on this text. However, later on the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* was considered in the contribution by Sylvain Grébaut.29

The first scholar who devoted himself to an accurate study of the *Chronicle* was Hermann Zotenberg. First, after having catalogued the manuscripts of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, he published three articles composing a sole contribution in *Journal Asiatique*, ‘Mémoire sur la chronique byzantine de Jean, évêque de Nikiou’, in 1877-1879. In this work he gives a detailed description of the *Chronicle*, information on the author, as well as translations of some portions of the text. He analyses the *Chronicle* from a historical point of view, gives interpretations of some proper names and studies its relations with other texts. The manuscript on which he mostly worked was BnF Éth. 123. On his request Wright compared some passages with the text of the manuscript in the British Museum (today’s British Library), BL Or. 818, and noted significant similarities.30

This contribution was reviewed by Theodore Nöldeke in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* in 1881. He evaluates the work done by Zotenberg favorably, underlining that he uses not only published editions in order to establish parallels with other texts, but also incorporates unpublished sources into his work.31 Nöldeke mostly agrees with the reconstructions and interpretations of Zotenberg suggesting only two other identifications of proper names. He points out a high quality of Zotenberg’s contribution:

Ref., der gern einem Kundigeren die Besprechung dieser Schrift überlassen hätte, kann hier nur im Wesentlichen Zotenberg’s Resultate wiedergeben, thut das aber mit gutem Gewissen, da derselbe mit großer Sorgfalt und Umsicht gearbeitet hat, unterstützt von einer Gelehrsamkeit, wie sie schwerlich einem andern Pariser Semitisten zu Gebote stände; er hat nicht bloß die einschlägige byzantinische und römische Literatur in weitestem Umfange herangezogen, sondern auch die gedruckte und ungedruckte christlich-arabische, syrische und koptische.32

In 1883 Zotenberg published the whole text of the *Chronicle* and its translation in French with numerous notes on the parallels with other texts, on the traces of Arabic and Greek and on many other aspects. The edition was prepared on the basis of two manuscripts with the following sigla: A = BnF Éth. 123, and B = BL Or. 818; whereas for some parts, like Preface and the Table of Contents, he did not use the manuscript of

29 Grébaut 1952.
30 Zotenberg 1878, 248.
31 Nöldeke 1881, 588.
32 Nöldeke 1881, 587-588.
the British Library itself, but the printed text in Wright’s catalogue for an unknown reason.\textsuperscript{33}

Unfortunately, Zotenberg could not include the manuscript from the collection of d’Abbadie in his research neither in his first publications in \textit{Journal Asiatique}, nor in that of the year 1883. However, he was certainly aware of its existence, and mentions it in his very first article:

\begin{quote}
Un autre exemplaire existe dans la bibliothèque du British Museum, et un troisième dans la collection de M. Antoine d’Abbadie.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

Zotenberg, who probably just could not get any access to the manuscript, tried anyway to include it into his research. In the preface to his edition of 1883 he mentions that he compared his manuscripts with a fragment translated and published by d’Abbadie in his catalogue.\textsuperscript{35}

According to my knowledge this contribution was reviewed three times, first again by Nöldeke in \textit{Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen} in the same year. He analyses in his review once more the historical significance of different parts of the text, stressing the importance of the last Chapters as a historical source; discusses the complex question of the original language of the \textit{Chronicle}, while defending a purely Coptic original; and also proposes other variants of interpretation of proper names or some poorly understandable passages, as well as of translation.\textsuperscript{36}

The second review was contributed by Edmond Drouin in \textit{Le Muséon}.\textsuperscript{37} He summarizes the content of the \textit{Chronicle} and provides some further references to events and personalities mentioned in the text.

The third review belongs to Rubens Duval. The contribution was published in \textit{Revue critique d’histoire et de littérature} in 1884.\textsuperscript{38} Duval adduces arguments against the Coptic original and also points to some difficult passages in the text. He offers a high estimate of Zotenberg’s contribution, a readable French translation of the text accompanied by numerous notes shedding light on the history of the text transition:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Zotenberg 1883, 8, n. 1.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Zotenberg 1877a, 452.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Zotenberg 1883, 9, n. 1. The manuscript from d’Abbadie’s collection was first granted to the Bibliothèque nationale de France in 1902, after the latter’s death in 1897, almost twenty years after Zotenberg’s edition was printed.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Nöldeke 1883, 1364-1374.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Drouin 1884, 255-268.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Duval 1884, 2-6.
\end{itemize}
Les quelques exemples que nous avons cités des altérations du texte suffisent à montrer de quel chaos M. Z. l’a tiré pour en donner une traduction intelligible; sans cette traduction et les notes qui l’accompagnent, le livre était inutilisable. 39

A book by Alfred Joshua Butler, *The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Last Thirty Years of the Roman Dominion*, published in 1902, is a natural consequence of the fact that the *Chronicle* became ‘utilisable’. The *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* became one of his main sources. I have already cited his opinion above on the role of the *Chronicle* in scholar’s understanding of the history of the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs. Nevertheless, he also criticizes Zotenberg’s edition and translation at some points and mentions the preparation of another translation:

Zotenberg’s edition is defective in some points of translation and in the calculation of dates; but scholars are awaiting with much interest the appearance of Dr. Charles’ English translation.40

This translation appeared in the year 1916. Robert Henry Charles published his book *The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.), coptic bishop of Nikiu: being a history of Egypt before and during the Arab conquest: translated from Hermann Zotenberg’s edition of the Ethiopic version*. As it appears from the book title, Charles prepared a new translation of the *Chronicle* based on Zotenberg’s edition. Writing on the available witnesses of the text, he does not mention the existence of the d’Abbadie’s manuscript (although he worked with Zotenberg’s contributions, where this manuscript is mentioned several times), and writes as follows:

There are only two manuscripts known of this version, which for convenience are designated A and B. A is No. 146 in Zotenberg’s Catalogue of the Ethiopic manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. […] This manuscript (B – D.E.) is Orient 818 in the British Museum (3914 in Wright’s Catalogue of the Ethiopic manuscripts there).41

Charles analyzes Zotenberg’s edition and suggests other emendations and interpretations. Underlying that Zotenberg delivered a very important contribution, he, however, criticizes it to some extent:

Thus, frequently, where the text is unquestionably and sometimes hopelessly corrupt, no attention is drawn to this fact either by the use of obeli in the text or footnotes, and not unfrequently the translation proceeds as if the constructions were quite normal. In footnotes in my translation I have called attention to some of these passages.42

---

39 Duval 1884, 6.
40 Butler 1902, ix.
41 Charles 1916, v.
42 Charles 1916, vi.
Charles provides quite a long number of passages which were in his opinion mistranslated or misunderstood by Zotenberg. In my edition and translation, I also draw attention to them. Charles introduces a more convenient text structure by using numbered text subdivisions. This innovation improved navigation in the text considerably, for some Chapters of the Chronicle are quite long and might occupy several printed pages. In my edition I use this subdivision introduced by Charles with some minor innovations of mine. It allows better text usability, as well as an opportunity to use both English translations (Charles', and mine) side by side without significant complications. The same subdivision I apply to the Ethiopic text itself.

Walter Ewing Crum in his review of Charles’ translation underlines the author’s attempts at further identifications of proper names and his notable contributions on this aspect, and also proposes his own readings which I note in my translation.

Besides being a remarkable contribution, Charles’ translation adopts some doubtful conjectures by Zotenberg without drawing attention to this. In another review of the contribution Ernest Walter Brooks writes as follows:

[A]lthough a new translation should supersede all previous ones, the scholar who wishes to use John of Nikiu for historical purposes must have the three volumes of the Journal Asiatique before him as well as Dr. Charles’ translation.

Brooks mentioned exactly Zotenberg’s publications in Journal Asiatique, because there Zotenberg provided more detailed explanations than in his later publication from 1883, for example, of conjectures and transliterations from Arabic.

Concerning my own critical opinion on Charles’ translation, I just want to add that he is not very consistent in the usage of proper names. For example, Dometius of Persia is referred to as Domecius in the Introduction but as Domitius in the main text. Despite this, and the points summarized by the reviewers, his translation represents a considerable contribution to the study of the text.

I would like to mention here further contributions which either provide alternative translations, or deliver insights into previously unedited manuscripts of the Chronicle. The first contribution of such kind belongs to Franz Altheim and Ruth

---

43 See Chapter 3.
44 Crum 1917a, 208-209.
45 Brooks 1917, 429.
46 Charles 1916, 8, 76-80.
The authors point to limitations of Zotenberg’s translation and Butler’s later interpretations:

Bei aller Anerkennung Zotenberg’s wird man sich gestehen, daß viele Stellen unerklärt geblieben oder geradezu falsch übersetzt worden sind. Auch Butler’s Interpretation hat darunter gelitten, wobei hinzukam, daß ihm das Äthiopische fremd geblieben war. [...] Im folgenden ist versucht, diese Korruptelen tunlichst zu beseitigen. [...] Wenn die im folgenden vorgeschlagenen Verbesserungen Zustimmung finden sollten, müßte nicht wenig von der Geschichte der arabischen Eroberung Ägyptens neugeschrieben werden.48

Altheim and Stiehl deliver a new translation of Chapters 111-121 into German and propose new interpretations of proper and place names, as well as a new translation of Chapters 107-109 as an attachment to their contribution.49

Maxime Rodinson studied Chapters 90 and 91. His student, Michel Boisset, collated the text of these two Chapters of the manuscript from the collection of d’Abbadie on Rodinson’s request.50 Having analyzed this collation, he states in his article ‘Notes sur le texte de Jean de Nikiou’ that the manuscript from d’Abbadie’s collection represents another branch of text transmission, although it derives from the same translation from Arabic.51

Le manuscript C (Abbadie) semble manifester une tradition manuscrite différente de celle que représentent le manuscrits A (Paris) et B (Londres), tout en remontant à un meme archetype original de la traduction guèze.52

In this contribution he also lists some interesting new readings from d’Abbadie’s manuscript for Chapters 90 and 91, and discusses Charles’ translation and identification of some proper names.53 He collated the colophon of d’Abbadie’s manuscript himself and highlights that it shows differences in comparison with the colophons of the manuscripts edited by Zotenberg.54 The colophon of d’Abbadie’s manuscript contains the name of the second translator into Ethiopian which is lacking in colophons in the other Ethiopian manuscripts.55 Unfortunately, this colophon was not published or

48 Altheim und Stiehl 1971, 356-357.
50 Rodinson 1974, 132.
51 My collation shows the same result (see Chapter 2.2).
52 Rodinson 1974, 133.
53 Rodinson 1974, 132-137.
54 Rodinson 1974, 132.
55 See Chapter 1.4 of the current work.
translated in any of the catalogues of d’Abbadie’s collection. So, it remained known only to those who gained access to the manuscript itself, until Rodinson’s publication. Later Rodinson also published a note on Chapter 51 of the Chronicle.

The article ‘Giovanni di Nikius chronista bizantino-copto del VII secolo’ by Antonio Carile provides with the discussion of several aspects, including the sources of the Chronicle as well as the analysis of the contents of the Chronicle in the light of the social history.

In 1995 Gérard Colin published his translation of selected Chapters of the Chronicle recounting the history of pharaonic Egypt. He collated the text of the manuscript from d’Abbadie’s collection but did not consider the manuscript from Biblioteca dell’Accademia nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana. He also provides some new interpretations and conjectures as well, to which I draw attention in the footnotes of my translation.

In 2000 the Egyptian Muslim scholar ʿAbd al-Jalīl published an Arabic translation of the final part of the Chronicle’s text dealing mostly with relations between Copts and Arabs. As I have not been able to access this translation, I cannot offer any precise information about which edition, translation or manuscripts this translation was made from.

The contribution ‘Jean de Nikiou et sa Chronique: une écriture «égyptienne» de l’histoire?’ by J.-M. Carrié discusses the Chronicle’s text as a local historical writing. The article ‘Reliquie argonautiche a Cizico. Un’ipotesi sulle Argonautiche Orfiche’ in Incontri triestini di filologia classica 7 by Gianfranco Agosti contains an alternative translation of Chapter 40.4-9 in Italian provided by Alessandro Bausi from the Zotenberg’s edition. The contributions by Phil Booth of an excellent expertise shed light on the events described in the last part of the Chronicle. Pointing to some

56 Abbadie 1859, 37-40; Chaîne 1912, 19-20; Conti Rossini 1914, 207-208.
58 Carile 1986.
59 Chapters 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 30, 31, 51.
60 Colin 1995, 45-54. The catalogue by Strelcyn mentioning this manuscript was published in 1974.
61 It seems most probable that the translation was done from the French translation by Zotenberg. I express my gratitude to Fr. Bishoy L. Mikhail who drew my attention to this publication.
63 Agosti 2008, 24-25.
ambiguous cases, he provides alternative translations and interpretations of some problematic passages.\textsuperscript{64}

I am aware of only one project to involve explicit analysis of the four previously known manuscripts of the \textit{Chronicle}. This research was undertaken by Shamil Mingazov with the assistance of Maria Bulakh.\textsuperscript{65} They use BL Or. 818, BnF Éth. 123, BnF Abb. 31, and Lincei 27, to analyse a specific passage in Chapter 120 and describe differences in readings between the latter two and the manuscripts edited by Zotenberg.\textsuperscript{66}

A promising new project on the cultural biography of the \textit{Chronicle} is being overseen right now by Felege-Selam Yirga affiliated with the Department of History at the Ohio State University, USA under the working title ‘The Chronicle of John of Nikiou: Its Sources, Contexts, and Afterlife’. He presented his first results at the 44\textsuperscript{th} Annual Byzantine Studies Conference in San Antonio, Texas, US.

This short overview does not represent the complete state of the art in the study of the \textit{Chronicle}’s text, but allows me to place my own research in context.\textsuperscript{67}

\textbf{New Text-Critical Edition of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu}

The fact that d’Abbadie’s manuscript remained unedited along with the acquisition of another manuscript by Conti Rossini (Lincei 27), and the discovery of one more manuscript amongst uncatalogued ones of the EMML Collection (EMML 7919) by Jeremy Brown,\textsuperscript{68} made it necessary to prepare a new edition of the Ethiopic version of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu}.

In the course of my project I learned about the possible existence of a further manuscript containing the text of the \textit{Chronicle} which, though excluded from the current research for the reasons of its inavailability, gives hope for extending the dossier of the textual witnesses of the \textit{Chronicle} in future. Even before the discovery of the new witness from the EMML Collection, Fiaccadori already designated a new critical edition of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} as a ‘scholarly desideratum’ in 2009.\textsuperscript{69} I hope that my

\textsuperscript{64} See, Booth 2011, 555-601; Booth 2013, 639-670; and Booth 2016, 509-558.

\textsuperscript{65} Mingazov 2012.

\textsuperscript{66} On this case see Chapter 2.2 of the current work.

\textsuperscript{67} Amongst other important contributions I would like to mention as well Vycichl 1957; Fiaccadori 2006.

\textsuperscript{68} See Chapter 2.1 of the current work.

\textsuperscript{69} Fiaccadori 2009, 213. His opinion is shared by Booth 2011, 557.
dissertation is the first step in the direction of preparing such an edition which is the task I would like to dedicate myself to in the coming years.

The core and main goal of my work is the preparation of a text-critical edition of a portion of the Ethiopic version of the *Chronicle* and its translation into English. This requires a thorough study of the history of the text's transmission.

My dissertation is divided into three main parts. In the first part (Chapter 1) I discuss the historical circumstances of John’s life, his personality, the parallels with other texts, the problem of the original language, and the history of the text's transmission, especially the Amharic version of the *Chronicle*.

The second one (Chapter 2) is devoted to the Ethiopic version of the *Chronicle*. Here I describe the text witnesses included into the analysis, discuss the methodology I use and propose a *stemma codicum*; and describe the problems of the text reconstruction and on some emendations and interpretations.

The third part (Chapter 3) consists of a short introduction to my text-critical edition followed by the list of bibliographical references, and the text-critical edition of a portion of the *Chronicle* itself with a parallel translation into English, and a commentary. The edition and translation are prepared with the help of Classical Text Editor ©—a word-processing program designed for laying out critical editions.70

**My Presentations and Publications Related to the Chronicle of John of Nikiu**

My first presentation on the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* took place at the first bilateral Naples-Hamburg Workshop ‘Ethiopian Philology: The State of the Art and What to Do’ at the University of Naples “L’Orientale” which was held on 9-11 March 2016. This presentation was done during the first phase of my project and was dedicated to the study of the Amharic version of the *Chronicle*. After this presentation, my article ‘The Gǝ’ǝz text and the Amharic version of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*’ was published in *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici*, in 2017. The problem I pose in this article, namely the relation between the existing witnesses of Ethiopic version and the Amharic version, was solved by me later in the course of my project.71

My next presentation on the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* took place in the frame of the IV Dies Academicus of the Classis Africana at Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan which was held on 25-26 January 2018. This presentation will was followed by my

70 [http://cte.oeaw.ac.at/?id0=main](http://cte.oeaw.ac.at/?id0=main), accessed on 16.02.2018, at 16:52.

71 See Chapter 1.5 of the current work.
forthcoming article ‘Chronicle of John of Nikiu: Textual Transmission of the Ethiopic Version’. Another article ‘A New Witness to the Chronicle of John of Nikiu: EMML 7919’ was written in co-authorship with Jeremy R. Brown and has been published in Aethiopica.

I held my last presentation on the Chronicle during the 20th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, held in Mekelle on 1-5 October 2018. This presentation was dedicated mostly to some methodological issues I faced in the course of my work.
Chapter 1: Text Composition and Text Transmission

The following chapter is devoted to the personality of the Chronicle’s composer John and the circumstances of his life and the text composition. The most historically valuable part of the Chronicle corresponds to the last Chapters. They contain an account of the events which happened during the lifetime of John and of which he could have been an eyewitness. Further on I discuss in this chapter the related texts, the question of the original language of the Chronicle and the history of its text transmission, and in particular the Amharic version of the Chronicle.

1.1 John of Nikiu and the Composition of the Chronicle

The lifetime of John of Nikiu, composer of the Chronicle, corresponds to the time of considerable change in the history of Egypt, i.e. the last decades of Roman rule and the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs. The Roman dominion in Egypt lasted for over six hundred years. In the seventh century the pressure of the Persians on the borders of the province increased. It achieved its maximum during the reign of Heraclius (r 610-641) who came to power after a revolt against Phocas (r 602-610). In 618/19 the Persians successfully invaded Egypt and held it for several years, until Heraclius had the chance to restore his power. He did so in 629 and held it until the conquest of Egypt by ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀs from 640 to 642.  

At around this time John of Nikiu was born. John of Nikiu was a coeval of the governor ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, a son of Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. In 684 after a power struggle with Ibn Zubayr, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam entered Egypt and settled down there. Shortly afterward he appointed his son, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, governor and returned to Syria. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz remained in his position for twenty years until he died in 705. He groomed his son for the succession, but he predeceased his father by a few months. Instead, the Caliph, ʿAbd al-Malik, selected a new governor, his son, ʿAbd Allāh.

In this period John occupied the position of a bishop of Nikiu, a city in the southwest Delta known since the third century BCE. It has been known by several names, Nikiu (Νίκιος or Νικιοῦ) in Greek, Pšati (Πσατή) in Coptic, and Niqyūs (نقيوس)
or as Ibšādī (ابشادي) in Arabic. The precise site of Nikiu is not clearly identified; there are three main hypotheses regarding its location. According to the first one, Nikiu was situated on the site of the modern town of Ibšādī which was proposed by Emile Amélineau:

Comme conclusion, je place l’ancienne ville de Peschatî, ou Prosôpis, ou Nikious, à l’emplacement actuel du bourg d’Ibschady, au nord d’Aboukalas, à l’est de Zaouïeh et du Nil, don’t il est éloigné d’environ 4 kilomètres.

According to the second one, the ancient city of Nikiu corresponds to the ruins of Zāwyat Razīn (زاوية رزين). This hypothesis was proposed by Edith Louisa Butcher, an English philocopt and writer, who while living in Egypt had the opportunity to inspect the town of Ibšādī. Being convinced that the last one could not be the ancient city of Nikiu, she proposed another location:

The present Ibshadi is an entirely modern village, as I convinced myself by personal inspection. [...] A Coptic priest of the district told me that the ancient site of Nikius was marked by the modern town of Zawiet-Razin, and some years afterwards I was able to make an expedition to the place. Zawiet-Razin is certainly within the limits of the area of the ancient Isle of Nikius, and as certainly is the site of an ancient city. I found the remains of a Pharaonic temple, and the remains of pillars, etc., which had belonged to a Christian church. More than that I had not time to see.

This proposal was criticized by Alfred Joshua Butler who points out that geographically Zāwyat Razīn occupies the wrong position to be Nikiu.

Étienne Marc Quatremère, using diverse Greek and Byzantine sources (e.g. the Geography by Ptolemy and the Itinerarium Antonini) identifies this city with the modern one called Tabšîr (Sabsîr or Šabšîr on modern maps) that lies some six miles south to Ibšādī. Butler agrees with this identification and provides other sources which confirm this hypothesis; one of those is the Chronicle of John of Nikiu, not available to Quatremère:

Quatremère’s conclusions are entirely borne out by John of Nikiu’s Chronicle, which of course he had not seen. They are also confirmed by the MS. of Severus of Ushmûnain, who in the life of the Patriarch Andronicus expressly and explicitly identifies the two places.
Concerning the life and personality of John the data are scarce and the main source until now has been the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* which is the title commonly used for the principal text of Coptic historiography. It covers the period from the first to the thirteenth century and can be considered the official history of the Coptic Orthodox Church. In the text of the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* John of Nikiu appears at the death of the patriarch John III of Samannūd in 689:

> When he (*ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz – D.E.*) arrived at the city of Alexandria, the news was brought to the assembly of the bishops that he (John III of Samannūd – D.E.) was prostrate with fever. So they entered to him. And there were in company with them Gregory, bishop of Al-Kais, and Abba John, bishop of Niciu, and Abba James, bishop of Arwāt, and Abba John, bishop of Sakhā, and Abba Theodore, bishop of Metelites, and a body of the laity: and they were all sad because they saw their shepherd called from earth to heaven.

Further he is also present at the election of Issac in 690:

> For when Abba John departed to the Lord in good remembrance, the bishops assembled together under the presidency of Gregory, the bishop of Al-Kais; and James, bishop of Arwāt, and John, bishop of Niciu, and a body of bishops and of Christian laity took counsel with clergy of Alexandria, and associated with themselves the secretary who was commissioner for the city; and they agreed that they should promote the deacon George, who was a native of Sakha, to the dignity of patriarch without consulting the Amir Abd al-ʿAzīz.

From the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* we also know that John was appointed supervisor of monasteries by patriarch Simon I (689–701)—it explains the supplement *መደብር፡ madabbər* or *መደበር፡ madabbar* of his name which is apparently a transcription of the Arabic مدیر mudabīr (‘manager, director, ruler’). After some time, John was disposed for having beaten to death a monk for having sexual intercourse with a virgin:

> After this, Abba Simon committed to Abba John, bishop of Niciu, the management of the affairs of the monasteries, because he was conversant with the life of the monks, and knew their rules; and he gave him authority over them. At this time the monks were industriously rebuilding the cells, while the officials took charge of their maintenance. Then, however, some of those who were given up to their appetites took a virgin out of her monastery, and conveyed her to Wādī Habīb and committed sin with her secretly. When this was made known among the monks, there was great distress among them, the like of which had not been heard of in that place. So the

---

81 Evetts 1947, 20. For the text of the primitive recension see Severus ibn al Muqaffa’ 1912, 120.
82 Evetts 1947, 22. For the text of the primitive recension see Severus ibn al Muqaffa’ 1912, 120.
83 MS C, fol. 104r; MS G, fol. 96r.
84 MS A, fol. 62r; MS B, fol. 48r.
bishop took the monk who had committed the sin, and inflicted a painful beating upon him; and ten days after his punishment that monk died. Then when the affair became known, all the bishops in the land of Egypt assembled in secret and enquired of the bishop what had happened to the monk, so he informed them concerning the event, and confessed that it was he who had beaten him; and therefore they condemned him to be deposed, because he had transgressed the limit of what humanity required in him.\textsuperscript{85}

Another source which mentions John of Nikiu is the \textit{Life of the Patriarch Issac} composed by Mena of Nikiu.\textsuperscript{86}

According to the assumption of Witold Witakowski, it is probable that John started to write down his \textit{Chronicle} first after he had been forcibly deposed.\textsuperscript{87} However, in the Introduction to the main text of the \textit{Chronicle} he is still referred to as \textit{አብ፡ቐዱስ፡ዮሐንስ፡ጳጳስ፡ዘኒቅዩስ:} (‘Saint Father John, bishop of Nikiu’). As James Howard-Johnston rightly points out there is no hint of his dismissal in the text, so it appears much more probable that John composed his \textit{Chronicle} before the end of his church career.\textsuperscript{89}

Nothing else is known about his life so far. However, taking into account that his \textit{Chronicle} does not extend beyond 700 CE, it is probable that he died shortly after this time. Where his personality is concerned some information can be drawn from the cited parts of the \textit{History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria} and the way some historical events are depicted in his \textit{Chronicle}. It seems that John of Nikiu was a man of great religious zeal and devotion to his faith which apparently influenced his narration. This was pointed out by Nöldeke:

\begin{quote}
Johannes von Nikiu ist ein strenger Monophysit, mit dem ganzen fanatischen Eifer, den, wenn ich mich nicht täusche, diese Partei in noch höherem Grade entwickelt hat als die s.g. orthodoxe. Natürlich wirkt seine kirchliche Parteistellung stark auf die Darstellung ein; sie führt nicht selten zu wahrer Geschichtsverdrehung. Dabei wird er freilich durchweg nur die unter seinen Parteigenossen gangbare Auffassung wiedergegeben, nicht mit Bewußtsein gefälscht haben.\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{85} Evetts 1947, 32-34. For the text of the primitive recension see Severus ibn al Muqaffa’ 1912, 125.
\textsuperscript{86} Porcher 1915, 354.
\textsuperscript{87} Witakowski 2006, 288.
\textsuperscript{88} Zotenberg 1883, 27; MS A, fol. 67r; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108r, MS D, p. 1; MS G, fol. 49r.
\textsuperscript{89} Howard-Johnston 2010, 182.
\textsuperscript{90} Nöldeke 1881, 592.
1.2 Note on the Sources of John of Nikiu

Concerning the sources John of Nikiu presumably used to compose his work, the question deserves further and deeper investigation. This Chapter doesn’t aim at providing a complete overview of the potential sources, for that would enquire a thorough analysis of the whole text of the *Chronicle* and goes beyond the main goal of the present dissertation. I limit myself to the following observations I made while working on the text.

First of all, it seems to be obvious that John of Nikiu used a number of diverse sources. This is stated in the Introduction to the Table of Contents, as well as in the Introduction to the main text of the *Chronicle*. However, no precise references are mentioned there. There are several references in the text of the *Chronicle* itself which I list further in this subchapter, which however could have been copied from the real source.

The *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* shows considerable similarities with the *Chronicle of John Malalas*. The last is the earliest extant example of a Byzantine world chronicle. The *Chronicle of John Malalas* covers history from Adam to at least 565 CE. In 2000 a new edition of the Greek text prepared mostly by Hans Thurn appeared in the series *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*.

The *Chronicle of John Malalas* is the text with which I worked most intensively in finding parallels with the text of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*. For my work I used an English translation which appeared in 1986 in the series *Byzantina Australiensia*. This translation was prepared by Elizabeth Jeffreys, Michael Jeffreys, and Roger Scott, in

91 See, Zotenberg 1883, 9-10; Charles 1916, xi-xii; Carile 1986, 362-363; Booth 2016.
92 MS A, fol. 62r; MS B, fol. 48r; MS C, fol. 104r, MS G, fol. 96r; MS D lacks this part.
93 MS A, fol. 67r; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108r; MS D, p. 1; MS G, fol. 49r.
95 The first steps in the preparation of a new text-critical edition of the *Chronicle of John Malalas* were undertaken by Kristen Weierholt who suddenly died in 1973 having prepared the manuscript dossier on the *Chronicle*. In the mid-1970s these materials arrived in Hamburg and were handed over to Johann Erwin Karlheinz Thurn. At the beginning of 1990s the manuscript of a new text-critical edition was ready. But after a short and severe illness Thurn died in 1993. Only in 2000 did these efforts result in the publication of that edition (Thurn 2000).
96 Many of these parallels have already been documented by Zotenberg and Charles (Zotenberg 1883 and Charles 1916).
cooperation with many other researchers.\textsuperscript{97} Being aware of the disadvantages of using a translation instead of the edition of the original text, I hope still to provide valuable information. The similarities between these two texts are so obvious that the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} was also included into the list of the witnesses of the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas}.\textsuperscript{98} Quite frequently, the text of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} can’t be followed without consulting the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas}. However, the absence of an original of the Malalas’ text\textsuperscript{99} complicates establishing of a relation between these two Chronicles.\textsuperscript{100}

In this regard I would not claim that John of Nikiu used the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas} directly as a source for his own ouvrage. Indeed, Nöldeke writes as follows:

Seine direkten Quellen waren gewis nicht zahlreich; bei der Art, wie diese Leute einander abschrieben, wird man über diese Quellen selbst aber vielleicht nie in’s klare kommen. Den Malalas hat Johann von Nikiu schwerlich vor sich gehabt; die große Übereinstimmung beruht auf gemeinsamen (inderecten) Quellen.\textsuperscript{101}

In this respect, I want to draw attention to Chapter 2.1 of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} which reads as follows:

\begin{quote}
ወሴትሰ፡ መልዱ፡ ለአዳም፡ ይረከበ፡ ይበበ፡ እምኀበ፡ እግዚአብሔር፡ ይመየ፡ እስማተ፡ ይዋክብት፡ ይ፡ ይለ፡ ይሐውሩ፡ ይ፡ ይከuckets:: መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ። ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መሽተሪ׃ ይካልኡ፡ መシーン۔
\end{quote}

Seth, son of Adam, who received his wisdom from God, gave names to the five stars (planets) which are moving: the first \textit{Zuḥal} (Saturn = Cronus), the second \textit{Maštarī} (Jupiter = Zeus), the third \textit{Mariḵ} (Mars = Ares); the fourth \textit{Zəhrā} (Venus = Aphrodite), the fifth \textit{ʿAtārd} (Mercury = Hermes).

This passage corresponds to the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas} 1.1.,\textsuperscript{103} with an exception that the second planet was named Hera in the available witnesses of its direct

\textsuperscript{97} Jeffreys u. a. 1986, vii-x.
\textsuperscript{98} However, pointing that ‘John of Nikiu is rarely of independent value as a witness to Malalas’ text’ (Jeffreys u. a. 1986, xxxvi).
\textsuperscript{99} On the witnesses to the Cronicle of John Malalas and the transmission of the text, see Jeffreys u. a. 1990.
\textsuperscript{100} For example, Carrié demonstrates that the similarities between the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} and the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas} might be rather traced back to the shared common sources for Byzantine chronicles (Carrié 2003, 161-).
\textsuperscript{101} Nöldeke 1883, 1365. Karl Krumbacher also suggests the usage of same sources by both, John of Nikiu and John Malalas (Krumbacher 1891, 153).
\textsuperscript{102} Zotenberg 1883, 28; MS A fol. 67r; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108r; MS D, p. 1; MS G, fol. 49r.
\textsuperscript{103} I apply the reference system introduced by Jeffreys u. a. 1986.
tradition.\textsuperscript{104} However, the same reading, as in the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu}, occurs in the presumably indirect tradition of the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas}, that is in \textit{Parisinus Graecus 1336, Parisinus Graecus 1630} and \textit{George Monachos, Chronicon}.\textsuperscript{105} At the same time Chapter 75\textsuperscript{106} of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} has similarities with the Bonn’s manuscript of the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas}.\textsuperscript{107}

Some passages in the \textit{Chronicle} attest similarities with the \textit{Copto-Arabic Synaxarium}. Thus, for example, Chapter 77.106-112 tells the legend of Saint Theognosta who was credited with Christianisation of Georgia or Yemen (of Yemen and India in the Ethiopic version of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu}). The same legend appears in \textit{Synaxarium} on the 17\textsuperscript{th} of Tut, however, in the text of \textit{Synaxarium} the name of bishop appointed by Honorius is not mentioned,\textsuperscript{108} whereas the \textit{Chronicle} preserved the name \textit{Tawonayos}. At the same time, at least two Coptic manuscripts record this same legend and preserve the bishop’s name Theophanes.\textsuperscript{109} Some similarities are attested between Chapter 72 and the entry for the 18th of Hatour,\textsuperscript{110} Chapter 78.9-78.10 and the entry for the 12\textsuperscript{th} of Bachons.\textsuperscript{111} Taking into account that the \textit{Copto-Arabic Synaxarium}, in the form we know it, was composed around the fourteenth century and represents still a dramatically unstudied material,\textsuperscript{112} its precise relation to the \textit{Chronicle} remains unclear.

Howard-Johnston proposes the usage of at least two Egyptian sources for the topic related to the history of Egypt – \textit{History of the Partriarchs of Alexandria} and a certain local chronicle composed in Nikiu. Unfortunately, Howard-Johnston does not provide with any specific examples. Concerning the usage of non-Egyptian sources, he identifies the first and the second continuation of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Antioch} as

\textsuperscript{104} Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 2.

\textsuperscript{105} On these manuscripts, see Jeffreys u. a. 1986, xxxi–xxxiv.

\textsuperscript{106} MS A fol. 81r; MS B, fol. 61v; MS C, fol. 119v; MS D, p. 31; MS G, fol. 57v. Cp. Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 161-162.

\textsuperscript{107} For discussion of other differences between the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu} and the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas}, see Zotenberg 1883, 10.

\textsuperscript{108} Basset 1909, 277-279.

\textsuperscript{109} ‘Theognosta, Saint’, CE, 7 (1991), 2243a–2244b (M. van Esbroeck). See also, Lemm 1899, 417.

\textsuperscript{110} Basset 1907, 228-232.

\textsuperscript{111} Basset 1922, 1019-1020.

\textsuperscript{112} Pilette 2019, 34-35.
such. However, at the same time he does not exclude the possibility that John wrote his account independently.

The Chronicle, more precisely Chapter 51, also shows strong parallels with the so-called Cambyses Romance. This last text survives only in a fragmentary version of six parchment leaves (Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, P9009) in Sahidic Coptic datable to eighth or ninth century. The character of its relation to the Chronicle is not clear, Müller write as follows:

The incomplete state of the manuscript makes it very difficult to judge the character of this romance. It can be compared with the world Chronicle of Bishop John of Nikiu (C. A.D. 700). But, of course, this cannot be considered a source for the romance, although both works include the prophet Jeremiah.

However, according to Eugene Cruz-Uribe it is probable that the composer of the Cambyses Romance made use of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu. He even concludes his observations on the texts suggesting that John of Nikiu could have been the composer of both texts:

The above discussions make it clear that the author of the Romance was familiar with the Chronicle of John. It is also possible that John of Nikiu was the author of both, though that assumption is impossible to demonstrate. [...] The author of the Romance utilized “history” as found in the only current “history” he was familiar with: the Chronicle of John.

Here I would like to discuss the possibility of the relationship being the other way around, that the Cambyses Romance might have been a source for John of Nikiu. Concerning the date of composition of the Cambyses Romance, opinions vary a lot. Possibly, the work was composed before fifth or sixth century. Heinz-Joseph Thissen even argues that the Cambyses Romance ‘im Umkreis der jüdisch-hellenistischen

113 Howard-Johnston 2010, 183. Zotenberg points to similarities with the Chronicle of John of Antioch as well (for example, Zotenberg 1878, 245; ).
115 For a comparison of both texts see Schwartz 1948 and Cruz-Uribe 1986.
117 As Cruz-Uribe rightly points out the styles of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu and of the Cambyses Romance are very different, and it seems to be rather probable that the authors used the same sources (Cruz-Uribe 1986, 52).
119 Cruz-Uribe 1986, 55-56.
120 For a short summary of different opinions, see, for example, Cruz-Uribe 1986, 51.
According to Leslie MacCoull, ‘the redactor (of the Cambyses Romance - D.E.) [...] was a Syrian monastic settler in Scetis during the patriarchate of Benjamin I, working in about the decade 630-640’. If these suggestions are right, it would mean that the text of the Cambyses Romance was composed long before or around the time when John of Nikiu was born, and that nothing would have prevented John from using this text in producing his Chronicle. As Ludin Jansen, for example, suggests:

It is more likely that what we have in our text (Cambyses Romance - D.E.) is a fragment of one of John of Niku’s sources or at least of a related text. [...] At the same time it is quite clear from even a cursory reading that the Cambyses story cannot be a fragment of the Chronicle, nor can Chapter 51 be simply a copy of the Cambyses story. On the contrary, there is good reason for believing that John of Nikiu’s account is based in part on the Cambyses story.

However, if the Romance was composed in eighth or ninth century as a response to the Arab invasion, this relation might be excluded. The question of a relation between the two texts and whether John might have used the Cambyses Romance as a source for his Chronicle remains open and deserves further investigation.

In regard of other sources John of Nikiu might have used, there is a considerable contribution by Booth, where he discusses the editorial process which the text had undergone and argues for the usage of a certain Constantinopolitan source at the later stage of the text’s composition:

Besides the problems which have arisen from the Chronicle’s convoluted transmission and abbreviation, the text itself bears witness to the complex editorial processes which have produced the current arrangement of these later chapters (Chapters 116-120 – D.E.). The duplication of material, and the contradictions contained within the different streams, at once suggest the presence of two sources; but comparison with the chapter rubrics – the witness of which almost all scholars have ignored – suggest that the problems are the result of significant alterations made to an earlier organization. I have argued here that these alterations are the product of a later editor’s attempted integration of a substantial source covering political events in Constantinople from 641 to 642, none of which appears in the text of the rubrics. [...] It is possible that this

122 Thissen 1996, 149. Further arguments in favor of this theory were adduced by Tonio Sebastian Richter (Richter 1997).
123 MacCoull proposes ‘narrative’ as a preferable term (MacCoull 1982, 185). However, in this work I continue to use the term ‘Romance’.
125 Jansen 1950, 27-28. However, the arguments provided by Jansen do not seem to me to be very convincing. (Jansen 1950, 28-29)
source has been excerpted from a larger text, but we might also imagine that it circulated as some sort of short, apologetic pamphlet, distributed in the immediate aftermath of Cyrus’ death, when the rivalries described remained relevant.127

Many similarities with the texts by ecclesiastical historians were already identified by Zotenberg. So, for example, he points to the parallels with Eusebius in Chapter 72,128 Chapter 77; with Socrates in Chapter 78, Chapter 83, Chapter 84; with Rufinius in Chapter 78; with Theodoret in Chapter 80, Chapter 83; with Sozomen in Chapter 83. The Histories of Herodotus 2.108-9, 2.137, and 2.124-6 appear to be the source for Chapter 17, Chapter 18 and Chapter 19 correspondingly.

Concerning the references found in the text of the Chronicle, they are not frequent, and as I have already mentioned above were rather copied alongside with the text. For example, in Chapter 2.3 there is mention of Ovid and Plutarch who are also mentioned in the related passage in the Chronicle of John Malalas. The mentions of the work Jewish Antiquities by Josephus Flavius in Chapter 27.10 and of the Chronographiae by Sextus Julius Africanus in 29.2 are of the same nature, the same references being found in the Chronicle of John Malalas 3.2 and in 3.9 correspondingly. Additionally the chronicler Timothy mentioned in Chapter 36.2 is

---

127 Booth 2016, 551.
128 Zotenberg 1883, 293, nn. 2, 3.
129 Zotenberg 1883, 306, n. 3.
130 Zotenberg 1883, 312, n. 1.
131 Zotenberg 1883, 329, 2.
132 Zotenberg 1883, 341, n. 6.
133 Zotenberg 1883, 315, n. 2.
134 Zotenberg 1883, 318, n. 3.
135 Zotenberg 1883, 326, n. 2; 329, n. 2.
136 Zotenberg 1883, 326, n. 1; 327, n. 2.
137 Zotenberg 1883, 247, n. 1.
138 Zotenberg 1883, 247, n. 3.
139 Zotenberg 1883, 248, n. 3.
140 MS A, fol. 67r; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108r, MS G, fol. 49r; MS D, p. 1.
141 Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 4.
142 MS A, fol. 70r; MS B, fol. 53v; MS C, fol. 110v, MS G, fol. 50v; MS D, p. 7.
143 MS A, fol. 70r; MS B, fol. 53v; MS C, fol. 111r, MS G, fol. 51r; MS D, p. 8.
144 Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 28, 30.
145 MS A, fol. 71v; MS B, fol. 54v; MS C, fol. 112r, MS G, fol. 51v; MS D, p. 11.
cited in the parallel passage in the *Chronicle of John Malalas* 4.10.\(^{146}\) In Chapter 50.7\(^{147}\) of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*, the writings of St Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, are also mentioned. I could not find the parallel reference in the *Chronicle of John Malalas*, but still this reference might be a secondary one as well.

### 1.3 Original Language of the Chronicle

The original language of the *Chronicle* is still a subject of debate. Scholars have proposed three possibilities: Greek, Coptic and the interchangeable usage of these two languages.\(^{148}\) Zotenberg was first convinced that the *Chronicle* was originally written in Greek, although he then wondered why the text remained unknown to Byzantine authors and no mention of it is available:\(^{149}\)

> L’original de cette compilation historique était écrit en grec; mais on ne le trouve mentionné dans aucun livre ancien, ni modern, et il est resté absolument inconnu.\(^{150}\)

Some years later Zotenberg, however, changed his mind and proposed that some Chapters of the text reporting specifically on the history of Egypt were written in the Coptic language:

> Le texte original était écrit en grec, sauf un certain nombre de chapitres, se rapportant à l’histoire spécial de l’Égypte, que l’auteur avait rédigés en copte. L’emploi alternatif de deux langues différentes dans un même ouvrage, imité peut-être de certains livres de la Bible, s’explique par l’origine des récits de cette chronique, tirés, les uns de sources grecques, les autres de traditions indigènes.\(^{151}\)

Charles subscribes to the opinion of Zotenberg in the introduction to his translation pointing out that the Coptic forms of proper names support the theory of the

---

\(^{146}\) Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 37.

\(^{147}\) MS A, fol. 73v; MS B, fol. 56r; MS C, fol. 1113v, MS G, fol. 53r; MS D, p. 15.

\(^{148}\) There is also another suggestion by Colin, that the text was composed in Greek, then translated into Coptic, from Coptic into Arabic, and then into Ethiopic. However, he does not provide any evidence or arguments for this suggestion (Colin 1995, 44).

\(^{149}\) There is a proposal that the text of the *Chronicle* was used by an unknown Byzantine author of the eighth century for an account on the Bulgars. This account was retold by Theophanes the Confessor in his *Chronicle* and by Nikephoros I of Constantinople in *Historia syntomos, breviarium* (Sirotenko 1972; Mingazov 2012, 13). This claim should be regarded with caution. First of all, it is not always clear whether the identification of certain ethnic groups in the *Chronicle* as Bulgars is correct; and whether John’s account is original and not based on other sources, as it could have been used by Theophanes and Nikephoros as well.

\(^{150}\) Zotenberg 1877a, 451.

\(^{151}\) Zotenberg 1883, 6-7.
usage of two languages. He also admits that it is impossible to delimit the boundaries of these presumable sections.\footnote{152}{Charles 1916, iv.}

Crum in his review of Charles’ work criticised this theory on the grounds that no other such bilingual text is known so far and that the historical circumstances do not support this idea:

Why should a Coptic ecclesiastic, late in the seventh century, write in Greek, and in the age too wherein Coptic, as a literary idiom, was spread wider throughout Egypt than in most others? I have not observed an instance throughout the book, whether of incidental Greek phrases, words or names, that cannot equally well be accounted for if the Arabic version had been made from Coptic. [...] Such Greek words as those collected on p. v of the present work would be perfectly in place in a Coptic text, in all of which, as is well known, numberless Greek words (less often syntactically connected than singly) are embedded.\footnote{153}{Crum 1917a, 207. Howard-Johnston has also expressed a similar opinion (Howard-Johnston 2010, 185).}

Coptic was a standard literary language of the Egyptian Christians just before and after the conquest of Egypt by Arabs. The lifetime of John corresponds to the time when the Coptic language developed and even flourished in its literary form.\footnote{154}{Wilfong 1998, 185.} Moreover, there are also evidences that the city of Nikiu used to be an important center of literary production in the Coptic language at that time.\footnote{155}{Orlandi 1998, 145.} Nöldeke in his review adduces arguments for a pure Coptic original:

Die Form griechischer Wörter in unserem äthiopischen Text scheint mir nämlich allerlei Spuren koptischen Einflusses zu zeigen; besonders verweise ich auf den beständigen Wechsel von \textit{t} und \textit{d}, welcher dem Griechischen, Arabischen und Aethiopischen eben so fremd als dem Koptischen geläufig ist.\footnote{156}{Nöldeke 1883, 1367.}

Tito Orlandi states that the original was written in Greek and later translated into Coptic, but he provides no arguments for this theory.\footnote{157}{Orlandi 1970, 109.}

An argument for Greek as the original language is given by Serge Frantsouzoff in his article ‘Hronika Ioanna Nikiuskogo: nekotorye osobennosti jazyka I soderžanija’ (‘The Chronicle of John of Nikiu: Some Peculiarities of its Languages and Contents’). He points to a translation mistake which would prove the usage of the Greek language. The text of the \textit{Chronicle} mentions two main circus parties (\textit{demes}) of Byzantium: Veneto (‘Blues’) and Prasinoi (‘Greens’). For the first one a transliteration of the corresponding
Greek word was used, thus μᾶρπος: ἀλώνατος or μᾶρπομὸν: ἀλώνατος. But for the second one an Ethiopic word መስተገብራን: መስተገብራን is applied. That fact has already been explained by Zotenberg as a misunderstanding of the Greek word Πρᾶσινοι and its confusion with one of the derived forms from the verb πράσσειν (‘do, work, make’), possibly, as Frantsouzoff suggests, with an active participle in genitive. Frantsouzoff states that in this case the original language must be Greek. Phil Booth, in his article on the Blue and Green fractions in the Chronicle, writes that this case does not point directly to the Greek as the original language of the text, for the Greek verb πράσσειν was also sometimes in use in the Coptic language with the same meaning. In my opinion, it appears that this case is supposed to point to the implication of the Greek grammar, not only of the Greek lexica. Eventhough it does not point directly to the Greek original, because this confusion might have happened already at the stage of the text composition, and not at the stage of the translation into Arabic.

There are no traces either of a Coptic or of a Greek manuscript containing the text of the Chronicle. A Sahidic fragment found by Heinrich Schäfer in the Egyptian Museum of Berlin (Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, P9009) turned out to be another text related to the Chronicle, namely that of the previously mentioned Cambyses Romance. The original language of the Chronicle remains for me an open question, although I personally estimate the arguments for its being Coptic stronger than those for its being Greek.

1.4 Textual Transmission of the Chronicle

The history of the text transmission of the Chronicle could be summarized as follows: having been written either in Coptic or Greek (see above), the text was first translated into the Arabic language, and then, at the very beginning of the seventeenth century, in

---

158 Another attested reading is λαρπος (’alwatos). It is not clear, however, whether this word always correspond to Veneti. For the usage in text see, for example, MS A, ff. 120v, 124r, 127r, 128r; MS B, ff. 90r, 93r, 95r; MS C, ff. 150v, 153v, 155v, 156r; MS D, p. 113; MS G, ff. 82v, 85v, 87v, 88r.

159 For the usage in text see, for example, MS A, ff. 128rv, 130v, 132v; MS B, ff. 95v, 97r, 99r; MS C, ff. 156rv, 158r, 159v; MS G, ff. 87v, 88r, 89v, 91r.

160 Zotenberg 1883, 410, n. 2; Frantsouzoff 2010, 79.

161 Booth 2011, 563.

162 Möller 1901, 113-16; Charles 1916, iv; see also Schäfer 1899.
1601, into Ethiopic. At the end of the nineteenth century the Chronicle was translated into Amharic from Zotenberg’s edition. There are no traces of any other translations or traditions of the Chronicle. The only evidence for the history of the text transmission at our disposal is the colophons at the end of the Chronicle and the text of the Chronicle itself. These colophons are part of the Chronicle’s text and are practically identical despite a difference discussed below. Five manuscripts contain these colophons. The two manuscripts lacking them are one manuscript in the Amharic language (BnF Éth. 241) and one in the Ethiopic from the collection of Conti Rossini (Lincei 27). The first did not preserve its colophon due to the later loss of the material, for this manuscript should have served as the Vorlage for another manuscript in Amharic (see below) which has preserved it. Concerning the presumably existing MS M, no information is available to me.

Colophons of the manuscripts are not identical, and as I have already mentioned, the manuscript from the collection of d’Abbadie (BnF Abb. 31) preserved a colophon on ff. 163v-164r which differs from others. Maxime Rodinson was the first to collate this colophon and to take into account the information delivered in it. From this colophon we know that the Chronicle was translated from Arabic by Məḫərkə Dəŋəl and deacon Qəbrayał the Egyptian, son of the martyr Yoḥannas of Qalyubi.

We have translated this book in great labor, i.e. I, Məḫərkə Dəŋəl, the poorest and most contemptible amongst men and the humblest amongst people, and deacon Qəbrayał the Egyptian, ‘son’ of the martyr Yoḥannas of Qalyubi.

All other manuscripts containing colophons, namely BnF Éth. 123, BL Or. 818, EMML 7919, and BnF Éth. 240, lack the name of Məħərkā Dāŋal.

---

163 The date of accomplishment of its translation is provided in the colophon of the Chronicle (Chapter 123.6) (22 Ṭəqamt 1594 = 29 October 1601). See, MS A, fol. 138v; MS B, fol. 103r; MS C, ff. 163v-164r; MS G, fol. 95r. MS D lacks this part.

164 See Chapter 1.5 of the current work.

165 MS A, fol. 138v; MS B, fol. 103 v; MS C, ff. 164r-v; MS E, ff. 82r-v; MS G, fol. 95r.

166 See Chapter 2.1 of the current work.

167 Rodinson 1974, 132-133.

168 MS C, fol. 164v.

169 MS A, fol. 138v; MS B, fol. 103v; MS G, fol. 95r; MS E, fol. 82v.
In addition to some traces of Arabic in the text, there is also a clear statement in the colophon concerning the translation of the *Chronicle* from the Arabic language into Ethiopic. No witnesses of the Arabic version have been found, according to my knowledge. However, Amélineau gives a hint that he probably knew of an Arabic version of the *Chronicle*:

> Si je ne me trompe, je crois savoir que cette version arabe existe encore et ne pas ignorer où elle se trouve.\(^{170}\)

Nevertheless, all further investigations by his colleagues turned out to be fruitless: The Arabic version is wholly lost, though Amélineau, in his *Vie du Patriarche Copite Isaac*, p. xxiv, n 2., states that he knows of an Arabic manuscript of John’s *Chronicle*. But when asked for further information by Dr. Butler, none was forthcoming.\(^{171}\)

It is not clear whether Amélineau really possessed any information on an Arabic copy, or if he confused this text with another one. In any case he did not mention this Arabic version in his later article in *Revue Historique* on the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs from the year 1915.\(^{172}\)

Translation of the *Chronicle* into Arabic seems to be a part of a natural process at that time, for after the decree of 705 Arabic became the language of all administrative offices and all accounts.\(^{173}\) Although Coptic did not lose its role as a literary language the extensive usage of Arabic influenced the literary production as well. Original compositions in the Arabic language by Christian authors as well as translations are known from the tenth century onwards.\(^{174}\)

The precise date of the translation of the *Chronicle* is not known, but there are some indications as to the period when it could have taken place. Frantsouzoff analyzes the usage of transliterated Persian lexical items which are to be attributed to the Arabic version, and concludes that the translation of the text into Arabic probably happened the twelfth-thirteenth century.\(^{175}\)

---

\(^{170}\) Amélineau 1890, xxxiv, n. 2.

\(^{171}\) Charles 1916, v.

\(^{172}\) Amélineau 1915, 292 ff. Crum in his bibliographical note on Christian Egypt in 1917 writes that ‘Amélineau boasted (v. p. xxiv of the Introduction to his *Hist. du patr. Isaac*) of knowing the whereabouts of the Arabic text, whence the Ethiopic was translated. Has the secret died with him?’ (Crum 1917b, 53).


\(^{174}\) Wilfong 1998, 185.

\(^{175}\) Frantsouzoff 2010, 80. Witold Wikowski also suggests that the *Chronicle* was translated into Arabic around the thirteenth century, although he does not provide any evidence for that (Witakowski 2006, 288).
The only trace of the Arabic version by now is the colophon of the *Chronicle*. It states, as I have cited above, that the translation was made with the help of a certain deacon Qəbrǝyāl the Egyptian, son of the martyr Yohannǝs of Qalyubi (John of Qalyub).

The translation of this passage varies greatly between different contributions. Zotenberg first, in his catalogue of 1877, translates it as ‘fils de Jean de Qalyoûb’, just omitting the word ḥǝmāt (‘martyr’). Later, he rethought this translation and suggested a new one: ‘moine de l’ordre de Saint Jean Colobos’, explaining that he meant ‘Saint Jean le Petit’. Charles follows the identification of John and translates it ‘son of the martyr John Colobos’.

Crum interprets the expression ‘son of the martyr Yohannǝs of Qalyubi’ as a parishioner of the latter’s church in Qalyub. This interpretation also seems possible to me, although, I have not found yet any mention of this church.

In my turn, I propose the following interpretation of an expression ‘deacon Qəbrǝyāl son of the martyr Yohannǝs of Qalyubi’: this deacon was, probably, a disciple, a spiritual son, of the martyr Yohannǝs of Qalyubi (John of Qalyub). A certain John of Qalyub is known as neo-martyr. The original martyrology of him is recorded in Cairo, Patriarchal Library, MS Liturgy 106 (2). From this source we learn that he lived in the monastery of Anba Bishoi and was martyred on 6 December 1582, because he refused to deny his Christianity.

The monastery in which John of Qalyub lived is one of the most ancient monasteries of Wādī l-Naṭrūn. Anba Bishoi was founded presumably in the fifth century and survived until the present. If deacon Qəbrǝyāl also lived in this monastery, it is then highly probable that at least by the beginning of the seventeenth century, the time when the translation of the *Chronicle* from Arabic took place, the monastery’s library still contained the Arabic version of it. I should assume that this is only a hypothesis.

The fate of the monastery’s library is complicated. Stephen Emmel in his article ‘Reconstructing a Dismembered Coptic Library’ gives a detailed account of the visitors

---

176 Zotenberg 1877a, 240.
177 Zotenberg 1883, 467.
179 Crum 1917a, 208.
180 El-Masri 1978, 460; Emmel 1990, 146; Armanios 2015, 176.
of Anba Bishoi starting from the early seventeenth century who moved manuscripts out of the library. He analyses European collections containing Coptic and Copto-Arabic manuscripts and proposes a list of those which seem to originate from the monastery of Anba Bishoi. I could not find in his list anything resembling the Chronicle.\(^{182}\) The monastery seems still to contain many items and Otto Meinardus, describing the state of the monastery current at the time of the publication in 1989, writes as follows:

At one time, the library was housed in the qasr. A small room in the monastery-yard now contains the remains of the library, and the books are stored in two cabinets with six shelves each. There are approximately five hundred volumes.\(^{183}\)

Concerning the personality of this certain deacon, Lanfranco Ricci gives the following note:

E sarebbe davvero significativo se nel traduttore in etiopico di questa cronaca, un certo diacono Qebryāl egiziano, fosse concesso di identificare il Qebryāl che, agitator politico, si fece paladino della fede alessandrina contro la cattolica un paio di decenni piú tardi, cadendo ucciso per quelle lotte religiose.\(^{184}\)

Thus he proposes to identify him with a certain Walda Qǝbrǝyāl who led an aggressive guerrilla war in 1623-1624.\(^{185}\) Andreu Martínez d’Alós-Moner writes about him as follows:

Wäldä Qǝbrǝyāl was reportedly the son of an Egyptian merchant and a prostitute; dressed in the habits of a monk, he claimed to be king of Šäwa under the throne name of Tewodros Şâhay.\(^{186}\)

This claim may warrant further investigation which would probably provide with a more detailed context of the translation of the Chronicle into Ethiopian.

As I have already mentioned above, according to the colophon of the manuscript from d’Abbadie’s collection, another person involved in the translation of the Chronicle was Mǝhǝrka Dǝngǝl. He was a court priest and a chronicler, and supporter of the Jesuit missionaries, for which he was later dispatched from the country.\(^{187}\) His later turn to Catholicism can explain the omission of his name in other manuscripts. In this case I consider the colophon of the manuscript from the d’Abbadie collection to be the most complete one.

\(^{183}\) Meinardus 1989, 119.
\(^{184}\) Ricci 1969, 841.
\(^{186}\) Martínez d’Alós-Moner 2015, 295.
\(^{187}\) „Mǝhǝrka Dǝngǝl“, EÆe, III (2007), 913b–914a (D. Toubkis).
Further in the colophon we also read who had commissioned the translation and for what purpose:

by the order of ʾAtnātewos, commander-in-chief of the army of Ethiopia, by the order of the empress Māryām Sənā. Moreover, God sets it up for salvation of soul and protection of body.

The translation was supported by the court, and the didactic reasons of it are also clear. However, why was the translation of the *Chronicle* of John seen as worthy of commission and as a tool for ‘salvation of the soul and protection of body’? Translation of the *Chronicle* into Ethiopic took place in the period when the arrival of Jesuits into Ethiopia provoked a new period of literary production. The first mission of the Jesuit Order was that to Ethiopia whose aim was the subjection of Ethiopia’s Church to Rome. The history of the mission and relations between the Jesuits and Ethiopians were complicated; the Jesuits tried to collaborate with the local nobility and to develop effective tools for religious debates. For that reason, they started their literary production, translating and composing texts dealing with Christological and theological questions in Ethiopic. These literary productions from the Jesuits’ side encouraged Ethiopians to undertake the same activity to defend their religious dogmas. The translation of Coptic Christian texts from Arabic was thus intensified as a response to propaganda of Catholicism.\(^\text{189}\)

Translation of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* was apparently part of this process. Written by a Coptic bishop, this *Chronicle* is highly influenced by the religious dogma of its author. John of Nikiu defends his faith with passion and depicts representatives of the Roman church in a quite unattractive manner. Sevir Chernetsov writes about the translation of the *Chronicle* into Ethiopic as follows:

The fact that it was chosen to deal with a writing by a Coptic author of the 7th century, who witnessed the Muslim conquest of Egypt, could be entirely explained for Ethiopia of the 17th century, because the defeats of the ‘Rumes’ at the hand of the Muslims are explained by John through their deviation from ‘the true faith’, i.e. the Monophysite faith. Thus the history of Egypt of the 7th century turned in Ethiopia of the 17th century to be if not a formidable warning, then in any case a sufficiently unequivocal and quite timely hint.\(^\text{190}\)

---

\(^{188}\) MS A, fol. 138v, MS B fol. 103v, MS C, fol. 164v, MS G, fol. 95r.


\(^{190}\) Chernetsov 1994, 206.
Concerning the development of the text of the Chronicle, the information is very scarce. Zotenberg proposes that the Introduction to the Chronicle with the Table of Contents was composed by the translator into Arabic.\(^{191}\) This explanation, however, is not the only possibility.\(^{192}\)

1.5 Amharic Version of the Chronicle

In this subchapter I describe the Amharic version of the Chronicle and pose the question of its Vorlage. All cited passages of the Amharic text contain references to the folia of manuscripts. For comparison with Ethiopian text I use the available manuscripts in Ethiopian as well as Zotenberg’s edition with a reference to a folio or a page. The translations accompanying each passage are my own, unless otherwise stated.

I came across the Amharic version of the Chronicle while going through catalogues of Ethiopic and Amharic manuscripts looking for witnesses of the text for my PhD project as part of the recensio. I found two manuscripts containing the text of the Chronicle in Amharic in the catalogue by Marius Chaîne of 1913. Both manuscripts were brought to France by Casimir Mondon-Vidailhet (1847-1910) after his stay in Ethiopia and eventually entered the collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.\(^{193}\)

Mondon-Vidailhet left for Ethiopia in 1892 (Chaîne states that he departed in 1891) and stayed there until 1897.\(^{194}\) His interest in Amharic inspired him to gather different texts in this language. All in all, he collected one hundred and thirteen manuscripts; eighty-six of them are in the Amharic language. Amongst them, Mondon-Vidailhet brought two manuscripts with the Chronicle of John of Nikiu. I became extremely interested in this version, hoping that it would be valuable for the reconstruction of the Chronicle’s text.

As soon as I came to it I began to question this version’s origin, and could not avoid thinking about the role of Mondon-Vidailhet in its translation. There are indeed indications that some manuscripts were copied, or sometimes translated, on his request.\(^{195}\)

---

\(^{191}\) Zotenberg 1883, 229, n. 4.

\(^{192}\) See Booth 2016, 551-552.

\(^{193}\) Chaîne 1913, 1.


\(^{195}\) Chaîne 1913, ix, n. 1; Rouaud 1997, 125.
Whatever the circumstances of the translation, the most important aspect of this version is its Vorlage. It seemed to me possible that the translation was made from an unknown manuscript. I started to study these two manuscripts and compare them with the known manuscripts in Ethiopic. I attached to them sigla E (BnF Éth. 240 = Mondon-Vidailhet 53) and F (BnF Éth. 241 = Mondon-Vidailhet 54), following the tradition of labelling of Ethiopic manuscripts. Both manuscripts are parchment manuscripts of the nineteenth century with original bindings. MS E has 88 ff. and is complete, ff. 83r-88v are blank. Ms F has 62 ff., ff. 61r-62v are blank. The manuscript is incomplete and the text ends abruptly in the middle of Chapter 79. The last folio with text corresponds to the last folio of a quire and is fully used up; the blank ff. 61r-62v are end-leaves. All this leads to the conclusion that MS F is incomplete due to the later loss of the material.

While collating these manuscripts their mutual relationship became clear to me: MS E derives from MS F. The incompleteness of MS F does not weaken this suggestion, for the copying could have taken place before the manuscript was damaged. Moreover, there are two cases where the derivation of MS E from MS F is quite apparent. Both cases represent the same kind of mechanical error; the scribe of MS F wrote two omitted passages in the margins or between the lines, adding a mark where they should be inserted. The scribe who did a copy from this manuscript (whether it was MS E itself or not could not be defined) misunderstood this and inserted both passages in wrong places, so that the text became corrupt. I provide below a detailed description of these cases.

The first one is in the short Introduction just at the beginning of the Chronicle. MS F has the following text:

It tells from the appointment of ʾAndayās (Valentinian?) till the end of the time of Tādosyos (Theodosius); from the reign of sons of Tādosyos (Theodosius), ʾArqādyos (Arcadius) and ʾAnores (Anoreus), till Yānasatātyos (Yanestius).

---

196 At the time of assigning the sigla I was still not aware about the manuscript from the EMML collection, which later received siglum G.
197 Chaîne 1913, 34-35.
198 I am wondering in this case whether the binding of MS F is original. The manuscript appears to loose quite a big number of quires. It should either be clearly visible on the condition of the binding, or the manuscript was rebound. However, I haven’t checked the physical condition of the manuscript by myself.
199 MS F, fol. 1r.
The word እሎት (‘children’) is written in the margin and there is a mark between
the proper names ላልስዮስ: ደልስዮስ (Theodosius) and እርጭወys: የልርጭወys (Arcadius) indicating that the former should be inserted between them, as is shown in
the image below:

In MS E the copyist made an error by having written down these lines, as if the
word እሎት: (‘children’) were just the first word in a line. So, the text of MS E reads as
follows:

It tells from the appointment of በስንሮስ (Andrew) till the end of the time of ደውወysos
(Theodosius); from the reign of ደውወysos (Theodosius) who had children, የልርጭወys (Arcadius) and የስርወys (Anoreus), till ዯስናስስትማስ (Yanestius).

This reading is possible if one accepts that the verbal form ያለው፡ is derived from
the verb እለ፡ በልላ (‘have’) and not እለ፡ በልላ (‘say’) and that a mistake in the agreement
between the expression ያለው፡ and the plural form እሎት: (‘children’) was made. However, considering the version of MS F, it is obvious to me that the word እሎት: (‘children’) occurs wrongly between the words ደረስ፡ and ያለው፡, see the image below:

Comparison with the Ethiopic version also shows that MS F provides the right
reading:

---

202 MS E, fol. 2r.
From the accession of Ǝndəyās (Valentinian?) till the end of the great and blessed emperor Tawodosyos (Theodosius); and from the time of 'Arqādewos (Arcadius) and 'Anorewos (Anoreus), sons of the God-loving emperor Tawodosyos (Theodosius) till the end of the beatific emperor 'Anọṣatayos (Yanestius).

Another error is in Chapter 5. It is similar in character and occurred also due to a passage incorrectly inserted from between the lines. MS F has the following reading:

The Persians whom he ruled over, worshipped him as a god. They named him with a name of the stars. They called him ʾAryon (Orion) that is Dabarāh. He started to hunt and eat animals.

The last sentence አራዊት፡ አድኖ፡  //!< ք ለላ፡  ገመር፡ (’he started to hunt and eat animals’) is written between the lines and there is a small sign above the two dots after the word አሉት፡ (’the called him’) indicating where this sentence should be inserted, as shown below:

The scribe of MS E inserted this sentence between the words ይሚባል፡ and ኢርዮን፡, thus creating the following variant:

The Persians whom he ruled over, worshipped him like he worshipped.204 They named him with a name of the stars. One named Dabarāb started to hunt and eat animals. They called him ʾAryon (Orion).

See the picture below:

---

201 Zotenberg 1883, 11. I use here Zotenberg’s edition because this passage in the manuscripts causes some problems. In my edition I use the emendations made by Zotenberg.

202 MS F, fol. 15r.

203 MS E, fol. 8v.

204 I consider this reading in MS E an error as well.
Also in this case comparison with the Ethiopic text reveals the right variant:

Also in this case comparison with the Ethiopic text reveals the right variant:

The Persians served him and worshiped him as a god. They called him after a name of a star in the sky. They called him after the name of ʾAryon (Orion), i.e. Dabārāh. He began to hunt and eat animals.

I suppose that these two cases provide enough evidence to suggest that MS E derives from MS F. The scribe of MS E also introduced quite a large number of errors. As a result, MS E which is clearly written and complete, is so corrupt that without collation with MS F, quite a different text could have been edited from this manuscript. I want to mention here just a couple of examples with my explanation.

I found one interesting error in a proper name in the Introduction. MS E has the following variant:

It tells from the appointment of ṢAndrayās (Andrew) till the end of the time of Tāwodasyos (Theodosius).

The reading appears to be quite normal, as the name ṢAndrayās (Andrew) is a well-known name in Ethiopia.

The variant in MS F reads as follows:

It tells from the appointment of ṢAndrayās (Valentinian) till the end of the time of Tādosyos (Theodosius).

205 Zotenberg 1883, 28; MS A fol. 67rv; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108v; MS D, p. 2; MS G, fol. 49r.

206 MS E, fol. 2r.

207 For example, the current database of the project Beta maṣāḥef: Manuscripts of Ethiopia and Eritrea (Schriftkultur des christlichen Äthiopiens und Eritreas: eine multimediale Forschungsumgebung) contains fourteen accounts for persons with such name.

http://betamasahaeft.eu/as.html?AttestedInType=2&query=%CA%BE%C6%8Endr%C7%9Dy%C4%81s&work-types=pers&xmlid=&start=1, accessed on 21.07.2018, at 17:42.

208 MS F, fol. 1r.
It even seems to be an error at the very first glance. But if one compares this passage with the Ethiopic version, one would find only the last variant of this name or the form እንድያንስ፡ Ǝndəyanəs:

From the appointment of Ǝndəyānəs (AB Ǝndəyā) (Valentinian).

Here the proper name እንድያንስ፡ Ǝndəyānəs is probably a corrupt form of Valentinian, as suggested by Zotenberg, and should be the right reading. It might have been reinterpreted into a common እንድርያስ፡ Ǝndrəyās in MS E later. I evaluate this case as lectio difficilior in MS F and as lectio facilior in MS E correspondingly.

I found another case of a later reinterpretation in a short description of Chapter 113 (0.113) in the Table of Contents. MS E has the following variant:

Moreover, it tells concerning [...] his return from a child to Rome.

MS F has another reading:

Moreover, it tells concerning [...] the return of Kalaǧ to Rome.

Here a personal name እስክልጂ፡ Kalaǧ was reinterpreted in MS E as a combination of the preposition እ and a noun እስክልጂ፡ (‘child’, ‘boy’, ‘son’). The Ethiopic text has a slightly different variant of that proper name: እስክልጂ፡ Kalaği:

And also the return of Kalaği to Rome.

Chapter 21.5 on Perseus and his overcoming of Medusa, the Gorgon, contains the next case. MS E reads:

Having shown her, he overcame them.

This variant seems to be right and logical. According to the legend, Perseus beheaded Medusa who was able to turn the onlookers to stone, and used her head which retained this magical ability, against his own enemies. However, in this context MS F has even a better reading:

---

209 Zotenberg 1883, 11; MS A, fol. 62r; MS B, fol. 48r; MS C, fol. 104 r; MS G, fol. 96r.
210 Zotenberg 1883, 223.
211 MS E, fol. 7v.
212 MS F, ff. 13v-14r.
213 Zotenberg 1883, 15; MS A, fol. 66r; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 107v; MS G, fol. 98v.
214 MS E, fol. 10r.
Having shown her head, he overcame them. This variant fits the context better and is also confirmed by the Ethiopic text: He took the head of the virgin magician Kurkunā (Gorgon), showed to them and so vanquished them. In this case word እራሷን፡ (‘her head’) was falsely substituted by the pronoun እርሷን፡ (‘her’) in MS E probably due to their graphical similarity.

Chapter 22.3 contains another interesting case. MS E has the following reading: He built a city, named Nābulis (Iopolis) after her (the moon’s) name; for people of this city worshipped the moon. This might be correct, but comparison with the variant of MS F, reveals that the latter has quite a different meaning and represents a lectio difficilior: He built a city, named Nābulis (Iopolis) after her (the moon’s) name; for people of this city called the moon Yo. An expression ከታሱቲ፡ should actually be written: ከ፡ ወንታሱቲ፡ (‘they called her Yo’). Yo is to be identified with the Greek Io (Ἰώ), and the city called ዝካለለስ፡ Nābulis with Iopolis. Iopolis was a town situated not far away from Antioch whose inhabitants worshipped Io as a moon goddess. This interpretation is confirmed also by the Ethiopic text: He built a city in the country of ልሩናየን (Argives) which is called after the name of the moon Nābulis (Iopolis), because the people of ልሩናየን (Argives) call the moon Yu (Io) secretly till nowadays.

In Chapter 31.1 telling the legend on the first ruler in Egypt MS E contains the following reading:

215 MS F, fol. 19v.
216 Zotenberg 1883, 33; MS A, fol. 69r; MS B, fol. 52v; MS C, fol. 109v; MS D, p. 5; MS G, fol. 49v.
217 MS E, fol. 10v.
218 MS F, fol. 20v.
219 Zotenberg 1883, 34; MS A, fol. 69r; MS B, fol. 53r; MS C, fol. 110r; MS D, p. 6; MS G, fol. 50v.
The name of him who first ruled over Egypt at the time when they worshiped idols, was ʾAbrusubidā (Prosopis).

The expression በ... እይ is means ‘on, above, in’, and in this case የሚኞች: እይ could be understood as ‘over/in Egypt’. But MS F has another variant:

The name of him who first ruled over Egypt in ሚስራ (Absai) at the time when they worshiped idols, was ʾAbrusubidā (Prosopis).

This reading appears to be the right one which also corresponds to the Ethiopic text:

In the time, of him who first reigned in Egypt, while they worshiped idols and those which are mentioned previously, and of the famous city ሚስራ (Absai), that is Nikiu, the king’s name was ʾ Abrusubidā (Prosopis).

In this case the city name (እ)ንላይ: ሚስራ (Absai) was falsely turned in MS E to the postposition እይ.

There is another case in Chapter 32.1 on Joshua and the city of Jebus. MS E has the following reading:

And when he subdued it, he called it Haynu (Jebus).

This reading is not apparently incorrect, but a comparison with another manuscript reveals the better one, MS F reads as follows:

And when ከያሱ (Joshua) subdued it, he called it Hayānus (Jebus).

The second reading is proved to be the correct one by comparison with the Ethiopic text:

'Yāsu (Joshua), son of Nawē (Nun), subdued it and named it Ḥayānus (Jebus).
In this case, the proper name አወልብቶስ : (‘Joshua’) was replaced in MS E with a pronoun እርሱ : (‘he’) apparently due to the graphical resemblance of the words.

Chapter 43.1 contains another case of a later reinterpretation of an unknown proper names. MS E reads:

In the time of Samson a king named እርሱ፡ (‘he’) apparently due to the graphical resemblance of the words.

Chapter 43.1 contains another case of a later reinterpretation of an unknown proper names. MS E reads:

In the time of Samson a king named እርሱ፡ (‘he’) apparently due to the graphical resemblance of the words.

This reading would point to a kind of coup d’état, because of which Lapathus became king with the help of a certain herald’s man. The reading of MS F seems to be closer to the right one:

In the time of Samson, in the land of እርሱ፡ (‘he’) apparently due to the graphical resemblance of the words.

A corrupt form of a proper name እርሱ፡ was reinterpreted into an expression እርሱ፡ (‘a herald’s man’) and the word እርሱ፡ (‘land, city’) into the word እርሱ፡ (‘lance’). The fact that it should be a proper name is proved by the Ethiopic text. Zotenberg provides the following text:

In the days of Samson, the last of the Judges, እርሱ፡ (Lapathus) reigned in the land እርሱ፡ (‘Ağiysatu).

The reading in Zotenberg’s edition differs from readings in manuscripts (on this emendation see below). The manuscripts read as follows:

The manuscripts read as follows:

After the relation between manuscripts became clear, I turned to the aspect of the Vorlage for this version. It was obvious for me that the translation was made from the Ethiopic text, because the Amharic text contains traces of Ethiopic, for example, in Chapter 8.1, where the translator preserved the Ethiopic expression የእምድኅረ፡, later corrected by the copyist in MS E:

226 MS E, fol. 14r.
227 MS F, fol. 28v.
228 Zotenberg 1883, 40.
229 MS A, ff. 72v-73r; MS B, fol. 55v; MS C, ff. 112v-113r; MS D, p. 14; MS G, fol. 52v.
230 MS F, fol. 16v.
And after Wayləyus (Belus) died

One can compare it with the Ethiopic text:

And after Walulayus (Belus) died, Ninunas (Ninus) reigned in Soryā (Assyria).

My comparison of the Amharic text with Ethiopic manuscripts was not productive; I was not able to establish any relation between the former and the latter. Moreover, there was one case where my false estimation was misleading. In Chapter 88 of the text the witnesses in Ethiopic, MSS ABDG, have the following passage:

Only MS C has:

This passage causes some confusion. Zotenberg translates it as follows:

Il tomba du ciel, dans la ville de Constantinople, au lieu d’eau, une pluie d’éclairs. Zotenberg translates it as follows:

Charles has practically the same variant:

And lightning rained from heaven on Constantinople instead of rain.

But Charles adds that the word ‘lightning’ must be a corruption and the right variant should be ‘dust’ and compares it with the text of the Chronicle of John Malalas.

However, MS E, in Amharic, has the following reading:

Some soil rained from the sky like rain.

My first impression was that the Amharic version was translated from an exemplar which preserved the right reading attested in the Chronicle of John Malalas. However, after having analyzed this case more thoroughly, I found out that Ethiopic manuscripts, except MS C, contain already the right reading. The word ከረቅ፡ has the main meaning ‘light, bright light’, but there is also another one ‘white stone or soil used

---

231 Zotenberg 1883, 29; MS A, fol. 67v; MS B, fol. 52r; MS C, fol. 108v; MS D, p. 3; MS G, fol. 49r.
232 Zotenberg 1883, 124; MS A, fol. 102r; MS B, fol. 77r; MS D, fol. 74; MS G, fol. 70r. This part is not included into the current edition.
233 MS C, ff. 135v-136r. This part is not included into the current edition.
234 Zotenberg 1883, 354.
237 MS E fol. 41v; MS F stops in the middle of Chapter 79, so it lacks this part.
for whitewash’. In other words, the Amharic version did not preserve the right variant lost in the Ethiopic one, but just contain a correct translation of the Ethiopic text.

At the last stage of my analysis, I compared the Amharic version with the text edited by Zotenberg and established a strong relation between them. There are several cases which allow for considering Zotenberg’s edition as the Vorlage of the Amharic version. All these cases show that the emendations made by Zotenberg occur also in the Amharic text, being in that case shared innovations missing in all Ethiopic manuscripts which I had at my disposal.

For example, in Chapter 40.4 Zotenberg edits the text as follows, restoring the passage in square brackets [ ], which is not attested in any of the studied Ethiopic manuscripts:

\[
\text{ወእምድኅረ፡} \; \text{መወይ፡} \; [ \text{ሐነፁ፡} \; \text{ቤተ፡} \; \text{አማልክት፡} \; \text{ወ} \; \text{ሰመይዎ፡} \; \text{ስሙ፡} \; \text{ረአውስ፡} \; \text{አሉት፡} \; \text{ዘበትርጓሜሁ፡} \; \text{እመ፡} \; \text{አማልክት፡} \]

He translates it as follows:

Après avoir remporté la victoire, ils construisirent un temple qu’ils appelèrent Rhea, c’est-à-dire, mère des dieux.

This passage, proposed by Zotenberg as a restoration, occurs in the Amharic text:

\[
\text{ከዚያም፡} \; \text{በኋላ፡} \; \text{የጣዖት፡} \; \text{ቤት፡} \; \text{ሰርተው፡} \; \text{ስሞን፡} \; \text{ረዓውስ挹} \; \text{አሉ틀፡} \]

And after that they built a temple and called it Rhea.

In Chapter 43.1 Zotenberg’s edition contains the following passage:

\[
\text{ወበመዋዕለ፡} \; \text{ሳምሶን፡} \; \text{ዘውእቱ፡} \; \text{ፍጻሜ፡} \; \text{መሳፍንት፡} \; \text{ነግሠ፡} \; \text{አውሊብጦስ፡} \; \text{በአድዋለ፡} \; \text{አጂይስቱ} \; \text{አወሊብጦስ፡} \]

He translates it as follows:

Du temps de Samson, le dernier des Juges, régna dans le pays de ..., Lapathus...

Whereby MSS AB, from which he edited his text, as well as three others, namely, MSS CDG, have the following variant:

\[
\text{ወበመዋዕለ፡} \; \text{ሳምሶን፡} \; \text{ዘውእቱ፡} \; \text{ፍጻሜ፡} \; \text{መሳፍንት፡} \; \text{ነግሠ፡} \; \text{አውሊብጦስ፡} \; \text{በመዋዕለ፡} \; \text{አጂይስቱ} \; \text{አወሊብጦስ岬} \]

---

238 Leslau 1987, s.v.

239 The usage of square brackets for restored passages corresponds to the editorial practice of Zotenberg. In my edition I apply angle brackets instead.

240 Zotenberg 1883, 43; Cp. MS A, fol. 72r, MS B, fol. 55r; MS C, fol. 112r; MS D, p. 12; MS G, fol. 52r.

241 Zotenberg 1883, 263.

242 Zotenberg 1883, 45.

243 MS E, ff. 13r-v; MS F, fol. 26v.

244 Zotenberg 1883, 265.
And in the time of Samson, the last of the Judges, 'Awalibṭos Lapathus reigned in the time of 'Aḡiyəstu.

Zotenberg replaces an expression ʾAwəlibṭos (Lapathus) reigned in the time of 'Aḡiyəstu by an expression ʾAwəṣu (Lapathus) reigned in the land of 'Aḡiyəstu. This emendation was suggested by August Dillmann. Zotenberg comments on this, noting that this passage causes problems and can hardly be understood; he was not able to restore the original writing of this word, despite having taken into consideration the texts John Malalas, John of Antioch and by George Cedrenus. Charles proposes identification with 'Aegistheus' in his translation and also points that 'this identification is most doubtful'.

However, this reading, proposed by Dillmann, is attested in the Amharic version:

In the time of Samson a king named 'Awalibṭos (Lapathus) reigned in the land of 'Awegəstu.

There is another emendation by Zotenberg in Chapter 89:

He translates:

Ils se rendirent ensuite à la maison de Julienne qui était de la famille de l'empereur Léon, afin de proclamer empereur son mari, nommé Ariobinde.

This passage ('to proclaim her husband emperor') is not attested in any studied Ethiopic manuscript, but it is present in the Amharic version:

They went to the house of Yulyānā to appoint her husband emperor. And his name was 'Awonəstu.

These three cases representing shared innovations lead to a conclusion that the Amharic translation was done from Zotenberg's edition. His publication appeared in 1883, and Mondon-Vidailhet went to Ethiopia in 1891-1892. From the chronological point of view, it is possible that by the time Mondon-Vidailhet collected these two

---

245 MS A, ff. 72v-73r; MS B, fol. 55v; MS C, ff. 112v-113r; MS D, p. 14; MS G, fol. 52v.
246 Zotenberg 1883, 165-166, n. 5.
247 Charles 1916, 34, n. 2. For my suggestion on this passage, see p. 47 of my translation.
248 Zotenberg 1883, 144.
249 Zotenberg 1883, 376.
250 Zotenberg 1883, 376.
251 MS A, fol. 109v; MS B, fol. 82r; MS C, fol. 141v; MS D, p. 89; MS G, fol. 75r.
252 MS E, fol. 49r.
manuscripts the edition had already arrived in Ethiopia. I would personally suggest that it was even brought by Mondon-Vidailhet himself, and that he prompted this translation into Amharic because of his strong interest in the Amharic language.

One can eliminate these two Amharic manuscripts from the text reconstruction as descripti. Despite their low philological value for the text reconstruction of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*, they deliver some insights into the process of text transmission and represent interesting documents of the Amharic language.
Chapter 2: Introduction to the Text-Critical Edition of the Chronicle

The main goal of my PhD-project is the preparation of a new edition of a text portion of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*. This text portion includes Introduction, Table of Contents, and first eighty Chapters of the main text which corresponds approximately to fifty per cent of the whole text of the *Chronicle*. For my editorial practice I have chosen the so-called genealogical-reconstructive method, also known as the common-error or (Neo-)\textsuperscript{253} Lachmannian method. The method inaccurately ascribed to the outstanding German Classicist and Germanist Karl Lachmann (1793-1851) is a product of a collective effort of philologists at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{254}

The genealogical-reconstructive method, based mostly on formal logic and calculus of probability designates a set of operations and techniques with a purpose of establishing genealogical relationships between all available text witnesses. Based on this genealogical tree, or *stemma codicum*, of manuscripts a philologist can weight high- and low-ranking copies and properly evaluate equally acceptable readings.

The main principle of genealogical-reconstructive method, states that if two or more copies share a monogenetic error (or an innovation, the term some philologists prefer),\textsuperscript{255} it is likely that these copies are related. This kind of error is called conjunctive. Conjunctive errors could be only of monogenetic nature that means they could not have been done independently by two or more copyists (or at least that the probability of this is so low that it could be disregarded). Polygenetic errors instead could have been made independently, for example, omissions of single words, or even of larger passages in the case of *homoioteleuton*.\textsuperscript{256}

\textsuperscript{253} The Italian term ‘neo-lachmannismo’ mostly refers to the Italian philological school, strating from Pasquali, which provides the Lachmannian method with certain modifications. See, for example, Trovato 2014, 18.


\textsuperscript{255} Ben Salemans prefers to use the term common (derived) changes (Salemans 2000, 19).

\textsuperscript{256} I do not intend to discuss in this paper the theoretical issues raised by this method, but I want to briefly remark the matter of whether several shared polygenetic errors can be regarded as one monogenetic error. Here one can apply probability calculus to evaluate how high or low the probability is that in this particular text material two independent copyists could have made same several errors independently. If
Disjunctive errors (also known as separative errors, Trennfehler, errore separativo) indicate that a manuscript which contains such an error, could not have been the Vorlage for a manuscript which has the correct reading instead. A disjunctive error should be one which could not have been corrected by the scribe independently while copying. For the sake of greater accuracy, I do not consider any errors which could have been corrected using the context as disjunctive.

Based on these and many other principles a stemma codicum might be reconstructed. The stemma codicum is supposed to indicate clearly, as much as possible, genealogical relationships between surviving witnesses. Stemma codicum does not depict the actual history of the text transmission. One should be aware that it is mostly not clear what part of the whole textual transmission the surviving witnesses constitute. An archetype in the reconstructed stemma codicum should represent a manuscript from which all surviving manuscripts appear to derive. Based on the stemma codicum, one should try to reconstruct this archetype as accurately as possible which however would represent the lost original text to an unknown extant.

2.1 Description of the Witnesses

In my current edition I tried to include all witnesses of the Chronicle, to which I could gain access, either direct or indirect. All in all, I was able to gather evidence on eight manuscripts with the text of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu. Six of them are in Ethiopic, and two of them are in the Amharic language. According to the common practice the surviving witnesses are labeled with capital letters A, B, C, D, G, (and M) for manuscripts in Ethiopic and E and F for the Amharic version. For my edition I

two or more manuscripts share a relatively big number of accidentals, it could point to the existence of a relationship between them. In other words, an association of several polygenetic errors could be regarded as one monogenetic error in specific cases. I had no need to apply this principle in my current study, but for some cases it might be useful.

257 Those studies of textual criticism I found useful include Maas 1957; West 1973; Kenney 1974; Foulet und Speer 1979; Timpanaro 2005, Trovato 2014.

258 For the Amharic version, see Chapter 1.5 of the current work.

259 There is evidence for existence of this manuscript; however, I had no access to it.

260 I learned about the manuscript designated by me with siglum G and the possible existence of the manuscript designated by me with siglum M, after I came upon manuscripts in Amharic, the sigla of which I preferred to preserve. This fact explains certain inconsistency in ascribing of sigla.
preferred to continue the tradition of Zotenberg in labeling, so my sigla A and B correspond to those sigla by Zotenberg.

A  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Éthiopien 123, seventeenth century, ff. 62r-138v, with colophon. It is a parchment manuscript with a text written in three columns which was dated back to the seventeenth century by Zotenberg based on its palaeography. It was handed over to the Bibliothèque nationale de France by a traveler named Charles-Xavier Rochet d’Héricourt after his third journey to Ethiopia in the middle of the nineteenth century.

B  London, British Library, Or. 818, first half of the eighteenth century, ff. 48r-103r, with colophon. It is a parchment manuscript with a text written in three columns. This manuscript was dated back to the first half of the eighteenth century by Wright basing on its palaeography. It is a part of the manuscript collection from Maqdalā which was handed over to the Trustees of the British Museum on the 28 August 1868.

C  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, d’Abbadie 31, 1766, ff. 104r-164r, with colophon. It is a parchment manuscript with the writing laid out in three columns, and a colophon mentioning Maḥerkā Dǝngǝl. This copy is a part of a rich manuscript collection gathered by Antoine d’Abbadie during his stay in Ethiopia and adjoining regions in 1837-1848.

D  Rome, Biblioteca dell’Accademia nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana, fund Conti Rossini 27, pp. 1-120, twentieth century. Incomplete, it lacks the Introduction, Table of Contents and Chapters 103-122. The manuscript is a European ledger with lined

261 Cp. Zotenberg 1877a, 222-249, no. 146. In a forthcoming contribution Massimo Villa suggests a possible redating of this manuscript to the eighteenth century (Villa forthcoming).

262 Zotenberg 1877a, 249.


264 Wright 1877, 297-314, no. 391.

265 Wright 1877, 297.

266 Wright 1877, vi.

267 Maxime Rodinson also used the siglum for the manuscript from d’Abbadies’s collection in his contribution to Chapter 90 and 91 (Rodinson 1974, 127-37).

268 Conti Rossini reads this date as: ‘l’an 7182 des martyrs (lire: “du monde”= A.D. 1690)’, which I suppose to be a mistake (Conti Rossini 1914, 207).

269 d’Abbadie 1859, 37-40; Chaîne 1912, 19-20; Conti Rossini 1914, 207-208, no. 209.

270 See Chapter 1.4 of the current work.


272 Strelcyn 1976, 100-102.
paper, with single-column script written in European black ink. Taking into consideration the material features of this manuscript it is probable that this copy was produced on the request of Conti Rossini during his stay in Eritrea in 1899-1903.  

G Collegeville, MN, Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, Ethiopic Manuscript Microfilm Library 7919, which Jeremy R. Brown, from The Catholic University of America, Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures, dated back to the early eighteenth century, ff. 49r-98v, with colophon, and the main text preceding the Table of Contents.  

It is a parchment manuscript written in three columns. This manuscript was filmed during the EMML project in 1973-1994, and was again scanned by the HMML team in 2005. Currently the manuscript is stored in the National Museum in Addis Ababa; no information on its previous location is so far available.

This manuscript has some peculiarities not common for other studied manuscripts containing the text of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu. It has many marginal notes, despite the omitted passages, possibly referring to the text of the Chronicle (ff. 49r, 50v, 59r, 68v, 72r, 97r). Marginal notes written on ff. 70r, 74r, 79r, 80r, 89r, 94r, 97v seem to be in Greek, or in another language which I could not identify. The numbering of Chapters is duplicated later in Arabic numbers. Fol. 84v is blank, f. 71rv seems to have been written by another hand, there is a caesura in the text on fol. 71v with a decoration, but on fol. 72r the text continues further.

This siglum is assigned for a further probable text witness to the Ethiopic version of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu on which I was told by Hagos Abrha during the 20th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies in Mekelle, Ethiopia in October 2018.

It appears to be preserved in እንፋርንሽ፡አምባባሚም፡ʾƎnfrānzʾAmbā Māryām in Gondar. I was told on the existence of a certain printed document in Amharic with a list of manuscripts preserved in this monastery. Amongst these manuscripts a certain

---

273 Although I have found no clear statement concerning this precise manuscript, there is a statement by Strelcyn that ‘une part très importante de cette collection a été copiée par lui ou pour lui’ (Strelcyn 1976, ix). Colin states that this manuscript was copied for or by Conti Rossini, however with providing any reference (Colin 1995, 45).

274 For more information on the manuscript, see Brown und Elagina forthcoming.

275 This manuscript was not accessed and so not involved into the text editing.

276 I express my deep gratitude to Hagos Abrha for sharing this information with me.

277 Unfortunately, this document was lost, and I had no opportunity to study it by myself. For the same reason, I can’t provide any bibliographical reference for it.
manuscript is designated as የሆስ ዋልደ፡ መደብ ብር፡ የሆስ ዋልداء ብ ስለ በሆስ ብሩ፡ የሆስ ዋልداء ብ ስለ በሆስ ብሩ with ‘John, son of Madabbar’), የሆስ ዋልداء ብ ስለ በሆስ ብሩ being the traditional way to refer to the Chronicle of John of Nikiu in the Ethiopic tradition. The extension of the title into የሆስ ዋልداء ብ ስለ በሆስ ብሩ might be a later interpretation. When Hagos Abrha, after having consulted the list of manuscripts preserved in this monastery, arrived there in 2012, he was shown a certain manuscript amongst others which was claimed to contain the text known as የሆስ ዋልداء ብ ስለ በሆስ ብሩ. Unfortunately, he was not able to check the content of this manuscript to be sure that this manuscript in fact contains the Chronicle of John of Nikiu. For the reason of its inaccessibility this manuscript is by now excluded from my research, however, gaining access to this manuscript would be one of the main goals for my further research on the Chronicle in the coming years.

The indirect transmission of the Chronicle includes a translation into Amharic, as well as the Ethiopian hagiographies of John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria. As MSS E and F, representing the Amharic version of the Chronicle, as discussed above, are discarded from the reconstruction as descripti, I do not list them here. Concerning both hagiographies, in my PhD-Project I consider only the Vita of Cyril of Alexandria, because it is of relevance for the portion of text I prepared for my edition.

I was able to collect information on the following witnesses of the Vita of Cyril of Alexandria:

H(101,113),(895,993)

I

Veronika Six writes on this particular text as follows:

Ein Vergleich mit dem Text von Bl. 9rb-10va der Handschrift ጫስጿሔ 37 = ከሔራን 37 [vgl. VOHD XX 1, 169 (Nr. 5)], der eine Zusammenstellung aus dem ከስፋስጺ, aus ያሁﻧስ.
Madabbar, Abušāker and Giyorgis Walda ‘Amid ist, hat keine Identität der Texte ergeben, obwohl Ähnlichkeiten (auch in der Formulierung) vorhanden sind.\textsuperscript{283}

However, the digital copy of the folia does not contain the text described in the catalogue, or any related text as well. It seems that a certain error occurred. The manuscript is foliated, so the foliation error is not very probable. The excerpts provided in catalogue don’t show any similarity with the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu}. It might be that this particular text doesn’t represent an indirect witness to the \textit{Chronicle}. However, a detailed analysis of this manuscript will be included in the future research.

\textbf{J} Collegeville, MN, Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, Ethiopic Manuscript Microfilm Library 688, a paper manuscript dated 20 Genbot 1955 EC (= 28 May 1963 CE) on fol. 180a, ff. 1r.-4v.\textsuperscript{284}

\textbf{K} Collegeville, MN, Hill Museum & Manuscript Library, Ethiopic Manuscript Microfilm Library 747, a parchment manuscript dated 1919 EC (= 1926-27 CE) on fol. 145b, ff. 1r.-4v.\textsuperscript{285}

\textbf{L} Island Kǝbrǝn, Church Kǝbrǝn Gabrǝ’el, Tǝnǝsee 37 = Kebrǝn 37. It is a parchment manuscript datable to the beginning of the eighteenth century, ff. 9r.-10v.\textsuperscript{286}

Today the microfilm of this manuscript is available in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preßische Kulturbesitz, in the Department of Oriental Manuscripts.

The \textit{Vita of Cyril of Alexandria}, as it appears in MSS HJKL, starts with a citation of the whole Chapter 79 of the \textit{Chronicle of John of Nikiu}\textsuperscript{287} referring, and correctly, to the number of Chapter. The latter is of interest because at least four of the manuscripts I collated, namely ABDG, have a numbering mistake, and MS C has a lacuna instead of a number (or the number is rubricated and is not readable due to the quality of reproduction). Interestingly, all studied witnesses of the \textit{Chronicle} mention the name of Cyril of Alexandria in this Chapter only once. On the contrary, three witnesses of the indirect tradition, namely MSS HJK contain the name of Cyril instead of St Theophilus in 79.13, thus the last sentences of Chapter 79 appear to refer to Cyril instead of St Theophilus.\textsuperscript{288}

\textsuperscript{283} Six 1989, 95.

\textsuperscript{284} Cp. Macomber 1976, 446.


\textsuperscript{287} The text itself is referred to as \textit{윤ሐንስ፡መደበር׃} (\textit{Yoḥannas madabbar}).

\textsuperscript{288} MS H, fol. 3vb; MS J, fol. 2ra; MS K, fol. 1vb; Cp., MS A, fol. 89ra; MS B, fol. 67vb; MS C, fol. 125vc; MS D, p. 47; MS G, fol. 62rc.
The *Vita of John Chrysostom* represents the indirect tradition of Chapter 84 of the *Chronicle*’s text and so is excluded by now from my research. I am going to include this text in the preparation of the critical edition of the whole text of the *Chronicle* in future. According to Witakowski, at least eighteen manuscripts containing this text are known, the earliest one dating back to the seventeenth century.\(^{289}\)

Both texts contain short notes on which sources they are based, namely *Synaxarium*, *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*, ‘Abušākər\(^{290}\) and Walda ʿAmid.\(^{291}\)

### 2.2 Stemma Codicum

Evaluating the results of my collation,\(^{292}\) I could define clearly two groups of manuscripts based on conjunctive errors. One of these groups consists of MSS A and B, which were used by Zotenberg for his edition. This result underlines once more the importance of a new critical edition of the *Chronicle*, because these manuscripts share a number of errors (mostly omissions), which were either obvious to the editor or came to light only through a comparison of them with the three other Ethiopic manuscripts. Zotenberg in the introduction to his edition points to the strong relation between A and B and suggests that they either derive from a common ancestor or the one is a copy of the other:

> Ces deux exemplaires, qui datent de la fin du XVII\(^{e}\) siècle ou du commencement du XVIII\(^{e}\), ne diffèrent que par des variants d’importance secondaire; la resemblance est si complète que parfois un mot écrit, par erreur, deux fois, se trouve répété dans l’une et l’autre copie. Par conséquent, il y a lieu de croire que les deux manuscrits ont une source commune ou que l’un a été copié sur l’autre.\(^{293}\)

Further on he discusses on a case in Chapter 90. In the passage: ʰፅፋፅ ነፒፀ; ʰፅፋፅ ነፒፋ;\(^{294}\) MS A has ʰፅፋፅ ነፒፋ instead of ʰፅፋፅ ነፒፀ and B has ʰፅፋፅ ነፒፋ. Zotenberg proposes that the reading ነፒፋ in A could be an attempt to

---

\(^{289}\) Witakowski 2008, 224-225.


\(^{291}\) “Giyorgis Wäldä ʿAmid”, *EAe*, II (2005), 812b–814a (U. Pietruschka).

\(^{292}\) Although I edited just a portion of the *Chronicle*’s text, I collated the full text of all available manuscripts.

\(^{293}\) Zotenberg 1883, 8.

\(^{294}\) MS A, fol. 114r; MS B, fol. 85v; MS C, fol. 145v; MS D, fol. 100; MS G, fol. 78r.
correct a mistake in MS B which omits the letter ያ. He concludes that B could have been a Vorlage for A.295

However, such a case can also be explained through the existence of a common ancestor (subarchetype), which already contained the false reading መንሥኒ፡. In that case, it could have been that the scribe of MS B copied this reading automatically as it is (as it occurs often in the text transmission), and the copyist of MS A recognized that something was missing and tried to correct an error. In any case I do not consider this case sufficiently plausible to establish a relationship between manuscripts. Charles in the introduction to his translation writes on the relationship between the witnesses as follows:

These two manuscripts are not copies of the same manuscript, but are derived, and not distantly, from one and the same exemplar.296

In short, he claimed that MSS AB have a common ancestor, but that they are not direct copies of this ancestor. Unfortunately, Charles does not provide further evidence for this assertion. In my opinion MSS AB derive from a common ancestor (subarchetype). First, they share some conjunctive errors. One conjunctive error for MSS AB is in Chapter 18.1 which discusses King Sabacon (also called Shabaka). Both manuscripts have the following text:

ወእምድኅሬሁ፡ነግሠ፡ላዕለ፡ሀገረ፡ሀገር፡ስዋኬን፡ንጉሠ፡ህንድ፡፶ዓመት፡297
And after him Sabacon, the king of India, reigned over the country of the country (the city of the city) for fifty years.

The passage ቦር፡ቄሬ፡ (‘the country of the country’, ‘the city of the city’) does not make much sense and was recognized by Zotenberg as an error in his edition; he emends as follows:

ወእምድኅሬሁ፡ነግሠ፡ላዕለ፡ሀገረ፡ግብጽ፡ስዋኬን፡ንጉሠ፡ህንድ፡፶ዓመት፡298
And after him Sabacon, the king of India, reigned over the country of Egypt for fifty years.

His emendation generally corresponds to the variant found in MSS CDG:

ወእምድኅሬሁ፡ነግሠ፡ላዕለ፡ሀገረ፡ምስር፡ስዋኬን፡ንጉሠ፡ህንድ፡፶ዓመት፡299
And after him Sabacon, the king of India, reigned over the country of Egypt for fifty years.

Another conjunctive error is found in Chapter 30.3, MSS AB read:
And when one of the Jews asked the diviner Taninus […] that is in the Heaven, the Immortal, the First.

This passage seems to be corrupt, and Zotenberg provides his emendation:

And when one of the Jews asked the diviner Taninus, he heard the words, that he is the God of Jews who is in the Heaven, the Immortal, the First.

However, MSS CDG have the following reading:

And when one of the Jews asked the diviner Taninus, he heard the words, that he is in the Heaven, the Immortal, the First.

In this case MSS CDG seem to have the right reading, while MSS AB share a conjunctive error, for the omission of the passage is of no *homoioiteleuton* nature:

The third case I provide here is an omission in Chapter 98, in a passage a certain worshipper of demons, Paulinus is mentioned. MSS AB read:

Zotenberg provides with an emendation changing *rationes* into *rationes* and translates so:

prétendant que l’empereur Maurice tolérait ces pratiques

Charles follows this and provides his translation:

However, MSS CDG provide the following reading:

302 MS A, fol. 70v; MS B, fol. 54r.
301 Zotenberg applies square brackets for restored passages.
303 Zotenberg 1883, 38.
304 This passage is not included into the edited portion of the text.
305 MS A, fol. 122r; MS B, fol. 91r.
306 Zotenberg 1883, 179.
307 Zotenberg 1883, 414.
308 Charles 1916, 161.
309 MS C, fol. 151v; MS D, p. 116; MS G, fol. 84r.
And he said falsely: ‘I am Christian’, and exercised sorcery. But the emperor Maurice ignored him in this practice.

I evaluate the reading in MSS CDG as the right one, and the case in MSS AB as another conjunctive error. Besides such errors which I evaluate as monogenetic ones, MSS AB share also a very large number of omissions of single words and some transpositions – cases which also could be of polygenetic nature. However, the number of shared omissions of single words in MSS AB is so great that I consider it improbable that they could all have been made independently. Using the search function in the Classical Text Editor, the software I use for my edition, I counted these cases. According to my collation and further search, MSS AB share fifty-three omissions of one or two words, disregarding cases of homoiooteleuton or omissions of the word ከፀፋ: (‘chapter’).

Another unanswered question is the relationship between MS A and MS B. Three variants are possible: 1) MS A derives from MS B; 2) MS B derives from MS A; 3) MSS AB derive from a common subarchetype. As I have mentioned above both manuscripts were dated back to the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries based on palaeography. This makes it difficult in this case to evaluate which manuscript is younger and so exclude at least one possible relation logically. I found some cases where MS B has better readings than MS A. The first such disjunctive error is in a short description of Chapter 2 (0.2). MS A reads:

\[
 \text{በእንተ፡ ኢስማት፡ ወከቀብተ፡ ወሐይ፡ ወወርኅ፡} \text{ } 311
\]

Concerning the names and the stars of the sun and the moon.

This seems to be a corrupt reading. MSS BCG have a better reading:

\[
 \text{በእንተ፡ ኢስማት፡ ወከቀብተ፡ ወሐይ፡ ወወርኅ፡} \text{ } 312
\]

Concerning the names of stars, the sun and the moon.

Another example of a disjunctive error is found in the short description of Chapter 51 (0.51). MSS BCG have the following reading:

\[
 \text{በእንተ፡ መንግሥተ፡ ረርሽ፡ የሸሥ፡} \text{ } 313
\]

Concerning the kingdom of the king Cyrus.

MS A has ከርሬ፡ instead of ረርሽ፡, which is the wrong form of the proper name. This is the first mention of this person in the text; and the right form is not to be

---

312 Zotenberg 1877b, pp. 222-249; Wright 1877, pp. 297-314; for a possible redating of both manuscripts to the eighteenth century, see Villa forthcoming.

311 MS A, fol. 62r.

312 MS B, fol. 48r; MS C, fol. 104r; MS G, fol. 96r; MS D lacks this part.

313 MS B, fol. 48v; MS C, fol. 105r; MS G, fol. 96v; MS D lacks this part.
found nearby, so that the copyist was not able to correct the form of the name while copying. The next case of a disjunctive error is in Chapter 50.1. MSS BCDG read:

Before he burnt the sanctuary of God with fire, Jeremiah entered the second chamber which is called the Holy of Holies.

But MS A has የርምያስ፡ (‘Jeremiah’) instead of ከርርምም፡ (‘Jeremiah’):

Before he burnt the sanctuary of God with fire, he entered Jerusalem (and) the second chamber which is called the Holy of Holies.

In this case it is, however, probable that the error could have been corrected, because this episode is well-known outside of the Chronicle. On the other hand, the reading in MS A is not a striking mistake.

Taking into account all three cases and also some other smaller mistakes introduced in MS A, it seems unlikely that MS A was a Vorlage for MS B. Concerning the possibility of a relation the other way round, I have so far found one case where MS A preserved, as I suggest, a better reading than MS B. This case is found in a short description of Chapter 89 (0.89) on the banishment of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch (which corresponds to Chapter 90 of the main text) and is an example of diffraction in praeentia according to my evaluation. MS A reads:

Concerning the prayer he (Severus) made upon the people of Alexandria and Constantinople regarding the evil the emperor Justin had done.

MSS BG have the following reading instead, mentioning only the people of Constantinople:

Concerning the prayer he (Severus) made upon the people of Constantinople regarding the evil the emperor Justin had done.

314 MS A, fol. 62v.
315 MS B, fol. 56r; MS C, fol. 113r; MS D, p. 15; MS G, fol. 52v.
316 MS A, fol. 73r.
317 MS A, fol. 65v.
318 MS B, fol. 50v; MS G, fol. 98r.
This reading was preferred by Zotenberg in his edition.\textsuperscript{319} MS C has the third variant mentioning only the people of Alexandria:

\footnotesize{መበእንተ፡ ወእለት፡ ወገብራ፡ ወበእንተ፡ ወኑለ፡ ወስክንድሩ፡ ወእከይ፡ ወገብራ፡ ይሰብአ፡ ከሆስኗም።} \textsuperscript{320}

Concerning the prayer he (Severus) made upon the people of Alexandria regarding the evil the emperor Justin had done.

MS D does not include this part of the text. I suggest that MS A has the right reading, and MSS BCG preserved the right reading only partially. MS A has the right reading also from a historical point of view – Severus first stayed in Alexandria, in Egypt, and in 535-536 he went to Constantinople.\textsuperscript{321} From the context this right reading couldn’t have been restored, either using the short description of Chapter or the Chapter itself. The only grounds for doubt is the fact that both cities, Constantinople and Alexandria, are mentioned very frequently in the text, and an automatic exchange of the city names can’t be completely ruled out.

MSS DG are also strongly related to each other. For example, they share longer omissions  \textsuperscript{322} ዋወሰው፡ ወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው፡ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗው׃ ዋወስኗowied.\textsuperscript{323} in Chapter 95 which are of no homoioitelenon nature, as well as some additional, smaller omissions in Chapters 89.87\textsuperscript{324} and 90.90.\textsuperscript{325} As MS D is of much more recent date than MS G, only two possibilities remain open: either MS G was the Vorlage of MS D, or they derive from a common subarchetype. MS G introduces some minor, often obvious, omissions in comparison with MS D which could have been restored using, for example, context. However, I could not find any case of a disjunctive (separative) error, which would point to the existence of a common subarchetype. Consequently I stand by the assumption that MS D derives from MS G.

There are several cases which potentially could point to the existence of a common subarchetype for MSS C and G. The first such case is in a short description of Chapter 120. MSS AB has the following reading:

\textsuperscript{319} Zotenberg 1883, 22.
\textsuperscript{320} MS C, fol. 107r.
\textsuperscript{321} Brock und Fitzgerald 2013, 5-7.
\textsuperscript{322} MS D, p. 109; MS G, fol. 81r.
\textsuperscript{323} MS D, p.110; MS G, fol. 81v.
\textsuperscript{324} MS D, p. 91; MS G, fol. 75v.
\textsuperscript{325} MS D, p. 102; MS G, fol. 79r.
Concerning Cyrus, the archbishop of Chalcedonians, that it was he who went to Babylon and to Amr (Amr), chief of the Muslims, and brought it/him on a ship and delivered it/him into his hands.

The passage is obscure, for it is not clear what or whom he (who?) embarked on a ship and delivered into the mentioned hands. Zotenberg, apparently basing on the text of Chapter 120 itself, emends the text:

Concerning Cyrus, the archbishop of Chalcedonians, that it was he who went to Babylon and to Amr (Amr), chief of the Muslims, and brought [tribute] on a ship and delivered it into his hands.

This emendation is very logical and is wholly supported by the content of Chapter 120 which tells that Cyrus went to Muslims to Babylon in order to offer them tribute and so to establish peace. But MSS C and G read:

Concerning Cyrus, the archbishop of Chalcedonians, that it was he who went to Babylon and to Amr (Amr), chief of the Muslims, and he brought it/him to Alexandria and delivered it into his hands.

This reading might also be correct. In Chapter 120 it is told that Theodore, prefect of Alexandria, brought Cyrus to Alexandria. In any case, the passage seems to me to be corrupt, and probably something is missing in both cases.

The second case of a possible conjunctive error for MSS C and G is found in Chapter 4. MSS AB read:

It is said concerning Qāynān (Cainan), son of Arphaxad (Arphaxad) who was born from Shem, the son of Noah, that he was a wise man and a shepherd. He began to write down astrolabes after the Deluge, and after him the Indians composed (them).
MSS CDG read:

It is said concerning Qāynān (Cainan), son of ʾArfāksd (Arphaxad) who was born from Shem, the son of Noah, that he was wise and intelligent man. He began to write down astrolabes after the Deluge, and after him the Indians composed (them).

“At first glance one can think that the variant in MSS AB is lectio difficilior and should be the right one. However, I have not been unable to find any mention of Cainan’s having been a shepherd in other sources. This precise passage seems to have been taken from the Book of Jubilees (Jub. 8.1-5). Cainan is, however, also listed in genealogies of Shem in the Septuagint (LXX), LXX Gen. 10.24, Gen. 11.12-13, 1 Chron. 1.18, and Lk. 3.36-37. According to the narrative in Jub. 8.1-5., Cainan discovered the knowledge of astronomy and astrology carved into a rock which the fallen angels had transmitted to humans before the Flood. This passage resembles the Chronicle of John Malalas 1.5 as well which, however, doesn’t mention Cainan as a shepherd. In my opinion MSS CDG contain the right reading while MSS AB have an error, probably, inspired by phonetic similarity. However, this suggestion can’t be regarded as the only possible evaluation of this case.

The third case is a passage on a baptism of a certain ethnic group whose identification is still vague. In Chapter 120.47 MSS AB read:

When people of Byzantium heard of that case, they were saying: ‘This is because of Qatrādas, the chief of the people Muṭāns, the nephew of Kwnāk who was baptized in the city of Constantinople and became Christian as a child and had grown up in the imperial palace’.

While MSS CG in Chapter 120.47 (D lacks the Chapter) read:

332 MS C, fols. 108rv; MS D, pp. 1-2; MS G, fol. 49r.
333 Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 4.
334 MS A, fol. 136v; MS B, fol. 101v.
335 MS C, fol. 162r; MS G, fol. 93v.
When people of Byzantium heard of that case, they were saying: ‘This is because of Quṭrādās, the chief of the people Muṭānas, the cousin of Kuṃrnāk who was baptized in the city of Constantinople and became Christian as a child and had grown up in the imperial palace’.

The passage gained much attention due to the interpretation of proper names Zotenbergen proposed in his publication of 1883 apparently based on the similarity with Breviariurom of Nikephoros.336 While in his first contributions he gave the proper names just in their transliteration,337 later he identified Quṭrādās with Kubratos, one of the chiefs of Great Bulgaria, Muṭānas with Huns, and Kuṃrnāk with Organa.338 Charles adopted this interpretation,339 which Brooks criticized strongly in his review:

A very bad case occurs on p. 197, where we read ‘Kubratos chief of the Huns the nephew of Organa’ without any hint that these names are not in the Ethiopic, and the same is the case with Zotenbergen’s final translation.340

This identification has often been contradicted by other scholars.341 The argument for Zotenbergen’s interpretation is the parallel family relation between these characters: Quṭrādās is a nephew of Kuṃrnāk, as well as Kubratos is a nephew of Organa. But the variant of MSS CG does not fit this hypothesis. Either MSS CG have the right variant, and the interpretation by Zotenbergen is false, and MSS AB compressed ꠚለደ፡እኀሁ፡ሰቡሁ፡ (‘cousin’) into ꠚለደ፡እኀወ፡ኣቡሁ፡; or if the interpretation is right MSS CG have probably a conjunctive error. However, if the interpretation was based on a family relation as a main criterion, then I would suggest that the interpretation is false, and MSS CG have the right reading. The contribution by Mingazov from 2012 is dedicated to this problem, and the author states that accordingly Quṭrādās and Kuṃrnāk should not be identified with Kubratos and Organa.342

All these three cases cannot be evaluated by me with certainty, either they point to the existence of a common subarchetype for MSS CG, or not. A direct relation between MSS CG can be excluded. In Chapter 31.1 MSS ABDG read:

336 Beševliev 1978, 229.
337 Zotenbergen 1879, 379.
338 Zotenbergen 1883, 460.
339 Charles 1916, 197.
340 Brooks 1917, 429.
341 For the arguments for the Zotenbergen’s identification, see, for example, Marquart 1911, 7, n. 5; for the arguments against it, see, for example, Fehér 1921, 40.
342 Mingazov 2012
The king’s name was ʾAbrusubidā (Prosopis), and the interpretation of his name ‘the lover of gods with three faces’. He was on the western river bank.

MS C omits a passage in አብሩሱቢدافع፡ ያስመይ፡ ያለንጉሥሰ፡ የሚለውም፡ ያለሮታ፡ ያብዛር፡ ያለመልክት፡ 343 in Chapter 31.1 and also contains further, longer omissions, for example 51.59-60.345 On the other hand, MS G completely omits the short description of Chapter 65 (0.65)346 which is present in MS C.347

I present both variants of stemma codicum, including also the Amharic version and Zotenberg’s edition (designated by siglum Zot), as part of the text’s transmission. Siglum O designates the lost original text, while x states for the lost text witness from which all other studied (for the moment) witnesses appear to derive. Small Greek letters designate reconstructed sub-archetypes. The percentages near sub-archetypes or certain witnesses designate the nominal value of each branch or witness in the reconstruction of the text, making it possible to apply the method of qualified majority for the reconstruction of the text.

If we assume that in the above-mentioned cases MSS AB introduced errors and MSS CG (and D when the text is present) preserved the right readings, then the stemma codicum would be as follows:

Stemma codicum I (first hypothesis)

\[
\begin{align*}
O \quad & \quad \text{Siglum O designates the lost original text.} \\
\times \quad & \quad \text{Siglum x designates the lost text witness.} \\
\alpha \quad & \quad 33\% \quad \text{C} \quad & \quad 33\% \quad \text{G} \quad & \quad 33\% \\
\text{A} \quad & \quad 16.5\% \quad \text{B} \quad & \quad 16.5\% \quad \text{D} \\
\text{Z} \quad & \quad \text{F} \\
\text{E} \\
\text{MS A, fol. 71r; MS B, fol. 54r; MS D, p. 10; MS G, fol. 51v.} \\
\text{MS A, fol. 111v.} \\
\text{MS C, fols. 114v-115r.} \\
\text{MS G, fol. 97r.} \\
\text{MS C, fol. 105v.}
\end{align*}
\]
In this case if a certain variant is attested in MSS CG, but α has another one, then according to the nominal weight, the probability that the variant of MSS CG is the right one corresponds to 66%, but that of α to still 33%.

But if we suggest that the three above discussed variants represent a common error for MSS CG, then it would indicate the existence of a common subarchetype for them, this assumption influences the stemma codicum and the nominal weight of witnesses drastically.

Stemma codicum II (second hypothesis)

As I have mentioned above both variants of the stemma codicum are possible under certain assumptions. I base my reconstruction of the text of the Chronicle on the first hypothesis of the stemma codicum, because in my opinion the existence of a common subarchetype for MSS CG could not be stated with certainty. From both variants the Amharic version as well as MS D could be eliminated as copies of preserved witnesses (eliminatio codicum descriptorum).

2.3 Text Reconstruction

Critical reconstruction of a text is subdivided into two aspects – reconstruction of a textual substance and reconstruction of a textual form. Under a textual substance one understands readings which influence the meaning of a text, while reconstruction of a
textual form deals with linguistic, stylistical, and purely graphical aspects. For the reconstruction of both layers I rely on my stemma codicum. I chose among equally acceptable readings applying the principle of qualified majority. The difference in reconstruction of substance and form might be expressed using a simple example from the text. The short description of Chapter 8 reads:

Chapter 8. Concerning him who began the construction of the city of Nineveh; and concerning him who married his own mother.

Here the actual graphical variant I preferred is attested only in MS C, i.e. which nominal weight corresponds to 33%. However, if one distinguishes between the layer of substance (‘eight’ instead of ‘seven’) and the layer of form (spelled-out form instead of a numeral), the situation appears to be different. The variant ‘eight’ (substance) is attested in C and α, so its nominal weight corresponds to 66%. The spelled-out form is attested in C and G, so that its nominal weight corresponds to 66% as well.

Concerning the process of the text reconstruction, I should make a note on my workflow with the text. In my workflow I tried to follow the historical development of the text. Accordingly, I began the proper analysis, reconstruction and translation with the main part of the text, for it was written earlier than the Introduction with the Table of Contents. After having finished with Chapters 1-80, I continued working with the Table of Contents, constantly comparing the main text with the summary in the Table of Contents. All my observations are to be found in the footnotes to the translation.

Concerning the emendations, I propose in the text, there is a methodological issue I want to touch upon. My goal is to attempt a reconstruction of an Ethiopic archetype from which all known witnesses appear to derive. In accordance with that I have to decide every time at what stage of the text transmission this or that innovation might have taken place: in the original text, in the Arabic version, or in the Ethiopic one. I undertake an emendation of the text only when it seems probable to me that the innovation was introduced in the Ethiopic version. I would like to illustrate this approach with two examples. The first one is situated in Chapter 7:

348 In some cases, it is not very clear how these two layers may be delimited.

349 MS A, fol. 62v; MS B, fol. 48r; MS C, fol. 104r; MS D lacks this part; MS G, fol. 96r.
Chapter 7. 1. Moreover Picus, i.e. Nirus (Zeus), was the first to marry his own sister. 2. He begat by her a son named Belus. And he resembled his grandfather Cronus. 3. This Belus reigned over Assyria after his father <Rāʾan> (Zeus) and his grandfather Cronus. 4. Moreover after he died Persians worshipped him together with gods.

My emendation <ረአን፡> is based on the form of the proper name Zeus mentioned also in Chapter 6.3. This emendation also corresponds in its substance to the text of the Chronicle of John Malalas.351

Zotenberg proposes another emendation:

He translates this passage as follows:

who ruled in Assyria after the disappearance of his father and his grandfather Cronus.

Charles basing on the text of Chronicon Paschale suggests:

Text reads ‘appearance’: we must therefore, add h, before ɾ-e-f.354

He translates the text according to his emendation as follows:

And this Belus rules in Assyria after the disappearance of his father and his grandfather Cronus.355

In this case I emend the text because it appears that such a corruption took place in the Ethiopic text already. The name of Zeus was transliterated, already erroneously, from Arabic as ɾ-e-f. Later on the copyists altered this name, likely due to the graphical similarity of some letters.

Another example I want to discuss here is situated in Chapter 59.10. Manuscripts read as follows:

He also appointed Ptolemy who was named Baylāgos, king of the land of Egypt.

Zotenberg explains the strange form of the name Lagus, i.e. Baylāgos, either through a misinterpretation of an Arabic preposition, or through a preservation of

352 MS A, fol. 67v; MS B, fol. 51v-52r; MS C, fol. 108v; MS D, fol. 2; MS G, fol. 49r.
351 Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 7.
352 Zotenberg 1883, 29.
353 Zotenberg 1883, 243.
354 Charles 1916, 18, n. 1.
355 Charles 1916, 18.
356 MS A, fol. 77v; MS B, fol. 59r; MS C, fol. 116v; MS D, fol. 24; MS G, fol. 55v.
However, according to John Malalas 8.6 Ptolemy was son of Lagus.

I suggest that the prefix Ṣe: in Ṣaylāgos is rather a misinterpreted Arabic ح (‘son’). In this case, the Arabic version still had the right reading ‘Ptolemy, son of Lagus’. During translation the Arabic text was interpreted incorrectly, creating a strange form Ṣaylāgos instead of Ṣaylār: Ṣaylā. Then the word Ṣaylāpp: was inserted into the Ethiopic text, probably at the stage of the translation as well, as if the person had two alternative names. In this case, thus I could provide a more intelligible, and reconstructable, reading Ṣaylāpp: Ṣaylār: Ṣaylā: I preserve the original reading instead. It appears that the Ethiopic text never attested the reading Ṣaylāpp: Ṣaylār: Ṣaylā: (or a comparable one), because the innovation had already taken place during the composition of the Ethiopic version.

2.4. Note on the Linguistic Features of the Ethiopic Version of the Chronicle

In this subchapter I summarize briefly some, most peculiar, linguistic features of the Ethiopic text of the portion of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu I edited. First of all, the text might contain some not well-documented lexical items. For example, at the very beginning of the text, in its Introduction there is a word እምሔይው: for ‘grandfather’. By now I consider this reading a spelling variant, not an error.

There are several cases of systematic gender disagreement in the text. If in some cases such disagreement might be explained through an accidental error, in others, it seemed to be rather systematic. I can’t exclude that this disagreement might have some stylistic purposes. Mostly, masculine forms are applied where feminine forms are expected. So, nouns naturally being of feminine gender (for example, ‘women’) are

357 Zotenberg 1883, 283, n. 3.
358 Jeffreys u. a. 1986, 103.
359 MS A, fol. 62r; MS B, fol. 48r; MS C, fol. 104r; MS G, fol. 96r; MS D lacks this part.
360 MS A, fol. 67v; MS B, fol. 52r; MS C, fol. 108v; MS G, fol. 49r; MS D, p. 2.
361 As, for example, in Chapter 56.10 (MS A, fol. 76v; MS B, fol. 58v; MS C, fol. 116r; MS G, fol. 54v; MS D, p. 22), where I propose a conjecture.
accompanying with verbs in masculine form, as for example, in Chapter 0.71,\textsuperscript{362} 35.3,\textsuperscript{363} 56.15.\textsuperscript{364} In Chapter 67.2\textsuperscript{365} the term ፉሮሥ: is applied to Cleopatra, when it is told on her reign in Alexandria. The manuscripts read የንጉሥ፡ የንጉሥ፡ ያስቴታ፡, thus the verb is in feminine form.

I could find only one case, in Chapter 51.15,\textsuperscript{366} where a feminine form of a word ‘enemy’, that is ወለእ፡ was applied for a man, namely for Croesus. Maybe, in this case the usage of the feminine form was intended to belittle the figure of Croesus as an enemy.

The text contains many lexical items transliterated from Arabic. So, for example Chapter 2.1 lists the names of the stars transliterated from Arabic,\textsuperscript{367} and Chapter 5.3 gives the Arabic name for the constellation of Orion.\textsuperscript{368} There are several occasions where transliteration of the Arabic word is provided alongside with its translation into Ethiopic. Thus, for example, Chapter 42.1\textsuperscript{369} reads:

\[ \text{And he put it (nail) into the sarǧ <of> a horse that is saddle.} \]

In this case የርጉሥ: sarǧ is transliteration of the Arabic ṣrsa ‘saddle’. Similar cases are found in Chapters 0.76\textsuperscript{370} and 0.77.\textsuperscript{371}

Some other minor observations on the language of the Chronicle are summarized in the footnotes to my translation.\textsuperscript{372}

\textsuperscript{362} MS A, fol. 64r; MS B, fol. 49v; MS C, fol. 105v; MS G, fol. 97r; MS D lacks this part.

\textsuperscript{363} MS A, fol. 71rv; MS B, fol. 54v; MS C, fol. 111v; MS G, fol. 51v; MS D p. 11.

\textsuperscript{364} MS A, fol. 76v; MS B, fol. 58v; MS C, fol. 116r; MS G, fol. 55r; MS D p. 22.

\textsuperscript{365} MS A, fol. 78v; MS B, fol. 59v; MS C, fol. 117v; MS G, fol. 56r; MS D p. 25.

\textsuperscript{366} MS A, fol. 74r; MS B, fol. 56v; MS C, fol. 114r; MS G, fol. 53r; MS D p. 16.

\textsuperscript{367} MS A, fol. 67r; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108r; MS G, fol. 49r; MS D p. 1.

\textsuperscript{368} MS A, fol. 67v; MS B, fol. 51v; MS C, fol. 108v; MS G, fol. 49r; MS D p. 2.

\textsuperscript{369} MS A, fol. 72v; MS B, fol. 55v; MS C, fol. 112v; MS G, fol. 52v; MS D p. 13.

\textsuperscript{370} MS A, fol. 64r; MS B, fol. 49v; MS C, fol. 105v; MS G, fol. 97r; MS D lacks this part.

\textsuperscript{371} MS A, fol. 64r; MS B, fol. 49v; MS C, fol. 106r; MS G, fol. 97r; MS D lacks this part.

\textsuperscript{372} See, for example, the translation of Chapters 0.21, 27.12, 77.21, 77.30, 77.37.
Chapter 3: Prolegomena to the Critical Edition

This Chapter contains some technical notes, and is followed by the list of bibliographical references and by my edition of the portion of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu and its translation into English. The Ethiopic text and its translation are organized in parallel; folia (and pages) of manuscripts and pages of Zotenberg’s edition are given in the margins on even pages.

3.1 Apparatus

In my edition I apply two systems for apparatus, one for the direct transmission, and another for the indirect transmission. The direct transmission is represented by a positive apparatus criticus, a positive apparatus for lectiones minores, and a separate apparatus for punctuation. The indirect transmission is documented by a single positive apparatus both for readings as well as punctuation. I disregarded orphographical variants of spelling in regard of sibillants and laryngeals. Where punctuation was concerned I followed my stemma codicum also in the reconstruction of punctuation signs. Only in some very rare cases I undertook a transposition of the punctuation signs. In particular, I distinguished between mulu nāṭəb (＃), ḏorrəb saraz (¶), and their absence. A special apparatus for punctuation indicates, however, only the presence of mulu nāṭəb (＃) and ḏorrəb saraz (¶).

In my collation I consider conjectures and readings proposed by Zotenberg374 in his edition (siglum Zot), as well as in his translation (siglum Zot’). References to the pages of his edition are given alongside the references of the folia (and pages) of manuscripts on the margins. The references to his translation are given in the apparatus criticus in brackets. Conjectures by Charles375 (siglum Cha), Nöldeke376 (siglum Nöl), and Colin377 (siglum Col) are also given in apparatus with a reference to a page and

373 MS D is paginated.
374 Zotenberg 1883. So, for example, ‘አክላኡበጥራ፡ Zot: B’ means that the reading ከክላኡበጥራ፡ is, in my opinion, attested only in MS A. Zotenberg, however, suggests that the same reading is attested in B. ‘አወዐዮን፡ Zot: ትወስ ከ ትወስ A’ means that according to Zotenberg MS A reads ትወስ, disagreeing, I provide my own variant. ‘አመተም፡ Zot’ means that the edition of Zotenberg contains the reading ከአመተም፡ without any other variants provided, of which I find no attestation.
375 Charles 1916.
376 Nöldeke 1883.
footnote if applicable. As Nöldeke provides his variants using a system of transliteration for which he provides no explanation, my interpretation of his conjecture remains hypothetical.378

3.2 Proper Names

Concerning the proper names, for the edited part of the text I mostly rely on the identifications and restorations done by Charles and Zotenberg. Where there are disagreements between them, or other contributors considered in my work, I provide this information in footnotes to the translation. I similarly indicate any identification I propose for proper names.

One of the disadvantages of the contributions by Zotenberg and Charles is the lack of an adequate transliteration of the proper names. If a proper name was identified no transliteration is provided, and transliteration (however, without explanation of the applied rules) is given only when the proper name remains non-identified. Brooks absolutely rightly pointed to one aspect of this problem in his review of the Charles’ translation:

Again, when a Greek word or name is restored by conjecture, the exact transliteration of the Ethiopic word should be given, since a reader may have a different opinion as to the word or name intended; but in this version we are frequently told merely that the text is corrupt or that the name was restored by Zotenberg.379

For the sake of clarity, I give transliteration of all proper names, disregarding how common they are, found in the portion of text I edit. The transliteration is given according to Table 1, and the rules of transliteration it presents. However, the list of the most common and less problematic proper names is provided in alphabetical order.380 It contains variants of the spelling in Ethiopic, its transliteration(s), and the corresponding English variant.381 Names from this list are not transliterated in the translation, so as to leave it more readable. If any doubts concerning the actual spelling in Ethiopic version

378 For example, Nöldeke proposes to conjecture the word ይኤት as follows: ‘so lese ich […] in Z. 3 jäatet für das jetë: „denn Fleiß […] entfernt das Leid“’ (Nöldeke 1883, 1372).
379 Brooks 1917, 429.
380 This list should not be considered as an Index.
381 If several orthographic variants are equally acceptable I prefer to use only one. So, for example, I use Belus, and not Belos, unless I provide a citation. I used The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire for controlling the spelling of some personal names (Jones u. a. 1971; Martindale 1980, 1992a, 1992b). However, this contribution is only partially applicable to the text of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu.
occur, this list may be easily consulted. Some proper names are transliterated in the translation; mostly these are names which occur rarely in the text, cause some problems, not identified, or are supposed to contain, for example, traces of the Coptic language. If a proper name can be identified, the English equivalent is written in round brackets after its transliteration.

3.3 Navigation in the Text

The Chronicle is a long text which can be divided into Introduction containing information on the author and a descriptive summary of the content, Table of Contents with a short description of each chapter and one hundred and twenty-two Chapters themselves. The Chapters vary greatly in length: some of them consist only of several lines, while others may occupy many folia. This fact makes it difficult to use the original system of Chapters for quick and easy navigation in the text. Zotenberg in his edition of 1883 did not use any additional navigating system or subdivisions. A reference can be made only to a certain page of the edition, so that it is quite difficult to find any precise word or passage in the text of the edition or its translation.

In my opinion, the length and complexity of the text make it necessary to introduce usable subdivisions. Charles took a further step on this way, having introduced further subdivisions in his translation of 1916. He divided long Chapters into passages according to the content and numbered them, the numbering restarts at the beginning of each Chapter. It is quite a useful measure, for the text became more structured and precise references can be made in regard to this translation.

In my edition I used the system of subdivisions introduced by Charles applying to the Ethiopic text as well as to the English translation. However, in some cases I find the subdivisions by Charles confusing, and that they do not always correspond to the contents. Accordingly, I undertook a number of changes of the subdivisions which I marked in the footnotes.

3.4 Translation

Regarding the translation in English, I tried to make my translation as comprehensible as possible. For the sake of readability, I tried to avoid a literal translation of the Ethiopic text. However, my attempt was to follow the Ethiopic text in its sequence and not to overinterpret it. In some cases, a proper translation is not possible due to the corruption of the text; I always mark such passages and draw attention to them in my notes.
The translation and interpretation of the Chronicle’s text is not an easy task. As Booth rightly points out the various ambiguities of the Ethiopic language aggravates the problems of an adequate translation; he also summarizes the Ethiopic lexica which causes particular problems.382 Those terms which are most problematic designate various official titles, as for example, የስሆም፡ እያሮም (‘appointee, official, governor, prefect’), መስፋን፡ መስፋን (‘ruler, governor, prince, prince, chief official, judge’), መኡንን፡ መኡንን (‘ruler, prince, governor, magistrate, officer, high official, prefect’), እግዚእ፡ እግዚእ (‘master, lord, owner, ruler, chief governor’). Not mentioned by Booth, the same problematic terms are in my opinion መልአክ፡ መልአክ (‘messenger, governor, prefect, prince, chief, captain’) and ዲሬሮ፣ ሲሬሮ፣ መሬሮ፣ ዲሬሮ፣ ዲሬሮ (‘army, troops, officers’). The identification of specific titles and concepts behind those terms is not always possible. I follow here the solution proposed by Booth for such cases and prefer to use in my translation ambiguous terms like ‘official’, ‘ruler’, ‘governor’, ‘general’, but I don’t provide the Ethiopic term in transliteration for the moment. As a common rule, one should not consider such attributes in the text as official historical titles and bear in mind their ambiguity.

Another problematic Ethiopic term is ምርር፡ ከሆር (‘town, region, province’). The precise meaning of that term might not be always drawn from the context, especially if the identification of the place name is vague.

In addition to these problematic cases already identified by Booth, I would like to mention some other Ethiopic terms which cause problems for interpretation.

For example, the terms ይስኡ፡ እልብ (‘north, south’) and ከማን፡ ከማን (‘north, south’) are ambiguous as well. Originally, ከማን፡ meant ‘south’, and as a result the high land region to the south of Axum inherited this name. Later, with the shift of the core of the Christian kingdom southwards, the word’s meaning changed and it appeared to mean ‘north’.383 Apparently, ይስኡ፡ እልብ means rather ‘direction opposite to ከማን፡ ዲሬሮ (‘north’).384 Because of this ambiguity I give a transliteration of the Ethiopic term in my translation in brackets to avoid misinterpretations.

382 Booth 2013, 645-646.
383 „Samen“, E.Ae, IV (2010), 611a–613b (J. Quirin).
3.5 Footnotes

The notes accompanying my translation are diverse in nature. They contain my own remarks on some difficult passages, alternative translations and explanations of conjectures; not only mine, but also those proposed by Zotenberg and Charles, where they give an explanation or I could deduce their logic. If I do not follow conjectures by them, I also make a note of it. I tried to include also the remarks by Zotenberg, Charles, Nöldeke, Crum and others who contributed to this part of the text. All such remarks contain bibliographical references. However, I do not make any claim of exhaustiveness in this aspect on my part, and the reader should at least consult Zotenberg’s and Charles’ contributions for more precise information. Notably, I did not include very valuable restorations and explanations of proper names done by Zotenberg into my translation. My notes also contain references to the passages from the Chronicle of John Malalas and some other written documents which show similarities with the Chronicle of John of Nikiu.

Orphographic normalization and standardization of Ethiopic is an important part of editorial practice which allows the editor to avoid disambiguation. However, for now I have left this aspect of the matter aside. All transcribed text is italicized.
List of Proper Names Not Transliterated in the Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Transliteration Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>አርሮን፡ ʾAron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>አብርሃም፡ ʾAbrāhām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absai</td>
<td>አብሳይ</td>
<td>ʾAbsāy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achaia</td>
<td>አክአይያ</td>
<td>ʾAbsāy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adah</td>
<td>እ ኪ</td>
<td>ከADā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>እ ከም</td>
<td>ʾAdām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Antonius Pius</td>
<td>እ ኰስፋ፡ እ ወ NGO ኪ፡ ʾIlyos ይንንነናን ከNGero</td>
<td>ʾIlyos ይንንነናን ከNGero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas</td>
<td>አይናስ</td>
<td>ከAynās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>ይርኔቄ</td>
<td>Farneqe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelia</td>
<td>ካኔ ወ ከይኔ ኮ ኪ</td>
<td>ካኔ ወ ከይኔ ኮ ኪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>እ ወ ከርዎር</td>
<td>እ ወ ከርዎር</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amandra</td>
<td>መንወር</td>
<td>ከMandor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amr</td>
<td>ይምር</td>
<td>ከEmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amosius</td>
<td>ይምኔብው</td>
<td>ከAmusāyus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amycus</td>
<td>ይምእትሬኳ</td>
<td>ከAmekeṭas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius</td>
<td>እ ወ ከአዱትዮስ</td>
<td>እ ወ ከአዱትዮስ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonia</td>
<td>እ ወ ከዱጋንያ</td>
<td>እ ወ ከዱጋንያ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonus</td>
<td>እ ወ ከስግኔ</td>
<td>ከAndigos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antinoe</td>
<td>እ ወ ከኡ</td>
<td>ከAndinā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>አብረትነት</td>
<td>ከAbonyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apries</td>
<td>እ ወ ከወ</td>
<td>ከAbrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>እ ከም ኪ ኪ</td>
<td>ከArgādyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadius</td>
<td>እ ከም ኪ ኪ</td>
<td>ከArgādyèwos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archelaus</td>
<td>እ ከም ኪ ኪ</td>
<td>ከArkəyāwos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argives¹</td>
<td>እ ከም ኪ ኪ</td>
<td>ከArkəyā[-]wōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristomachus</td>
<td>እ ከም ኪ ኪ</td>
<td>ከAristomakgs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This term causes some problems. See, Chapter 22 of the edited text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arius</td>
<td>Ἄριος :</td>
<td>ሆርዮስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arphaxad</td>
<td>Ἀρφαξάδ :</td>
<td>ሁርፋክስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>ἈրΜάն :</td>
<td>ሆርማንያ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes</td>
<td>Ἀρτάξερξης :</td>
<td>ለፋርፋክሲስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Ἄσία :</td>
<td>ሆይያ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyria</td>
<td>Ἀσσυриα :</td>
<td>ሁሬሥ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyages</td>
<td>Ἀστῖγης :</td>
<td>ሁንያሚን :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius</td>
<td>Ἀθανασίους :</td>
<td>ለፋስልዮስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Ἀθήνα :</td>
<td>ለቂሳር :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Ἀττική :</td>
<td>ሁንዲካ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Ἀὔγουστος :</td>
<td>ለቄሳር :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelian</td>
<td>Ἀὐրολίαν :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Ἑβύλιον :</td>
<td>ለበብሎን :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardane</td>
<td>Ἐβруч :</td>
<td>ሁንያሚን :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil</td>
<td>Ὁσία :</td>
<td>ሁስልእ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basiliscus</td>
<td>Ὁσίλισκος :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belshazzar</td>
<td>Ὁβλशᾷզ :</td>
<td>ለውጡትስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Ἡβнием :</td>
<td>ለቡንያሚን :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium</td>
<td>Ὁywaćῳ :</td>
<td>ለባրንታይ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>ὍἹاآ :</td>
<td>ለቃዕር :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarea</td>
<td>ὉἸῖα :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan</td>
<td>Ὁקנה :</td>
<td>ለጌን :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambyses</td>
<td>ὉΜῆν :</td>
<td>ለዘም :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaan</td>
<td>Ὁካና :</td>
<td>ለቃዕር :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>Ὁጎ :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappadocia</td>
<td>Ὁκպᾶداول :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcedon</td>
<td>Ὁማ 예수 :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage</td>
<td>Ὁር_fifo :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartima</td>
<td>Ὁርgiatan :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysopolis</td>
<td>ὉΧρשם :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>Ὁክlis :</td>
<td>ለቁንዳቅስ :</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Claudius: Kilqayā
Cleopatra: ራልኗያ፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል፡ እልክል_dates:

Constantia: ትስታኝስ:
Constantine: ትስታኝስ:
Constantinople: ትስታኝስ:
Constans: ትስታኝስ:
Constantius: ትስታኝስ:
Cosmas: ትስታኝስ:
Crete: ትስታኝስ:
Crispus: ትስታኝስ:
Croesus: ትስታኝስ:
Cronus: ትስታኝስ:
Cush: ትስታኝስ:
Cyprus: ትስታኝስ:
Cyrene: ትስታኝስ:
Cyril: ትስታኝስ:
Cyrus: ትስታኝስ:
Cyzieus: ትስታኝስ:
Damascus: ትስታኝስ:
Damian: ትስታኝስ:
Daniel: ትስታኝስ:
Darius: ትስታኝስ:
David: ትስታኝስ:
Decius: ትስታኝስ:

Aqlondayos: ስልኗያ:
Aklautàrà: ስልኗያ:
Aqlontanos: ስልኗያ:
Aklantanos: ስልኗያ:
Aklantayos: ስልኗያ:
Aklastanos: ስልኗያ:
Aklastayos: ስልኗያ:
Qastos: ስልኗያ:
Farnastà: ስልኗያ:
Qastantayos: ስልኗያ:
Cosmas: ስልኗያ:
Qartès: ስልኗያ:
Akresas: ስልኗያ:
Akresas: ስልኗያ:
Akrisas: ስልኗያ:
Akrisas: ስልኗያ:
Akronas: ስልኗያ:
Kuš: ስልኗያ:
Qopros: ስልኗያ:
Qirwân: ስልኗያ:
Cyril: ስልኗያ:
Kurš: ስልኗያ:
Kurš: ስልኗያ:
Kurš: ስልኗያ:
Kurš: ስልኗያ:
Kayras: ስልኗያ:
Keyras: ስልኗያ:
Kasikas: ስልኗያ:
Damásqo: ስልኗያ:
Dømyanos: ስልኗያ:
Dān‘el: ስልኗያ:
Dāryos: ስልኗያ:
Dāwit: ስልኗያ:
Dākeyos: ስልኗያ:
Dākiyos: ስልኗያ:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deucalion</td>
<td>ዓበታኝ</td>
<td>Dido</td>
<td>ሜወት</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocletian</td>
<td>ዓጋደትንያስፋን</td>
<td>Dido</td>
<td>ሜወት</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysus</td>
<td>ዓንስፋን</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ዓንጋరትና ዋናውስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td>ዓንስፋን</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ዓንጋరትና ዋናውስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ዓንጋራትና ዋናውስፋን</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ዓንጋరትና ዋናውስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitius</td>
<td>ዓንጋራትና ዋናውስፋን</td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>ዓንጋሹ ዋናውስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>እልያስ</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td>እፋስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epheus</td>
<td>እፋስፋን</td>
<td>Epimetheus</td>
<td>ቀወምታና እፋስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius</td>
<td>እፋታርፋን ዋናውስፋን</td>
<td>Epiphanius</td>
<td>እፋትና ዋናውስፋን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudocia</td>
<td>እውወቂስፋን</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>ብያኔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>ለወን</td>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td>ለዓገወን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>ለዓርራ</td>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td>ለዓገወን</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faiyum</td>
<td>ለላይም</td>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>ብያኔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunus</td>
<td>ብያኔ</td>
<td>Gelasinus</td>
<td>ለላስዮስ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td>ለዓገወን</td>
<td>Gelasinus</td>
<td>ለላስዮስ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelasinus</td>
<td>ለላስዮስ</td>
<td>Gelasinus</td>
<td>ለላስዮስ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gihon</td>
<td>ለጋይን</td>
<td>Gorgon</td>
<td>ከርናና</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>ከርርኗን</td>
<td>Golgotha</td>
<td>ከርፋታ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golgotha</td>
<td>ከርፋታ</td>
<td>Goliath</td>
<td>ከፋታከ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Goliath    | ከፋታከ | Gorgon       | ከር-
| Gorgon     | ከር-
<p>| Hadrian    | ከፋርራታፋን | Hadrian      | ከፋርራታፋን | ሴንዳርፋኗንےօʊስ            |
| Ham        | ከም | Ham         | ከም | Kām                |
| Heber      | ከወር | Heber       | ከወር | ሴወር            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place/Name</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hellas</td>
<td>Ἡλλᾶς</td>
<td>Ḥelēn</td>
<td>Ḥlānš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>Ἡλένη</td>
<td>Ḥeleni</td>
<td>Ḥlēnì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>Ἡβραῖος</td>
<td>Ḥbōr</td>
<td>Ḥbōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracles</td>
<td>Ἡρακλῆς</td>
<td>Ḥərqāl</td>
<td>Ḥərqāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>Ἡράκλειος</td>
<td>Ḥərqāl</td>
<td>Ḥərqāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>Ἑρμῆς</td>
<td>Ḥarmās</td>
<td>Ḥarmās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>Ἡζεκίας</td>
<td>Ḥazqāyās</td>
<td>Ḥazqāyās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorius</td>
<td>Ἄνωρ</td>
<td>ḤAnorewos</td>
<td>ḤAnorewos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconium</td>
<td>Ἰκόνιον</td>
<td>Ḥqonyon</td>
<td>Ḥqonyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatius</td>
<td>Ἀγνατίος</td>
<td>ḤAgnāṭyōs</td>
<td>ḤAgnāṭyōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inachus</td>
<td>Ἰναχῦς</td>
<td>ḤAnyāhus</td>
<td>ḤAnyāhus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Ἰνδία</td>
<td>Ḥōnd</td>
<td>Ḥōnd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io</td>
<td>Ἰό</td>
<td>Ḥu</td>
<td>Ḥu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iopolis</td>
<td>Ἰόπλις</td>
<td>ḤNābulis</td>
<td>ḤNābulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isauria</td>
<td>Ἰσαῖας</td>
<td>ḤHisuryā</td>
<td>ḤHisuryā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Ἰσραήλ</td>
<td>ḤIsrāʾel</td>
<td>ḤIsrāʾel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ἰταλία</td>
<td>ḤItālyā</td>
<td>ḤItālyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabal</td>
<td>Ἰβαλ</td>
<td>ḤQābel</td>
<td>ḤQābel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambres</td>
<td>Ἰάμπρας</td>
<td>ḤIyānbares</td>
<td>ḤIyānbares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannes</td>
<td>Ἰάννης</td>
<td>ḤIyānes</td>
<td>ḤIyānes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japhet</td>
<td>Ὀφέτ</td>
<td>ḤYāfēt</td>
<td>ḤYāfēt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebus</td>
<td>Ἰβύς</td>
<td>ḤHayānus</td>
<td>ḤHayānus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Ἰερομήν</td>
<td>ḤErmayās</td>
<td>ḤErmayās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Ἰερουσαλήμ</td>
<td>ḤIyerusālem</td>
<td>ḤIyerusālem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ἰωάννης</td>
<td>ḤYohḥannās</td>
<td>ḤYohḥannās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Ἰούσιος</td>
<td>ḤIyāsu</td>
<td>ḤIyāsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovian</td>
<td>Ὄβιαν</td>
<td>ḤYuānos</td>
<td>ḤYuānos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jozadak</td>
<td>Ἰοζαδάκ</td>
<td>ḤYusedeq</td>
<td>ḤYusedeq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas</td>
<td>Ὅδας</td>
<td>ḤYodā</td>
<td>ḤYodā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian</td>
<td>῾Ιούλιαν</td>
<td>ḤYulyānus</td>
<td>ḤYulyānus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Greek Name</td>
<td>Latin Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius</td>
<td>Υολῑανος</td>
<td>Yolyānos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>Υολῑανος</td>
<td>Yulyānos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>Λακωνία</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāmeḥ</td>
<td>Λάμη</td>
<td>Lāmeḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinus</td>
<td>Λατίνη</td>
<td>Lādinos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yostaiyanos</td>
<td>Λατίνη</td>
<td>Lādinos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Λυκία</td>
<td>Lūnayā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius</td>
<td>Λύκια</td>
<td>Lukiyos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Λύκια</td>
<td>Luqwān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonius</td>
<td>Μακεδωνία</td>
<td>Maqedoonyā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnentius</td>
<td>Μαγνητιος</td>
<td>Magāndayos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcian</td>
<td>Μαρκιαν</td>
<td>Marqāyān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>Μάρκια</td>
<td>Mārqos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Turbo</td>
<td>Μάρκια τορμ</td>
<td>Mārqos Durārān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mareotis</td>
<td>Μαρεώτις</td>
<td>Maryuṭ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsyas</td>
<td>Μαρσύας</td>
<td>Marsayāsisus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Μάριο</td>
<td>Muraqiyyus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxentius</td>
<td>Μάξεντιος</td>
<td>Maksāndayos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximian</td>
<td>Μαξιμιαν</td>
<td>Maksāmyānos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximinus</td>
<td>Μαξιμιν</td>
<td>Maksāminus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>Μαξιμός</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchizedek</td>
<td>Μελχιζेडेक</td>
<td>Malka šedeqq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Μερκуβ</td>
<td>Marqorewos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methuselah</td>
<td>Μηθυσέλα</td>
<td>Mātuṣalā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Μιχαήλ</td>
<td>Mikāʾel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas</td>
<td>Μίνας</td>
<td>Minās</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Μόσες</td>
<td>Muse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>ٍنبوخذنسر</td>
<td>Nabukadnešor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>ٍنرو</td>
<td>Neron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestorius</td>
<td>ٍنستاروس</td>
<td>Naštaros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikiu</td>
<td>ٍنقيوس</td>
<td>Naqiyus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile</td>
<td>ٌنيل</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>ٍنامرود</td>
<td>Nāmrud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineveh</td>
<td>ٍنانيه</td>
<td>Nanawe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninus</td>
<td>ٍنينوس</td>
<td>Ninunos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>ٍنوح</td>
<td>Noḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubia</td>
<td>ٍنوب</td>
<td>Nobā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numa</td>
<td>ٍنومايوس</td>
<td>Numamayos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun</td>
<td>ٌنويه</td>
<td>Nawe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>ٍأريون</td>
<td>Aryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>ٍفلسطين</td>
<td>Falastāʾem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallas</td>
<td>ٍيالاس</td>
<td>Yalāls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmyra</td>
<td>ٍبالميزا</td>
<td>Balmizā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>ٍفارس</td>
<td>Fārs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petissonius</td>
<td>ٍباديسانيوس</td>
<td>Bādisānayus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphus</td>
<td>ٍفيلادلفوس</td>
<td>Filādalfus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>ٍفيلوس</td>
<td>Filpos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoca</td>
<td>ٍفوقا</td>
<td>Fuqā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>ٍكونوس</td>
<td>Kunās</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picus</td>
<td>ٍباكيوس</td>
<td>Bakūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidon</td>
<td>ٍبوسيتون</td>
<td>Busițon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prometheus</td>
<td>ٍ‌أبراميتوس</td>
<td>‌Abrumitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy</td>
<td>ٍباشليموس</td>
<td>Bašlimos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pulcheria  ፋርካልያ፡ Barkalyā
Pyramus  ይልማኝ፡ Bayrāms
Rakoustis  ዕጊን፡ Rākudi
Remus  ይማበስ፡ Romānos
Rome  ይም፡ Rom
Romulus  ይምሎስ፡ Romlos
Roxana  ዋኅኩ፡ Rak’asānī
Sabacon  ዋስኔ፡ Sawāken
Sadanapalus  ወርዓት ያለበል፣ Sārtā Bāblalun
Salem  ወሌም፡ Sālem
Samson  ይምስ፡ Somson
Semiramis  ወሚራ፡ Sāmirā
Seruch  ዋስ፡ Seroḵ
Sesostris  ዋስታን፡ Sasṭātrim
Seth  ሊት፡ Set
Severus  ወውስ፡ Sāwiros
Shechem  ወጆጊያ፡ Saqimā
Shem  ሊም፡ Sem
Sicheaus  ዋለውና፡ Sanḥawās
Sidon  ወጊያ፡ Sāydā
Sidus  ወጊያ፡ Sidu
Sinai  ሊንን፡ Sinai
Socrates  ዋደለት፡ Saqrāṭ
Solomon  ዋለመምያ፡ Salomon
Sosthenium  ዋስትሰን፡ Sastānis
Taurus  ሣዓር፡ Tūrus
Theodore  ተዯድሮስ፡ Tewodros
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Amharic</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius</td>
<td>ጥወዶስዮስ</td>
<td>Tāwadosyos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognosta</td>
<td>ጥወጆንስታ</td>
<td>Ta’oganesṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>ጥንብስ</td>
<td>ጥንፋስ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus</td>
<td>ጥወፍሎስ</td>
<td>Tewoflos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalonica</td>
<td>ጥሰሎንቄ</td>
<td>Tasalonqe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrace</td>
<td>ጥራቅያ</td>
<td>ጥብራይያ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberias</td>
<td>ጥብራይős</td>
<td>Tibaryos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>ጥብራይős</td>
<td>Timatāwos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>ጥብራይős</td>
<td>Timotewos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>ጥጥ-os</td>
<td>ጥィtos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyre</td>
<td>ጥሮስ</td>
<td>ጥiros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyro</td>
<td>ጥሩ</td>
<td>Diru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentia</td>
<td>ጥላንድያ</td>
<td>Walandyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeno</td>
<td>ጥያንና</td>
<td>Zaynun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerubbabel</td>
<td>ጥራብባቤል</td>
<td>Zarubābel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zillah</td>
<td>ጊላ</td>
<td>ጊላ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion</td>
<td>ጊይዮን</td>
<td>ጊዮዮን ነውን</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>litterae additae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{}</td>
<td>delevit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>† †</td>
<td>loci corrupti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add.</td>
<td>addit, addunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coni.</td>
<td>coniecit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr.</td>
<td>correxit, correxerunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.m.</td>
<td>in margine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lac.</td>
<td>lacuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.l.</td>
<td>non legitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om.</td>
<td>omittit, omittunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praem.</td>
<td>praemittit, praemittunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep.</td>
<td>repetit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>transponit, transponunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.l.</td>
<td>supra lineam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chronicle of John of Nikiu

Text and Translation

(Introduction and Chapters 1-80)
In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, one God. An introduction to this book by enumeration of its one hundred and twenty-two chapters. He (author) collected those accounts, which have passed and are gone to the ancestors, from the books of the previous generations: from Adam till Dido, who reigned over the Ionians and Africa; Remus and Romulus, who reigned over Rome, of a good memory, till the end of the reign of St Constantine, the first Christian emperor of Rome; the accession of the children of the great Christian emperor Constantine, servant of God, till its end and till the God-loving emperor Yuyāyənus (Jovian); from the accession of ʾIndəyənus (Valentinian) till its end and till the great and blessed emperor Theodosius; and from the time of Arcadius and Honorius, sons of the God-loving emperor Walaʾədəyus till its end and till the beatiic emperor Anastasius; and from the days of the emperor Justin the First till the reign of Heraclius and till its end; and from Theodore, the first prefect of the province of Egypt and John, monk of the monastery of Sinai, who entrusted in the faith of Chalcedonians. Moreover, John madabbər and ascetic, which is by interpretation administrator, who is a bishop of the city of Nikiu of Egypt, which is called Absai, collected these accounts completely; and there are one hundred and twenty-two chapters, which he collected from the extended chronicles, which are an account of times from the beginning of the contemporary tribe.  

Chapter 1. Concerning the names of Adam, Eve, his children and all creatures.
Chapter 2. Concerning the names of the stars (planets), the sun and the moon; and concerning the things found in the books of Hebrews.
Chapter 3. Concerning those, who were the first to begin building ships and travel upon sea.
Chapter 4. Concerning those, who wrote ʾasturlābāt from the first to the last.

1 I do not follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg, which would mean: 'till the end of the emperor Jovian'. I find this conjecture thus logical, but not necessary.  
2 I am not sure which spelling of the name appears to be correct. According to my stemma codicum all three variants are equally possible; nevertheless I prefer this spelling, because the two others could easily have been derived from it. However, this reading differs from the form of this proper name in the main text.  
3 This form of a proper name is not easy to explain. Arcadius and Honorius were sons of the emperor Theodosius (see the conjecture by Zotenberg in Apparatus Criticus). However, I don't follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, for which I see no grounds. I could rather propose a following explanation for this form. As it appears from this introduction, it was composed not by John but by another person, who apparently had added this Index, as well as this short overview at the beginning based on the content of the Chronicle. If one assumes that this contributor had at his disposal already the Arabic text and based his summary on it, one could propose that the contributor, having taken this name from the text, rendered the initial wa as part of the proper name, thus became. The loss of of the first could have occurred later. Such a corruption might have happened also during the translation into Ethiopic, however, this appears less probable. Though the real Arabic wording is lost, the legitimate presence of in this passage is not easy to explain. If this explanation of the corruption is plausible, it might be indicate that the Index was first composed for the Arabic version of the Chronicle.  
4 I do not follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg, which would mean: 'till the end of the beatiic emperor Anastasius'. I find this conjecture thus logical, but not necessary.  
5 I do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here, which would mean: 'till John, monk of the monastery of Sinai', because I do not find it necessary.  
6 The passage remains unclear. I could not find any other attestation of the word Ḥonṣəl. Thus I propose my own interpretation of this word. Zotenberg makes a conjecture and replaces the word with Ḥonṣəl, and translates it as follows: 'qui forment une chronographie commençant par la génération des hommes primitifs' (Zotenberg 1883, 224). Charles translates it as follows: which is (thus) a chronography beginning with the generation of primitive men' (Charles 1916, 2).  
7 I do not follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg, although it is logical. This reading is proved by the text of Chapter 1.  
8 Charles points here to the necessity of changing the word order (Charles 1916, 2, n. 1).  
9 Although Zotenberg and Charles translate this word as 'astrolabe', both point out that it should rather be translated as 'astronomy' (Zotenberg 1883, 240, n. 4; Charles 1916, 16, n. 4).
Chapter 5. Concerning the beginning of the construction of Babylon; and concerning <those, who> worshipped an image of a horse as a god; and concerning the beginning of hunting and eating animals.

Chapter 6. Concerning those, who began to eat human flesh; and concerning him, who was the first to kill his <sons> and also concerning him, who killed his father.

Chapter 7. Concerning him, who was the first to marry his own sister.

Chapter 8. Concerning him, who began the construction of the city of Nineveh; and concerning him, who married his own mother.

Chapter 9. Concerning him, who was the first to produce gold and extract it <from> mines.

Chapter 10. Concerning him, who were the first to make weapons of war.

Chapter 11. Concerning him, who began building furnace and him, who married two women.

Chapter 12. Concerning him, who built a city, which is called the city of Sun.

Chapter 13. Concerning him, who built two cities of 'Abuseyər, the one in the Upper Egypt and another in the Northern (=Lower, dabub) Egypt.

Chapter 14. Concerning those, who built the city of Samnud and 'Ĕlbarābi, which is a house of idols.

Chapter 15. Concerning the Greeks, who were the first to pronounce the Glory of the Holy Coequal Trinity.

Chapter 16. Concerning those, who were the first to make a plow in the provinces of Egypt; and in which state Egypt was before.

Chapter 17. Concerning him, who was the first to begin collecting taxes in the land of Egypt and measuring land with a reed and who made them to pay out to a king; and concerning who he was, who dug earth to bring in waters and for a river called Dik.

Chapter 18. Concerning him, who made the waters disappear and who drained the lakes of Egypt, until they built cities and villages on them and planted plants there.

Chapter 19. Concerning them, who built three temples in the city of Manuf (Memphis).

Chapter 20. Concerning him, who began to make dyes for garments.

Chapter 21. Concerning him, who built beautiful statues and <worshipped> them; and concerning him, who built Iconium and Tarsus; and who he was,
who called Assyria Persia; and who he was, who planted trees\(^{23}\) in Egypt; and who he was, who was the first to worship the sun, the moon, fire and water.\(^{24}\) Chapter 22. Concerning him, who worshipped the moon only and built a sanctuary for it like for a goddess.

Chapter 23. Concerning him, who named Yonān;\(^{25}\) and who it was, who built Ṣur (Tyre);\(^{26}\) and who he was, who named Canaan, Syria and Cilicia.

Chapter 24. Concerning him, who named the cities\(^{27}\) of Ōrya (Europe) and who built the city of Qǝrṭāgnā (Gortyna).\(^{28}\)

Chapter 25. Concerning him, who first began to adjust wood to the men’s feet.\(^{29}\)

Chapter 26. Concerning him, who began to build altars for idols and to worship them.

Chapter 27. Concerning Melchizedek, the priest; from which tribe he is; and concerning those, who built Sidon and Zion, which is called Salem and the naming of Jews, i.e. the Hebrews.

Chapter 28. Concerning those, who first invented the Greek writing and the knowledge of writing their books.\(^{30}\)

Chapter 29. Concerning the deluge, which happened in the land Dik\(^{31}\) and the reason of its stagnation there and its becoming a desert.\(^{32}\)

Chapter 30. Concerning the situation of Pharaoh in front of Moses\(^{33}\) and the destruction of him and those, who were with him, in the depths of the Red Sea.

Chapter 31. Concerning him, who changed the name of the city Absai and named it Nikiu;\(^{34}\) and the reason, why a river, which flowed there from the East, turned to the West according to the commandment of God.\(^{35}\)

Chapter 32. Concerning the construction of Jerusalem; the change of its name into Nablus; and concerning, that a house of God was built in it.

Chapter 33. Concerning him, who was the first to do handicraft amongst the ancients.

Chapter 34. Concerning who he was, who found an ancient\(^{36}\) inscription and delivered <it> to people; and who he was who invented teaching;\(^{37}\) and concerning him, who interpreted the verses inscribed <on> the stone tablet.

Chapter 35. Concerning him, who established a law of marriage, that men should take to wife young virgins and call them brides; and who he was, who established common meals.

\(^{23}\) This plural form seems to be not well attested in other texts, but occurs several times in the Chronicle. Nöldeke proposes that it should be considered as a correct one (Nöldeke 1883, 1370).

\(^{24}\) This last passage on the worship of the sun, moon, fire, and water does not correspond completely to the content of Chapter 21.

\(^{25}\) I don’t follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg, which is apparently based on the text of Chapter 23.2. Thus, Zotenberg translates this proper name as Lybia; however for the sake of clarity I just give the transliteration.

\(^{26}\) Arabic form for Tyre. See “Ṣūr,” EI, IX (1997), 883a–885b (M. Lavergne). Chapter 23 itself attests, however, the form Ṣūr.\(^{\textit{\textit{i}}\textit{t}}\).

\(^{27}\) According to Chapter 24.2, one should rather read ‘the land of’.

\(^{28}\) According to Zotenberg Qǝrṭāgnā is an imprecise transcription of the Arabic form (Zotenberg 1883, 226, n. 1). However, the precise mechanism of this error is not clear. Chapter 24 attests the correct reading Qǝrṭinā.

\(^{29}\) Comparison with Chapter 25 shows that it should be a sort of punishment.

\(^{30}\) Charles translates: ‘teaching of the writing of letters’ (Charles 1916, 3).

\(^{31}\) Charles identifies this toponym with Attica and proposes a conjecture, which is based on the reading in Chapter 29 (Charles 1916, 3). I don’t follow his conjecture, but the reading of manuscripts. I agree that the toponym should stay for Attica; however, this reading might have been inherited from the Arabic Vorlage.\(^{\textit{\textit{i}}\textit{t}}\) On the reasons of the deluge in Attica it is told in Chapter 35.

\(^{32}\) Zotenberg translates: ‘Du pharaon qui était l’adversaire de Moïse’ (Zotenberg 1883, 226).

\(^{33}\) Chapter 31 gives both names of the city but does not tell anything on the change of the city name; however the beginning of Chapter 31 is very confused and probably corrupt.

\(^{34}\) I suggest that a construction of an enclosing channel is meant (cp. Chapter 31).

\(^{35}\) My conjecture is based on the content of Chapter 34. I consider the word ṫent,\(^\textit{\textit{i}}\textit{t}\) an adjective, thus put it in accusative as well. Zotenberg does not translate this word at all: ‘Qui a trouvé une inscription et l’a communiquée aux hommes’ (Zotenberg 1883, 226), Charles proposes another translation: ‘Concerning him who was the first to find an inscription and communicate it to men’ (Charles 1916, 4).

\(^{36}\) The invention of teaching does not occur in Chapter 34.
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Chapter 36. Concerning, who he was, who first amongst the Greeks believed in the name of the Holy Trinity, that He is coequal in one Godhead.

Chapter 37. Concerning those, who were the first in the world to begin practicing medicine.

Chapter 38. Concerning who he was, who began to play on flute and on similar (instruments) like horn and trumpet.

Chapter 39. Concerning who he was, who began the first in the world to begin constructing baths.

Chapter 40. Concerning the construction of Kasikas (Cyzicus); and the reason, why the spirits there entrusted in the unity of the Holy Trinity and moreover announced to all²⁸ people that a virgin will give birth to God.

Chapter 41. Concerning who he was, who established the temple of Sosthenium; and concerning the construction of a church according to the command of the God-loving emperor Constantine.

Chapter 42. Concerning who he was, who built Farmā (Pelusium) and Bulkinun.

Chapter 43. Concerning who he was, who gave names to two provinces.

Chapter 44. Concerning who he was, who named the island Lunānayā (Peloponnesus) and built a city there and called it Lubāniyun (Peloponnesus).⁴⁰

Chapter 45. Concerning who he was, who built Farmā (Pelusium) and Bulkinun.

Chapter 46. Concerning who he was, <who> first taught playing on musical instruments.

Chapter 47. Concerning who he was, who named the island Ephesus, which is Asia; and previously it was called Saqālbah, and they changed its name and named it Ἰγονυον (Iconium).⁴¹

Chapter 48. Concerning who he was, who built a city, which is called Palmyra because king David overcame the Philistine there.

Chapter 49. Concerning the reason, why Nebuchadnezzar conquered the city of Tyre, which is an island.

Chapter 50. Concerning the Ark of God, the Tablets and the blossoming rod of Aaron, the measure of manna and dry flinty rocks; and concerning who he was, who hid them from men.

Chapter 51. Concerning the reign of the king Cyrus; the sending away the captive children of Israel; and how Cambyses prohibited them to build a temple; and what Yāsid, the commander of the forces of Egypt, advised Cambyses;⁴² that he killed the governors of Egypt, and that Cambyses⁴³ carried the captives he had taken from Egypt to his country; and the return of Egyptians to their country for the second time; and that after forty-one

---

³⁸Charles and Zotenberg identify it with Cyzicus (Charles 1916, 4; Zotenberg 1883, 227). However, the foundation of the city is not mentioned in Chapter 40, it mentions only the king Cyzicus. ³⁹Zotenberg writes that the word Ἰθνα presents here rather a definite article (Zotenberg 1883, 227, n. 2). ⁴₀For identification of these toponyms, see Zotenberg 1883, 227, n. 3. ⁴¹The main text of Chapter 47 is very corrupt; however is does not mention Ἱγονυον. ⁴²Charles transposes this passage to the previous clause (Charles 1916, 5).
years Alexander of Macedon, called the conqueror of the world, became king.

Chapter 52. Concerning the construction of a city named Lunya (Lavinia).  
Chapter 53. Concerning who he was, who was the first to build a house and name it ‘fortress’.  
Chapter 54. Concerning, who he was, who built Halwan (Alba).  
Chapter 55. Concerning the construction of the city of Carthage.  
Chapter 56. Concerning the construction of the city of Rome; the reason why they are called Romans; the beginning of writing down the documents of petitions and commandments; the circulation of appointments;  
and that soldiers went into battle riding horses; the establishment of the places of contest for women; and concerning the decree of administration of the army, and the position of officials and those who assist them; concerning what is the reason of our Fathers, the monks of Egypt, to celebrate Eucharist on the first day of each month.  
Chapter 57. Concerning who he was, who manifested stamped money, and the beginning of sale and commerce; and the establishment of governors, officials and judges.

Chapter 58. Concerning who he was, who built the city of Thessalonica.  
Chapter 59. Concerning who he was, who built the city of Alexandria and Ḍkorsa, a city of Byzantium, i.e. Alexander; concerning the reason why he defeated Darius and took captive his daughter; and the reason why queen Candace captured Alexander, when he came to her with spies, together with the messengers he sent to her; the reason, why he made her his wife.  
Chapter 60. Concerning the time, in which the Scriptures inspired by God were translated and how many translations there were.  
Chapter 61. Concerning, who he was, who built Ḍndiā (Antigonia), Antioch, Lodōgyā (Laodicia) and Ḍyāmyā (Apamea) – the renowned cities.  
Chapter 62. Concerning who he was, who wrote down the first chronicles and named them.  
Chapter 63. Concerning who he was, who persecuted the Maccabean saints.

Chapter 64. Concerning the birth of Julius Caesar, the emperor of Rome; the reign of Cleopatra; and the construction of the great church called Caesarion in the city of Alexandria.  
Chapter 65 (66). Concerning who he was, who built Caesarea of Palestine.  
Chapter 66 (67). Concerning who he was, who built Alexandria and dug the earth in order to bring in the river of Karyun, which is by interpretation ‘pit’, until the water from the great river Gihon entered the great city of Alexandria; and the entering of water into a reservoir, which was

---

44 This information is not given in Chapter 51. However, it is said that Jews were sent back to their country after forty-one years of their captivity.  
45 The form Lunya derives apparently from the reconstructable <. Chapter 52 attests the form Lāwinā.  
46 Zotenberg does not translate this passage (Zotenberg 1883, 228).  
47 Probably Ḍkorsa stays for Chrysopolis. See Chapter 59.2.  
48 Starting from this short description there is a disaccordance with Chapters of the main text, I give the number of corresponding Chapter in brackets.  
49 This proper name is missing in Chapter 67.  
50 This information is missing in Chapter 67.
built skillfully; and at what period Our Lord Jesus Christ was born; and for what reason the Romans declared the sixth month of the year to be the beginning of the year.

Chapter 67 (68). Concerning who he was, who established one of the signs on the sixth day of Tār; and the violent banishment of ʾIstədrābī (Ezra), an innocent man.  

Chapter 68 (69). Concerning that in the time of which of the kings Our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified; and who he was, who built the city of Tiberias.

Chapter 69 (70). Concerning, what happened to the emperor Nero, and (concerning) his bitter death.

Chapter 70 (71). Concerning the emperor Domitian; and how he sent St John the Evangelist in exile two times and concerning his death; and how they built the city of Domāduyānu (Domitianapolis) and concerning the grievous death of Domitian; and concerning the abolition of combats and concerning the punching of men.

Chapter 71 (72). Concerning the death of Ignatius, clothed by God, and also concerning women, who became martyrs with him; and the construction of a fortress in Egyptian Babylon; and who he was, who called it Babylon; and who he was, who dug the channel for a river called Dəryānus (Trajan), which terminates in the Red Sea; and (concerning) a fortress in Manuf (Onouphis).

Chapter 72 (73). Concerning who he was, who built Antinoe in the province of Rif.

Chapter 73 (74). Concerning who he was, who ordered to fathers to make testament for their children; and concerning the construction of two gates in the city of Alexandria – in its West and in its East.

Chapter 74 (75). Concerning who he was, who brought lions to Egypt and Palestine.

Chapter 75 (76). Concerning who he was, who introduced the books for accounts and guarantees of debt, for the security of people.

Chapter 76. (77) Concerning the reign of Diocletian, the Egyptian; the reason why he lost his mind and was exiled; and concerning who his children were, who exercised the evil; concerning the sudden death God brought on idolaters, unless nobody was left to bury them; and concerning the reign of God-loving Constantine; and the establishment of his works and the

---

53 I can’t propose any adequate translation for this passage. Zotenberg translates: ‘Qui a fixé l’un des jours types au sixième jour du mois de ter’ (Zotenberg 1883, 229). Charles emends ΛΠΠΤΥΠΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ (of the Zotenberg’s edition into ΛΠΠΤΥΠΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ (Charles 1916, 6, n. 1). Thus he translates: ‘Concerning him who fixed one of the ‘changes’ on the sixth day of the month Ter’ (Charles 1916, 6). I choose the reading according to my stemma codicum and provide a literal translation of it.  
54 The information on banishment of Ezra is missing in Chapter 68.

55 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here. His conjecture is apparently based on the content of Chapter 71.

56 Zotenberg proposes that the abolition of gladiatorial combats is meant here (Zotenberg 1883, 230, n. 1). I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here, but follow the text of the manuscripts.  
57 Apparently, Zotenberg proposes this passage to stand for θεόφορος, thus he translates: ‘De la mort d’Ignace le Théophore’ (Zotenberg 1883, 230).  
58 There is a gender disagreement in this passage.  
59 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, which is apparently based on the content of Chapter 72.

61 This toponym can not be indentical to the Arabic Rif, which designates Delta. Chapter 73 tells explicitly on the construction of a city of Antinoe in Upper Egypt. In this particular case Rif corresponds at least to the region around Antinoe, or even to Upper Egypt as the whole. See also Frantsuzoff 2010, 84-85; Booth 2013, 660-661.  
62 Egypt is not mentioned in Chapter 75.

63 This summary does not correspond completely to the content of Chapter 76, where only registration is mentioned.
magnificence of the <churches> in his time; and who he was, who was the first to build qanāṭər, that is a bridge; and concerning the finding of the Cross; and concerning the construction of Constantinople and its naming with this name, and its previous name was Byzantium; and concerning the faith of Gelasinus through a miracle, which he saw, - i.e. the holy baptism, and his marvelous death; and through which reason the Indians recognized Our Lord Jesus Christ, Our God, because it was Apostolic St Athanasius, who appointed the first bishop over India and Yemen; and that an angel of God appeared to Constantine each and every day of his life and waked him up for a prayer.

Chapter 77 (78). Concerning the construction of qantarâb, i.e. a bridge on the river called Pyramus; and the fall <of> Nicaea; concerning the appearance of the Holy Cross at midday on Golgotha, in the place, where Our Lord was crucified; and the sufferings, which Apostolic St Athanasius received from the Arians; and the exile of St Liberius and the holy bishops, who were with him, because of the evil advice of the Arians; and moreover concerning the impious emperor Julian; and the reason of his abandonment the ranks of the church; that he became the chief of the army, until he ascended to the throne instead of Gallus, his brother; and the exile of St Athanasius, in order to kill him, according to the advice of the heathen; and what was the reason that Alexandria was found worthy to receive the body of St John, the Baptist, so that it might dwell there and they might build for him a beautiful place according to the commandment of the patriarch Theophilus.

Chapter 78 (79). Concerning how we know from which country and from which family is Theophilus, the patriarch of Alexandria; and St Cyril, the son of his sister, and the place where he was born.

Chapter 79 (80). Concerning the consummation of the death of the martyr St Domitius; and the revenge, which God exercised on Julian, the heretic; and how God punished him through the hand of St Mercury, the martyr; and that he died through an evil death.

Chapter 80 (81). Concerning the reign of Jovian; and how the church shined in his time; and the reason why holy Athanasius was returned to his throne in great honor; and the manifestation of the Church in the Orthodox faith in every place.

Chapter 81 (82). Concerning the reign of Sāmustəyus (Sallustius); his hate for injustice and his righteous and just judgment; and his construction of stone gates, i.e. Ḫərqālyun (Heracleotis), that he arranged the gates of the great river of Egypt in hard labor; and the reason, why the waters of the sea...
stopped over Alexandria so that they might not inundate\(^6\) the city, but were not able (to do that) through the prayer of the holy bishop Athanasius.

Chapter 82 (83). Concerning the reign of God-Loving Theodosius, the elder; and the parable, which \*Felgos* (Amphilochius), the bishop of Iconium, presented to him on the unity of the Holy Trinity; and concerning the Council, which the emperor assembled in the city of Constantinople, in order to strengthen the Church; and concerning the reason, why Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, admonished Gregory, bishop of *Baryjas* (Nazianzum),\(^6\) to leave the imperial city Constantinople\(^7\) and to go to his country; and that he appointed one man whose name is Maximus patriarch of Constantinople; and moreover concerning the construction of the church <of> Ta’odoksaya (Theodosius) in Alexandria and the church of the holy martyr<< Cosmas and Damian and the martyrs their brethren; and concerning the burning down <in> fire the city of Antioch by the command of the emperor; and the plundering of all the treasures from the palace; and moreover concerning the empress Eudocia, wife of the emperor Theodosius the younger and from which family she was; and what was the reason of an alliance of the emperor with her and that he took her to wife; and at what time they wrote down the name of St John Chrysostom in the law after he had gone to Our Lord; and concerning how Arcadius loved God and the struggle of Honorius; and concerning how Arcadius married a woman into a square until she died and burnt her body in fire by a command of the patriarch and how they dragged the pagan (synagogue and converted it into a church because of his discussion with Jews; and how they dragged the pagan (\*bana\*fawi) woman into a square until she died and burnt her body in fire by a command of the patriarch *Abba* Cyril.

Chapter 83 (84). Concerning the appointment of kings Arcadius and Honorius, Arcadius over Constantinople and Honorius over Rome; and concerning how Arcadius loved God and the struggle of Honorius; and concerning that they exercised mockery on the Cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ, while they crucified a small child and killed him in mockery.

\(^{6}\) Charles translates the text as follows: ‘And the ocean tide rose to such a height that it would have submerged the city...’ (Charles 1916, 9).

\(^{7}\) According to Zotenberg it is a corrupt transcription of the Arabic (Zotenberg 1883, 232, n. 3).

\(^{8}\) Charles translates: ‘the city of the emperor Constantinë’ (Charles 1916, 9).
Chapter 85 (86). Concerning *Finkasор* the Jew, who appeared to Jews saying: ‘I am Moses, the chief of prophets.’

Chapter 86 (87). Concerning the apple, which they brought to the emperor Theodosius as a present; the reason of appointment of his sister Pulcheria; and the darkness over the whole earth from daybreak till evening on the day, when Marcian, the heretic, became emperor.

Chapter 87 (88). Concerning the reason, why the sky rained with *ğıran*, that is borax,1 in Constantinople and that fire burnt from sea to sea; and the conversion of the ...2 philosopher *Ansukāsəyus* (Isocaius) to the Orthodox faith; and as for patriarch Timothy, from which place he is; and the severe pestilence, which happened in Constantinople; and the fall of a mountain of Syria; and the reason of apostasy of Basiliscus in a manner of Chalcedonians on the corrupt goods; the reason for the reign of the emperor Zeno over the imperial city of Constantinople; and the exile of Basiliscus until his death; and the death, which happened to judges because of their negligence in judgment; and concerning the reign of Zeno; and his command, that they should read the Book of Epistles in every place; and concerning *Baronge* (Verina), his mother-in-law and her warring with him, until the death of hers and her adherents.

Chapter 88 (89). Concerning the reign of God-loving Anastasius because of *ʾAnsukāsəyus* (Isocaius) to the Orthodox faith; and as for patriarch Timothy, from which place he is; and the severe pestilence, which happened in Constantinople; and the fall of a mountain of Syria; and the reason of apostasy of Basiliscus in a manner of Chalcedonians on the corrupt goods; the reason for the reign of the emperor Zeno over the imperial city of Constantinople; and the exile of Basiliscus until his death; and the death, which happened to judges because of their negligence in judgment; and concerning the reign of Zeno; and his command, that they should read the Book of Epistles in every place; and concerning *Baronge* (Verina), his mother-in-law and her warring with him, until the death of hers and her adherents.

Chapter 89 (90). Concerning the reason of the exile of holy Severus from his throne of Antioch because of the accusation of heretics; concerning the prayer, which he made to God, on behalf of the people of Alexandria and Constantinople concerning the evil, which the emperor *Lasṭənās*3 (Justin) did, and the instruction he heard from God; and concerning the fire that burnt in the city of Antioch and in the cities of the East; and concerning the destruction of many dwellings of the martyrs and all the miracles, which happened; and concerning the baptism of the Arians,25 the kings of India and of *ʾElmuwarad*, who are Nubians; and of which faith they were previously; and concerning the earthquake, which happened in Egypt; and *Nādu*, which was outside the city;26 and that the Indians, were formerly Jews, i.e. *ʾElmuwarad*.

25Zotenber translates the word አርዮሳዊያን as ‘éclairs’, Charles follows him and translates it ‘lightnings’ (Zotenber 1883, 234; Charles 1916, 10). I think that rather another word is meant, a homograph, which stays for borax (sodium borate).27 I don’t follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg for I do not find it necessary. Zotenberg proposes that አርዮሳዊያን (or አርዮሳውያን as found in the manuscripts used by Zotenberg) stands for a corrupt form of Tzatius *Abba* which is written in the text of Chapter 90. Thus he proposes that one should rather read Lazi than Arians (Zotenber 1883, 234, n. 4).28 The text is not very clear, Charles adopts the suggestion by Zotenberg, thus he translates: ‘and the Huns without the city’ (Charles 1916, 11).29 I do not follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg, for I do not find it necessary. Zotenberg proposes to identify *ʾElmuwarad* with Homerites.

APP. PUNCT.: 2 አርዮሳዊያን # *αCG | 4 አርዮሳዊያን # *αCG | 5 አርียงاوي # *αG | 6 አርียงاوي # *αC G | 8 አርียงاوي # *αC G | 9 አርียงاوي # *αC | 10 አርียงاوي # *αG | 12 አርียงاوي # *αG | 13 አርึงاوي # *αG | 14 ኱ንባ # *αG | 15 ኱ንባ # *αG | 16 ኱ንባ # *αG | 17 ኱ንባ # *αG | 18 ኱ንባ # *αG | 20 ኱ንባ # *αG | 22 ኱ንባ # *αG | 24 ኱ንባ # *αG | 25 ኱ንባ # *αG | 26 ኱ን pienią # *αG | 27 ኱ን pieniąd # *αG | 28 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 29 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 30 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 31 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 33 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 34 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 35 ኱נ النقد # *αG | 36 ኱נ النقد # *αG
Chapter 90 (91). Concerning the appearance of the girdle and the garment of Our Lord Jesus Christ; they were found in the house of a Jew from Alexandria.

Chapter 91 (92). Concerning the reason, why we Christians were named after the name of Theodosius; and the appearance of Athenians and their faith; and the reason, why the chiefs wrote a letter at a market place, so that there should be a commemoration of them until they take everything they want.  

Chapter 92 (93). Concerning the first construction of the city of Rome.

Chapter 93 (94). Concerning the disturbance that happened in the city of Constantinople on the matter of the holy body of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Chapter 94 (95). Concerning Aristomachus, son of Theodosius from the city of Absai; and the accusation they made upon him in the presence of the emperor, until the last put him in bonds; and the reason, why the king of Persia Kasrā (Chosroes), who became Christian, believed.

Chapter 95 (96). Concerning Kalanduh, the wife of batriqā; 79 which is a title of honor; and concerning the vision, which she saw clearly in a prison during her exile.

Chapter 96 (97). Concerning those who were in the corner of a dwelling of the city of Mawəsal; and concerning the beast, which appeared in the guise of a woman in the river of Egypt.

Chapter 97 (98). Concerning Yulyənəs (Paulinus), the magician, who made sacrifices to the demons in a silver bowl.

Chapter 98 (99). Concerning who he was, who began writing ‘In the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ’.

Chapter 99 (100). Concerning the water, which covered in the same night the city of Ṣunu wa (Antinous) and Tarsus, the capital of Cilicia.

Chapter 100 (101). Concerning the sunset at midday and the appearance of the stars and a great earthquake, which happened.

Chapter 101 (102). Concerning the governor Surikus, who practiced piety and the evil death which he found; and the reason, why people of Constantinople sent persecuted the emperor Maurice.

Chapter 102 (103). Concerning the case of the ship captains suitable for freemen, 80 if the goods, which were on it (ship) were sunk; and the reign of Phocas and the massacre he did.

Chapter 103 (104). Concerning the reason, why it was not possible to appoint a patriarch or any of the church officials without Phocas’ advice; and concerning, what people of the East did because of this matter; and that in Palestine the tomb pits of the church were filled with blood when people fled to the baptisteries of churches.

Chapter 104 (105). Concerning Theophilus of the city of Mawrad; and the massacre, which Phocas did in Antioch and Palestine, because of his death.

78 The meaning of the passage is not clear. Zotenberg does not translate it at all (Zotenberg 1883, 235). Charles translates this passage as follows: ‘and concerning that which the chief officials published in the market-place that there should be a memorial with them till all who wished might take’ (Charles 1916, 11). | 79 Charles follows Zotenberg’s interpretation thus he translates: ‘Concerning Galanduh, a woman of patrician rank – the name of dignity’ (Chales 1916, 12). | 80 Translation of this passage is not clear.
C107vb: ወጤትእ፡ ፍጡነ፡ መንግሥቱ፡ ፎቃ፡ ወበዛቲ፡ ዘመን፡ እምርኵሰ፡ ፎቃ። እደ፡ እስላም፡ ወገደፎሙ፡ በእንተ፡ ኑፋቄሆሙ፡ ወተፈልጦቶሙ፡ ወአምጽ ለእስላም። በእንተ፡ ፊርሃቶሙ፡ ለእስላም፡ ወሥቃየ፡ ዕመር፡ ወነሢአ፡ ወወለቱ፡ አውልያ፡ ድንግል። ወምክንያት፡ ዘአድኅኖሙ፡ አክርስዩስ:

G98va: አስተካ剋ዎ፡ ምክንያተ፡ አይሁድ፡ ዘተጋብኡ፡ ኵሎሙ፡ ኀበ፡ መፋ። ወውእቱ፡ ሮም፡ በሀገረ፡ 

C107vc: ዘቤቶሆም፡ ምስር። ምርያ፡ በምክንያት፡ ዘበዝኁ፡ ዓማፅያን፡ በጥንተ፡ ዓመፃ፡ ወኮኑ፡ ይትራ ወውእቱ፡ ሮም፡ በሀገረ፡ 

A66va: የአህጕሎት፡ ሰብአ፡ ምስር። ምርያ፡ በምክንያት፡ ዘበዝኁ፡ ዓማፅያን፡ በጥንተ፡ ዓመፃ፡ ወኮኑ፡ ይትራ ወውእቱ፡ ሮም፡ በሀገረː
Chapter 105 (106). Concerning the wife of Heraclius the elder and the wife of Heraclius the younger, and his daughter81 ‘Awulāyā,82 a virgin; and the reason, why ‘Akraṣayūs (Crispus), a governor, saved them from the filth of Phocas.

Chapter 106 (107). Concerning the revolt against Phocas in Egypt, Mareotis and in the city of Alexandria; and a great massacre, which they did because of this action; and the reason, why they cast his statue down to an abyss.

Chapter 107 (108). Concerning Theophilus, the Stylite; and his prophecy to Yəftetāḥ (Nicetas): ‘<You> will defeat him and the reign of Phocas will fail quickly and in these days Heraclius will reign’.

Chapter 108 (109). Concerning that there was a bridge in the city of Dafāšər (Taposiris) close to the church of St Minas.

Chapter 109 (110). Concerning the death of Phocas; and the dispersion of the treasures from the castle; and the hardship, which Heraclius inflicted to Phocas because of the disgrace he had done to his wife and daughter.

Chapter 110 (111). Concerning the appearance of the Muslims on the borders of Faiyum and that they defeated the Romans, who were there.

Chapter 111 (112). Concerning the first battle between Amr and Romans in the city of Awwun (Heliopolis).83

Chapter 112 (113). Concerning that all Jews assembled in the city of Manuf, because they were afraid of Muslims; the torments inflicted by Amr; and the plundering of their possessions until they left the gate of Məsr open and fled to Alexandria; and concerning the reason, why those lawless multiplied in the beginning of injustice85 and they began to help destroying the people of Egypt.

Chapter 113 (114). Concerning the reason, why the people of Samnud despised Amr, so that they would not greet him; and also concerning the return of Kalāǧi to Rome; and concerning the reason, why they seized his mother and wife and hid them in Alexandria, because he joined and helped Muslims.

Chapter 114 (115). Concerning that the Muslims took Məsr in the fourteenth year of the cycle; and in the fifteenth year they took by assault the fortress of Babylon.

Chapter 115 (116). Concerning the death of the emperor Heraclius; and the return of the patriarch Cyrus from exile and his coming to Məsr in order to pay tribute to Muslims.

Chapter 116 (117). Concerning that God delivered Romans into the hands of Muslims and abandoned them because of their heresy and their schism and the persecution they had brought on the Christians of Egypt.

---

81 Charles translates ‘her daughter’ (Charles 1916, 12).
82 Zotenberg proposes an identification with Fabia (Zotenberg 1883, 236). I am not sure that this identification is correct.
83 Zotenberg identifies this toponym with the Coptic form for Heliopolis (On) (Zotenberg 1883, 237).
84 The precise identification is vague. This passage does not have a precise correspondence with the text of Chapier 113. However, in the text of Chapter 113 a certain Manuf is also mentioned, which can be associated with Memphis as well as with Ounouphis according to Timm (Timm 1988, 1578).
85 Apparently this toponym does not correspond to Egypt. See, Zotenberg 1883, 237, n. 1. In this case this toponym refers rather to the city or cities situated south-west of later Cairo. See, ‘Miṣr’, (2012) (A. J. Wensinc et al.). | *Do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, the preposition the might have the meaning ‘concerning’. |
86 Meaning of this passage is not completely clear. In this passage this toponym does not correspond to Egypt. See, Zotenberg 1883, 237, n. 1. In this case this toponym refers rather to the city or cities situated south-west of later Cairo. See, ‘Miṣr’, (2012) (A. J. Wensinc et al.). | Apparently this toponym does not correspond to Egypt. See, Zotenberg 1883, 237, n. 1. In this case this toponym refers rather to the city or cities situated south-west of later Cairo. See, ‘Miṣr’, (2012) (A. J. Wensinc et al.).
Chapter 117 (118). Concerning the reason, why Amr subdued 'Abşādi (Absai), that is Nikiu; and the escape of the general Domitian and the destruction of his army in waters; and a great massacre that happened in the city of 'Absādiyy and in all remaining cities, until Amr came to the city of Sawāmā, which is an island under the dominion of Absai on the eighteenth day of the month Gənbot in the fifteenth year of the cycle.

Chapter 118. Concerning the reason, why the Muslims subdued Caesarea of Palestine and the tribulation that befell it.

Chapter 119. Concerning the big tumult and massacre that happened to the inhabitants of Crete both on their island and in all cities in their neighborhood.

Chapter 120. Concerning Cyrus, the patriarch of Chalcedonians; those who went to Babylon to Amr, the chief of Muslims and brought it (him) to Alexandria and delivered it (him) to his hands; and moreover concerning that Amr increased the taxes on the Egyptians; and the death of Cyrus, the Chalcedonian, after a penance, for he had delivered the city of Alexandria into the hands of Muslims.

Chapter 121. Concerning the return of 'Abbā Benjamin, patriarch of Egypt, from his exile, from the province of Rif in its fourteenth year – and out of them ten years of his exile were during the emperors of Rome; and four years during the reign of the Muslims; and the remaining history at the end of the book.

Chapter 122. And moreover concerning what follows that story.

In the name of God, merciful and compassionate. The holy father John, bishop of Nikiu, who compiled this book said: ‘O, friend of labor till the love for goodness is obtained, for the love for labor is pain and it increases all virtues, for which all zealous men strive and for the sake of all good things, which are the eternal wisdom that is omnipotent and lord of everything, because they (zealous men) preserved it for those, who come after them, so that they might do what they have chosen. And that’s why also I, the most wanting in eloquence amongst all authors and weak in discourse, indeed tempted with many trials selected portions (of text). We begin to do this from many previous books of chronicles and (give) also the report on what we have witnessed in the times, to which we have come. And I was sincere in order to tell (this) and leave a good memory for the friends of virtues in this mundane world. And we left this account written in a good order and in an exalted

---

*Charles translates this passage as follows: ‘Concerning the great earthquake and the loss of life in Crete both in their island and in all their cities round about’ (Charles 1916, 14). *91* The passage can’t be evaluated by me with certainty, the variant proposed by MSS A and B is also possible. For more details, see Chapter 2.2 of my thesis. *92* The toponym might refer either to the region around Antinoe or to Upper Egypt, see the rubric to Chapter 72 (73). *93* Zotenberg omits the translation of this part completely noting that except for some phrases the meaning of this passage escapes him (Zotenberg 1883, 239). Charles proposes a translation of this part pointing out that he has ‘only found it necessary to make one or two slight changes’ (Charles 1913, 13). *94* Charles translates አስተዳኅርዋ ‘He hath reserved’ without any conjecture (Charles 1913, 13). Although it might represent a case of *pluralis majestatis*, I translate this form as a normal plural one.
Chapter 1. We begin with those, who were created at first; for it is written about Adam and Eve, that indeed it was God, who gave them names. And it was Adam, who named them all: his children and all creatures.

Chapter 2.1. Seth, son of Adam, who received his wisdom from God, gave names to the five stars (planets), which are moving: the first Zuhal (Saturn = Cronus), the second Maštari (Jupiter = Zeus), the third Marīk (Mars = Ares); the fourth Zohra (Venus = Aphrodite), the fifth ‘Aṭārd (Mercury = Hermes).

Chapter 3. The sons of Noah, who were great and strong, began to build ships and travel upon the sea.

Chapter 4. 1. It is told about Cainan, son of Arphaxad, who was born from Shem, son of Noah, that he was a wise and intelligent man. 2. And he began to write down ‘aṣṭurlābāt (astrolabes) after the Deluge.

Chapter 5. 1. And there was one man from India, whose name was Gandubarius. There was an Ethiopian from the tribe of Ham, whose
Crum takes this proper name as an example for 'confounding radical consonants with particle' as a trace of the Coptic language. However, he supposes that this form stays for 'Nebrôd' (Crum 1917, 207).
Chapter 6. 1. Cronus was also a giant from the tribe of Ham,\textsuperscript{110} the firstling of Noah, whom they called after the name of the first star amongst the existing ones – that is Zebal (Saturn=Cronus). 2. And his son Domyos (Domnus) (was) a warrior, a dreadful one and a murderer.\textsuperscript{111} 3. It was he, who began to reign over Persia and Assyria. He married a woman from Assyria, whose name was ’Arāwān (Rhea). She bare him two sons: Picus, who is called Rā’an (Zeus), and Ninus, who built a city of reign in Assyria, that is Nineveh. 4. Cronus left his son in his kingdom and went to the West. And reigned over them (people of the West), for they were without king. 5. Picus, his son, who is called Birus\textsuperscript{112} (Zeus), arouse against his father Cronus and killed him; because he ate his children and made pregnant the daughter of Nikes,\textsuperscript{113} his mother, named ’Arāwān (Rhea).\textsuperscript{114}

Chapter 7. 1. Moreover Picus, i.e. Nirus\textsuperscript{115} (Zeus), was the first to marry his own sister. 2. He begat by her a son named Waylulayus (Belus).\textsuperscript{116} And he resembled his grandfather Cronus. 3. This Waylulayus (Belus) reigned over Assyria after his father <Rā’an> (Zeus)\textsuperscript{117} and his grandfather Cronus. 4. Moreover after he died Persians worshipped him together with gods.\textsuperscript{118}

Chapter 8. 1. After Waylulayus (Belus) died, Ninus, his paternal uncle, reigned over Assyria. 2. He married Semiramis,\textsuperscript{120} his mother, and made her wife.\textsuperscript{121} He established this impure custom and preserved it for his successors. And they are called by this evil name till nowadays. 3. This was <not> a stumbling-
block in Persia; and they would take their mothers, sisters and daughters to wives.\textsuperscript{122}

Chapter 9. 1. After the death of Picus, Faunus, called Hermes reigned in the West for thirty-five years. 2. He was a silversmith; he was the first to begin making gold in the East and to smelt it. 3. When he learned that his brothers were envious of him and wanted to kill him, he got afraid and fled to Egypt with a lot of gold. 4. He dwelt in Egypt and was wearing beautiful golden clothes. 5. Moreover he was a sage, who knew everything beforehand. He gave people a lot of money and a lot of gifts to the people of Egypt. 6. Due to this reason, they greeted him with honor and called him ‘Lord of Gold’. He became honorable amongst them, like a god. And the poor bowed down to him.\textsuperscript{123}

Chapter 10. 1. There was one man, named \textit{Qāstos} (Hephaestus), who reigned in Egypt. He was considered a god. He was a warrior and full of rage. 2. People believed that he explored mysteries and received weapons from nothing like an ironsmith.\textsuperscript{124} And he was the first to make weapons to fight in the war times and stones, with which people killed one another.\textsuperscript{125} 3. Indeed he was lame, when he went to a battle, he fell down from a horse and was injured and became lame for his whole life.\textsuperscript{126}

Chapter 11. 1. Methuselah begat Lamech, and Lamech married two women, the name of the first one was Adah, and of the second one was Zillah. 2. Adah bare \textit{Qābel} (Jabal),\textsuperscript{127} and after a short \textit{time} she (Zillah) bare \textit{Tobel} (Tubal-Cain).\textsuperscript{128} He smited with hammer to produce brass and iron. 3. So, \textit{Tobel} (Tubal-Cain), son of Lamech, was a brass and iron smith before the Deluge; for he received wisdom from God, praise be on Him.

Chapter 12. 1. After \textit{ʾAyqās} (Hephaestus), named Sun, his son, named Sun\textsuperscript{129} after his father’s name, reigned in Egypt. 2. It was he, who built a city of Sun (Heliopolis)\textsuperscript{130} and \textit{named it} after his name. There were temples of the supreme gods there as well as the bodies of kings.

Chapter 13. 1. There was a man, whose name was \textit{Māṭunāwis}, who came after \textit{Ayqāsbera}, whose name is by translation Dionysus. 2. He built a city in the

\textsuperscript{122} Cp. \textit{John Malalas} 1.10 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 7). \textsuperscript{123} Cp. \textit{John Malalas} 1.14 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 9-10). \textsuperscript{124} I do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg. Thus, Zotenberg translates: ‘Les hommes croyaient qu’il savait découvrir les choses cachées et faire sortir du néant des armes de guerre; car il était forgeron’ (Zotenberg 1883, 243). Charles translates as follows: ‘And men believed that he investigated hidden things and received weapons of war from the non-existent; for he was an ironsmith’ (Charles 1916, 18-19). \textsuperscript{125} Cp. \textit{John Malas} 1.15: ‘for before his day men had fought with clubs and stones’ (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 10). Colin translates this passage as follows: ‘c’est lui qui fabriqua le premier des armes pour combattre au moment du combat à la place des pierres avec lesquelles les hommes se battaient (auparavant)’ (Colin 1995, 46). \textsuperscript{126} Cp. \textit{John Malalas} 1.15 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 10). \textsuperscript{127} Not identified by Zotenberg and Charles (Zotenberg 1883, 245; Charles 1916, 19). I identify Qābel with the half-brother of Tubal-Cain Jabal. \textsuperscript{128} Not identified by Zotenberg and Charles (Zotenberg 1883, 245; Charles 1916, 19). I identify Tobel with Tubal-Cain (Gen. 4:22). The mother of Tubal-Cain was Zillah, and not Adah. \textsuperscript{129} According to \textit{John Malalas} 2.1 Helios was the son of Hephaestus; however Haephestus himself is not identified with Sun (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 11). \textsuperscript{130} This identification seems to me to be doubtful. It should be noted that elsewhere in the Chronicle the author uses Heliopolis’ Coptic and Arabic names, On and ‘Aīn-Sams.
Chapter 14. Suras, whose name is by translation Apollo, who was called (so) amongst the Greeks, built a city of Samnu (Sebennytos) and a large temple in it. This is a city, which is called Bab’el Fegor.

Chapter 15. 1. In the book of Egyptian wise men Abra’tus is mentioned at that time, that is Hermes, extraordinary in judgement, in which (book) they (wise men) announced to the heathen saying: ‘Truly, three great powers (are) creator of everything (and) one Godhead’. 2. And this Hermes, a great sage amongst the heathen, proclaimed: ‘The Glory of the coequal holy Trinity (is) the Giver of life and King over all things’.

Chapter 16. 1. One region began to cultivate land and was skilled in sowing of wheat and of all related grain. It was the most elevated land in the whole Egypt; for the lands of Egypt were full of water and lakes, because of the abundant flow of the river Gihon.

Chapter 17. 1. Sesostris, who reigned over the whole land of Egypt and its provinces, was the first to levy taxes and to measure land. 2. When he had gathered much booty and taken many captives from the whole land, in consequence he brought them into Egypt. He forced all humans under his power to pay taxes, to dig soil and to fill all the waters of Egypt with earth. 3. Due to that people of Egypt received opportunity to plant plantations and to cultivate fields like the land of Ṣa’ād, which was the first to learn cultivation of land. 4. Moreover he commanded that they should pay taxes and production of the field to the king properly. And he dug a river (channel), which is called Dīk till nowadays.

Chapter 18. 1. After him Sabacon, a king of India, reigned over the land of Egypt for fifty years. 2. He loved people and did not like to shed blood unjustly. He established a law in Egypt so that none, who committed crime, should die or be tortured. Rather they should stay alive, and he commanded

---

131 For a proposal of identification see Zotenberg 1883, 245, n. 4; Booth 2013, 661.
132 Zotenberg identifies this name with Osiris (Zotenberg 1883, 245). Colin follows him in this identification (Colin 1995, 46). 133 Zotenberg first supposes that this presumable city name is composed of two names: ‘Le mot Belphégor paraît être le résultat d’un melentandu, et composé des deux noms de Bel et d’Agénor’ (Zotenberg 1877, 473, n. 1). In 1883 he writes: ‘Il est probable que la dernière phrase renferme quelque erreur (peut-être እልበራቢ፡ est-il une corruption de እልበር፡). Ce mythe est d’ailleurs inconnu’ (Zotenberg 1883, 246, n. 1).
134 From Chapter 17 one learns that it is the region of Ṣa’ād. 135 I do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg but the manuscripts.
136 Cp. Herodotus, Histories 2.108-9, as pointed out by Zotenberg (Zotenberg 1883, 247, n. 1).
to all criminals according to their crimes to sweep the earth, gather soil and put it into the river. 3. When they had done this hard work for a long time during imprisonment, the waters of the river withdrew from the land. And they placed their cities on a high place because of the fear for water, lest they would get flooded. 4. Before, in the days of Sesostris the waters inundated, before they dug a channel for the river. But despite what they had done by adding earth to the water, there was no delight for them, because of the abundance of the river flow. 5. And Sabacon, the king of India, arranged a dwelling for them on a high place in the diligence of his heart.

Chapter 19. 1. There was one man, called Faʾawənǧuyus, a Pharao, who reigned in Egypt. 2. He closed temples of Gods and other idols, which people of Egypt worshipped, and they (also) made sacrifices to demons. He built temples in the city of Manuf (Memphis) and forced the Egyptians to worship Sun. 3. He paid to the construction workers one thousand and six hundred measures of silver despite of leek and vegetables; indeed it is found written so in a book amongst their books in the Egyptian language, which is engraved on a stone wall and made it known to those, who read. 4. He paid out all taxes and laid waste the royal treasuries through these large constructions, which were not even for a good purpose. 5. When he fell in a big trouble and was tormented by his poverty – he had a beautiful daughter. She was stirred through the actions of satan and impure seduction. He put her in a brothel, and she existed in darkness and grief and became a prostitute. 6. And everyone, who wanted to lie with her, carried one of big stones and put it on the construction. 7. It is said that a stone, which one should have brought, was no less than thirty feet, which is twenty cubits, until they built one of the three temples through the impure lust of this wretched girl.

Chapter <20.> 1. It was Heracles, a philosopher of the city of Tyre, who invented how to make silk and linen. He invented the silk garments and was clothed (in them). 2. And Kunəs (Phoenix), the king of Tyre, a Canaanite, and the kings of all places, as well as his successors, did likewise. They became distinguished and recognizable from servants. 3. And the garment of the predecessors was out of wool only. And the kings and
አንደደ በእንተ coni. Cha (23, n. 1)

አንደደ በእንተ coni. Cha (22, n. 2)

አንደደ በእንተ coni. Zot

አንደደ በእንተ coni. Cha (23, n. 1)
governors changed their clothes like this and clothed themselves with silk clothes.\textsuperscript{151}

Chapter 21. 1. There was one man, named Nirus (Perseus).\textsuperscript{152} He wished the throne of Assyria. And the children of Ninus, the brother of his father Nirus (Zeus), looked askance on him.\textsuperscript{153} 2. On his way to Qorontos\textsuperscript{154} he met a virgin, who went alone. 3. He took her hair, cut off her head with a sword and put it on his shield,\textsuperscript{155} according to the magic, his father Nirus (Zeus) had taught him. 4. He carried it with him in all battles he went in. 5. When he travelled, he went down to Bayuriṭe\textsuperscript{156} and returned to Assyria. When Lycoanians wars against him, he took the head of Gorgon, the magical virgin, showed to them and overcame them. 6. And he built a city Iconium - previously it was a small town called Amandra - because he put in front of it a statue (icon) of him with the impure Gorgon.\textsuperscript{157} 7. Then he went to the land of Isaria and Cilicia.\textsuperscript{158} And they also warred upon him, he overcame them through the magic in the Gorgon's head. 8. He made the town Andrasus in Cilicia a city and called it Tarsus. 9. From Cilicia he went to Assyria, and put it on his shield,\textsuperscript{159} there † Sadranapalus, which is a name of dignity.\textsuperscript{159} 10. He revolted against his relatives, seized the kingdom, altered the name of the country, and named it Assyria that is Persia after his name and their kingdom <with> another name. 11. When he took away this name, he planted trees there, which are called bərsəyān (myrtle) that is plum. 12. They also plant these plants as a commemoration of his name till nowadays. Persians were Assyrians at that time, and he reigned over all of them fifty-three years. 13. When there was an earthquake, hissing, and much rain, the river in Assyria called Bayuriṭe\textsuperscript{156} stopped. 14. And when Perseus was wondering what had happened, he said that Ionians, who performed it (were) demonical magicians.\textsuperscript{160} At this time the fire was burning\textsuperscript{161} fire and they preserved this fire. 17. Because of that he (Perseus) took it and brought it to Persia on his return, and brought it to the kingdom of Assyria. 18. Persians made it to God, worshipped it and built for it a temple and called it 'the immortal fire'. 19. And they called this fire the son of the Sun,\textsuperscript{162} which is enveloped into a crystal and the form of a crystal resembles cotton, of the color of water, because it was born from water and its core is like water.\textsuperscript{163}

\textsuperscript{151}Cp. John Malalas 2.9 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 15-16). | \textsuperscript{152}According to Zotenberg, Nirus is a misreading of the Arabic which is in itself a corruption of | \textsuperscript{153}Cp. John Malalas 2.14: 'He was jealous of the children of Ninos, his uncle, his father's brother' (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 17). | \textsuperscript{154}For Zotenberg's interpretation see Zotenberg 1883, 249, n. 2. Charles leaves the word transliterated. According to John Malalas 2.14, Perseus went to Libya (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 17). | \textsuperscript{155}Nöldeke proposes to translate the word Ḍtšče- rath as 'Tasche' (Nöldeke 1883, 1373). | \textsuperscript{156}Zotenberg identifies this toponym with Ethiopia (Zotenberg 1883, 249, n. 5). | \textsuperscript{157}In this verse the origin of the city's name is explained. | \textsuperscript{158}Charles interprets the passage as follows: 'to Isaria, a city of Cilicia' (Charles 1916, 22). However, Isaria, is a district, not a city. | \textsuperscript{159}This passage remains obscure. I don't follow the conjecture by Zotenberg. | \textsuperscript{160}The passage remains obscure. For the interpretation by Charles, see Charles 1916, 22-23, n. 4. I follow the manuscripts and translate the text wordly. | \textsuperscript{161}Cp. with John Malalas 2.20 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 20). | \textsuperscript{162}Cp. John Malalas 1.3 another ball of fire is mentioned, which was called son of the sun (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 3). Probably this passage is a result of merging of two different accounts. | \textsuperscript{163}Cp. John Malalas 2.14-2.20 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 17-19).
Chapter 22. 1. Inachus, of the tribe of Japhet, son of Noah, who reigned in the East in the land of Argives,\(^{164}\) was the first to reign over this land. 2. He worshipped the moon and made her goddess. 3. He built a city in the land of Argives, which is called after the name of the moon Iopoli, because the people of Argives call the moon Io secretly till nowadays. 4. And he built a house, performed sacrifices in it and created a brazen image for moon and wrote on it yomokarda\(^{165}\) that means ‘full of light’.\(^{166}\)

Chapter. 23. 1. Libya, - the daughter of Picus and her mother (was) Qalnayā\(^{167}\) - was the wife of Poseidon, who reigned in the north (sumer). 2. And he (Poseidon) named the country, over which he reigned, after his wife’s name Libya. Poseidon\(^{168}\) begot by her †Walubih (Belus)\(^{169}\) and †ʾAwərun (Agenor),\(^{170}\) in Canaan.\(^{171}\) 3. The last, when he took him a wife named Tyro, he built also a city and called it after the name of his wife Dayrus, that is Tyre. 4. When he reigned there, he begot by her three children illustrious ones and legislators - †ʾAkbānurus\(^{172}\) and Qabnikəs (Phoenix), who was the first to wear silk.\(^{173}\) 5. When he was about to die, he gave a share to his three children and put the land under their rule. 6. Qabnikəs (Phoenix) took Canaan and all its provinces and called it Futuniki (Phoenicia) after his name. 7. The second one took Syria and gave it his name.\(^{174}\) 8. And † Qabnikəs (Phoenix) †, the third one, received his provinces and named it after his name Qilqəyā (Cilicia).\(^{175}\)

Chapter 24. 1. There was one man named Taurus, who reigned in Crete, he left it and came to Tyre on sunset, he made war, overcame it and took its riches and captured many cities. 2. On this occasion he took †ʾAwrabi (Europe) and made her wife. When he came from the sea at night, he went to his land Tarsus and Crete\(^{176}\) together with his wife †ʾAwrabi (Europe), and he named this land after his wife’s name. 3. He built a city there and named it

\(^{164}\) This toponym was taken from the translation by Charles and causes some problems (Charles 1916, 23-24). I was not able to identify a precise toponym behind this term. Zotenberg does not make any difference between the toponym ʾAwərun and the ethnonym ʾAwərun.\(^{165}\) This means ‘full of light’.\(^{166}\)

\(^{167}\) Transliteration of ʾ Awərun (Charles 1916, 24).\(^{168}\) According to John Malalas 2.8 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 13-14).\(^{169}\) According to John Malalas 2.8, her mother was Io (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 14).\(^{170}\) According to Crum this proper name contains traces of Coptic (Crum 1917, 237).\(^{171}\) According to John Malalas 2.8, Poseidon had three sons named Agenor, Belos and Enyalios (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 14).\(^{172}\) The conjecture by Zotenberg corresponds to the text of John Malalas 2.8 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 14). However, I don’t follow it, but the readings of manuscripts.\(^{173}\) The passage is very confused. Zotenberg and Charles identify the name ʾAwrabi with Syros (Zotenberg 1883, 251; Charles 1916, 24). This corruption might be explained through a mistaken reading of Cypov for Oupov. Alternately it should be associated with Europe. However, Syros is referred to in 23.7. The name of Cilix is corrupt as well; this form is rather used for Cilicia throughout the text, as well as in this Chapter (23.8).\(^{174}\) According to John Malalas 2.8: ‘So he reigned there and had sons by Tyro - Kadmos, Phoenix, Syros and Kilix - and a daughter, whom he named Europe’ (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 15).\(^{175}\) In this case Syros is probably meant.\(^{176}\) The text is confused, the dominion of Phoenix is meant above, in 23.6. Here the text should rather read ‘Cilix’. However, the conjecture proposed by Zotenberg does not seem to me to be appropriate: he uses an invented form of the name attested nowhere in the text.\(^{177}\)
Qәrtinә (Gortyna) after his mother’s name. And he was from the tribe of Picus, that is Biәrus (Zeus).177

Chapter 25. There was one man named Lәуәn (Laius), <father> of Waykә (Iokkas).179 When he saw that his son had intercourse with his mother, he commanded his soldiers to suspend him on a tree and to cut off its branches so that the feet of the suspended one, were fixed.180

Chapter 26. 1. There was one man named Seruch from the tribe of Japhet, son of Noah. 2. He appeared to be the first one of those, who worshipped idols through the action of Satan. He set up altars for the idols and served them.181

Chapter 27. 1. The pure Melchizedek <appeared>, indeed he was a Gentile, he served God and was a chaste without wrongdoing. 2. The Holy Scripture proclaimed that he was without father and mother, because he was not of the tribe of Abraham. 3. He hated the gods of his father and made himself a priest of the living God. 4. † ...182 he descended from the tribe of Sidus, son of the king of Egypt and Nubia, after whom the Egyptians <are named.> 5. Indeed, Melchizedek means ‘the king of righteousness’. 6. This priest (Sidus) reigned over Canaan and he was from a powerful tribe. The Egyptians named him so because of the Canaanites, which is till nowadays the land of Palestine.183 7. When he warred against them, they subjected to him. While they were pleased with him, he dwelt there, built a city and named it after his name Sidon, which is reckoned in Canaan till nowadays. 8. Indeed, concerning the father of Melchizedek, who left Sidon, we have learnt what his origin was. His father is reckoned in Canaan till nowadays. 9. He reigned there for one hundred and thirteen years and died in chastity and righteousness, as the wise Yosef (Josephus), a chronicler, wrote at the beginning of his book, that is the History of Jews.184 10. He reigned there for one hundred and thirteen years and died in chastity and righteousness, as the wise Yosef (Josephus), a chronicler, wrote at the beginning of his book, that is the History of Jews.184 11. Indeed he was the first <to offer> sacrifices to God of heaven and a bloodless oblation of bread and vine in a likeness of the Holy Mysteries of Our Lord Jesus Christ. As David sung saying: ‘You are His priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek.’185 12. He also said:

---

177 According to Crum, this form of the proper name contain traces of a Coptic article (Crum 1917, 208).
178 Cp. John Malalas 2.8 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 15). 179 Charles proposes here another emendation and interpretation: ‘hence the whole word may be a corrupt form of Labdachus, the father of Laius, Then read (ወልደ፡) ለብደኮስ፡’ (Charles 1916, 25, n. 2). I propose another emendation, which is, however, vague for the form አቡወይካ፡ might also have been created through misinterpretation of the Arabic Vorlage. The translation of this passage causes problems. Cp. John Malalas 2.36 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 24). 180 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, who just deletes the word መስክን፡. Although I can’t provide any proper translation, it seems possible that the usage of መስክን፡ might refer to a certain construction in the Arabic Vorlage. The passage is not very clear. Charles proposes the following emendation and translation: ‘and the Egyptians so named him because of <the land of> the Canaanites, which is the land of Palestine’, which is till nowadays the land of Palestine.183 181 Cp. John Malalas 2.43 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 26). 182 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, who just deletes the word መስክን։. Although I can’t provide any proper translation, it seems possible that the usage of መስክን፡ might refer to a certain construction in the Arabic Vorlage. The passage is not very clear. Charles proposes the following emendation and translation: ‘and the Egyptians so named him because of <the land of> the Canaanites, which is the land of Palestine’.
Chapter 28. 1. There was one man named 'Anastartās (Hesiod) from the tribe of Japhet, son of Noah. 2. It was he, who was the first to invent the Greek writing and to teach this writing. 3. It is said that in the days of the kings of Egypt there was a philosopher in the land of Lidya from the offsprings of giants from the tribe of Japhet, whose name was 'Andimyānos (Endymion). 4. It is said that he prayed secretly to the moon and that he learned from the moon the name of God in a vision. 5. One day, on his way, he heard the holy name, at that moment he gave up the ghost, died and has not arisen. 6. His body remained kept in the city of Lidya till nowadays and they showed it to all people every year, when they opened his coffin, where it stays.

Chapter 29. 1. It is said that in the time of Joshua, son of Nun, a king named 'Awodiketun (Odyges) reigned over the country of Attica. There was a great deluge only in this country. And this king perished, as well as, those who dwelt there. 2. It became a desert, and no one dwelt there for two hundred and seven years years as Firkayānus (Africanus) wrote in the chronicles.

Chapter 30. 1. In the time of Moses, law-giver and servant of God, who lead the Exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt there was Petissonius, i.e. Pharaoh Amosius, king of Egypt, who reigned with the help of <the book magicians> Jannes and Jambres, who did disgraceful things in front of the god.
great Moses, who talked to God. For that reason they said, that they did not want to let the children of Israel go, after the miracles and wonders, which had been performed by his rod.\(^{197}\) 2. Indeed he (Petissonius) went towards the wise men of Manuf (Memphis).\(^{198}\) He told of the vision\(^{199}\) and made sacrifices. 3. When one of the Hebrews asked Taninus (Pythia),\(^{200}\) the augur, he heard the following words: ‘It is the God of Hebrews, who is in the heaven, the immortal, the first, indeed the heaven trembles before him, as well as the earth, and all the seas are afraid of him, and the satans tremble. And few angels remain, for He is a creator of powers and measures’. 4. And Petissonius inscribed this oracle on a tablet and put it into the temple, in the place of a water-measure, where they indicated\(^{201}\) (the level of) the river of Nile.\(^{202}\) 5. We should report that in these times also the destruction of the temple <until the bottom of the foundations of the idol temples>\(^{203}\) happened, nevertheless only this tablet was not destroyed in Egypt. And no one could maintain the temple of Manuf (Memphis). 6. Indeed, all the temples were destroyed through the power of Our Lord Jesus Christ. 7. And this insane Petissonius, i.e. Pharaoh Amosius, sunk in the Red sea with his horses and his horsemen. 8. Then he learned after the Exodus of the children of Israel, that they had taken the properties of the people of Egypt. It was according to the will of God and rightly, because the children of Israel took the properties of Egypt, (as a) compensation for the hard labor they had been forced to do without rest. Wrath overwelmed Pharaoh at that time. 9. He went forth to chase them with his army, and sunk in the sea with those, who were with him, and none survived. 10. The children of Israel went across the sea like on the land and came to the place, where God wished, because he is the conquer of all the elements of creation – Glory be on Him!\(^{204}\) 11. Thereafter the people of Egypt perished. Those, who remained, worshipped the demons and abandoned God. Those rebels destroyed their own souls and resembled the angels, who rebelled against God. They worshipped the work of their own hands. 12. There were those who worshipped an ox, and those (who worshiped) a cow, and those (who worshiped) a dog, and moreover those (who worshiped) a mule, and those (who worshiped) a donkey, and those (who worshiped) a lion, and those (who worshiped) fish, and those (who worshiped) a crocodile, and some – leek, and many others alike. 13. They named the cities of Egypt after the name of their god. And they worshipped the building (temple?) of

\(^{197}\) Charles marks this passage as a corrupt one (Charles 1916, 28, n. 1). However, this passage corresponds to the content of John Malalas 3.12: ‘Then Jannes and Jambres, using their wizardry, turned their rod into a snake which attacked Moses. Moses prayed and he too hurled to the ground the rod which he held. His rod also turned into an extremly large snake which swallowed up the snake which Jannes and Jambres had made. So Moses won, and the wizardry, turned their rod into a snake which attacked Moses. Moses prayed and he too

\(^{198}\) See Timm 1988, 1556, n. 5. | \(^{199}\) I disregard here the conjecture by Zotenberg. | \(^{200}\) According to John Malalas 3.13 it was Petissonius who posed Pythia the question (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 32). | \(^{201}\) The conjecture proposed by Zotenberg in his translation part is based on the text by John Malalas (Zotenberg 1883, 257, n. 1). I don’t follow this conjecture. | \(^{202}\) A Nilometer is meant. | \(^{203}\) The passage is not very clear, I suggested a transposition. However, the passage still remains a bit problematic. See also Colin 1995, 46, n. 23: Zotenberg and Charles do not draw attention to this passage and provide a very bad translation of the passage (Charles 1916, 28; Zoten berg 1883, 257). | \(^{204}\) Cp. John Malalas 3.11-3.14 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 30-32).
Busir and Manuf (Memphis), and Samnud (Sebennytos), and Ašna (Antinoe), and the tree, the crocodile and they worshipped the buildings of many cities and also the whirlwind.

Chapter 31. 1. In the time, of him, who first reigned in Egypt, while they were worshiping idols and those, which are mentioned previously, and of the famous city Absai, that is Nikiu, the king’s name was ‘Abrusubidā (Prosopis), and the interpretation of his name ‘the lover of gods with three faces’. He was on the western river bank. He was warring the whole time with barbarians, who came from the five cities (Pentapolis), who were called Riṭānāwəyān (Mauritanians). 2. When those came full of wrath, people of the land warred against them violently and killed many of them. 3. Due to the favor of this victory, they did not come back to the land for a long time, through the mercy of God, who brought everything from non-existence to existence through the power of his almighty Godhead. 4. And the Greeks called the great river of Egypt ‘Akrisuru (Chrysorroas), and in the book, inspired by God, it is called Gihon. 5. This river was in the East of the city. It flowed from the East to the West of the city. So, the city was like an island in the midst of a river, like plantation of a tree, which is called ‘akrəyās, that is myrtle.

Chapter 32. 1. Canaanites, i.e. Palestines, reigned over Jerusalem, which was built by Melchizedek. And Joshua, son of Nun, subdued it and named it Jebus. 2. He dwelt in Shechem, for he subdued all the adjoining countries; and it is called Nāblos (Neapolis) until nowadays. 3. In the time of the kings – sages David and Solomon, - David prepared all the construction works regarding the holy temple of God. And Solomon built <it> in Jerusalem. 4. He named it the city of Sanctuary, due to the sanctification and the legal sacrifice and its great holiness, because Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ underwent his passion there - Glory be on Him!

Chapter 33. In the time of Judges there was one judge amongst the Greeks, whose name was Bāynudəs, who was called centurion (chief) with sharp eyes, who would look from a big distance and would see better than anyone. And he was the first to invent in the West all the handicrafts.

---

205 According to Timm this placename should be rather rendered as Memphis, however, he bases this suggestion on the translation by Zotenberg, which differs from my translation (see below) (Timm 1988, 1577). 206 See Timm 1991, 2254-2262. 207 See Timm 1991, 2239-2242. 208 Zotenberg supposes that certain cities are meant: ‘et (la ville) de l’Arbre et (la ville) du Crocodile’ (Zotenberg 1883, 257). Crum follows him and suggests to identify the ‘city of the tree’ with Edna (Crum 1917, 208). I, however, interprete the passage differently. 209 A corrupt passage according to Charles (Charles 1916, 29). 210 According to Crum this proper name contains traces of Coptic (Crum 1917, 207). 211 Zotenberg interpretes this as Pentapolis; Charles just remarks that the passage is corrupt (Zotenberg 1883, 258; Charles 1916, 29, n. 2). 212 Zotenberg explains this form as a distorted transliteration of the Arabic (Zotenberg 1883, 258, n.2). 213 Zotenberg translates as follows: ‘coulait (primitivement) à l’orient de la ville; puis il changea son cours et coula vers l’occident’ (Zotenberg 1883, 259). ‘Now this river flowed (anciently) to the east of the city, but it changed its course from the east to the west of the city’ (Charles 1916, 29). 214 Nöldeke writes on this word as follows: ‘der unter akrejās Cp. 31 am Ende verborgene Name der Myrthe ist vielleicht ṣāhraṯ (Lōw, Aram. Pflanzennamen S. 50), das wohl in ‘entstellt sein könnte’ (Nöldeke 1883, 1371). Alternatively, ’akrəyās, might have been derived from ṣāhraṯ = myrtle. 215 Cp. John Malalas 4.3 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 33). 216 Bāynudəs might derive from the Greek πανόπτης in Malalas (cp. Thurn 2000, 49, l. 30). 217 For the expression ለቤ፡ ምእት፡ see Dillmann 1955, 104. However, the comparison with the Chronicle of John Malals shows that the word ለቤ፡ might refer to the number of eyes as well. Cp. John Malalas 4.4: ‘and all-seeing Argos, whom men called Hundred-eyes because he was perspicacious and quick’ (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 33).
Chapter 34. 1. Prometheus and Epimetheus found an engraved stone tablet, which had been written and engraved in previous times. 2. The prophet Elijah interpreted the verses. And the Greeks remembered this, saying: 'on account of this he ascended to heaven, and what was in the heaven was in his heart'.

3. And moreover Deucalion wrote verses and an account, on what had happened in the time of the deluge and miracles.

Chapter 35. 1. After a deluge in Attica the reign passed to the Athenians. 2. One man named Ἀρφοις (Orpheus)† βητα ῥάκαν's enlarikus ba-Tarses (in Odrysae) †, who was called a great sage amongst the Greeks. 2. He established for them what is called 'combatant for God', as it is appropriate.

Chapter 36. 1. In these days there were Arfas (Orpheus)† beta rak's enlarikus ba-Tarses (in Odrysae) †, who was called a great sage amongst the Greeks. 2. He established for them what is called 'awgānya' (Theogony), the interpretation of which amongst them is 'combatant for God', what the
CHRISTINE OF JOHN OF NIKIU: TEXT 36.2. – 40.7.

1. ወዜነዎሙ፡ ጢማታዎስ፡ ጸሓፌ፡ አዝማናት፡ 3. ይቤ፡ እምቅጻ፡ ኵሉ፡ አዝማን፡ ሀሎ፡ ሥሉስ፡ ቅዱስ፡ ዕሩይ፡ በ፩፡ መለኮት፡ ሁጣሬ፡ ኵሉ። |

2. ወውስ፡ ለሰብእ፡ 2. እስመ፡ ኮኑ፡ ቅድመ፡ ፈላስፋ፡ ዘከሠቱ፡ ግብረ፡ ለገቢረ፡ ፈውስ፡ ዘይሰነአው፡ ለከርሥ፡ 3. ወብዙኃን፡ ሰብእ፡ የሐውሩ፡ ይበ፡ አቴና፡ በእንተ፡ ዝንቱ፡ ግብር። ዓዲ፡ እስመ፡ | ሀሎ፡ ህየ፡ እስከ፡ ዮም። |

3. ንጉሥ፡ ሰሎሞን፡ ወልደ፡ ዳዊት፡ ውእቱ፡ ወጠነ፡ ሐኒጸ፡ በተ፡ ብለኔ፡ ወመካነ፡ ምንባባት፡ ወትምህርት፡ ውስተ፡ ኵሉ፡ መካን፡ ዘሀሎ፡ ቤሕተ፡ ሥልጣኑ፡ እስመ፡ አጋንንት፡ ኮኑ፡ ይትቀነዩ፡ ሎቱ፡ 2. እስመ፡ ኮነ፡ ™

4. ወሶበ፡ አእመሩ፡ አተዘኑ፡ ወኮኑ፡ አዝማዲሁ፡ ኵሎሙ፡ አመህይ:

5. ተብህለ፡ እሙንቱ፡ ሖሩ፡ ኀበ፡ መካነ፡ ዜናውያን፡ ወምንባረ፡ ልሂቃን፡ ወተስእልዎ፡ ለ፩፡ እምኔሆሙ፡ እንዘ፡ ይብል። አንሰ፡ ሹከብኩ፡ ሲሳየ፡ ሰብእ፡ እምአባል፡ ንኡስ፡ 3. ወተምዐ፡ እግዚአብሔር፡ ወቀሠፎ፤ ወተወለጠ፡ ልቡናሁ፡ ወገደፈ፡ ርእሶ፡ ውስተ፡ ለአእላፍ፡ 7.

6. ወወሀብዎ፡ አምኃ፡ ለዘይነግሮሙ፡ ወይቤሎሙ፡ ሠላስ፡ ለጸብእ፡ ሰብአ፡ ከሲከስ፡ ዘውእቱ፡ ተሰምየ፡ | በዐለ፡ ዝ፡ | መልክዕ፡ ወእምድኅረ፡ መዊኦቶሙ፡ | ነሐነጹ፡ ቤተ፡ አማልክት፡ ወሰመይዎ፡ ስሞ፡ ሊከውስ፡ ዘበትርጓሜሁ፡ እመ፡ አማልክት። 5. ተብህለ፡ እሙንቱ፡ ሖሩ፡ ኀበ፡ መካነ፡ ዜናውያን፡ ወምንባረ፡ ልሂቃን፡ ወተስእልዎ፡ ለ፩፡ እምኔሆሙ፡ እንዘ፡ ይብሉ፡ ተነበይ፡ ለነ፡ ኦነቢይ፡ ላእኩ፡ ለአጰሎን፡ ምንት፡ ይከውን፡ ሎቱ፡ ወስሙː ይከውን፡ ለአእላፍ፡ 7.
Chapter 37. 1. It is said that the sages of Athenians were the first to practice medicine for people. 2. Indeed, there were previously philosophers, who discovered the good art of practicing medicine, which is in harmony with the stomach. 3. Moreover, many people went to Athens because of that matter, in fact it remains there also until nowadays.

Chapter 38. 1. King Solomon, son of David, began to construct baths and places for reading and learning in all places under his dominion; for demons were subjected to him. 2. Indeed, this matter happened to him before he provoked God, Lord of everything, through the heathen women, who lived with him. They polluted Jerusalem with their gods.

Chapter 39. 1. Also in these days there was a philosopher, named Marsyas, arose in the land of ‘Afraqəyā (Phrygia). 2. He began to play on flute, horn and trumpet. 3. He deafened the ears of people and made a God out of himself saying: ‘I found food for people out of a small member’. 3. God was enraged and punished him. He lost his mind, cast himself into a river and disappeared.

Chapter 40. 1. Also in these days there was Ḥorqāl (Heracles) and the people of Luṇoyā assisted the sailors, who were with him. They went to Pantōn (Hellespont). 2. There was with them (people of Hellespont) a king whose name was Cyzicus. They (sailors) attacked him and killed the king Cyzicus without awareness. 3. When they became aware, they became sad, and they all were his relatives, <and he was> from their country. 4. Then they went to battle against the people of Cyzicus, who was called the lord of seven images. After their victory <they built a temple, and> called it Ra’awas (Rhea), which means ‘mother of gods’. 5. It is said that they went to the place of oracles and the seat of the seniors and they asked one of them saying: ‘Predict us, O, prophet, the servant of Apollo, what is this and for whom is this building?’ 6. They gave him, who talked to them, presents and he told them: ‘They are three but in one God only. Now, a virgin will get pregnant according to His word, and this house will be for Him, and His name will..."
መፍርህ፡ ወሶበ፡ ተሀውከ፡ ሕሊናሁ፡ በኑፋቄ፡ ጸለየ፡ ወሰአለ፡ ኀበ፡ እግዚእነ፡ መዛርዒሁ፡ ዐቢያን፡ በአምሳለ፡ ንስር፡ መፍርህ፡ ጥቀ። 6. ወይብሎሙ፡ ሶበ፡ ለይእት፡ ዘይመስል፡ ብእሴ፡ ዘቦቱ፡ ፪፡ አክና|ፍ፡ ላዕለ፡ ለውእቱ፡ ሀይከል፡ ቤተ፡ ክርስትያን፡ ለቅድስት፡ ድንግል፡ ወላዲተ፡ ወአእሚሮ፡ D ወአሠርገዎ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ለውእቱ፡ ቤት፡ ወአዘዘ፡ ይሚጥዎ፡ መንገለ፡ ምሥራቅ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር። ቤተ፡ ክርስቲያናት፡ | በስመ፡ ቅዱስ፡ ሚካኤል፡ ርእሰ፡ መላ ቤተ፡ ንጉሥ፡ D ወእምዝ፡ ሶበ፡ ኖመ፡ ሰም|ዐ፡ በውስተ፡ ራእይ፡ ከመ፡ ጤሽያ፡ ውስቴታ፡ ወበጊዜሃ፡ አእመረ፡ ከመ፡ ውእቱ፡ ሥዕለ፡ በአምሳል፡ ዘርእዩ፡ 8. ወሰመይዎ፡ ዕጉትዎ፡ ለውእቱ፡ መካን፡ ዘርእዩ፡ ቦቱ፡ ሥዕለ፡ ኀይል፡ ወሐነጹ፡ በ|ህየ፡ በውእቱ፡ ብእሲ፡ ጐዩ፡ እስከ፡ ጽንፈ፡ ሐይቅ፡ መፍርህ፡ ጥቀ። 5. ወርእዩ፡ ጥደ፡ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋዩ። ወተ በአምሳል፡ ዖር፡ ሀገሮሙ፡ D በስመ፡ ቅዱስ፡ ሚካኤል፡ ርእሰ፡ መላ ወአእሚሮ፡ D ገስጠንጢስ፡ G ካንጋራ፡ ለውእቱ፡ ለቅድስት፡ ድንግል፡ ወላዲተ፡ ወአእሚሮ፡ D ወአሠርገዎ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ለውእቱ፡ ቤት፡ ወአዘዘ፡ ይሚጥዎ፡ መንገለ፡ ምሥራቅ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር። በአምሳል፡ ዘርእዩ፡ ዘኅሮ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር። ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋዩ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋዩ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን־ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋዩ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉsoftmax; ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋዩ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይução; በንዋወፋዎ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋወፋዎ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአቱ፡ ለእግዚእነ፡ ዐቢያን፡ ማርያም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይúdo; በንዋወፋዎ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአጥየም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋወፋዎ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአጥየም። 9. ዘንተ፡ ረሰየ፡ ንጉሥ፡ ዘይኑን፡ ተሣይጦ፡ በንዋወፋዎ። ወተ ለአጋንንት፡ ዘሰበኩ፡ በእንተ፡ ምጽአተሏጫ;
belong to thousands.’ 7. The idolaters wrote down this prophecy on marble²⁴⁰ with a brazen pen, and they put it in one of the sanctuaries. 8. After those times, in the days of the God-loving emperor Zeno they turned this sanctuary into a church of the Saint Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. 9. The emperor Zeno established that on his costs. And the prophecy of demons, who proclaimed the coming of Our Lord Jesus Christ, was accomplished.²⁴¹

Chapter 41. 1. The sailors of ’Arğun (Argo) went from Ṕaṇṭon (Hellespont) to an island named Fāskarikinēs (Principi). 2. From there they went in the direction of Chalcedon and wanted to cross over to the sea of Pāntos (Pontus). 3. They had taken with them one strong man, and he warred against them, tyrannized and overcame them.²⁴² 4. When they became afraid of the wrath of this man, they fled to the wild seashore. 5. They saw a mighty portent in the sky resembling a human with two large wings on his shoulders in likeness of a terrifying eagle. 6. He told them: ‘When you battle with Amycus, you will overcome him’. When they heard this utterance from the vision they saw, they became strong, battled, overcame and killed him. 7. They praised the place, where they had seen the vision of power and built a house there. They placed there an image²⁴³ resembling what they had seen. 8. They named this house Sosthenium, for they sought protection there and were saved. And it is called so till nowadays. 9. In the days of Constantine the Great, the most honored of Christian kings, servant of Jesus Christ, when he reigned first over the city of Byzantium, that is in Rome, he entered Sosthenium in order to close the idol temple, which <was> there.²⁴⁴ 10. Then he saw the image there, at that moment he understood that it was an image of an angel. When his mind was stirred up in doubt, he prayed and appealed to Our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom he trusted soundly, saying: ‘O Lord, reveal to me this image!’ 11. Thereafter while sleeping he heard in dreams that this image was the image of St Michael the Archangel. 12. He learned that he sent to me this image! 13. And there were many miracles of healing the ill there. Thereafter Christians began to build churches in the name of the St Archangel Michael and to offer holy sacrifices to God there.

²⁴⁰ Zotenberg proposes an alternative translation: ‘sur une pierre de cristal’ (Zotenberg 1883, 263). However, John Malalas 4.12 reads: ‘in bronze letters on stone, that is, marble’ (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 38). | ²⁴¹ Cp. John Malalas 3.12 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 37-38). See also Agosti 2008. ²⁴² Zotenberg translates: ‘Ils furent attaqués par les habitants qui mirent en avant un homme puissant, qui les repoussa victorieusement’, whithout any conjecture in the Ethiopic text (Zotenberg 1883, 264). Charles follows him and translates: ‘But the inhabitants brought with them a man of valour and fought with them. (And) he gained the mastery and overcame them’ (Charles 1916, 32). | ²⁴³ Zotenberg, as well as Charles, translate the word ሥዕል፡ as ‘statue’ in this Chapter (Zotenberg 1883, 264; Charles 1916, 33). For the sake of clarity, I prefer to translate ሥዕል፡ as ‘image’ here. | ²⁴⁴ I changed the plural form into singular, because I consider the relative construction to refer to the first word of the status constructus. | ²⁴⁵ Cp. John Malalas 3.13 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 38).
The passage causes some problems. It might be that the passage α C: የስመ: ወስመ: ካል is a duplication, or that something is missing just before it. | 260Zotenberg proposes to render sarāwīt as 'senate' (Zotenberg 1883,
Chapter 42. 1. It is told concerning the holy nails, which were found together with the Cross of Our Savior Jesus Christ, on which his holy body was nailed, that God-loving St Constantine took one of them and put it into the sarg of a horse that is saddle. The second one he put into the horse's brindle. The third one he put into the passage of Chalcedon. 2. For they had been in a big difficulty until the sea storm got tranquil for them, on behalf of this benevolent saint, as well as all the waves of the ocean. 3. His reign was strong in the city of Constantinople, and in the days of Zeno the reign was in Rome. According to the decision of the generals (saraq) they united their empires. 4. It happened due to the continuous rebels of barbarians. It occurred according to the advice of officials, that there should be another authority for them in Asia.

Chapter 43. 1. In the days of Samson, the last of the Judges, 'Awəlibṭos (Lapathos) reined in the time of 'Ağiystu. He had two children, <whose names> were 'Akāwun (Achaius) and <Lu>qinā (Lacon). 2. He divided the lands <of> his empire in two parts – one half for himself and one half for his children. 3. After he had died, they named this land 'Akāyəyā (Achaia) after the name of his elder son; and the name of another one is Luqānəyā (Laconia) after the name of his younger son until nowadays.

Chapter 44. 1. In this time one king, named Biluyəs (Pelops), reigned in the land of Hellas. 2. The Greeks call this man the king of an island after his name Bālubābyā (Peloponnesus) till nowadays. 3. He built a city and named it Bāləbānyun (Peloponnesus) after his own name, and the name of his kingdom is Hellas till today.

Chapter 45. There was one man named Bilāwon (Peleus). He built a city of Fārmā (Pelusium) in his name. And 'Abrəyāmanus (Priam) built a city of Malkubinun, that is 'Afraqəyā (Phrygia) in 'Asbarṭubulus (Sparta), the land of Hellas, when he arrived there.

Chapter 46. There was one man, whose name was Bilāmidəs (Palamedes), a wise and intelligent man. He was the first to teach playing music on fiddle, harp and flute, and all musical instruments.

245 The translation of this passage causes some problems for me. I follow the text rather wordly, whereas Zotenberg interpretes this passage as follows: 'L’un (de ces deux empires) avait été établi, à cause des soulèvements continuels des barbares, et l’autre, sur l’avis des généraux, afin qu’il y eût un autre chef en Asie’ (Zotenberg 1883, 265). Charles translates: ‘For one of these had been established on account of the continual outbreaks of the barbarians, and the other in accordance with the counsel of the prefects in order that they might have another authority in Asia’ (Charles 1916, 34).

250 The identification is problematic. Here I do not follow a conjecture of በመዋዕለ፡ into በአድዋለ፡, which was proposed to Zotenberg by Dillmann. Zotenberg pointed to the similarity of this proper name with the toponym Αἰγύπτου (Egypt) in John Malalas (Zotenberg 1883, 265-266, n. 5). Cp. John Malalas 4.17: ‘At that time Lapathos reigned over the land of Egypt’ (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 40). However, Charles interpretes this name is ‘Aegistheus’ (Charles 1916, 34). Probably, Aegisthos, a contemporary of Samson is meant here (cp. the Chronicle of Eusebius). Aegisthos is also mentioned in John Malalas 4.21 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 41). I base my conjecture on the graphical similarity of the letters ሉ and ኩ. I suppose that due to this similarity the mistake in the spelling of the proper name might have been done first in the Ethiopic version.

251 The whole passage causes problems, Zotenberg does not attempt to translate it (Zotenberg 1883, 266). Cp. John Malalas 4.19 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 41). I don’t follow the conjecture by Charles. I would rather suggest that something is missing after the word ደሴት፡, probably a passage ending with the word ደሴት፡ as well (meaning ‘and they call this island’). However, other explanations are possible as well.

252 ‘Il est impossible de trover dans ce texte corrompu une narration raisonnable. Dans les noms propres, également fort altérés, on croit reconnaître les noms d’Ilion, de Priam, de la Phrygie, de Sparte’ (Zotenberg 1883, 266, n. 5).

253 The letter part bulus comes from πόλις (polis).
Chapter 47. 1. Moreover ʾAtrus (Tros), who reigned in the land of ʾAfrāqəyā (Phrygia), before he killed ʾAbrəyāmanus (Priam) and Qābin (Hecuba), he killed their young men and seized their palaces, so that there might be memorial on him. And this land was under his dominion and he named it ʾAndəryān. 2. And he named Ṭibāryā of Ṭān Ṭon ʾƎsyā (Asia) of ʾƎfeson (Ephesus). It is called now Saqālyā. And it is a big island, its previous name was Qubābā.

Chapter 48. 1. Solomon, son of David, king of Israel, built a large building in Bilimikṭun in the middle of the city as his memorial, so that his name and his father’s name would not be forgotten. 2. He granted it to one man, whose name was ʾAywayni, which is by interpretation ‘light’ in Canaan. He named the building Palmyra. 3. Indeed, on this place a victory happened to his strong and powerful father David, when he killed Goliath, the Philistine, and conquered him. 4. Because of that he named it Mezād, in order that strangers can dwell there. There were many Jewish soldiers in it. 5. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Persia took this city with much toil and effort until he could destroy it and burn in fire. He destroyed the memory of it till nowadays.

Chapter 49. 1. Moreover, concerning the city of Tyre, that is an island: he (Nebuchadnezzar) made much effort to take it. 2. He commanded to his soldiers, to cavalry and foot-soldiers, and to all people of Persia to throw earth into the arm of the sea, which surrounded it. 3. They filled it with earth until the waters of sea dried up and became like land. By these means Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Persia, could seize this city.

Chapter 50. 1. In this time Jeremiah, the greatest of the prophets and the lover of virtues, - in the time of the captivity, which happened through the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, - was commanded by God, and the force of angels was granted to him. Before Nabuchadnezzar came and burnt the sanctuary of God with fire, Jeremiah entered the second chamber, which is called the Holy of Holies, and he took the Ark of God, covered outside and inside with gold and the glorious objects that were in it, that is the Tablets of the Law, the golden box of manna, the almond-blossoming rod of Aaron, and a dry flinty stone, from which Moses had given people to drink when they thirsted. 2. Moreover, Moses, the prophet, carried this stone going in front of people

---

255 The beginning of Chapter resembles John Malalas 4.15 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 39). However, the rest of the narrative is close to John Malalas 5.42-43 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 57). One could suggest either a loss of text in the course of its transmission (not supported by Index) or a corruption of John’s Vorlage.

256 The edition of Zotenberg contains the reading present only in manuscripts A and B, that is ʿdh. ʿPlq. ʿf. Charles transliterates this toponym as ‘Sitabarja’ (Charles 1916, 34).

257 The text of the Chapter 47 is not very clear. Zotenberg does not translate this Chapter, but he identifies some proper names in the text (Zotenberg 1883, 266, n. 7). See also Charles 1916, 34-35. Charles changes the word order in this passage, thus merging two sentences into one and pointing to the fact that ‘the text is very confused’ (Charles 1916, 35, n. 2). However his translation follows the translation by Zotenberg, rather than the Ethiopic text (Zotenberg 1883, 268).
 Chronicle of John of Nikiu: Text 50.1. – 51.11.
during their journey in desert according to the commandment of God. 3. Each time people thirsted, he threw it to the ground and stroked it with his rod, and water poured out, and people and all cattlle would drink. 4. Jeremiah took those objects and the stone, went quickly to the rocks and hid them until nowadays. 5. During the second Coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ proceeded by the sign of the Cross, this Ark will appear being carried by angels. Also Moses, who made it, will come, as well as Jeremiah, who hid it in the rocks. 6. In the time when the dead shall rise, the sign of the Cross will appear; and thereafter Our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified – glory be on Him! 7. As for these words, they are found in the teaching of St Epiphanius, our luminous father, bishop of Cyprus. He wrote down all the accounts of the prophets in his book after the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the Jewish kingdom.

Chapter 51. 1. Cyrus, the Persian, overcame Astyages, and Cyrus, that is Cambyses’ <father>, became king. 2. Croesus was stiff-necked and presumptuous. And all kingdoms, far away and nearby, were subjected to him. 3. Those, who were subjected to him, payed him tribute and dwelt in peace. Those, who resisted him, he took captive, plundered their possessions and took their kingdoms, because he was great, dreadful and victorious. 4. And Cyrus was disquited. He had a wife, whose name was Bardane, and she had been previously wife of Darius, who reigned after Belshazzar. 5. She said to him: We have a prophet from the Jews, whose name is Daniel, who has the wisdom of God. And he is from the captive children of Israel. 6. Darius used to do nothing without his advice, and everything happened as he had said. 7. When Cyrus heard this, he sent to the prophet Daniel and brought him with honor and asked him: 'Will I overcome Croesus, or not?' 8. He was silent and did not speak for one hour, and thereafter he said him: 'Who knows the wisdom of God?' Thereafter the prophet Daniel prayed and asked the Lord, his God, to reveal to him, whether it is possible to resist this violent presumptuous Croesus. 9. God said to him: 'If he sends back the captive children of Israel, he will overcome him and take power over Croesus'. 10. Having heard this from God, he said to Cyrus, that he would overcome Croesus, if he would send back the children of Israel. 11. When Cyrus heard these words, he bowed down to the Daniel’s feet and swore saying: ‘Your God is living. I will send back Israel to their city of Jerusalem and they shall serve their God.’ 12. Cyrus did for them a good thing, as it was proper...
according to God, and sent Israel back. 13. Croesus went out with big forces
to make war against the dominions of Cyrus. When he crossed the river of
Cappadocia in order to kill Cyrus and to insult him, Cyrus could not secretly flee, because there was a river in front of him. 14. Nevertheless when
Croesus entered this river, many people who were with him sank immediately; and he himself could not cross it, for God delivered him into the hands of Cyrus on this occasion. 15. Soldiers of Cyrus chased him, caught him alive and put him in chains; and they killed fourty thousand souls of his soldiers. Cyrus hung his enemy Croesus on a tree. He inflicted on the survived soldiers humiliation and mockery. 16. As for the Jews and their king, he let them go back to their country, as he had promised to the prophet Daniel. 17. When Cyrus returned to Persia, he killed everyone under his power, and he appointed his son Cambyses king of Persia and Babylon. And he was an evil man, he left the wisdom of his father and the divine worship of God. 18. Moreover, Apries was king in Egypt, he dwelt in Tānbaš (Thebes), in Manuf (Memphis) and in two other cities – Wobib and Safīrīn. 19. In those days Cambyses sent to Jerusalem and commanded to forbid them building of a Temple of God according again to the evil advice of the neighbouring peoples. 20. Thereafter he went to Egypt with innumerable soldiers – cavalry and foot soldiers – from Damādyā (Media). 21. Moreover the people of Syria and Palestine got ready to meet him, and he destroyed not a few but many cities of Jews, for he was a master over the whole world. 22. He changed his name in the arrogance of his heart, and was named Nebuchadnezzar. His disposition resembled that of a barbarian. He hated people according to the evil council of his desire. 23. Cyrus, his father, was great and honored in the presence of living God. He commanded to build a temple of God in Jerusalem in labor and effort, when he sent back Joshua, the high priest, son of Jozadak, and Zerubbabel, that is Ezra, and all the captive Jews so that they might go to the land of Hebrews and Palestine. 24. <Cambyses>, who was the new Nabuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar burnt down the holy city of Jerusalem and the Temple according to the prophecy of

---

264 The passage was emended by Zotenberg, apparently, basing on the text of John Malalas 6.10 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 83). Charles proposes another emendation for this passage: ‘There is no need for the addition of three words to the text by Zotenberg. It is only necessary to excise the before and place it before (Charles 1916, 37, n. 1). Thus he translates: ‘And having crossed the river of Cappadocia in order to slay Cyrus, Cyrus put him to shame and he was not able to escape secretly because of the river confronting him’ (Charles 1916, 37). I follow the text of the manuscripts, which is though somewhat confusing, not completely improbable. 265 Four hundred thousand in John Malalas 6.10 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 2017, 83). Since the word might also mean ‘ten thousand’, such reading is also possible here. 266 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg and preserve the feminine form of the manuscripts here. It might be that such disagreement has some stylistic reasons. 267 The passage causes problems. The reading of manuscripts doesn’t fit in the context. Zotenberg proposes instead of (Zotenberg 1883, 48). He translates the passage as follows: ‘Lorsqu’il fut de retour en Perse, Cyrus distribua toutes ses possessions’ (Zotenberg 1883, 271). Charles proposes another emendation, he replaces with , and translates: ‘When Cyrus returned into Persia, he settled all the affairs of his government’ (Charles 1916, 37) I can neither agree with either of these variants, nor propose my one conjecture. See also Colin 1995, 50, n. 29. Cp. John Malalas 6.12; however, the Chronicle of John Malalas contains a different account, so it is not very useful for evaluating of this precise passage (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 84). 268 Cp. John Malalas 6.7-12 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 81-84). 269 For identification of the placename see Timm 1988, 1556, n. 5, 1577-78. Thus, he writes: ‘Als Aufenthaltsort des ägyptischen Königs kommt hier nur Memphis ("Mant") in Frage’ (Timm 1988, 1578). 270 I am not sure about the exact meaning and position of the expression in this sentence. 271 According to Crum, this form of the proper name contains traces of a Coptic feminine article (Crum 1917, 208).
CHRONICLE OF JOHN OF NIKIU: TEXT 51.23. – 51.35.
saint prophets Jeremiah and Daniel. 25. After having burnt the city, Cambyses went to Gaza and assembled the troops by him and all weapons of war, he went down to the land of Egypt to make war. When he fought, he gained victory and took the cities of Egypt, that are Farmā (Pelusium)\(^{272}\), Šanbur, Sanbūr, Basētāb,\(^{273}\) and seized Apries, the Pharaoh, alive in the city of Ṭənfās\(^{274}\) and killed him with his hand. 26. Moreover there was a warrior in Egypt, whose name was Fusid, who exercised justice and hated violence. During the war between Persians and Egyptians, he went and warred against Syria and Assyria, and seized four children of Cambyses and his wives, and the number of them was forty souls. 27. He put them in chains, burnt down their homes, took captive everybody, who were with them, brought them into the city of Manuf (Memphis) and closed them in a palace. 28. When there was the second battle between Assyrians and Egypt, the Assyrians were strong, dominated over Egypt and seized the reign,\(^{276}\) which was in the city of Ṭənfās\(^{277}\). 29. The warriors of Assyria shot with arrows, and while they shot one arrow stroke the right thigh of the warrior Fusid. The Egyptian soldiers snatched away the warrior Fusid from the Assyrians before he died. He was alive for one more hour and thereafter he died and left a good memory for those, who come after him. 30. The Egyptians had fear, because they did not have any other warrior like Fusid. That’s why they fled to the city of Dā (Sais), because it was a fortified city and its fortifications were stronger than any others. 31. Cambyses attacked this city for the second time, opened it and destroyed it and all the cities of the Lower Egypt in the direction of South (dabūb) until he arrived on the shore of a salty lake,\(^{279}\) and he plundered all their possessions, destroyed their cities and provinces, burnt in fire their houses, and neither human, nor animal was left. 32. He chopped down their trees and spoiled their plantations. He made the land of Egypt desert. When he turned to the direction of Rif,\(^{280}\) he attacked the city of Manuf (Memphis) and overcame the king, who was there. 33. He also destroyed the city of Busir, which lies below Manuf (Memphis), spoiled it, plundered its possessions, burnt it in fire and made it desert. 34. The survived royal children fled to another city nearby, into a fortress, and closed the fortification’s gates. 35. The Assyrians besieged this fortress, opened it at night and destroyed the great city of Manuf (Memphis). 36. And there was one of the kings of Egypt named Mažib, he sent to his son named Ἀλκαῖος secretly, in order that he brings the possessions of him and of all his officers, and fourty women, who

\(^{272}\) Identified by Colin (Colin 1995, 51). \(^{273}\) Colin identifies this toponym with Tanis (Colin 1995, 51). \(^{274}\) Colin identifies this toponym with Bubastis (Colin 1995, 51). \(^{275}\) Zotenberg and Charles identify this toponym with Thebes (Zotenberg 1883, 272; Charles 1916, 38). Crum suggests instead the identification with Tahpanhes-Daphnae (Crum 1917, 208). \(^{276}\) Charles translates the word awyrmawm as ‘palace’ without any further explanations (Charles 1916, 38). \(^{277}\) Zotenberg and Charles identify this toponym with Thebes (Zotenberg 1883, 272; Charles 1916, 38). \(^{278}\) See Colin 1995, 51, n. 34. \(^{279}\) Colin suggests that the Lake Moeris, in the Fayyum Oasis is meant here (Colin 1995, 51, n. 34).
were wives of Cambyses, i.e. Nebuchadnezzar, and whom the mighty Fusid had brought. 37. They opened the gates of the fortress, seized them and lead them away to the wilderness by another secret way. The people of Manuf (Memphis) turned aside the four children of Cambyses, lead them up to the city of ʾƎšmun (Hermopolis). 282 When people of this city recognized (that), they were afraid and fled to the city of ʾƎšmun (Hermopolis). 41. They sent to Nubia to ʾElekād, son of Mužib, so that he might come to them, and they might make him king and set him on the place of his father, for he had made war in the provinces of Assyria previously. 42. Then ʾElekād assembled many soldiers from Ethiopians and Nubians and warred against the army of Cambyses eastwards to the river Gihon. Ethiopians were not able to cross the river. 43. Persians, filled with deceit, turned around, pretended that they would flee, crossed the river at the beginning of the night vigilantly, took the city, and ruined it, while the soldiers of ʾElekād were not aware about that. 44. When they finished the destruction of the city of ʾElekād, king of Egypt, made another council with men, who escaped from Persians, and they went and held a meeting with Cambyses from a distance, they brought with them presents, a fiddle, a drum, timbrels, 283 they bowed down to him and asked him, whether they might receive from him compassion and friendship. 47. Cambyses had mercy on the survived soldiers of Cambyses and they went to the Upper Egypt and destroyed the city of ʾƎlkād (Hermopolis) and Babylon. He appointed them a governor from their own number. 48. He did not take the royal crown from ʾElekād, but he put him on the royal throne and took him with him. 49.

281 Charles translates this passage as ‘Fusid the captain’ (Charles 1916, 39). 282 See Timm 1984, 198-220. 283 Zotenberg translates this passage as ‘la rive orientale’ (Zotenberg 1883, 274). Charles does not translate this expression at all (Charles 1916, 40). 284 See, Zotenberg 1883, 274, n. 1; Charles 1916, 40, n. 1. 285 Zotenberg prefers here the form ኢንስኤው፡ of MS A (Zotenberg 1883, 52). However, I think that the right form should be ኢንስኤው፡ for the direct object ኢንስኤው፡ is not preceded by the preposition እ.

---

APP. LECT. MIN.: 4 ኢንስኤው፡ CG, ኢንስኤው፡ αD | 7 ኢንስኤው፡ αD | ኢንስኤው፡ βC,  ኢንስኤው፡ AD, ኢንስኤው፡ G | 23 ኢንስኤው፡ αD, ኢንስኤው፡ G | 36 ኢንስኤው፡ αD | CG, ኢንስኤው፡ αD

APP. PUNCT.: 1 ኢንስኤው፡ CG | 2 ኢንስኤው፡ G | 3 ኢንስኤው፡ CG, ኢንስኤው፡ αD

APP. PUNCT.: 1 ኢንስኤው፡ CG | 2 ኢንስኤው፡ G | 3 ኢንስኤው፡ CG, ኢንስኤው፡ αD
The number of Egyptians, whom Cambyses took with him, was fifty thousand except women and children. They remained for forty years in captivity in Persia and Egypt became desert. 50. Cambyses, having destroyed Egypt, died in Damascus, and the great and wise Artaxerxes reigned for twenty years and he did not lessen the love for God and love for people. 51. He commanded to Yos, a man ..., to build a wall for Jerusalem. He received the Jews, for Cyrus and Darius venerated the God of heaven and served him. For this reason he supported all the activities of the Jews. 52. He received the Egyptians, treated them well and made them officers having counsel with his officials. Thereafter he sent the Egyptians back to their country in the fourty-first year of their captivity and destruction of their land. 

53. When they arrived, they began to construct houses in each of their cities, not large ones as formerly, but small ones – so, they built shelters for themselves. They planted plants and much wine. 54. They appointed upon themselves a king named Féwāturos according to the command of Artaxerxes, the philanthropic. 55. There was an Egyptian, comforter, hard-worker, wise, the lover of virtues, whose name was Šənufi, which means by interpretation ‘good news’. 56. This man was making much effort for construction of cities and provinces and in cultivating land until he built up all provinces of Egypt in a short time. He restored Egypt and established it as it had been before. There was a great abundance in his time, and the number of Egyptians increased a lot, and moreover their cattle increased in number. 57. He reigned over them for fourty-eight years in joy and peace due to the return of the Egyptians from captivity for the second time. He died in honor. Before his death he counted the Egyptians and their number was five hundred thousand people. 58. After the death of Šənufi, the Egyptians lived without a king for a long time, but they paid taxes at the same time to Persians and Assyrians and remained in peace, until they appointed them another Pharaoh as king and they paid taxes to him. 59. Persians did not like that Egyptians paid taxes to their king. Also Persians were without king after the death of the great Artaxerxes, who had had mercy on Egyptians. 60. The one, who reigned after Artaxerxes warred first against the Jews, and the Jews submitted to him. He also warred against Egyptians, overcame them, plunder their possessions, for the land of Egypt was very beautiful through the help of God. 61. When Saktānāfus (Nectanabus), the last of the Pharaohs, was informed by the great magicians, that he was a magician as well, he asked the impure demons, whether he would reign over Egyptians or not. After he had learned and recognized from demons, that he would not reign over Egyptians or not. After he had learned and recognized from demons, that he would not reign over Egyptians, he shaved his head and changed his appearance. He fled and went to the city of Farmā. He also went to Macedonia and dwelt there. 62. Egyptians remained subjected to build a wall for Jerusalem. He}

---

287. Charles translates: 'and made them officers in order to take counsel with his prefects'.
289. Zotenberg translates as follows: 'Il choisissait eux des fonctionnaires, pour délibérer avec ses propres officiers' (Zotenberg 1883, 275).
290. The passage is not clear. See Zotenberg 1883, 275, n. 1; Crum 1917, 208.
to Yulyānos, until Alexander ‘Arsāntoros’, whose name is by interpretation ‘the master of the world’, came. He killed Ḥastātas, the king of Persia. 63. After a short time ‘Akuš (Ochus) reigned over Persia for twelve years. Thereafter a certain Artaxerxes reigned for twenty-three years. After him Darius, whose name was ‘Akrūys’, reigned for six years. Thereafter Alexander arose against him, killed him, and took from him the kingdom of Babylon. For Alexander, son of Philip of Macedon, became the master of the world.

Chapter 52. There was one man named Aeneas, he married the daughter of Latinus named Lāwinā (Lavinia). He built a big city and named it after her name Lāwinā (Lavinia). He made his reign strong there.

Chapter 53. 1. There was one man from the land of Italy, whose name was Pallas, with his son. He was a good man and a warrior. He warred with power against many cities amongst the cities of Ḥaliṯor. 2. When he fought with Yustōn, he took his city and built a big house there. He adorned it, and there was no another such house in the whole city. 3. He also built a fortress and named it Bayllāldyun (Pallantium), which is by interpretation ‘citadel’, and he named it after his own name Pallas.

Chapter 54. When ‘Akrūys’ became king, he built a city named Ḥowlān (Alba). When he left Ḥaliṯor, he entered Ḥlwānyā (Lavinia), he entered Ḥlwānyā (Albania), that is Ḥowlān (Alba), which is by interpretation ‘light’.

Chapter 55. 1. There was one Canaanite woman, whose name was Dido, a wife of a man named Sichaeus. 2. She was from a small city named Chartima, which lies on a seashore between Tyre and Sidon. 3. She was very rich. She had a brother, whose name was Gamālyun (Pygmalion). He arose against her husband and killed him in jealousy, in order to take her possessions and her riches. 4. This woman arose rashly, collected all her possessions and treasures of her house, entered a boat and fled to the city of Tonā (Libya) in Africa from Canaan. She build a great city in this province, and she named it Carthage, which means in the barbarian language ‘new city’. She reigned wisely there until her death.

---

291 According to Zotenberg and Charles, this is a transliteration of the Greek ὁ πάνταρχος (Charles 1916, 42; Zotenberg 1883, 276). 292 This word remains obscure. Zotenberg could not identify it with any proper name (Zotenberg 1883, 276, n. 3). Nöldeke proposes a transliteration of the Greek word υποταγος (Nöldeke 1881, 594). Charles follows this interpretation and translates: ‘And he slew the last king of the Persians’ (Charles 1916, 42). 293 Cp. John Malalas 6.17 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 86). 294 ‘The city of Lavinium is meant. 295 Cp. John Malalas 6.24 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 89). 296 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg which is based on the spelling of this name in Chapter 52. I think that two different spellings might be explained through different vocalizations of an Arabic form. 297 See Zotenberg 1883, 277, n. 5; Charles 1916, 43, n. 1. 298 Cp. John Malalas 6.25 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 89). 299 According to Crum this form of the proper name contains traces of the Coptic language, i.e. ‘confounding radical consonants with particles’ (Crum 1917, 257). 300 A corrupt transliteration of the Arabic (Zotenberg 1883, 278, n. 1). 301 Cp. John Malalas 6.19. However, the passage on a ‘new city’ is present in the Slavonic version and in Cedrenus (‘which is Neapolis in the African language’) (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 86-87).
CRONICLE OF JOHN OF NIKIU: TEXT 55.4. – 56.12.

APP. CRIT.: 3 α, Δ, G | 10, 11, 12 | 15, 16 | 17, 18 | 19, 20 | 21, 22 | 23, 24 | 25, 26 | 27, 28 | 29, 30 | 31, 32 | 33, 34 | 35, 36 | 37, 38 | 39, 40 | 41, 42 | 43, 44 | 45, 46 | 47, 48 | 49, 50 | 51, 52 | 53, 54 | 55, 56

...
Chapter 56. 1. In the days of the king of Judaea Hezekiah there were two brothers, whose names were Romulus and Remus. They built a great city near the small city of Valentina, which was previously a royal residence named Bāliantōs (Pallantinum) in Italy, in the land of Latinus. At that time they named it in their language Qabādulyun (Capitol). The appearance of one of the buildings of the royal palace was so wonderful! They named it Ḣqabādulyun (Capitol) 'head of the city' in the Latin language. 4. At that time they called themselves Romans, and the name of their city was Rome. Both brothers reigned together there. Thereafter there was a conflict between them, and Romulus killed Remus, his brother, and seized the reign for him alone. 5. At that time the earth trembled, and all people were terrified, because a big earthquake happened to them. Romulus was afraid too, and his heart was weak. Out of a great fear he learned from diviners and impure spirits, that his reign in Rome would not be strong without his brother Romus. 6. At this moment he searched for the ways to rise him up, but he could not. But a great earthquake happened. During this earthquake he saw a perfect image of his brother from his breast to his head. 7. From his breast to his head. He made, following his vision of his brother as he had been before, a golden statue in the likeness of his brother from his breast till his head. He put it on the throne and adorned it with all kinds of decoration. 8. Thereafter he was writing in his declarations so: a declaration from me and my brother: we say so and so, we command so and so, we do so and so, and so on. 9. This rule has been strong from Romans till nowadays. Their kings and governors preserved this law in the court for their ordinations, which is named Ḳbrhtuyros (praetorium) that is a place of justice. 10. Romulus also began to ride on a horse in Rome, to be first in races and eager to win. He discovered these devil’s practices and source of evil and seduction, in order that his cavalry might be the strongest in the world. 11. Moreover he established a place of contest for women, named Ḳlmantāţun, in order that soldiers might come and be with them. For previously they defamed those without a husband, virgins and old women altogether. 12. Because of the fear and discouragement Romulus established the women cavalry and arranged them into certain troops alone without men. 13. And he also divided them in two: one front row – virgins, and one front row – married women. And he gathered from all the provinces, from nearby and far away, a big group of the

---

306 Charles emends Ḍtግሀታት፡ into ደግህቶት፡ and translates: ‘And Romulus also was the first to ride on horseback in Rome and to rush to the encounter at full speed and to be ardent to be victorious’ (Charles 1916, 44). | 307 I think that chariot-races are meant. | 308 Crum supposes this word to be a transliteration from Coptic and, thus, translates it ‘place of contest’ (Crum 1917, 208).
female riders without number. 14. And they kept watching the foreign women, who were not from Rome, in order they might accomplish their lust and <they> seized any one <they> could find. 15. And concerning the virgins of the city of Sābā (Sabina) near Rome they were beautiful women. He invited them and gathered them by him.310 And after Romulus had assembled the women, he gave them to the soldiers without women. And he called this soldiers māntāqūn, that is ‘warriors’. 16. He commanded to those who were left to seize violently any of them as best they could. But after this ordinance they took women according to their character without violence.311 17. He also established312 idol priests and named them the priests of Apollo. 18. Romulus also commanded to the honored officers and soldiers to † pray † in the winter time till alpha and omega.314 He asked from each and every of the nobles, sārāwīt (officers), the seniors of people and all the soldiers, whom he wished. This custom remained in Rome.315 19. He also established a law in Rome, which is called ‘abrāsontus’316, that is ‘place of officials’, of those who guarded the fortress the whole time.317 20. He also built the walls of the city of Rome and accomplished them. 21. He also built an idol temple in the city of ‘Arāw (Ares) in the month of Mardayus (March), i.e. Maggābit. Mardayus (March) is the beginning of the months. 22. At the beginning of each month they celebrated a feast. They called this feast ‘Abūnas (Primus). After this feast he commanded to the army to fight. 23. They named this month of Mardayus (March) according to the custom of the heathen, who are people of deamons; as the previous ones commanded in foolishness without understanding. And the people of Rome preserved this custom. 24. Due to this reason the Holy Fathers, monks of Egypt, clothed by God, offer bloodless sacrifices at the beginning of each month to the Saint Trinity coequal in Godhead and receive the holy life-giving mysteries while chanting from the eightieth Psalm: ‘Blow up the trumpet in the day of the new moon on the notable day of our festival’.318

Chapter 57. 1. After Romulus, Numa reigned. He was a very wise and intelligent man. 2. He established so that the city of Rome followed the proper customs in illustrious instructions. 3. This outstanding man began to make fōlus319 for buying, selling and exchanging silver. Because of that they call the stamped copper money fōlus until nowadays. 4. He also established two places: one for governors and one for judges, so that they might

---

319 I associate this passage with the myth on the Rape of the Sabine Women. 315 In this sentence there is a disaccordance in gender. The pronominal suffixes are masculine instead of feminine. 316 Cp. John Malalas 7.6. According to John Malalas, Romus established chariot-races and invited to women only outside Rome to watch them. When they filled hypodrome, his soldiers seized these women. It was done so, because no Roman woman wanted to marry his soldiers (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 94-95). 317 I subscribe to the opinion of Charles, who points out that the emendation by Zotenberg is not needed (Charles 1916, 45, n. 4). 318 The passage seems to be corrupt. I can’t propose any solution by now. 314 I don’t follow the conjecture by Charles, but the text of the manuscripts. 318 See Charles 1916, 45, n. 7. Cp. πρόελεγκτος in the Slavic version of John Malalas (Thurn 2000, 135). 310 From Arabic فلس 'coins' (which in turn comes from Greek-Coptic φόλλις).
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Chapter 58. 1. In the days of the high priest of Jerusalem, whose name was Judas, Philip of Macedonia reigned. After becoming a king he warred against the land of Na\\th{wosalbat} (Thessaly)\textsuperscript{321} and gained victory. 2. Having gained the victory, he built a city in Macedonia and named it Thessalonica.\textsuperscript{322}

Chapter 59. 1. When Alexander, son of Philip of Macedonia, became king, he built a great city of Alexandria in Egypt and named it after his name Alexandria. 2. Its previous name was Rakudi (Rakote)\textsuperscript{323} in the Egyptian language. Thereafter made a war campaign against Persia till\textsuperscript{324} the boundaries of \textit{A\text\'woziz} (Europe), and built there a place, where he assembled his army and all his troops. He gave much gold there to his great army,\textsuperscript{325} to all the officers and to many soldiers. He named this place Chrysopolis, as all people of Byzantium called it. 3. While fighting against Persia, Alexander killed many soldiers of Darius until he destroyed them. He seized the whole kingdom of Darius and ruled over it. 4. He also took his daughter, whose name was Roxana. She was a virgin and he made her wife, and did nothing evil to her. 5. He did no harm to the queen of Ethiopia, whose name was Candace, because of the greatness of her heart; for she heard the stories about the deeds of Alexander and about his habits. Indeed, he joined the spies, when he wished to war with the kings of the earth. 6. The queen Candace recognized him, when he came to her with spies. She seized him and told him: ‘You are Alexander, who seized the whole world, but now you are seized by a woman’. 7. He told her: ‘You seized me due to your knowledge, the softness of your intelligence and your wisdom. I will protect you and your children from now on, without anything evil. And I will make you my wife’. 8. When she heard this, she bowed down to his feet and made an agreement with him. He made her his wife and thereafter Ethiopians subdued to him. 9. When Alexander was about to die, he divided his kingdom between his four companions, who helped him in war. 10. His elder brother Philip took the land of Macedonia and became king there and in all \textit{Awurrya} (Europe). He also appointed Ptolemy, who was named Baylágos,\textsuperscript{326} king of the land of Egypt.\textsuperscript{327}

\textsuperscript{321}This passage is not very clear. Zotenber does not translate this verse (Zotenber 1883, 281). \textsuperscript{322}A corrupt form of the Arabic (for \textit{Θεσσαλία}) (Zotenber 1883, 282, n. 1). \textsuperscript{323}Cp. John Malalas 7.18-19 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 110-101). Zotenber suggests that ‘le mot \textit{Awəziz} a été ajouté par le traducteur’ (Zotenber 1883, 281). However, the same expression occurs also in John Malalas (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 101). \textsuperscript{324}I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here. \textsuperscript{325}Zotenber translates this expression as ‘ses généraux’ (Zotenber 1883, 282). Charles in his turn translates it as ‘chief generals’ (Charles 1916, 47). \textsuperscript{326}Zotenber explains the strange form of the name Lagus either through a misinterpretation of an Arabic preposition, or through a preservation of a Coptic article (Zotenber 1883, 283, n. 3). However, according to John Malalas 8.6 Ptolemy was the son of Lagus (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 103). I suggest that the prefix \textit{Aw} is rather a misinterpreted Arabic \textit{awr}, then the word \textit{Awəziz} was inserted into the Ethiopic text, as if the person had two alternative names. \textsuperscript{327}Cp. John Malalas, 8.1-19 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 101-107).
Chapter 60. In the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus, whose name is by interpretation the lover of his brother, who was a man of a big thought and wisdom, son of Αγλαώς (Lagus), he (Ptolemy) translated the Holy Scriptures of God from the Hebrew language into the Greek language together with the seniors during seventy-two days, for there were seventy-two translators, but the two died, before they finished the translation.328

Chapter 61. 1. Antigonus reigned over the land of Asia, Cilicia and the river, named Tanin (Draco),329 that is in the land of Bayāwurondas (Orontes).330 2. There was a king in Syria, Babylon and Palestine, whose name was Sulukisgānur (Seleucus Nicanor). 3. He killed Antigonus, a king of Asia, while fighting against him, for he had built a city on the bank of the river Tanin and named it Antigonia. 4. He took all possessions from the region of Yabulis (Iopolis) and from the fortress, which was in the front of the mountain Lāsylus (Sipion). This city was previously named Fudidyā (Botti). 5. Moreover, he built there a great city of Antioch and named it after Bottia. 6. He also built a city in the name of his daughter and named it Lodoqyā (Laodicea), for the name of his daughter was Lāwudiqi (Laodicea). This city had been named Bārnāτān (Mazabān).331 7. He built another city and named it 'Abāmiyās (Apamea), which was formerly named Fārikā (Pharnace).332

Chapter 62. Sulikiyus (Seleucus), that is Busānyus (Pausanias), was the first to wright down accounts and chronicles and to name them.333

Chapter 63. ʾAnṭyākos (Antiochus), named ʾAsfānyos (Epiphanes), tortured the Maccabean.334

Chapter 64. 1. An account of the councils of the ancient Rome (and) Julius <Ceasar>,335 the dictator. He seized power and administration amongst Romans before the appearance of Our Lord ans Savior Jesus Christ. 2. The birth of Julius was not like the birth of a human, to whom women give birth in the ninth month. When his mother was pregnant, she died. After her death the baby moved around in her belly. When the wisemen saw that the baby was moving, they tore apart the mother’s belly and took him out alive, brought him up and named him Caesar. And Caesar that means ‘torn out, cut, severed’. 3. When he grew up, they also named him ʾAdrāyufāṭun (Triumvir), he was appointed according to the advise of the

---

328 Cp. John Malalas 8.7 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 104). | 329 Transcription of the Arabic (‘draco’).
330 Zotenberg supposes that this form preserved the Coptic article; he points as well to the fact that in this passage Orontes is falsely associated with a land or a city (Zotenberg 1883, 284, n. 1). Thus, I suppose that the word ḥūnā 1 might have been added later with the purpose of clarification. Yet I can’t exclude that it was added already at the stage of translation from Arabic to Ethiopic or even earlier. | 331 A don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here. The text of manuscripts appear to be quite clear. | 332 Cp. John Malalas 8.10-11 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 104-105). | 333 I suppose that here two different persons are merged in one. | 334 Cp. John Malalas 8.22-23 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 108). | 335 I follow here the conjecture by Zotenberg, which in fact changes just one letter. I find it very probable that the letter Φ written inaccurately with a large upper part might have been confused with ω. Concerning the possible confusion of Arabic J and ʃ, I find it less probable because the two letters are written quite differently in connection with following letters.
Roman officers (šarāwit)\textsuperscript{336} and became emperor. 4. When his empire became strong, people of Persia and Barbarians were frightened. This Caesar appointed the month, in which he became emperor, to be the main month (the beginning) of the year.\textsuperscript{337} 5. He established laws for the officers and prefects according to each of the rank in the whole land of his empire. 6. Thereafter he left the Eastern region and came to the great city of Alexandria in Egypt. He found the queen Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy, who was named Dionysus and who was the king of Egypt. 7. This girl was a virgin of a splendid beauty. He fell in love with her, married her, and she bare him a son. He gave her the kingdom of Egypt. He named this son Julius Caesar, and he also named him Qesār Yonā (Caesarion). 8. He built a beautiful castle, and he also built a beautiful and decorated house of a charming excellence. He named it after his own name and the name of his son. 9. In the days of the Great Constantine, emperor of the Christians, after he took possession of the Roman empire, he turned it into a church and named it in the name of St Michael. 10. Till nowadays it is named the church of Qisāryon (Caesarion) because Julius Caesar the younger and Caesar the elder built it.\textsuperscript{338}

Chapter 65. 1. It is told concerning Archelaus, the head of the officers of Cappadocia,\textsuperscript{339} Neron,\textsuperscript{340} filled with wrath, the killer of his father, began to eat raw meat with blood. He was not one of the people of faith. Herod reigned over Judea, who had subdued themselves to the Caesar the elder. They appointed him king over their provinces for the whole of their lives. 2. Archelaus built a city in Cappadocia and named it Caesarea of Cappadocia, in order that their might be commemoration of him. And it had been previously named Mārākā (Mazaca).\textsuperscript{341}

Chapter 66. 1. Herod also built a city in Palestine and named it Caesarea. This city was a very pleasant one. In the ancient times its name was 'Asturťunsirgōs (Straton’s Tower)\textsuperscript{342} in honor of the king.\textsuperscript{243} 2. He also built a street in the direction of the city of Antioch, and enlarged the city and paved the road with slabs of white stone at his own expenses and he made it into a path appropriate for kings. Previously it was not passable for people. 3. He also sent a Jewish army to Egypt and ordained to all provinces to be subject to the emperor. And likewise he made people of the East pay tribute to Caesar.

Chapter 67. 1. Queen Cleopatra came down from Palestine to Egypt in order to make her royal residence there. When she came to Fārmā, she warred
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against the Egyptians and overcame them. 2. Thereafter she came to Alexandria and became sovereign there. She was great in her nature and in her deeds, in her courage and power; and no other king of the previous time had achieved something like that. 3. She built a large castle in Alexandria of a charming beauty and everyone who saw it admired it. Nothing similar exists in the whole world. 4. to what she built on an island in the northern (Dabub) direction from the western part of Alexandria, outside the city, at a distance of four stadia. 5. She blocked the waters of sea with stones and earth, and turned water into land, previously it was passable with ship and now she made it passable by foot. 6. She did it with tremendous and hard work. She did on the advice of one wise man, whose name was Aksyafinos (Dexiphanes), and turned see into land, so that there might be a passable street. 7. She also dug a channel till the river and brought water from the river Gihon into the city. Through that she did so, that ships might go and enter the city. Due to that the riches were abundant. 8. The city had been previously without water. And she established the abundance of water, which was passable for ship. Because of that the fish became abundant in the city. She did many good things and strong customs before her death. This most honored and wisest one amongst women died in the fourteenth year of the reign of Augustus Caesar. 10. Thereafter people of Alexandria and Egypt until Upper Egypt submitted to the Roman emperors. They appointed governors and officials upon them. 11. Augustus reigned for fifty-six years and six months. In the forty-second year of his reign Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ was born in flesh in Bethlehem in Judaea. The truly God – praise be on Him – was in the Heaven and also on earth. 12. in the days, when an order was released to register the whole world and to count all the souls in order to levy taxes. This happened in consultation with Awwamanos (Eumenes) and Aylilus (Attalus) – the honored elders of Rome. 13. Moreover, Augustus found the name of the month Qirwaryus (February) written in the middle of the year. From Abridus (Primus), that is Mardaryus (March), the beginning of the months in Rome, Qiraryus (February) was the sixth month amongst the Roman months. 14. So, Augustus commanded to make this month the last one of the months of a year, for Augustus blamed the chief of the army in that time, for the reason of authority and superiority over him. The name of the chief of the army he blamed was Malyanos (Manlius) of Cappadocia, for it was he who had arranged the months. He was the most grievous and strongest amongst Romans. 15. On the place of this month Qirwaryus (February), which he made the last month, for it is the shortest among all months, he inserted in its stead the full month named Aaugastos (August) like his own name. It became the
sixth month. 16. The preceding of the sixth month, i.e. the fifth one of the name Julius, was named after an emperor, brother of Augustus’ father. 17. The people of Rome have accepted and strengthened this custom till nowadays. Mardayos (March) precede the sixth one and the fifth one.

Chapter 68. 1. Christians, complete in faith, did not accept another law without it being ordered to them, according to the saying of the Prophet Ezra, the enlightener of wisdom: when the months come on the sixth of Tubā, that is Ṭərr, the first month of the Franks, 2. then the beginning of this month coincides with the first, the second or the third day until the end of the seven days. 3. They establish the beginning of their months knowingly, so that it might be lucky or unlucky. 4. Socrates, a wise man, philosopher and astronomer strengthened this custom in Rome. 5. Socrates, legislator and estalisher of customs amongst the Greek changed the writing of the pure prophet Ezra. Being mislead he induced into error those, who read it in accordance with his evil activity.

Chapter 69. After the death of the emperor Augustus his son Tiberius became emperor. He subdued Cappadocia to Rome after the death of Archelaos, the chief of Cappadocia. 2. He built also a city in the province of Thrace and named it Tiberia. In the days of the Caesar Tiberius Our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified in Jerusalem.

Chapter 70. 1. After the death of Claudius the impure Nero became emperor, who was a pagan and idolater. 2. He added evil to evil and did sodomie deeds, and he was married like a woman. The Romans heard about this detested action and did not bear it patiently. 3. In particular the idol priests reproached him. And the chieves of the people conspired in order to kill him. 4. When this impure (man) learned about the plot of the chieves, he abandoned his place and hid himself, but he could not escape from the hand of God, mighty and strong. 4. Now, when he fell into this illness of mind concerning his marriage like a woman, due to that his belly rose up and became like the one of a pregnant woman. 5. They expelled him from the empire and he suffered a lot from an abundance of impure pains. Thereafter he commanded to the wise men to pay him a visit in a place where he was and to heal him. 6. Thereafter the wise men entered his place and tore apart his belly - it seemed to them that there was a baby in it - so that they might take it out. And he died through this evil death.

Chapter 71. 1. After the death of Titus, Domitian, his brother, became emperor in his stead. He was a great philosopher amongst the heathen. 2. He
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began a persecution against the Christians and brought down many torments on them through the hands of Decius and through the advice of his officers. 3. He brought the beloved Evangelist John to Rome and exiled him together with all believers. God because of the sure and Orthodox faith. 4. Thereafter when he was amazed by the greatness of his wisdom, he sent to him secretly, neither his soldiers (sarāwit) nor the idol priests knew that, and he returned him to his residence. 5. But Domitian exiled John the Theologian also for the second time on the island named Sun. when the messengers of the impure demons appeared his heart. 6. Domitian also built a city in the province of Hisryā (Isauria) and named it after his name Domitian. 7. When the completion of his sin was near, he exiled saint martyrs. He went to the idol temple of Titus and wanted to make sacrifices to demons, for he called a speechless thing ‘saviour’. 8. At that time his soldiers conspired to kill him, for he abused them the whole time because of his stiff neck and arrogance, and he did nothing justly, though he was a philosopher. They arose and killed him secretly. 9. And people did not know that they had killed him. They took his silk clothes and hang (them) on the chains of a lamp in the idol temple, in order to mislead all people saying falsely, that he was raised upward into the air from earth through the hands of idol priests, for he was a philosopher. 10. They mislead people for a short time. Thereafter they learned about that evil death and there was tumult concerning the murder of him in the temple and that they polluted it while saying: ‘We are guiltless and our temple is pure.’ 11. Thereafter there was tumult and they agreed on ‘Arawos (Nerva) and made him emperor. He was a chief officer, an elder, brilliant, philanthropic and wise. 12. At that time he sent to the sweet-tongued St John and returned him from his exile and brought him into the city of Ephesus and he died there in pleasant peace. Concerning his holy body, it is not known where it is buried except for Our Lord Jesus Christ – praise be on Him! 13. This emperor was good and established good laws. He went to the island of Titus and wanted to make sacrifices to demons, for he was a philosopher. They learned about that evil death and there was tumult concerning the murder of him in the temple and that they polluted it while saying: ‘We are guiltless and our temple is pure.’ 11. Thereafter there was tumult and they agreed on ‘Arawos (Nerva) and made him emperor. He was a chief officer, an elder, brilliant, philanthropic and wise. 12. At that time he sent to the sweet-tongued St John and returned him from his exile and brought him into the city of Ephesus and he died there in pleasant peace. Concerning his holy body, it is not known where it is buried except for Our Lord Jesus Christ – praise be on Him! 13. This emperor was good and established good laws. He also annulled amongst people that there was a slap for a slap and a stroke for a stroke. While he was engaged in this legislation he died at the age of eighty-eight and in the first year of his reign.

Chapter 72. 1. After the death of ‘Arwās (Nerva), good emperor, ‘Endəryānos (Trajan) became emperor. He loved to worship idols. 2. He was the third

---

**Note:**

363 Zotenberg explains this toponym as a misinterpretation of the Arabic (transcription of the Greek Πατμος) for (Zotenberg 1883, 291, n. 1). 364 Zotenberg suggests that this should mean oracle (Zotenberg 1883, 290). 365 According to John Malalas 10.48 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 139). 366 According to Crum this form of the proper name contains traces of the Coptic language, i.e. ‘confounding radical consonants with particles’ (Crum 1917, 207). 367 Domitianopolis is meant. 368 Cp. John Malalas 10.52 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 141). 369 The origin of the form ‘Arawos / Arwas is not clear. It is possible that the initial n of the name was misunderstood for the Coptic reposition n by a translator into Arabic, however, this mistake has to have been made twice (see 72.1). Is a phonetic explanation also possible? 364 As Zotenberg’s manuscripts have only the variant ፹፬፡ he translates it as ‘quatre-vingt-quatre’ (Zotenberg 1883, 292). Charles in his turn reads that as ‘fourty-four’, pointing however that the text is corrupt (Charles 1916, 54, n. 1). According to John Malalas 10.54, Nerva died at the age of seventy-one (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 141-142). 360 The entry in the Copto-Arabic Synaxarium on 18th of Hatour read the name of this emperor and the father of St Drusis (see below) as ᴇ́耷اداتوس and was subsequently rendered by Basset as Hadrian (Basset 1909, 228). This identification would however the narrative by John Malalas (cp. John Malalas 11.10 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 146)) and the transcription of the name Trajan as ᴇ́耷اداتوس does not seem improbable. The Ethiopic variant ᴇ́դ _: dahyanos might be a result of a copysis’ attempt to ‘normalize’ the name (for a similar case see p. xlviii of the current work). Crum proposes another explanation and points to the Coptic attributive en- in this proper name. He refers, however, only to the occurrence of this name in 72.19 for an unknown reason (Crum 1917,
one who persecuted Christians. There were many martyrs in all places and they were tortured a lot. Moreover, he sent to Rome in chains the holy man of God Ignatius, patriarch of Antioch, who had been appointed after Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and he delivered him to a lion. He also seized them and asked them: ‘Whom do you worship and in whom do you trust, so that you run in a hurry to death?’ They answered and said: ‘We shall die in the sake of Christ, who will give us the eternal life and deliver us from this body of corruption.’ 6. He was filled with wrath, for he was a heathen and did not wish the revelation of the doctrine of the resurrection. He commanded to cast the bodies of the holy women in fire. 7. He commanded to sweep up the soil on which the bodies of the holy women had fallen down and put it into the brass of the heater of a public bath, which he had constructed in his own name. 8. Thereafter in this bath happened that, (when) any one was bathing in it, a smoke arose. One fell down having smelled this smoke and had to be carried out. Everybody who saw it was wondering. Moreover, Christians derided the heathen and praised themselves in Christ and glorified him with the saints. 9. When Ṭendəryānos (Trajan) learned this, he changed the heaters of the bath and removed from it the brazen vessel with ashes of the bodies of the holy women in it. He put the ashes of bodies in five brazen columns. He put them into the bath. 10. He was diligent in humiliating the martyrs saying: ‘They (their deaths) were neither for me, nor for their God, they died foolishly’. 11. In this time Ḫtrāsīs (Drusis), his daughter and Yonā (Junia), the daughter of Filāsoṃryn, patrician, became martyrs. And moreover, many other virgins became martyrs through the hand of this unbeliever by burning in fire. 12. When Ṭendəryānos (Trajan) was in the city of Antioch the earth suffered and trembled because of the wrath of God at night, for it was polluted three times. 13. Not only in Antioch but also there was a similar earthquake on the island of Rutēs (Rhodes) after cockrow. 14. The Jews of Alexandria and of the province Cyrene assembled and appointed a governor named Lucas to be their emperor. 15. When Ṭendəryānos (Trajan) heard and learned this thing, he sent to them with many forces an officer named Marcus Turbo together with numerous cavalry, foot soldiers and also many people on ships. 16. Ṭendəryānos (Trajan) came to Egypt and built a citadel and a strong immovable fortress, and brought waters in it in abundance and named it Babylon of Egypt. 17. Formerly Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Mābi (Magi) and Persia, built its foundations and named it the fortress of Babylon, when he was a king there, according to the ordinance of God, and when he exiled the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Jews killed the prophet

207). Thus, I would suggest that in the present text as well as in the Synaxarium the name should be rendered as Trajan.

Cp. John Malalas 11.10: ‘He ordered them to be burned and he mixed ashes from their bones with bronze, and from this metal he made hot-water vessels in the public bath that he had constructed’ (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 146). Cp. Basset 1909, 228-232.
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of God with stones in the city of Tamfás (Thebes)⁵⁷³ in Egypt <and> the Jews added evil to their evil. 18. Nebuchadnezzar went in the direction of Egypt with many soldiers and he took Egypt because the Jews had opposed him, and he named it (the fortress) Babylon after the name of his own city. 19. 'Andoryanos (Trajan) also added a construction onto this fortress and on other places inside it. He dug a small channel too, in order to convey the waters of Gilon to the city of Qesälzam (Clyisma). He brought this stream to the Red Sea and named it Trajan after his name. 20. He built also a fortress in Manuf (Onouphis)⁵⁷⁴ and after having done all these deeds, he fell ill and died in the twelfth year of his reign.

Chapter 73. 1. After him 'Andoryanos (Hadrian) son of the brother of 'Andoryanos' the first (Trajan's)⁵⁷⁵ father became emperor in Rome.²⁰² 2. He built a nice and very beautiful town in the Upper Egypt and named it Antinoe, that is 'Ansina. Thereafter, misled people made him god. He was very wealthy and died through an evil death.

Chapter 74. 1. Thereafter Aelius Antonius Neros (Pius)⁵⁷⁷ became emperor. He was merciful, gentle and good. Romans named him at first Caesar, the servant of God. He was a righteous man in the time of his reign. 2. The chroniclers wrote on him that he was the first to exercise justice and that he annulled the acts of injustice that had happened to the Romans before. 3. Previously they were exercising injustice. They took the possessions of the rich, the half of their possessions on their death and gave to the government, because of the convenant which fathers made with their children. And his predecessors could not abolish this custom. 4. He (Aelius Antonius Pius) commanded and annulled (it) in order that everyone had control over their possessions and could give to whom one wanted.³⁷⁸ Moreover, he established many justful ordinances and righteous laws. 5. Thereafter he went down to Egypt and Alexandria and he had vengeance there on one who did evil and was merciful to one who did virtues, for compassion, mercy and patience were implanted in him. 6. He built two gates in Alexandria, one in its West and one in its East. He named the Eastern one 'Abbyev⁵⁷⁹ and the Western one Salanyaks.³⁸⁰ 7. He built a place of entertainment in white stone in the city of Antioch and named it 'Amilun,³⁸¹ and he brought the stones from the Upper Egypt.³⁸² 8. He constructed in all his cities baths and places for reading. 9. Thereafter he returned to Rome with many soldiers and remained there for a

⁵⁷⁵Zotenberg and Charles identify this toponym with Thebes (Zotenberg 1883, 293; Charles 1916, 55). Crum suggests instead the identification with Taphanes-Daphne. Moreover, he states that in this particular case 'the mention of the stoning of Jeremiah makes this quite clear' (Crum 1917, 208). ³⁷⁶See Timm 1988, 1578 (cited above in the Index). I suggest here a certain conflation of proper names, thus the same form 'Andoryanos is attested for Trajan as well as Hadrian. Due to this conflation an attribute qadāmāwī (the first) was added to the name of Trajan. ³⁷⁷A corrupt transcription of the Arabic read as. ³⁷⁸Cp. John Malalas 11.26 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 149). ³⁷⁹See Charles 1916, 56; Zotenberg 1883, 295. ³⁸⁰See Charles 1916, 56; Zotenberg 1883, 295. ³⁸¹See Charles 1916, 56, n. 4. ³⁸²See Zotenberg 1883, 295, n. 3; Charles 1916, 56, n. 4. Cp. John Malalas 11.30 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 149-150).
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short time. He died in the seventy-seventh year from his birth and in the twenty-third year of his reign. He gave his possessions to his son Marcus. And Marcus, his son, resembled his father in mercy and virtues. He accomplished all laws and justice and died in the religion of his father.

Chapter 75. 1. Thereafter the impious Decius, enemy of God, reigned. 2. He raised punishment and torment against Christians. He established a law of impure heathen in order to seek out the Christians. That’s why he poured the blood of many saints in all directions, who worshipped the true God. 3. This impure Decius brought many lions and lionesses from Africa. He also brought from Nubia many poisonous serpents and beasts, male and female. He put them to the east of the city of Filmunṭi of Arabia and Palestine till the fortress of Kirkisoyus (Circesium) us so that they might oppose Barbarians and rebels.

Chapter 76. 1. Thereafter a certain man named Aurelian became emperor. At the time when he became emperor, he constructed the fortification of Rome, which had been ruined, and accomplished it in a short time. 2. He forced all people of Rome to finish the construction while being diligent without arrogance. 3. At that time he strengthened the law that all workers might be registered and he might name them. He named them chief citizens in the honor of emperors. 4. He built a fortress to the East of the city and dwelt there for a long time, for he was not able to seize the city and to bring it under his power on this occasion. 5. After a long time the inhabitants of the city came to him and showed him an entrance, so that he might enter it. With much effort and labor he unlocked the city, and many, innumerable, many poisonous serpents and beasts, male and female. He put them to the east of the city and did not want to subdue themselves to him. But he was severe in fighting with them together with many troops and soldiers, and with three companions of him in reign – they are Maximian, of an evil origin, Constantius and Maximinus. 3. He went down to Egypt and subdued it to him and destroyed Alexandria. 4. He built a fortress to the East of the city and dwelt there for a long time, for he was not able to seize the city and to bring it under his power on this occasion. 5. After a long time the inhabitants of the city came to him and showed him an entrance, so that he might enter it. With much effort and labor he unlocked the city, and many, innumerable.

Chapter 77. 1. When Diocletian, the Egyptian, became emperor, the army came back in order to help this heretic, the persecutor of the faithful and the most lawless of all the lawless. 2. Alexandria and Egypt revolted against him and did not want to subdue themselves to him. But he was severe in fighting with them together with many troops and soldiers, and with three companions of him in reign – they are Maximian, of an evil origin, Constantius and Maximinus. 3. He went down to Egypt and subdued it to him and destroyed Alexandria. 4. He built a fortress to the East of the city and dwelt there for a long time, for he was not able to seize the city and to bring it under his power on this occasion. 5. After a long time the inhabitants of the city came to him and showed him an entrance, so that he might enter it. With much effort and labor he unlocked the city, and many, innumerable.
መክስምያኖስ፡ እምዘርእ፡ እኩይ፡ ወፈርንስጣ፡ ወመክሲሚኑስ፡ 3. ወወረደ፡ ሰሚ Rune: ግብጽ፡ ወረሰያ፡ ትትአዘዝ፡ ሎቱ። ወለሀገረ፡ እስክንድርያኒ፡ አጥፍኣ፡ 4. ወሐነጸ፡ ቅጽረ፡ መንገለ፡ ምሥራቀ፡ ሀገር፡ ወነበረ፡ ህየ፡ ብዙኀ፡ ወመን፡ እስመː ውእቱː ኢክህለː ነሢኦታː ለሀገርː ወአግብኦታː ውስተː ወአንስተː ወሕፃናተː ንኡሳነː ወከዐወː ᰀመː ብዙኃንː ወአልቦː ኍልቍː በእንተː ዘኮነː ውስተː ሀገርː ወአ|ውዐየː ኵሎː ወተሠልጠː ላዕሌሃː 7. ወኮነː ወወእቱː መምለኬː ጣዖትː ወሠዋዔː መሥዋዕትː ለአጋንንትː ርኩሳንː ወገብ|ረː ስደተː ለክርስቲያንː ወ麽artersː ዋጋንː ከመː አራዊትː 8. ወጋልአː ኵሎː ወሠናያተː ወተቃወሞː ለእግዚአብሔርː እስመː ሥልጣነː ሮምː ኮነː ኵሉː ወስተː እዴሁː 9. ወቀተለː ኵሎː ኖሎተː ወካህናተː ወመነኞስː እደː ወአንስተː ወሕፃናተː ንኡሳነː ወከዐወː ᰀመː ብዙኃንː ወአልቦː ኍልቍː በእደː ስዩማንː በላዕያነː ሥጋː ሰብእː ዘሤሞሙː ውስተː ኵሉː መካንː ወእምህትː ወምሕረት። 10. ወነሠተː አብያተː ክርስቲያናትː ወለ ምክስምያኖስː ዘገብረː ብዙኀː እከያተː እስመː መንግሥቱː ኮነትː ዋጂወː ወመክስምያኖስː ዳግማዊː ዘኮነትː መንግሥቱː ውእቱː ኮነː ይምትሩː ርእሶː ለቅዱስː አባː ጴጥሮስː ተፍጻሜተː ሰማዕትː ሊቀː ጳጳሳትː 12. ወለኵሎሙː ኤጲስː ቆጶሳትː ዘሀገረː ምስርː ወáltመː ዋማː በሃይማኖትː ኦርቶዶክሳዊትː ወቡጢልː ንጹሕ። ወእምህትː ወምሕረትː ለእገዚአብሔርː አውዐዮንː በእሳትː ኮነː ውስተː እስከː ተሐዘብዎː ኵሉː ሰብእː ዋማː ውእቱː ፀሩː ለክርስቶስː ዘመጽአː ላዕሌሆሙː ስደተː ወኢይበርቡː ንዋዮሙː ወኢያሕምምዎሙː ዋማː 16. ወዓዲː አዘዘː ከመː ኢይክልእዎሙː ተቀንዮቶሙː ውስተː ቤተː ክርስቲያንː ቅድስትː ከመː ዋጋልዩː በእንቲአሁː ወበእንተː መንግሥቱː ዋጋንː ከአተነː እምአመː ተኀየለː ወደአስ ለክርስቶስː ዘመጽአː ለእገዚአብሔርː ላዕለː ሆዕለሃː ዋጋንː ከአተነː እምአመː ተኀየለː ወደአስ ለክርስቶስː ዘመጽአː ለእገዚአብሔርː ላዕለː ሆዕለሃː ዋጋንː ከአተነː እምአመː ተኀየለː ወደአስ ለክርስቶስː ዘመጽአː ለእገዚአብሔርː ላዕለː ሆዕለሃː ዋጋንː ከአተነː እምአመː ተኀየለː ወደአስ ለክርስቶስː ዘመጽአː ለእገዚአብሔርː
soldiers accompanied him. 6. Many thousands of soldiers were assembled in the city, for there was a fight between them. Diocletian set fire to the city, burnt everything down and gained power over it. 7. He worshipped idols and offered sacrifices to impure demons, persecuted Christians and was like a beast. 8. He hated all virtues and rebelled against God, for the whole power of Rome was in his hand. 9. He killed all pastors, priests, monks, men, women and small children. He shed blood of many without number through the hands of his flesh-devouring officials, whom he appointed in all places, without compassion and mercy. 10. He destroyed churches, and he burnt in fire the Scriptures inspired by God. There was persecution of all Christians for nineteen years from the time he had got power and gained victory in Egypt. 11. In this time he sent to Alexandria in order that they cut down the head of St 'Abba Peter, the last martyr and bishop. 12. He killed all bishops of the land of Egypt when he found them in the Orthodox faith and in pure struggle, until all people considered him Antichrist, who had come to destroy the whole world. Indeed he was a vessel for evil and a storage for violence. 13. His companions were together with him in action and character. They are: Maximian, who did many evil things, for he received his sovereignty from him (Diocletian); and the second Maximian, whose kingdom was in the Eastern direction, was like a depraved beast, enemy of God and a doer of abominable things. 14. But Constantius, who was his companion in the reign of Asia, did nothing evil, but rather loved people and did good things for them. 15. He also made a herald to declare a message in all places under his power for Christians, that they might do the will of Lord, the one true God. 16. He also commanded that none should trouble them, exercise a persecution on them, rob their possessions or harm them. 17. Moreover, he commanded that none should hinder their service in the saint church, so that they might pray for him and for his empire. 18. While he was active in such a way, the impious Diocletian got sick and fell into a strong bodily illness in the third year after the accomplishment of a persecution, which he had brought upon the Christians. His thoughts and mind were disturbed. 19. Due to this reason he chased him away from his empire and exiled him, according to the advice of the Roman officers (sarāwit), on an island named Wāros. There were many trees there, and it lies to the East and he dwelt alone there. 20. There were some believers on this island, who had survived. They gave him daily food to maintain his body. While being in such condition, alone, his reason returned to him and he desired to reign. He asked his soldiers and officers (sarāwit) to take him out of the fortress and to make him emperor as it had been formerly. 21. But the governors, soldiers, and officers (sarāwit) did not agree saying: ‘We won’t accept again this one, who has lost his mind and reason and whom we have exiled from the empire.’ 22. Due to this reason the suffering of his heart became stronger, and this enemy of God and of the holy saints was not able to do what he wished, he was mourning and his eyes

---

20 I do not follow here the conjecture by Zotenber, which I find not necessary. The word ከሰራዊት ከስርmight be understood here not as an adverb meaning ‘altogether, completely’, but as a pronoun ‘all, everything’ in accusative. 21 Cp. Eusebius, EH 8.14. 22 On the proposal to translate the word ከታራዊት as ‘senate’ or ‘senators’, see Zotenber 1878, 249. 23 This place name remains unidentified. 24 On the grammatical form ከልለቀ, see Zotenber 1883, 298, n. 2.
አንስት፡ አንስት፡ ወይሠጥቅ፡ ከርሦን፡ ወያውፅኦሙ፡ ለሕፃናት፡ ወይሠውዕ፡ ሰብአ፡ ወእንስሳ፡ ለአጋንንት፡ ርኩሳን። 24. ወእንዘ፡ ሀሎ፡ በዘከመዝ፡ ግብር፡ ተሐንቀ፡ ወሞተ፡ እምድኅረ፡ ሞተ፡ አቡሁ፡ በክልኤ፡ ዓመት፡ ወኢተቀቱለ፡ በእደ፡ ሰብእ፡ ዳእሙ፡ ውእቱ፡ ፀረ፡ እግዚአብሔር፡ ወ|ሰማዕታቲሁ፡ ቅዱሳን፡ ኮነ፡ ይበኪ፡ ወአዕይንቲሁ፡ ያውሓceği፡ ለአንብዓ፡ ብዙኀ፡ ሶበ፡ ዐገትዎ፡ እከያት፡ እምኵለሄ፡ ወተወለጠ፡ ልቡናሁ፡ ሥድፋደ፡ ወዖራ፡ አዕይንቲሁ፡ ወጠፍአ፡ ሕይወቱ፡ ወሞተ። 25. ወወዲ፡ መክስሚኑስ፡ ከሓዲ፡ ኢያሕፀፀ፡ እከየ፡ ዘይገብሮ፡ ዲዮግልጥያኖስ፡ ወኮነ፡ ይገብር፡ በሀገረ፡ ምሥራቅ፡ ወፈርኔቄ፡ ወሀገረ፡ ዐባይ፡ እስክንድርያ፡ ወምስር፡ ወ፭፡ አህጉራት፡ 26. ወይቀትሎሙ፡ ለ|ቅዱሳን፡ ሰማዕታት፡ ዘእንበለ፡ ምሕረት። ቦዘይወግሮሙ፡ ውስተ፡ ባሕር፡ ወቦ፡ ዘይሁโบሙ፡ ለአራዊት፡ ወቦ፡ በአፈ፡ ሰይፍ፡ ወቦ፡ ለአውዕዮ፡ በእሳት። ወኮነ፡ ያመዘብሮሙ፡ |ለአብያተ፡ ክርስቲያናት፡ ወያውዒ_PANEL30 Scarborough, A., 1927, pp. 15-20.drivers, their wives and children. The recovery of the two small iron Separately from each other, the two iron transporters bind the iron (heme) and deliver it to the cell, where it can be used for the production of proteins. The process is highly regulated and involves various transporters and enzymes. The iron ion, Fe^{2+}, is the active form of iron and is transported across the cell membrane. The transporters, Tfr1 and DMT1, are responsible for the uptake of iron from the diet and from stored iron in body cells. Iron is essential for the proper function of many enzymes and proteins, such as enzymes involved in energy production, as well as in the production of oxygen-carrying hemoglobin in red blood cells. Iron is also used in the production of chlorophyll in plants. Iron deficiency can lead to a variety of health problems, including anemia, impaired immune function, and cognitive decline. Iron overload can also be harmful and can cause liver damage and other complications. The regulation of iron absorption, storage, and release is important to maintain adequate iron levels in the body. Iron homeostasis is controlled by various mechanisms, including the synthesis and degradation of transferrin, a protein that binds iron and transports it in the blood. The level of transferrin-bound iron is a key regulator of iron absorption and release. The transporters Tfr1 and DMT1 are regulated by the iron levels in the body, and their activity can be increased or decreased in response to iron availability. The balance of iron intake, absorption, storage, and release is crucial for maintaining the proper level of iron in the body. Iron is a critical nutrient that is essential for many biological processes. However, iron overload and iron deficiency can both be harmful to human health. Therefore, the regulation of iron homeostasis is critical to maintaining adequate iron levels in the body. The understanding of iron transport and its regulation is important for the development of treatments for iron-related disorders.
poured many tears, when the misfortunes encircled him in every direction. His reason was disturbed a lot, his eyes became blind, he lost his life and died. 23. Maximian (was) persistent in evil deeds and he brought many spells upon Diocletian. He dedicated himself to the impure deeds and to proclamation of demons’ names. He cut the bellies of pregnant women and sacrificed humans and animals to impure demons. 24. While doing so he choked and died two years after his father’s death. He was not killed by someone else, but by himself. 25. Moreover impious Maximinus did not reduce the evil done by Diocletian, but did it in the Eastern province, in Farneque (Africa). 26. He murdered holy martyrs without mercy. There were those whom he casted into sea, those whom he gave to the beasts, to the edge of a sword or to be burnt in fire. He destroyed churches and burnt down in fire the Holy Scriptures, and he re-erected the idol temples which had been ruined. 27. He had no mercy on pregnant women; he cut their bellies, took out babies and sacrificed them to impure demons. He forced many people to worship idols. 28. This one also did not escape the God’s wrath, for he got a cough in his chest according to the commandment of God. He lost his health, tormented with many torments, he despaired of life and he found no rest from his many torments. Therefore he understood and recognized that he had fallen into this illness due to Jesus Christ, the true God, because he had persecuted Christians. 30. When he properly collected his inner thoughts, he commanded to his appointed officials to stop the persecution amongst Christians. When he did this act of humanity, his disease left him, which had been brought on him by God and he restored his health. 31. Six months later after he had done penance of his sins, he decided again to rise a persecution against Christians and forgot him, who had cured him from a terrible disease – Jesus Christ, Our Lord and Savior. 32. He began again to kill Christians and established new idols in the great city of Antioch. He followed the deeds of demons and witchcraft, which he used to practice. 33. But in this time a rebel against him arose in Armenia, and also there was a severe famine in all provinces of his empire. No fruit emerged in their fields, nothing was found in their granaries. People collapsed and died because of the lack of food. 34. The rich became poor, because the people of ‘Abrākis’ robbed them rapidly. All people were weeping and lamenting bitterly, and they lost...
chronicle of john of niku: text 77.31. – 77.43.
their lives; and there was no one to bury them.\textsuperscript{403} 35. And idolaters of the Eastern province were filled with lamentation and sorrow, for they missed Diocletian and his son Maximian. 36. He (Maximian) sent his son Maxentius to them (the people of Rome), and he confirmed his reputation in that place, for he was a son of an impious one and was eager to ruin them. From the beginning he was treacherous wishing to please all the people of Rome and a pretender of our faith.\textsuperscript{404} 37. He commanded to cease from\textsuperscript{405} persecution amongst\textsuperscript{406} Christians. He took an appearance of those who worshipped Christ. He began to show the greater love for people than any of his predecessors, who were like him. 38. But after a short time his fraud was recognized, and he became, just like his fathers, like a wolf in his lair and accomplished the fraud of his fathers, revealed the evil inside him and became furious. He did not leave undone any form of the evil and impure. He accomplished the deeds of fornicators and destroyed all people. He lied down with married women openly, not even secretly, but publicly. Thereafter he sent them back to their husbands. 39. He did not wish to give them a relief from the oppression, which they exercised upon themselves by his command. Moreover, he took the possessions of the rich on many occasions, and from those, who had nothing to give he took what he had found in their possession. He killed many thousands because of their possessions. 40. The deeds this impious man had done on them could not be described. The people of Rome were helpless in what they were doing, for he treated them contrary to the customs of their land. 41. But Constantius was a servant of God of a good reputation, who accomplished his way in wisdom and prudence; beloved and just. All people were praying for him. Honored people, all generals and army petitioned him. 42. It was he, who built Byzantium. He followed a good way in justice. Thereafter he died and went to God. He left his excellent son, that is God-loving Constantine, glorious and illustrious in righteousness. He appointed him emperor and master in his stead. 43. This glorious blessed Trinitarian always fulfilled the will of God. He loved all people in his empire, and did for everybody good deeds. He accomplished the whole time of his reign in peace, power and chastity. He became great in front of the living God forever. 44. The army and all officers (serāwit) praised him, for he was zealous with a goodly zeal for God. In his time splendor, the powerful Christian wisdom, righteousness, philanthropy and tolerance were manifested. 45. The heretical doctrine\textsuperscript{407} was not at all accepted by him. But rather he made everybody under his power serve God and did no injustice. Moreover, he did not endure to leave the destroyed churches, but rebuilt them. He also did not allow anything to withstand the holy Christian worship of God, who had anointed him to be an emperor in goodness and peace. 46. He appointed Licinius, husband of his sister Constantia a partner of his reign in Rome. He did not lack in any virtues of the righteous emperor Constantine, for he made

\textsuperscript{403} Cp. Eusebius, \textit{EH} 9.8. \textsuperscript{404} See Charles 1916, 61, n. 2. \textsuperscript{405} \textit{ἀργία} has the meaning of partitive in this case. \textsuperscript{406} Zotenberg translates the expression \textit{ὦ ἥριτος, ὢ Ἱεροφανεία} as ‘dénonciation’ (Zotenberg 1883, 301). Charles follows this render pointing however that ‘this meaning is unknown to classical Ethiopic’ (Charles 1916, 62, n. 1).
himself to take a great and terrible oath, so that he would do justice and would not act wrongly against Our Lord Jesus Christ and against his servants. 47. In that time the impious Maximian came from the East, who was possessed with Satan and who resisted God, for he took the Eastern province for him alone. He plotted to kill the righteous emperor Constantine and did not want to execute the sealed rescript <from> Constantine. 48. Indeed he was making war in all cities and provinces under the power <of> Constantinople. But he could not subject them. Constantine, the servant of God, and Licinius, his sister's husband, two of them, got prepared to make war against these heretics. Constantine went to fight against Maxentius, who was in Rome. And Licinius went to fight against the impious Maximian of the Eastern province. 49. When Maxentius learned about the arrival of Constantine, the servant of God, he went by ship and entered the river of Constantinople. But he could not subject them. Constantine, the servant of God. When the impious Maxentius crossed the river of ʾAntalya, and all those who were with him, his cavalry over the bridge went out in front of him before the arrival of God-loving Constantine. 51. When Constantine arrived, he stopped at a distance and did not enter the battle, but was waiting for a revelation of the assistance of God. But the enemies were getting more powerful and stronger. 52. While Constantine was engaged like that, he lied down and fell asleep, being sad and concerned. He did not know that the help of Christ was with him. There was delight in Rome, that the impious ones saw a vision in a form of the Holy Cross in the sky and it was written on it: ‘By this sign of the Cross you shall conquer him’. 53. He woke up quickly and began to fight, made war and conquered those, who resisted him. No one was left from them. He destroyed them all. 54. Those who were with the general Maxentius wanted to flee away and to go to Rome, but the bridge was destroyed under them according to the commandment of God. They all sunk in a depth of the abyss. 55. There was delight in Rome, that the impious ones had sunk. The officers of Constantine, His nobles, his army, all troops and soldiers, farmers and children together took candles and they put on clean and tidy clothes. They went out with musicians to receive the servant of God, emperor Constantine. 56. Not only had the city of Rome rejoiced, but all cities and provinces as well as Constantinople. 57. But Constantine did not boast and did not praise himself for his honor and victory as other kings, but he rather don't follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, but propose my own one.

---

408 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, but propose my own one. 409 Zoetenberg and Charles identify this proper name with Italy (Zotenberg 1883, 302; Charles 1916, 63). 410 I don’t follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here.
was mild and humble. He glorified God and celebrated his Lord, Lord of everything, Jesus Christ, King of the Kings and Lord of the Lords. When he entered Rome in triumph, all people of Rome prostrated themselves before him. Those who survived in battle were subjected to him and submitted themselves to his command. Thereafter Constantine entered the palace crowned with a crown of triumph.

70. Thereafter he assembled three hundred and eighteen saints in the city of Nicaea and established the Orthodox faith, and no one could enumerate all his good deeds.

71. There was one man, one of the good Christians, who were there, he deposed all governors of the city and all officials. He appointed upon them Christian men. He built beautiful churches in all cities and provinces.

72. The three hundred and eighteen, who had discovered the glorious cross, crucified – praise be on Him! He received all Christians, who were there, he deposed all governors of the city and all officials. He appointed upon them Christian men. He built beautiful churches in all cities and provinces. 63. He also sent his mother God-loving empress Helena to search for the wood of the honored Cross, on which Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ had been crucified – praise be on Him – in the saint city of Jerusalem.

64. in the time of of the blessed Ἁββᾶ Ἀλιμῖνος, bishop of Jerusalem.

65. She also built an edifice of the Holy Resurrection in glory and restored the buildings of Jerusalem, so that they became better as they had been before and so they are till nowadays. Constantine built also a church in Byzantium of a pleasant beauty and splendid appearance. It was not small in size, but rather a very lofty one. 67. After he had accomplished the construction, he named the city Constantinople. Indeed, previously it was called Byzantium. 68. He loved dwelling there and made it into a residence of Christ. Moreover, he gathered Holy Scriptures and placed them in churches.

69. Moreover, he gathered Holy Scriptures and placed them in churches. And the Saint Sol Petros (Sylvester), patriarch of Rome instructed him with good instructions and taught him the pure faith. 70. Thereafter he went to make war on the cities of Persia and overcame them. When he conquered them, he established them in peace and he... 71. There was one man, one of the good Christians, who were there, he deposed all governors of the city and all officials. He appointed upon them Christian men. He built beautiful churches in all cities and provinces. 63. He also sent his mother God-loving empress Helena to search for the wood of the honored Cross, on which Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ had been crucified – praise be on Him – in the saint city of Jerusalem.

64. in the time of of the blessed Ἁββᾶ Ἀλιμῖνος, bishop of Jerusalem.

65. She also built an edifice of the Holy Resurrection in glory and restored the buildings of Jerusalem, so that they became better as they had been before and so they are till nowadays. Constantine built also a church in Byzantium of a pleasant beauty and splendid appearance. It was not small in size, but rather a very lofty one. 67. After he had accomplished the construction, he named the city Constantinople. Indeed, previously it was called Byzantium. 68. He loved dwelling there and made it into a residence of Christ. Moreover, he gathered Holy Scriptures and placed them in churches.

70. Thereafter he assembled three hundred and eighteen saints in the city of Nicaea and established the Orthodox faith, and no one could enumerate all his good deeds. 71. There was one man, one of the good officers, whose name was ᾿Ἀβλαώγιος, a Christian. He worked zealously to discover the glorious cross, on which Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ was crucified – praise be on Him! 72. The three hundred and eighteen, who had assembled in Nicaea, venerated the emperor Constantine, the servant of God,

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{The meaning of this passage remains to me obscure. Zotenberg translates it as follows: 'et les combla de présents, parmi lesquels était un cor dont on fait usage pour sonner devant le roi' (Zotenberg 1883, 303). See Charles 1916, 64, n. 1. Cp. John Malalas 13.3 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 172). Cp. Eusebius, EH 9.9.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{The form could not be identified neither by Zotenberg nor by Charles. Could this form be the corrupt form of the attribute of Jerusalem Μακάριος \(A\) ἕρωον (see Zotenberg 1883, 304, n. 1)? Or might the form \(\text{\textsuperscript{411}}\text{Aylimun}\) stand for the \text{\textsuperscript{412}}\text{Merciful'}, thus having been interpreted as a proper name, whereas the word \(\text{\textsuperscript{413}}\text{Aylimun}\) ('blessed') is a literal translation of the bishop's name \(\text{\textsuperscript{414}}\text{Makarios}$. \text{\textsuperscript{415}}\text{This verse belongs to the previous one. However I preserve the division by Charles (Charles 1916, 64).} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{411}}\text{Literally 'wood'.} \]
መልእክተ፡ ሥልጣን፡ ለክርስቲያን። በእደ፡ ወደወሰንት፡ ለስፋወጥስ፡ ወተመውኦት፡ በእደ፡ መምለኬ፡ ወለእሙ፡ ንግሥት፡ እሌኒ፡ መፍቀሪተ፡ አምላክ፡ ወገብሩ፡ ሎሙ፡ የስጋጆታት። አብያተ፡ ክርስቲያናት፡ በሰላም፡ ወይጻባእ፡ በእንተ፡ ሃይማኖት፡ ርትዕት። ወወረድ፡ ፩፡ ብእሲ፡ እምእሉ፡ ወወረድ፡ ጻሕለ፡ ብርት፡ ዐቢይ፡ ወአኀዙ፡ ይሳለቁ፡ ኵሎም፡ ዳግመ። ዳእሙ፡ ይቤ፡ አነ፡ እፈቅድ፡ እሙት፡ በክርስትናየ፡ በስዎ፡ ፀዓዳ፡ እስመ፡ ውእቱ፡ ኮነ፡ ምትሐታዌ፡ እምቅድመ፡ ዝንቱ፡ በጥምቀት፡ ቅድስት፡ ዘመሳሐውያን፡ ወበወረድ፡ ይታረኝ፡ ለንጉሥ፡ ወስተ፡ መካነ፡ ተውኔት፡ ክሱእወፋ፡ ለተጻብኦተ፡ መክስምያኖስ፡ ዋአይጤ፡ የሚፇርካት። አብያት፡ ክርስቲያናት፡ በሰላም፡ ወይጻባእ፡ በእንተ፡ ሃይማኖት፡ ርትዕት። ወወረድ፡ ፩፡ ብእሲ፡ እምእሉ፡ ወወረድ፡ ጻሕለ፡ ብርት፡ ዐቢይ፡ ወአኀዙ፡ ይሳለቁ፡ ኵሎሙ፡ ዳግመ። ዳእሙ፡ ይቤ፡ አነː እፈቅድ፡ እሙት፡ በክርስትናየ፡ በስዎ፡ ፀዓዳ፡ እስመ፡ ውእቱ፡ ኮነː ምትሐታዌ፡ እምቅድመː ዝንቱː በጥምቀትː ቅድስትː ዘመሳሐውያንː ወበወረድː ይታረኝː ለንጉሥː ወስተː መካነː ተውኔትː ክሱእወፋː ለተጻብኦተː መክስምያኖስː ዋአይጤː የሚፇርካትː አብያትː ክርስቲያናትː በሰላምː ወይጻባእː በእንተː ሃይማኖትː ርትዕትː ወወረድː ፩ː ብእሲː እምእሉː ወወረድː ጻሕለː ብርትː ዐቢይː ወአኀዙː ይሳለቁː ኵሎሙː ዳግመː ዳእሙː ይቤː አነː እፈቅድː እሙትː በክርስትናየː በስዎː ፀዓዳː እስመː ውእቱː ኮነː ምትሐታዌː እምቅድመː ዝንቱː በጥምቀትː ቅድስትː ዘመሳሐውያንː ወበወረድː ይታረኝː ለንጉሥː ወስተː መካነː ተውኔትː ክሱእወፋː ለተጻብዎː መክስምያኖስː ዋአይጤː የሚፇርካትː አብያትː ክርስቲያናትː በሰላምː ወይጻባእː በእንተː ሃይማኖትː ርትዕትː ወወረድː ፩ː ብእሲː እምእሉː ወወረድː ጻሕለː ብርትː ዐቢይː ወአኀዙː ይሳለቁː ኵሎሙː ዳግመː ዳእሙː ይቤː አነː እፈቅድː እሙትː በክርስትናየː በስዎː ፀዓዳː እስመː ውእቱː ኮነː ምትሐታዌː እምቅድመː ዝንቱː በጥምቀትː ቅድስትː ዘመሳሐውያንː ወበወረድː ይታረኝː ለንጉሥː ወስተː መካነː ተውኔትː ክሱእወፋː ለተጻብዎː መክስምያኖስː ዋአይጤː የሚፇርካትː አብያትː ክርስት
and his mother God-loving empress Helena. They commemorated them in an appropriate way and wrote down their splendid deeds from the beginning till the end. 73. When Licinius, who had seized the Eastern province, went to fight against the impious Maximian, this heretic, a servant of evil, learned that he came to him to battle with him, about the fall of Maxentius, and that he was overcome by the hand of the servant of God emperor Constantine. He demanded peace from Licinius. 74. Licinius sent to Constantine saying: ‘Maximian seeks peace, and he has accepted the glorious and pure Christian faith, he left his error that accompanied him, he concluded a treaty with me’. Constantine sent that they should admit that. 75. But Maximinus concealed evil and treachery in his heart, and he sent a letter to all officials under his power forbidding to inflict pain to Christians. 76. When this message reached his officials, they recognized that this was not according to his wish, but according to the faith of those who had gained power over him. Due to that he was not honored by anyone, for the evil deeds he had done to holy men previously. 77. The emperor Constantine did not forbid to any of the Christian leaders to organize synods and to build churches. But rather he was a guardian of the Christian faith and abandoned the worship of idols. According to that he commanded to all and instructed that the churches should be in peace. He fought on behalf of the Orthodox faith. 78. There was one man named Gelasinus from the city of MārSIMAŠ (Mariamme), which lies on the distance of one stadia from Damascus together with many people, who enjoyed worshipping idols of the city of ʾENTUNULYUS (Heliopolis) of Lebanon. 79. In that time they gathered in a theater and took actors with them. They poured cold water in a large brazen vessel and began to mock all those, who came to the holy baptism of the Christians. 80. One of the actors went down to this water and was baptized. When he went out of water, he did not want to be an actor and to mock anymore. Moreover he said: ‘I wish to die in the Christian faith on behalf of Christ’. He said: ‘I have seen a great power while I have been mocking the holy baptism’. 81. When he had gone a little way from the place with water, all those, who were there, were filled with wrath and rage, for they were idolaters. 82. They went down from the theater, seized this holy man and stoned him. He went down from the theater, seized this holy man and stoned him. He received an incorruptible martyrdom’s crown and was associated with holy martyrs. His relatives came together with many Christians, took his body and buried him in the city. They built a church above the place, where his body had been buried. The name of this man is Gelasinus, may God have mercy on us through his prayers. 83. The impure Maximian did not give up his evil treacheries, he was not prevailed upon by the power of justice, which the God-loving emperors obtained from God, and whose way was goodly in their appropriating way and wrote down their splendid deeds from the beginning till the end.

---

\[\text{Charles makes a following note on this passage: 'The grammar of the verse is impossible. I have omitted \textit{实物} before 'set out' (Charles 1916, 65, n. 1). I find the word order a little disturbing, however, not impossible.} ~\text{\textsuperscript{415}}\text{Here the source which John used follows the Cod. Bodleianus Baroccianus 182 (siglum O in the edition by Thurn) of the Malalas Chronicle placing Pentapolis in Lebanon, whereas other witnesses place it in Phoenicia. (Thurn 200, 241; cp. also Paschal Chronicle).} \text{\textsuperscript{416}}\text{Cp. John Malalas 12.50 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 171).}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{415}}\text{Cp. John Malalas 12.50 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 171).}\]
 Chronicles of John of Nikiu: Text 77.80 – 77.91.
learning and in their prudence. 84. This heretic decided to make war against Christ-loving emperors, for he was possessed by a demon, which infuriated him. Due to the lack of authority, which he had had previously without measure, he could not choose for himself one, with whom he was in accord and who was fitting for him. 85. He began in arrogance and stiffneckedness to violate the treaty he had arranged with Licinius. He was eager to do the destructive deeds, but he changed his mind in fear. He arose all people and stirred up all provinces and officials who were under his dominion. 86. He gathered many thousands to war against God-loving emperors, and he trusted in demons, from whom he received instructions. 87. When he began the war, the help of God left him. And Licinius gained victory, he killed all warriors, on whom he had relied. The army and all officers, who had survived, came together to Licinius and prostrated themselves to his feet. 88. When Maximian saw this, he fled in fear, for he was weak, he left the midst of a battle in fear and went to his province. He was filled with wrath and anger with idol enemies of God disappeared, i.e. Diocletian and his two sons. Before his death exhausted by many illnesses, which had befallen him through God. His body gathered many thousands to war against God-loving emperors, and he trusted Christ-loving emperors, for he was possessed by a demon, which infuriated seduce all the faithful like a violent lion, which deceives with sophisticated appearance changed, his limbs were rotten, and everything inside his stomach was destroyed, his bones were revealed, after that his eyes fell out. While he was in all these torments, his soul left his body. 92. These three enemies of God disappeared, i.e. Diocletian and his two sons. Before his death impious Maximian understood that all this occurred to him, because he had rejected Christ and had inflicted evil on the Christian saints. 93. In those days impious Maximian understood that all this occurred to him, because he had rejected Christ and had inflicted evil on the Christian saints. 93. In those days Licinius took the Eastern province, and was master of it and its provinces. The church remained in tranquility and peace. He renovated their (churches') buildings one more time. The church was enlightened with the light of Christ.

---

418 Zotenberg notes on this passage without an attempt to translate it: 'Il manque évidemment ici, dans le texte, quelques mots, et, de plus, le sene du texte original a été mal rendu par les traducteurs' (Zotenberg 1883, 306, n. 3). Charles marks this passage as corrupt and translates as follows: 'and he exerted himself to execute deeds which should issue in his destruction through fear' (Charles 1916, 66-67).


420 I choose the reading here according to my stemma codicum. However, the variant presented in MSS A and B ἄνθρωπον is also possible. Thus, Charles translates this passage: 'they had persuaded him through favourable counsels' (Charles 1916, 67).

421 I do not agree with the conjecture by Zotenberg. ἀνθρώπος is a plural form of ἄνθρωπος, thus the vowel i is attached before the pronominal suffix.
cunning, seduced Licinius as well. He made him forget the previous good deeds and inclined him to do the deeds of those, whose eyes are blind. He was zealous for their evil way, and his heart was not joyous as before. 95. Previously he had not been estranged from the emperor Constantine. However, Constantine the Great was succeeded by his three sons, Constantine II, Constans and Constans, although the form of the proper name of the first one would correspond rather to Constantine (Zotenberg 1883, 309; Charles 1916, 69). I suggest that in this verse Constantine II and Constans are meant, who one would correspond rather to Constantine (Zotenberg 1883, 309; Charles 1916, 69). However, Constatine the Great was succeeded by his three sons, Constantine II, Constans and Constans, although the form of the proper name of the first one would correspond rather to Constantine (Zotenberg 1883, 309; Charles 1916, 69). I suggest that in this verse Constantine II and Constans are meant, who

---

422 ‘on the south and on the north’ (Charles 1916, 69). | 423 Zotenberg and Charles identify these persons with Constantius and Constans, although the form of the proper name of the first one would correspond rather to Constantine (Zotenberg 1883, 309; Charles 1916, 69). However, Constatine the Great was succeeded by his three sons, Constantine II, Constans and Constans, although the form of the proper name of the first one would correspond rather to Constantine (Zotenberg 1883, 309; Charles 1916, 69). I suggest that in this verse Constantine II and Constans are meant, who took authority over Rome. Cp. John Malalas, 13.16-17 (Jeffreys et al. 1986, 177).
his days in virtues. 106. Thereafter people of Yemen received the knowledge of God and lighted up in the splendor of the glory of Our Lord Jesus Christ – praise be on Him! – because of one saint woman, whose name is Theognosta.⁴²⁴ 107. She was a virgin and a nun, who was captured from a monastery on the outskirts of Rome. They brought her to the king of Yemen and presented him as a gift. 108. This Christian woman was very rich with the grace of God. She cured many and led the king of India to the faith. He became Christian together with all people of India because of her. 109. Thereafter the king of India and his companions asked the God-loving emperor Honorius to appoint them a bishop. 110. He rejoiced with big joy because they converted to the faith and turned to God. He appointed them the saint bishop named Tāwonymayos,⁴²⁵ who instructed, taught and strengthened them in the faith of Our God Jesus Christ; until they were ready for baptism, which is the second birth, through the prayers of the saint virgin Theognosta. 111. Praise be on Our Lord Jesus Christ, the only doer of miracles and generous with good riches for those, who trust in Him! The same thing happened also in the land of Ḥindayā (India), which is great India. Indeed the people of this land accepted previously one man named Afrudit (Frumentius).⁴²⁶ He was a freeborn from India. They appointed him bishop over them through the permission of the Apostolic Athanasius, the patriarch of Alexandria, and ordination. 112. He (Athanasius) told him (Frumentius) about the favor they received from the Holy Spirit, and how they received the oblation to God and went to rest in heaven.

Chapter 78. 1. These are the names of the sons of the great emperor Constantine: Constantius, Constans and Constantine. They divided the kingdom of their father in three parts and cast lots. 2. The lot of Constantius was Asia and he reigned there. For Constantine – the city of Constantinople became Christian together with all people of India because of her. 109. Thereafter people of Yemen received the knowledge of God and lighted up in the splendor of the glory of Our Lord Jesus Christ – praise be on Him! – because of one saint woman, whose name is Theognosta. 111. Praise be on Our Lord Jesus Christ, the only doer of miracles and generous with good riches for those, who trust in Him! The same thing happened also in the land of Ḥindayā (India), which is great India. Indeed the people of this land accepted previously one man named Afrudit (Frumentius). He was a freeborn from India. They appointed him bishop over them through the permission of the Apostolic Athanasius, the patriarch of Alexandria, and ordination. 112. He (Athanasius) told him (Frumentius) about the favor they received from the Holy Spirit, and how they received the oblation to God and went to rest in heaven.

³⁴⁵ On the legend of Saint Theognosta and available sources see ‘Theognosta, Saint’, CE, 7 (1991), 2243a–2244b (M. van Esbroeck). | ³⁴⁶ Coptic fragments of the legend preserve the name Theophanes (‘Theognosta, Saint’, CE, 7 (1991), 2243a–2244b (M. van Esbroeck). See also, Lemm 1899, 417.). The Ethiopic form Tāwonymayos might be explained through the lost of the letter Š in the reconstructable form Tāwonymayos. As the name appears only once in the text, this explanation appears to be probable. | ³⁴⁶ This name was identified by Charles (Charles 1916, 70). Zotenberg gives only the transliteration (Zotenberg 1883, 309).
city of Rome. 3. There was a struggle between Constantius and Constantine concerning the reign and peoples who were under their dominion. When they fought with each other, Constantine died in battle. 4. Thereafter Constans was only in Rome, and he was the youngest among them. Constantius reigned over Byzantium that is Constantinople. 5. In his days Arius appeared, he turned to his faith and became Arian. Due to this reason Saffar was a king of Persia, arose against Rome, and there was a big battle between them. 6. Thereafter they reconciled and there was peace and tranquility between Rome and Persia. 7. When Constantius returned to Byzantium, he built a solid bridge on a river named Pyramus in Cilicia. 8. Also in his days the city of Nicaea, the head of cities of our three hundred and eighteen Fathers, fell down by a great earthquake, which happened by a command of God, to prevent the assemblement of Arians with the goal to corrupt the holy Orthodox faith, which our three hundred and eighteen Saint Fathers, bishops, had established, having been assembled previously in the days of Constantine, a festival of good memory. Because of that the wrath of God prevented them. 9. Thereafter a vision of the Holy Cross standing at midday above the holy place, where Our Savior Jesus Christ was crucified, appeared in the sky before the arrival of Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem, and other bishops, who were with him. 10. Thereafter Cyril wrote a letter together with bishops and sent it to the emperor Constantine concerning the great wonder and miracle, which had appeared. 11. Constans was zealous in his father’s faith and was not partial to the faith of God. He resembled his brother, who died in battle. He admired him, but hated his brother, who reigned in Asia, because he did not keep the faith of his father, the God-loving emperor Constantine, and because he established many things in opposition to the Apostolic Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria and exiled him for admiration of heretics, i.e. Arians. 12. The quarrel and separation between the two brothers, emperors Constantius and Constans, was not small. The quarrel was not only because of the killing of their brother, but also because of Saint Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria and because, he (Constantius) did not follow the way of his father and did not delight Our Lord Jesus Christ. 13. On behalf of that he strengthened the God, having delighted God and while cursing his brother Constantius on behalf of his evil deeds. 14. After the death of Constans, the emperor Constantius sent to Athanasius an official in order to kill the honored father, chief of the Christian church. 15. Previously Constans guarded him from the evilness of his brother. Constantius had been afraid of his brother and hid evil in his

\[\text{---}\]

5 The conjecture by Zotenberg is based on the context, however, I don’t follow it. 6 The text should rather read Constantius. However, I do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg. Charles wrongly translates ‘Constans’ (Charles 1916, 71).


Cp. the entry for the 12th of Bashons in the Copto-Arabic Synaxarium (Basset 1922, 1019-1020).

Charles translates the ‘patriarch of Constantine’ (Charles 1916, 71).

\[\text{---}\]
Chronicle of John of Nikiu: Text 78.12 – 78.24.
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16. After the death of his brother Constans he revealed everything in his heart and wished to kill him. But the right hand of the Most High God protected him. He fled, hid himself and escaped from him. 17. The official, who was sent to the Apostolic Athanasius, arose a tumult against the Christians; for he was from the people of Māni (Manes). In those days there were not only Arians who arose tumult against the church. Manicheans aroused in another way and began persecution against Christians, much tumult and bloodshed. 18. Thereafter one mighty official arouse against Rome, whose name was Magnentius. He seized power on sunset without permission of Constantius, he went to ‘Aworābi (Europe) and fought with Constantius. Many people died from both sides. After the death of the powerful Magnentius, Constantius gained victory and became master of everything that had belonged to Magnentius. 19. When Constantius gained victory, he did not praise God as Christian kings before him. But he rather followed the Arians in all his activities. 20. Thereafter heretic bishops assembled a council in the city of Mantolyā (Milan), that is Italy, according to the advice of those apostates, who rejected the Orthodox faith and denied the worship of the Holy Trinity. 21. He (Constantius) made them write a sentence of excommunication on the apostolic Athanasius, the patriarch of Alexandria, and on those bishops, who followed him. 22. These are the names of those, who were exiled together with apostolic Athanasius: Liberius, bishop of Rome, who had been appointed after Julius, and Yulys (Paulinus), the archbishop of Galātyā (Gaul), and Dionysius, metropolitan of Italy, and ʿAwōkinār (Lucifer), metropolitan of the island of Sadrāntyā (Sardinia). And ʿAwōsānyos and Arius appointed bishops for the country of Italy. 23. and the honored abbot and confessor Kerṭos (Hosius), bishop of the West. 24. Moreover, he put forth the holy ones, who had assembled in Nicaea, and exiled them from their bishoprics. Thereafter while the emperor Constantius was in Rome, the honored women assembled by him. They asked him to return the archbishop Liberius to Rome from his exile. 25. And Filəskəs (Felix) was a disciple of the archbishop Liberius, who was in agreement with the Arians, and they appointed him archbishop after the exile of his master. After the return of his master Liberius, he (Felix) was arrogant with him and hated him because of his appointment. They exiled him from Rome to the western province, in order that he stay there. 26. In those days Constantius sent Gallus, son of his brother, to the East at night, for he had previously fought with Magnentius, killed him and became Christian in every way. 27. 432

See Zotenberg 1883, 312, n.1; Charles 1916, 72, n. 1. | 433 I do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg here. | 434 Zotenberg and Charles identify this proper name as Auxentius (Zotenberg 1883, 312-313; Charles 1916, 72). Another possible identification could be with Eusebius (_exception misread as اوسیلوس_). Cp. Athanasius, Apologia de fuga sua 4 | 435 An alternative translation of the passage could be: ‘And they appointed ‘Awōsānyos and Arius bishops of the country of Italy’. Zotenberg and Charles translated this passage in a different way. Thus, Zotenberg proposes: ‘On nomma Auxentius l’Arien évêque de la province d’Italie’. (Zotenberg 1883, 312-313) Charles has almost the same translation: ‘And they made Auxentius the Arian bishop of the province of Italy’ (Charles 1916, 72). However, this translation does not correspond to the Ethiopic text. | 436 I do not follow the conjecture by Zotenberg, but the reading of manuscripts. | 437 The identification is still doubtful. See Zotenberg 1883, 313, n. 2. | 438 Charles surprisingly translates ‘his sister’s son’, marking this passage as corrupt (Charles 1916, 73). | 439 I do not consider the conjecture by Zotenberg necessary here. He, however, writes on this passage as follows: ‘Ce récit a été entièrement défiguré par le traducteur’ (Zotenberg 1883, 313, n. 3).
After he had killed this strong one, he returned to Constantinople. Constantius appointed him emperor over Rome and sent him to reside there. 28. When Gallus came to Rome, his brother Julian of an evil name, came to Constantinople from the province of Buța (Bithynia) to the emperor Constantius, for he killed many of his relatives and he feared they would blame him in front of the emperor 29. Indeed, this Julian was powerful and strong, he was previously a reader in the church of Nicomedia. He had doubt in the Christian faith. 30. Gallus, who was the emperor in Rome according to the order of the emperor Constantius, because he was his son-in-law and because he loved him, stayed for a short time and thereafter he died. 31. Julian abandoned reading Holy Books. He sought protection by the soldiers and the chiefs of Rome. He let his hair grow and became a great captain. 32. Thereafter he was appointed emperor of the region of ʿAwrunya (Europe) according to the Christian laws and permission of the emperor Constantius. He did not wait until they put the crown of reign on him according to law, but he rather followed the misguidance of augurs and the instructions of magicians. He became a servant of demons, he wished a proud position, and he killed many of his relatives and he feared they would blame him in front of the emperor.

33. When Constantius learned this, he assembled many soldiers from the cities of Syria. He went to Cilicia to make war with Julian. It seemed to him that he would kill him. 34. While he was thinking so, Constantius fell ill and died. He could not accomplish his plan, because God brought evil things on him, so that he might return to the earth from which he came. 35. Having learnt about the death of Constantius, Julian seized his kingdom, became strong and very powerful. He returned the exiled bishops to their thrones. He brought apostolic Athanasius from exile and sent him to Alexandria, and Cyril, the composer of homilies, to Jerusalem; and he returned ʿAsānəyos (Eusebius), Lukifār (Lucifer) and ʿAbəlyānos (Hilary) to the West, and others alike he returned to their churches. 36. After a short time he declared openly his heresies and apostasies on behalf of two philosophers, the name of one of them was Liwānyus (Libanius) from Antioch, and the name of another is Maksamuyos (Maximus), one of the magicians. 37. While they assisted and supported Julian, he closed churches and opened idol temples, he plundered precious possessions of God’s house and gave them openly to seducers. 38. Thereafter he opposed the worshipers of Jesus Christ, he named himself decorator of temples, he offered abominable sacrifices to idols, he kindled a fire in front of the altar of demons, he polluted earth with the blood of dirty sacrifices and he polluted air with the smoke of fat. 39. He sent to the great Apostolic Athanasius according to the advice of the heathen in order to
kill him. And he left his throne, fled and escaped from him. 40. This apostate emperor, who destroyed the holy places, which the God-loving emperor Constantine had constructed, resembled his father Satan. He converted all holy places into demons’ dwellings and idol temples. 41. They ruled over the meek Christians and began to deride them, to seize and kill them, to do evil upon them, not for a short, but for a long time. They shouted at them like evil beasts and terrified them at this time filled with evilness. 42. Idolaters kindled a fire in order to burn down the body of St John the Baptist, but the power of Our Lord Jesus Christ wasted their intention. They saw a terrible vision until all the unbelievers ran away. 43. The people of Alexandria were there, they took the body of St John, brought it to Alexandria and gave it to the archbishop St Athanasius before his escape. 44. He took it and placed it in a house of a magistrate, one of the great people of the city, secretly. A few priests and Theophilus, the third archbishop, knew this secret. 45. At this time the latter was singer and psalmist, when they brought the body of St John. After Athanasius, Peter became archbishop. After Peter – Timothy Akrimun (Aktemon), his brother, the translation of his name is ‘whithout possession’. After Timothy – Theophilos, who destroyed an idol temple named Arāmu (Serapis) and converted it into a church. 46. This one was firm, lofty, and much adorned. He made it into a dwelling of the body of St John the Baptist in honor. It is also said, that after a long time Theophilos took the body of St John and his head and placed it into a tomb, which was built inside the church. 47. He celebrated much joy and a glorious feast. And the people of the city glorified and honored him in laudation.

Chapter 79. 1. It is said concerning St Theophilus, archbishop of Alexandria, that he was from people of the city of Manuf (Memphis), which is the city of Pharaoh and was previously named Arcadia. He was from a family of Christians. 2. He had a small sister and one Ethiopian maid, who belonged to his parents. They were poor, and he was small in years and stature. 3. In one of the nights at dawn this maid took the hands of the children and brought them into the temple of impure gods of ‘Ardewos (Artemis) and Apollo in order to pray according to their error. 4. When these children entered, the gods fell down to earth and were shuttered. This maid got frightened because of that, she took the children, went away and fled to Nikiu, because she was afraid of the priests of the impure idols. 5. She also got afraid of the people of Nikiu, that they might hand her out to the idol priests, she put the children to
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This identification is doubtful.
flight and came to Alexandria. 6. Then the divine inspiration incited her and the
God’s grace dwelt on her, she took the children and brought them into a
church, in order to learn and understand the Christian mysteries. 7. At that
time God revealed to Father Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria, the case of
the children. When they entered the church and stood at the pulpit, he
commanded to guard those three until he finished the liturgy. 8. Thereafter
they brought children and the maid to St Athanasius. He asked the maid and
said to her: ‘What did you do and why the speechless gods did not help you?
But rather when they saw the children of the Church, they fell down to earth,
crushed, and from now this children will stay with me.’ 9. When the maid
heard that, she was amazed by the words of the holy man, for he knew the
secret that had happened in the idol temple. This time she could not deny
what she had done, but bowed down to his feet and asked him for the Holy
Christian baptism. 10. He baptized them and made them Christians, they
received the light of grace and became the new believers. 11. He sent the
younger girl to a virgins’ monastery for dwelling there, until the time of
marriage. Thereafter she gave her into marriage to one man from the city of
Mabale, that is in the South (dabub)441 of Egypt and was named formerly
Diyasaṣyā. 12. St Cyril, a great star, who illuminated everywhere in his
learning, clothed with Holy Spirit, was born there, who was archbishop after
St Theophilus, brother of his mother. 13. After they had baptized the child St
Theophilus, they shaved his head, counted him among the deacons442 and
appointed him reader. 14. They educated him perfectly as it is appropriate to
holy men, he grew up and became a young man pleasing God. He was skilled
in all Scriptures of the church, which were inspired by God and guarded their
laws. 15. Thereafter they appointed him deacon and he became very zealous
in the faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ in purity and holiness. 16. Thereafter he
put on priest’s clothes, became a chief and remained on the throne of Mark
the Evangelist of Alexandria. 17. After he became archbishop, he illuminated
the whole city with the light of his holy faith. He rendered all the cities of
Egypt pure of the worship of idols. He destroyed everyone, who produced
statues, according to the prophecy of the holy Apostolic Athanasius.

Chapter 80. 1. And the wretched Julian began building a temple of the Jews at
Jerusalem, which had been destroyed by Rome. And he offered sacrifices

441Zotenberg and Charles translate as ‘north’ (Zotenberg 1883, 316; Charles 1916, 76).
442ʾAnbābi means ‘reader, lector, deacon who reads the Scripture during the service’ (Leslau
1991, 383a)
there, for he loved shedding blood. 2. Our Lord Jesus Christ - praise be on Him - abolished his practices and customs. 3. *Sāfursākis* (Sapor Arsaces),\(^{443}\) king of Persia, who was peaceful and gave tribute to the God-loving emperor Constantine, arose to fight with the Romans. 4. In that time St Domitius became martyr and accomplished his struggle. And the emperor Julian, an enemy of God, made sacrifices to demons in the city named Kāsoryu\(^{444}\) in the province of Antioch, which is on the distance of seven stadia from it. There was there an idol of Apollo. Thereafter he and the Roman army arose and went to fight with Persians 5. accompanied by all demon worshippers and deceitful augurs. On his way, he arrived at an abandoned\(^{445}\) place, he saw many people there: men, women and children. 6. Many ill people were healed by the prayer of St Domitius, the servant of God. 7. He asked: ‘What is the assemblage, that you see?’ They told him: ‘A monk performs miracles and heals ill people. This assemblage that you see are the Christians. They receive blessing from him and are healed through him.’ 8. Julian got angry and sent to him one soldier deceiving him with powerful words. He told him: ‘If your dwelling is in this cave, in order to please your God, why do you wish to assemblage, that I see?’ 9. St Domitius replied: ‘I gave up my soul and my body to the hands of the God of Heaven, the true God, Jesus Christ. Now many years passed since I locked myself in this cave. I can’t send away these people, who came to me in faith.’ 10. Having heard that, the emperor commanded his soldiers to block the entrance of the cave with him inside until the death of the righteous old man. 11. In this manner he accomplished his struggle on the twenty-fifth of *Hamle*\(^{446}\) and received the uncorruptible crown of martyrdom.\(^{447}\) 12. The revenge of God was not slow with this impious heretic Julian. 13. He went to idolators like him, i.e. Persians, and went rapidly and never saw Rome again. 14. It did not happen to him as the liars had told him saying: ‘We, idols, would unite to help you when you enter the river.’ 15. This wretched one was seduced by their words. He could not open his mouth due to the abundance of their speeches. 16. They named this river ‘the river of fire’ because there were beasts in it; and because of that it was named with this name.\(^{448}\) 17. Julian was firm and
established in his errors, he named himself mocker of God’s word, for he believed in idols and prayed for deamons, who were not able to save him. But they rather seduced him in his worthless deeds. Indeed they spoiled his reason and he became an enemy of God, the honored Creator and Our Savior Jesus Christ, who shed His blood on behalf of many and became a truthful foundation for the faithful, who avenged His Christian servants. 18. Indeed Julian shed the blood of many Christians and slaughtered in his days many believers, and he persecuted severly those, who envoke the name of Christ. 19. When this impious became strong to fight with Persia, the revenge of God Jesus Christ came down on him and he was killed through the hand of his servant, the martyr Mercury. 20. In this night, when this impure heretic was killed, the holy Basil, clothed by God, bishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, saw a vision. 21. He saw the opened heaven and Our Lord Jesus Christ sitting on the throne of His glory. He shouted saying: ‘O, Mercury, go and kill Julian, the enemy of my anointed ones!’ And the holy Mercury stood up in front of him wearing a new corset covered with flowers. 22. When he heard the command of Our Lord Jesus Christ, he disappeared for a short time, and he appeared for a short time. For the third time he appeared shouting: ‘I killed the emperor Julian according to Your command and he died, O Lord!’ 23. At that time the bishop woke up in astonishment and wondering. Julian used to honor a lot the holy Basil, for they were friends since they were small and were versed in letters. Basil sent many letters to him in order to return him from his seduce but he did not accept this. 24. After the chief of priests Basil woke up from his sleep, he invited the honored priests and the faithful to pray at night in the church. 25. After the completion of the prayer he told them on a vision, he had seen and said: ‘Is Julian about to die?’ Having heard that, the priests and people became afraid. Thereafter they asked him to keep silence until he knew exactly the case. But the man of God did not want to keep silence. He rather spoke and had no fear because he trusted in God and in Our Lord Jesus Christ. 26. At that time it happened according to the vision of the holy Basil, the death of the heretic Julian became known in the whole land as well as his destruction, which had happened from God through the hand of the holy martyr Mercury. 27. This impious man practised desolation and evilness on soldiers and he cut off noses of two Persian men, when they led him away and brought him to a desolate region with no water and no path, when he desired to fight with the Persians. 28. Romans perished through hunger, thirst and many hardships in this place, because these Persians acted wisely with Romans and destroyed them. The impious Julian did not recognize the prudent sentence of God. 29. His torments endured his whole life, i.e. eighty-four years. After the death of Julian, the Roman army assembled in order to appoint an emperor. They all agreed with the help of the Christian foundation for the faithful, who avenged His Christian servants. 18. Indeed Julian shed the blood of many Christians and slaughtered in his days many believers, and he persecuted severly those, who envoke the name of Christ. 19. When this impious became strong to fight with Persia, the revenge of God Jesus Christ came down on him and he was killed through the hand of his servant, the martyr Mercury. 20. In this night, when this impure heretic was killed, the holy Basil, clothed by God, bishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, saw a vision. 21. He saw the opened heaven and Our Lord Jesus Christ sitting on the throne of His glory. He shouted saying: ‘O, Mercury, go and kill Julian, the enemy of my anointed ones!’ And the holy Mercury stood up in front of him wearing a new corset covered with flowers. 22. When he heard the command of Our Lord Jesus Christ, he disappeared for a short time, and he appeared for a short time. For the third time he appeared shouting: ‘I killed the emperor Julian according to Your command and he died, O Lord!’ 23. At that time the bishop woke up in astonishment and wondering. Julian used to honor a lot the holy Basil, for they were friends since they were small and were versed in letters. Basil sent many letters to him in order to return him from his seduce but he did not accept this. 24. After the chief of priests Basil woke up from his sleep, he invited the honored priests and the faithful to pray at night in the church. 25. After the completion of the prayer he told them on a vision, he had seen and said: ‘Is Julian about to die?’ Having heard that, the priests and people became afraid. Thereafter they asked him to keep silence until he knew exactly the case. But the man of God did not want to keep silence. He rather spoke and had no fear because he trusted in God and in Our Lord Jesus Christ. 26. At that time it happened according to the vision of the holy Basil, the death of the heretic Julian became known in the whole land as well as his destruction, which had happened from God through the hand of the holy martyr Mercury. 27. This impious man practised desolation and evilness on soldiers and he cut off noses of two Persian men, when they led him away and brought him to a desolate region with no water and no path, when he desired to fight with the Persians. 28. Romans perished through hunger, thirst and many hardships in this place, because these Persians acted wisely with Romans and destroyed them. The impious Julian did not recognize the prudent sentence of God. 29. His torments endured his whole life, i.e. eighty-four years.
of God while in Persia and elected Jovian to become emperor over them. 31. For he was an Orthodox Christian devoted to God and he did not want to become emperor, but became emperor by force. For he was a chief of the governors, and according to that he received the crown of empire. After becoming an emperor he ascended on a higher place, and shouted in a loud voice saying in front of all people and the army: ‘If you really wish me to become emperor over you, become Christian like me and believe in Christ and be enemies of idols.’ At that moment all people and the army cried out in one voice: ‘We are Christians, and from now on our king is Jesus Christ and His Holy Cross.’ According to that they honored the emperor and praised him with great laudation. 34. When the Persians learned about the death of Julian, they sent ambassadors to the God-loving emperor Jovian for peace and reconciliation. Emperor Jovian received them at his place with joy and there was peace and reconciliation between Rome and Persia. 35. The Persians agreed to pay tribute. But Jovian pardoned them a tribute of one year, because the impious Julian had destroyed previously the city of Endərwān and turned it into desert. 36. But he rather commanded them to construct one city outside their kingdom for them. He named this city Amidas, its wall and citadel were strong, and it was full with people. He made it like the former city, which the impious Julian had destroyed. The one, who was appointed in this city, asked the emperor Jovian many times to name it with the name of Rome. But he did not want it because of peace and reconciliation between Rome and Persia.

---

Dissertation Summary

The *Chronicle of John of Nikiu* is an extremely important historical source for the history of Egypt, as well as for the history of Late Antiquity in general. Being written either in Coptic or in Greek, the text was translated into Arabic at an undetermined date. Later it was translated into Ethiopic in 1601, and at the very end of the nineteenth century into Amharic. According to the current state of knowledge only these two versions have survived.

The *Chronicle* was completely published and translated for the first time by H. Zotenberg in 1883. Since that time the number of available witnesses to the text increased, and the preparation of a new edition became an obvious *disdecatum*. The present dissertation is devoted to the preparation of a new text-critical edition of the *Chronicle* applying the so-called genealogical-reconstructive method. The dissertation contains a summary of the history of research, analysis of the history of the text transmission, including the provenance of the Amharic version. In the frame of this project a new *dossier* of the text was prepared, which incorporated all available direct and indirect witnesses.

In the course of the work, all available witnesses were collated and two hypotheses for a possible *stemma codicum* were proposed. A text-critical edition of the first eighty Chapters of the *Chronicle* (which corresponds to some fifty per cent of the entire text) was prepared based on one of the proposed hypotheses for *stemma codicum*. The *Apparatus Criticus* of the edition includes not only readings attested in manuscripts, but also conjectures of the text proposed by different scholars.

The translation in English is accompanied by commentaries on various aspects, including comparison with other texts, which might have served as a source for the *Chronicle*, explanations of conjectures, historical and linguistic commentaries. The translation is supplied with transliteration of proper names and ambiguous lexica, which serves for better analysis of the content of the *Chronicle of John of Nikiu*. 
Zusammenfassung der Dissertation


Im Laufe der Arbeit wurden alle verfügbaren Zeugen zusammengetragen und zwei Hypothesen für ein mögliches stemma codicum vorgeschlagen. Eine textkritische Ausgabe der ersten achtzig Kapitel der Chronik (die ungefähr fünfzig Prozent des gesamten Textes ausmachen) wurde auf der Grundlage einer der vorgeschlagenen Hypothesen für das stemma codicum erstellt. Der Apparatus Criticus der Edition umfasst nicht nur die Lesungen von Manuskripten, sondern auch Konjekturen des Textes, die von verschiedenen Forscher_innen vorgeschlagen wurden.
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