

## Alexander in Jerusalem: Scribal Innovation and Biblical Propaganda in Kyivan Rus

Susana TORRES PRIETO (Segovia)

To Nina Garsoïan (1923–2022),  
In loving memory.

*Alexander of Macedon's life as narrated in the Alexander Romance was inserted early in historiographic works in East Slavic. One of the most innovative details was the inclusion of the visit to Jerusalem of Alexander of Macedon in the First Book, following the wording found in the chronicle of George Hamartolos, an episode he had borrowed from Josephus. More surprising was the later interpolation within this interpolation of a part of Epiphanius of Salamis' treatise De Gemmis, precisely the part describing the robes of the high priest in the Jewish temple and its relation to the filiation of the tribes of Israel. Neither addition was accidental, and their resonances echoed loudly in the limited literary corpus in Kyivan Rus' dealing with sacred kingship. The present article explores the functionality and instrumental use made by Kyivan scribes of the figure of the Macedonian king and his special relation to the chosen people of God. It was by means of these additions that Alexander acquired exclusively in East Slavic the special status of a king whose deeds are key in the salvation of Israel and of all Christianity.*

The title of the present article requires some explanation. The visit of Alexander of Macedon to Jerusalem is the most innovative and surprising addition to the first translation, or rather version, of the Greek *Alexander Romance* (AR) into Slavic.<sup>1</sup> It is innovative in terms of the place where it was inserted, the texts used in building the interpolation, the differences between the variants of this first East Slavic version,<sup>2</sup> and the resonances this particular visit had in other key works of East Slavic letters from a very early time. It is worth remembering that Alexander of Macedon was, for a long time, the only hero from Antiquity familiar to Kyivan Rus' scribes. The reasons for this cultural appropriation lie in the conception of Alexander as a king linked to the history of the people of Israel, which is not to say that he was regarded exactly as a biblical king.

---

1 The *Alexander Romance* is a text widely edited in all its Greek versions, as well as in its Slavic ones. For a full list of the Greek version, see C. JOUANNO, *Naissance et métamorphoses du Roman d'Alexandre : domaine grec*, Paris 2002. I have used as the base Greek text in this article the one prepared by R. STONEMAN published in *Il Romanzo di Alessandro*, Milan 2007. As for the Slavic versions, I only focus on the variants of the first East Slavic version in the present article, and their editions are specified in notes below.

2 The second Slavic version of the *Alexander Romance* was produced much later, most likely in the Balkans, from a different Greek version.

Nevertheless, he was considered a prominent figure in the eschatological Christian view of the world that the scribes adopted for the newly converted polity of Kyivan Rus', mainly thanks to his role in the famous episode of Gog and Magog, as interpreted by Pseudo-Methodios of Patara and recorded by the Kyivan scribes in the *Povest' vremennykh let* (PVL), *sub anno* 6604 (1096). Aside from Pseudo-Methodios' *Apocalypse*, the knowledge of Alexander of Macedon in Kyivan circles was supported by some biblical references and by Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*. It is probably within this messianic tradition that the translation of the AR finds its way into Kyivan historiography.

Alexander of Macedon is only mentioned directly in the Bible once, in the First Book of the Maccabees (vv. 1–10), and only as a reference to how the unfair Antiochus Epiphanes came to reign over the Jews:

After Alexander son of Philip, the Macedonian, who came from the land of Kittim, had defeated King Darius of the Persians and the Medes, he succeeded him as king. (He had previously become king of Greece.) He fought many battles, conquered strongholds, and put to death the kings of the earth. He advanced to the ends of the earth, and plundered many nations. When the earth became quiet before him, he was exalted, and his heart was lifted up. He gathered a very strong army and ruled over countries, nations, and princes, and they became tributary to him.

After this he fell sick and perceived that he was dying. So he summoned his most honored officers, who had been brought up with him from youth, and divided his kingdom among them while he was still alive. And after Alexander had reigned twelve years, he died.

Then his officers began to rule, each in his own place. They all put on crowns after his death, and so did their descendants after them for many years; and they caused many evils on the earth.

From them came forth a sinful root, Antiochus Epiphanes, son of King Antiochus; he had been a hostage in Rome. He began to reign in the one hundred thirty-seventh year of the kingdom of the Greeks.<sup>3</sup>

The opening of the historical First Book of the Maccabees holds Alexander to a certain extent responsible for the fate suffered by the Jewish people in Syria after Antiochus IV Epiphanes becomes king in the year 175 BCE and subsequently commences an aggressive campaign for the Hellenization of his realm. The crisis builds until the year 167, when Antiochus starts the radical Hellenization of Jerusalem, sacking the Temple and forbidding the observance of Jewish customs. That year, the Revolt of the Maccabees takes place (1 Maccabees 6, 1–4). In this account, the sole responsibility of Alexander is having left on the throne the ancestor of king Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>4</sup>

---

3 The translation into English of all biblical passages is given according to *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* of the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), 5th edition, Oxford 2018.

4 The other indirect connections of Alexander to stories narrated in the Bible, either with respect to Gog and Magog (Ezekiel, Apocalypse), or the theory of the Four Kingdoms (Daniel), are more widely established only in later literature, from the time of the Second

The special relation of Alexander and the Jewish people is very much an invention of Flavius Josephus in his *Antiquitates Iudaicae*. Josephus wrote his last and longest work probably around the year 90 CE, once he had installed himself in Rome after having witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus twenty years earlier. By the time Josephus had written his *magnum opus*, Titus had ascended from general to emperor and had become Josephus' patron. *The Antiquities of the Jews* was primarily intended for non-Jewish readers. It is a history of the Jewish nation, from the times of the Creation to Josephus' own time. The work draws heavily on the Septuagint, as well as on writings of Greek and Roman historians. It is within this context, and due to the author's insistence on showing to his Roman public the superior antiquity of the Jews by comparison to the Greeks, that he includes the visit of king Alexander the Great to Jerusalem. This visit is recorded in Josephus' *Antiquities* in chapter 8 of Book 11 (§ 304–346). According to Josephus, Alexander intervenes in a local conflict between Sanaballetēs, a king sent by Darius to Samaria, and Jaddus, the High Priest of the Temple of Jerusalem, regarding an arranged marriage of Sanaballetēs' daughter to Jaddus' brother, thus contravening the rules concerning marriages with foreign (non-Jewish) women. This conflict can be framed within the bigger context of the clashes between Samaritans and Jews at the time. Sanaballetēs soon changes sides when he sees that Alexander has defeated Darius in the battle of Issus. While Alexander is besieging Tyre, he asks the Jewish High Priest to send him reinforcements, which Jaddus refuses to do, in accordance with a previous loyalty pact with Darius. Sanaballetēs enjoys the protection of Alexander in his own conflict with Jaddus but dies before Alexander can actually enter Jerusalem. Jaddus, who had refused to help Alexander before, is now terrified at the prospect of Alexander destroying Jerusalem, as he had previously done with Tyre. Jaddus orders sacrifices to be made to God and, according to Josephus (§327):<sup>5</sup>

κατακοιμηθέντι δὲ μετὰ τὴν θυσίαν ἐρχημάτων αὐτῷ κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους ὁ θεὸς θαρρεῖν καὶ στεφανοῦντας τὴν πόλιν ἀνοίγειν τὰς πύλας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους λευκαῖς ἐσθῆσιν, αὐτὸν δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἱερέων ταῖς νομίμοις στολαῖς ποιῆσθαι τὴν ὑπάντησιν, μηδὲν προσδοκῶντας πείσσεσθαι δεινὸν προνοουμένου τοῦ θεοῦ.

But, when he had gone to sleep after the sacrifice, God spoke oracularly to him in his sleep, telling him to take courage and adorn the city with wreaths and open the gates and go out to meet them, and that the people should be in white garments, and he himself with the priests in the robes prescribed by law, and that they should not look to suffer any harm, for God was watching over them.

Temple onwards.

5 All quotations and translations of Josephus are taken from the edition *Flavius Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI*, R. Marcus (ed.), Cambridge, Mass. 1937. Here, see 472–3.

The Roman historian further narrates the encounter of Alexander with the people of Jerusalem (§ 331–339):

<p>[331] ὁ γὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος ἔτι πόρρωθεν ἰδὼν τὸ μὲν πλῆθος ἐν ταῖς λευκαῖς ἐσθήσιν, τοὺς δὲ ἱερεῖς προεστῶτας ἐν ταῖς βυσσίναις αὐτῶν, τὸν δὲ ἀρχιερέα ἐν τῇ ὑακινθίνῳ καὶ διαχρῦσῳ στολῇ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχοντα τὴν κίδαριν καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἔλασμα, ὃ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγγέγραπτο ὄνομα, προσελθὼν μόνος προσεκύνησε τὸ ὄνομα καὶ τὸν ἀρχιερέα πρῶτος ἠσπάσατο. [332] τῶν δὲ Ἰουδαίων ὁμοῦ πάντων μιᾷ φωνῇ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἀσπασαμένῳ καὶ κυκλωσαμένῳ αὐτόν, οἱ μὲν τῆς Συρίας βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος κατεπλάγησαν, καὶ διεφθάρθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ τὴν διάνοιαν ὑπελάμβανον, [333] Παρμενίωνος δὲ μόνου προσελθόντος αὐτῷ καὶ πυθομένου τί δήποτε προσκυνούντων αὐτὸν ἀπάντων αὐτὸς προσκυνήσῃ τὸν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχιερέα; ‘οὐ τοῦτον’, εἶπεν, ‘προσεκύνησα, τὸν δὲ θεόν, οὗ τῇ ἀρχιερωσύνῃ οὕτως τετίμηται.’ [334] ‘τοῦτον γὰρ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους εἶδον ἐν τῷ νῦν σχήματι ἐν Δίῳ τῆς Μακεδονίας τυγχάνων, καὶ πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν διασκεπτομένῳ μοι πῶς ἂν κρατήσαιμι τῆς Ἀσίας, παρεκελεύετο μὴ μέλλειν ἀλλὰ θαρσοῦντα διαβαίνειν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἠγήσεσθαι μου τῆς στρατιᾶς καὶ τὴν Περσῶν παραδώσειν ἀρχήν.’ [335] ‘ὄθεν ἄλλον μὲν οὐδένα θεασάμενος ἐν τοιαύτῃ στολῇ, τοῦτον δὲ νῦν ἰδὼν καὶ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους ἀναμνησθεῖς ὄψεώς τε καὶ παρακελεύσεως, νομίζω θείᾳ πομπῇ τὴν στρατείαν πεπονημένος Δαρεῖον νικήσειν καὶ τὴν Περσῶν καταλύσειν δύναμιν καὶ πάνθ’ ὅσα κατὰ νοῦν ἐστὶ μοι προχωρήσειν.’ [336] ταῦτ’ εἰπὼν πρὸς τὸν Παρμενίωνα καὶ δεξιωσάμενος τὸν ἀρχιερέα, τῶν Ἰουδαίων παραθεόντων, εἰς τὴν πόλιν παραγίνεται. καὶ ἀνελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν θύει μὲν τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ὑφήγησιν, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀξιοπρεπῶς ἐτίμησεν.</p>	<p>For when Alexander while still far off saw the multitude in white garments, the priests at their head clothed in linen, and the High Priest in a robe of hyacinth-blue and gold, wearing on his head the mitre with the golden plate on it on which was inscribed the name of God, he approached alone and prostrated himself before the Name and first greeted the High Priest. (332) Then all the Jews together greeted Alexander with one voice, and surrounded him, but the kings of Syria and the others were struck with amazement at his action and supposed that the king’s mind was deranged. (333) And Parmenion alone went up to him and asked why indeed, when all men prostrated themselves before him, he had prostrated himself before the High Priest of the Jews, whereupon he replied, “It was not before him that I prostrated myself but the God of whom he has the honour to be High Priest, (334) for it was he whom I saw in my sleep dressed as he is now, when I was at Dium in Macedonia, and, as I was considering with myself how I might become master of Asia, he urged me not to hesitate but to cross over confidently, for he himself would lead my army and give over to me the empire of the Persians. (335) Since, therefore, I have beheld no one else in such robes, and on seeing him now I am reminded of the vision and the exhortation, I believe that I have made this expedition under divine guidance and that I shall defeat Darius and destroy the power of the Persians and succeed in carrying out all the things which I have in mind”. (336) After saying these things to Parmenion, he gave his hand to the High Priest and, with the Jews running beside him, entered the city. Then he went up to the temple, where he sacrificed to God under the direction of the High Priest, and showed due honour to the priests and to the High Priest himself.</p>
---	--

Alexander receives several omens during his life, most of them anticipating his future victories and conquest of the world. The idea of a dream in which a king is spoken to and foretold a secure victory over his enemies is prominent in the Hebrew Bible, and it might have been from there that Josephus took the motif, as he is the first author who mentions this prophetic dream of God to Alexander of Macedon. In the Hebrew Bible, it is typically the way in which

the Lord communicated his wishes to the first kings of Israel, Saul and David,<sup>6</sup> for example. The only other recipients of this type of meaningful dream were usually the prophets themselves. This dream of Alexander, a creation of Josephus, would eventually be incorporated into the first East Slavic version of the AR, as well as into the broader Syriac Alexander tradition.

After offering sacrifices to God according to Jewish custom, Alexander is taken to the Temple and shown by the high priest the Book of Daniel “in which he [Daniel] had declared that one of the Greeks would destroy the empire of the Persians, he believed himself to be the one indicated (337)” (ἐν ἧ τινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καταλύσειν τὴν Περσῶν ἀρχὴν ἐδήλου, νομίσας αὐτὸς εἶναι ὁ σημαινόμενος). Here again, it is Josephus who links for the first time the interpretation of Daniel’s vision (Daniel 7, 8) to Alexander as king of the Greeks. After that, Alexander

<p>προσκαλεσάμενος ἐκέλευσεν αὐτοὺς αἰτεῖσθαι δωρεάς ἃς ἂν αὐτοὶ θέλωσιν. [338] τοῦ δ’ ἀρχιερέως αἰτησαμένου χρήσασθαι τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις καὶ τὸ ἕβδομον ἔτος ἀνείσφορον εἶναι, συνεχώρησε πάντα. παρακαλεσάντων δ’ αὐτὸν ἵνα καὶ τοὺς ἐν Βαβυλῶνι καὶ Μηδίᾳ Ἰουδαίους τοῖς ἰδίοις ἐπιτρέψῃ νόμοις χρῆσθαι, ἀσμένως ὑπέσχετο ποιήσειν ἅπερ ἄξιούσιν.</p>	<p>summoned them again and told them to ask for any gifts which they might desire. (338) When the High Priest asked that they might observe their country’s laws and in the seventh year be exempt from tribute, he granted all this. Then they begged that he would permit the Jews in Babylon and Media also to have their own laws, and he gladly promised to do as they asked.</p>
--	--

The protection granted by Alexander to the Jewish people, that some authors have even labelled as a *conversion* of Alexander to the Jewish God, could be seen as the fulfilment in his person of the prophecy of the Four Kingdoms expressed in the Book of Daniel (Daniel 2, 28–45, 7, 2–27 and 11, 3–4), a prophecy that would be exploited as one of the testimonies of a Christianised Alexander in the Middle Ages.

Whether the origin of this episode (the admission of Alexander to the Temple and his protection of the Jewish people) is to be found in the legends circulating among the Jewish community in Jerusalem since the conflicts between Jews and Samaritans dating back to the second half of the second century BCE, from where Josephus would have borrowed it, or was an original and genuine product of his imagination, a viewpoint defended by Cohen,<sup>7</sup> the episode, thus narrated by Josephus, had a long repercussion. Aside from its inclusion in rabbinic literature from the fifth century onwards and its presence in the Syriac

6 In fact, Saul is well aware that he no longer has the favour of God when he realises that, despite his prayers, God does not appear to him in his dreams to instruct him on what to do next; this is the reason why, after the death of Samuel, he is forced to visit a soothsayer in order to enquire about what to do in his war against the Philistines (1 Samuel 28), where his death and the death of his sons is foretold to him.

7 S. J. D. COHEN, Alexander the Great and Jaddus the High Priest According to Josephus, *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 7–8, 1982–83, 41–68.

Christian *Legend of Alexander* (dated to the seventh century), it figures also in two completely different works: the *Excerpta latina Barbari* and in the  $\epsilon$  version of the *Alexander Romance*.<sup>8</sup>

The *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, also known as *Alexandrian World Chronicle*, were originally written in Greek, probably during the seventh century, though the sole surviving copy is a translation into Latin made in Gaul in the eighth century. It includes material up to the year 392, but its final form was probably achieved between 675–700. Its Alexandrine origin, the purported same place of origin as the *Alexander Romance*, can only be deduced indirectly. In the case of the *Excerpta*, said origin could be inferred by the consistent addition of “Conditor” (founder) to the name of Alexander. The work is relevant to our study for several reasons, aside from the references to Alexander analysed further down. As Benjamin Garstad mentions in his introduction: “its Greek original, furnishes an important link in the Christian chronicle tradition, marking a transition from the sparse and tabular *Canons* of Eusebius of Caesarea to the fuller narratives of the popular world chronicles by John Malalas and his followers.”<sup>9</sup> As such, aside from the above-mentioned Malalas, key in the first translation of the *Alexander Romance* into East Slavic, the *Excerpta* are also relevant in Slavic due to their relation to two relevant works of Byzantine historiography whose translations into Slavic have been long attested: the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Ekloge chronographias* of George the Synkellos.

In the *Alexandrian World Chronicle*, the references to Alexander the Great constitute, as Garstad puts it, one of “two instances of protracted narrative” in a work dominated by long lists of kings, patriarchs, and Roman consuls. The other instance consists of paraphrases of the Bible. The first reference to Alexander in the *Excerpta* is to be found in chapter 6 of the First Book, after the list of the kings of Rome:<sup>10</sup>

---

8 On its inclusion in rabbinic literature, see A. KŁĘCZAR, The Kingship of Alexander the Great in the Jewish Versions of the Alexander Narrative, in: R. Stoneman (ed.), *The Alexander Romance in Persia and the East*, Groningen 2012, 339–348. The mentioning of Alexander’s entry into Jerusalem in the anonymous Syriac *Christian Legend of Alexander*, dated to the seventh century, is particularly relevant since it is probably one of the texts used by the unknown author behind the Pseudo-Methodios’s *Apocalypse* at the end of the seventh century, who, nevertheless, decided to leave this visit out of his narrative.

9 B. GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios. An Alexandrian World Chronicle edited and translated by Benjamin Garstad*, Cambridge, Mass. 2012, xviii.

10 GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 194–195.

<p>Post haec tradidit dominus deus regnum terrae Romanorum in manus Assyriorum, Chaldeorum, et Persarum, et Midorum. Et tributaria facta est terra illa Assyriis, et mansit Roma sine regnum, usque dum suscitavit deus Alexandrum Macedonem et conditorem. Iste quidem pugnavit contra regem Persarum et superavit eum. Et tradidit dominus in manum eius regnum Assyriorum, et introivit in potestate regnum eorum, et concussit civitates Persarum et Medorum, et liberavit omnem terram Romanorum et Graecorum et Egyptiorum de servitute Chaldeorum, et leges posuit mundo.</p>	<p>After these things the Lord God delivered the kingdom of the land of the Romans into the hands of the Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians, and Medes. And the land was made tributary to the Assyrians, and Rome remained without dominion until the time when God raised up Alexander of Macedon, the Founder. He fought against the king of the Persians and defeated him. And the Lord delivered into his hand the kingdom of the Assyrians, and he entered their kingdom in power, and he overthrew the cities of the Persians and the Medes, and he freed the whole country of the Romans and the Greeks and the Egyptians from slavery to the Chaldeans, and he bestowed laws upon the world.</p>
--	---

From this first mention, it is clear that Alexander, far from being a pagan king, is raised and protected by God, and it is to Alexander to whom He delivers his victories, as God does with other biblical kings. Alexander is mentioned several times throughout the chronicle. The most relevant references for our present study are in chapter 8 of Book I and chapter 6 of Book II:<sup>11</sup>

<p>Post hunc autem regnavit in Babyloniam Darius Midus ille Alsami annos VI: fiunt simul anni V milia CXXVIII. Istum deposuit Alexander Macedo et conditor. Fuit autem princeps sacerdotum Iaddus.</p> <p>Tunc Alexander Macedo et conditor, postquam legem poneret in Ellada et omnem Romanorum terram Syriam quoque et Egyptum et partes Lybiae, tunc venit in partes orientales et expugnans omnes civitates et oppida gentium obsedit regem Persarum Darium. Et tradidit dominus deus in manus eius Darium et omnem fortitudinem eius disperdit et omnem domum eius scrutavit.</p> <p>Et dominavit Alexander Macedo et conditor omnem terram Chaldeorum et introivit in omnem fortitudinem Darii et legem posuit in omnes civitates eius, et tributarii facti sunt ei sicut proprio regi.</p> <p>Ut enim condidit Alexander Alexandriam contra Egyptum, veniens in Hierusolima domino deo adoravit dicens : Gloria tibi, deus solus omnia tenens, qui vivis in saecula. Fuit autem tunc in Hierusalem princeps sacerdotum Iaddus. [...]</p>	<p>After him Darius the Mede, the son of Arsamnes, reigned in Babylon for six years: altogether this makes 5,129 years. Alexander the Macedonian, the Founder, brought him down. The High Priest was Jaddua.</p> <p>Then Alexander the Macedonian, the Founder, after he bestowed law upon Greece and all the land of the Romans and Syria as well and Egypt and parts of Libya, then he went into the eastern regions and storming all the cities and towns of the nations he besieged Darius, the king of the Persians. And the Lord God delivered Darius into his hands and wrecked all his strength and searched out his whole house.</p> <p>And Alexander the Macedonian, the Founder, dominated all the land of the Chaldeans and entered into the whole strength of Darius and imposed law on all his cities, and they became tributary to him as to their rightful king.</p> <p>For when Alexander founded Alexandria by Egypt he came to Jerusalem and worshipped the Lord God, saying, "Glory to you, Only God, grasping all things, Who liveth unto the ages." The High Priest in Jerusalem was Jaddua. [...]</p>
---	--

11 GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 214–217.

<p>Regnavit autem Alexander Macedo et conditor post Darium Midorum Alsami filium annos VIII : fiunt simul ab Adam usque ad finem Alexandri conditori anni V milia CXXXVII, et tunc Ptolomei.</p>	<p>Alexander the Macedonian, the Founder, reigned after Darius the Mede, the son of Arsamies, for eight years: altogether this makes from Adam up to the end of Alexander the Founder 5,137 years, and then there were the Ptolomies.</p>
<p>In diebus vero quibus regnavit Alexander Macedo et conditor, postquam superavit Darium regem Persarum, et Porum regem Indorum et omnes gentes subiugavit a Caspicas portas quae sunt in ortu solis usque in exteriores terminos Eraclii qui iacent in exteriores occidentis partibus contra Garirum.</p>	<p>In the days when Alexander the Macedonian, the Founder, reigned, after he defeated Darius the king of the Persians, he conquered Porus the king of the Indians and all the peoples from the Caspian Gates which are at the rising of the sun all the way to the outer Pillars of Hercules which are in the outer regions of the west opposite Gadeira.</p>

The *Excerpta* fully embed Alexander in the Christian history of the world, since his victory over Darius is clearly interpreted as an act of God’s deliverance. Proceeding from Josephus’ narrative, where Alexander sacrifices to the local god of Judea because he suspects he is the one who appeared to him in his dream to encourage him to conquer Asia, here the divine intervention is undeniable, as is Alexander’s acceptance of him being the only God. More importantly for our present analysis, in the *Excerpta*, the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem is placed immediately after his foundation of Alexandria.

In Book II of the *Excerpta*, Alexander is again mentioned briefly in chapter 5, entitled “The kings and Chronology of the Macedonians.” His name appears in several lists of kings of Macedonia (“Alexander held all the kingdoms in his power and joined them to the kingdom of the Macedonians. After Alexander the Founder, his affairs devolved to his captains. And Philip the brother of Alexander succeeded to the sovereignty of the Macedonians” II. 5, 2–3)<sup>12</sup> and Persia (“Alexander the Macedonian, the Founder, brought the kingdom of the Persians, which had lasted for 230 years, to an end and transferred the kingdom to Macedonia in the time of the 112<sup>th</sup> Olympiad”, II. 5. 6).<sup>13</sup> Chapter 6 is entitled “The reigns of the Macedonians and of Syria and the chronology from Alexander,” and continues thus:<sup>14</sup>

12 *Alexander omnia regna tenens Macedonorum regno coniunxit. Post Aleandrum autem conditorem in principes eius rebus venerunt. Et Macedonorum principato successit Filippus frater Alexandri.* GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 252–253.

13 *Alexander Macedo et conditor exterminans Persarum regnum traduxit in Macedonia regnum permanentem annos CCXXX, sub olympiada centesima duodecima.* GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 258–259.

14 GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 260–261.

<p>Alexander Filippi coepit regnare Macedonorum in olympiada centesima undecima, omnia simul regna comprehendens et sub Macedonorum iure redigens, per annos duodecim et dimidium. Obiit in anno ... relinquens post se principes IIII.</p> <p>Filippum fratrem suum Macedoniae regnum, Antigonum autem Asiae reliquid regnare, Filippum vocatum Ptolomeum omnem Aegyptum precepit regnare, Seleucum autem quem et Nicanorem Syriam omnem iussit regnare.</p>	<p>Alexander the son of Philip began to reign over the Macedonians in the 111th Olympiad; he seized control of all the kingdoms together and brought them under the law of the Macedonians in the course of twelve and a half years. He died in the ... year, leaving four princes behind him.</p> <p>He ordered his brother Philip to rule the kingdom of Macedonia, Antigonus to rule the rest of Asia, Philip called Ptolemy to rule all of Egypt, and he commanded Seleucus who is also known as Nicanor to rule all of Syria.</p>
---	--

The *Excerpta* insert, immediately after the end of the rulers of Egypt, a list of the High Priests of the Temple in Jerusalem, the sixth of whom is Jaddua: “After him Jaddua the son of John. In which time Alexander the Macedonian and the Founder, founded Alexandria. And he came to Jerusalem and worshipped the Lord God, saying, ‘Glory to you, God, Who liveth unto the ages, Only Prince’” (*Post hunc Iaddus filius Iohanni. Quo tempore Alexander Macedo et conditor Alexandriam condidit. Et veniens in Hierusalem domino deo adoravit dicens: Gloria tibi, deus, qui vivis in secula, solus princeps*, II. 6. 4),<sup>15</sup> which mirrors the above-mentioned reference in chapter 8 of Book I (*Gloria tibi, deus solus omnia tenens, qui vivis in saecula*), but the observance of the uniqueness of the Jewish God seems undeniable in both cases. As Garstad very aptly points out in a note, the use of the term “princeps” to refer to God the Father could theoretically translate the original Greek *ἀρχων*, a term used either to qualify angels (Daniel 10, 13–21); Satan (Matthew 9, 34, John 12, 31, 14, 30, 16, 11); or, occasionally, either Christ as Messiah (Isaiah 9, 6) or Christ as “prince of the kings of this earth” (Apocalypse 1, 5).<sup>16</sup>

### The entry into Jerusalem in the *Alexander Romance*

The Greek versions of the *Alexander Romance* that include the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem are the abridged and fully Christianised  $\epsilon$ , dated to the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth, and the later  $\gamma$ , a longer hybrid version combining  $\beta$  and  $\epsilon$ , probably compiled shortly after the former but before the tenth century. Some authors, like N. Trahoulia, place the  $\gamma$  version much later, possibly in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries.<sup>17</sup> Additionally, the visit was also included in all the later Middle Greek and Slavic versions deriving from both  $\epsilon$  and  $\gamma$ . In both versions (the episode is copied from  $\epsilon$  to  $\gamma$ ), Alexander’s visit to Jerusalem takes place, like in Josephus, before Alexander’s second entry into Egypt (ch. 25)

15 GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 264–265.

16 GARSTAD, *Apocalypse / Pseudo-Methodios*, op. cit., 380, n. 310.

17 See C. JOUANNO, *Naissance et métamorphoses*, op. cit., 441.

but, unlike in Josephus, once he has completely defeated Darius, whose death is narrated in the *Romance* two chapters before, in chapter 20 of Book II.<sup>18</sup> In all the versions of the visit to Jerusalem in AR, Alexander acknowledges, as in the *Excerpta*, the existence of a true and only God (ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἔσται μου θεός 20, 4) and, perhaps more importantly, that his victory over Darius is clearly the result of divine intervention (“And the Lord God delivered Darius into his hands” *Excerpta* I, 8, cited above).<sup>19</sup> If compared with the version of Josephus from which it clearly takes inspiration, at least two details are noteworthy, aside from the inclusion of the motif of the spies: firstly, the anonymous author of these versions of the AR does not care about the power struggles between Jews and Samaritans, which were key to Josephus, and, secondly, unlike the narration in the *Antiquities*, none of the companions of Alexander nor any of those present are surprised by Alexander’s immediate recognition of the superiority of the Jewish god. While in Josephus Alexander offers sacrifice to this god, without expressing any desire for conversion, in this fully Christianised version of the AR he actually enquires of the priest about the nature of the Jewish god.

In the later  $\gamma$  version, chapter 24 of Book II narrates Alexander’s entry into Judea:<sup>20</sup>

24, 1. Καὶ καταλαμβάνει τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν οἱ τινες ἀντιστῆναι βουλευθέντες ἐκπέμπουσιν κατασκοπούς, ὡς δῆθεν πρέσβεις εἶναι τούτους. Ταῦτα δὲ ὁμῶς οὐκ ἔλαθεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. 2. Καὶ προστάσσει τινὰς τῆς Μακεδονικῆς φάλαγγος νεανίσκους λίαν μαχιμωτάτους ἐν τῇ παρακειμένη φάραγγι ἑαυτοῦς ἀκοντίσαι. Οἱ δὲ τὸ προσταχθέν αὐτοῦ σπουδαίως ἐπλήρωσαν. ὁξὺ γὰρ τὸ Μακεδονικὸν στίφος εἰς τὸ κελευόμενον ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου. 3. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς κατασκοπεύσαι βουλομένους εἶπεν· «ὄρατε, οἱ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ ἔθνους πρέσβεις, πῶς ἀντ’ οὐδενός τῳ στρατῷ Μακεδόνων ὁ θάνατος. ἅπιτε οὖν καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ὑμῖν πραγματοποιέσθε. ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν αὔριον ἐπελεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ὡς τῇ προνοίᾳ δεκτὸν πράξω».

(1) On the way he reached Judaea. The Jews wanted to resist him and sent out spies, who presented themselves as ambassadors. But Alexander was not deceived. (2) He ordered some of the most warlike men of the Macedonian phalanx to ambush them in a nearby ravine; they hastened to carry out their orders. The Macedonian troops were always swift to obey Alexander. (3) Then he turned to the would-be spies. “See,” he said, “you ambassadors of the Jewish race: death is as nothing to a Macedonian soldier. Go therefore and do what is appropriate. I shall come to you tomorrow and shall do whatever is approved by Providence.”

18 In the  $\epsilon$  version, the arrival of Alexander in Judea occurs in chapter 20, while Darius’ defeat and death is narrated in chapter 18. In the  $\gamma$  version, which follows the original division into three books, the visit to Jerusalem is narrated in chapter 24 of Book II, with Darius’ defeat and death appearing in chapter 20 of the same book. The visit to Egypt that happens afterwards (chapter 25) will be Alexander’s second visit in this version.

19 See JOUANNO, *Naissance et métamorphoses*, op. cit., 378–381 for a full description of possible sources and differences between the respective accounts in the *Romance* and in Josephus. This quotation is taken from the critical edition of the  $\epsilon$  version prepared by J. TRUMPE, *Anonymi byzantini. Vita Alexandri Regis Macedonum*, Stuttgart 1974. The sentence is repeated verbatim in the chapter 24 of the Book II (II. 24. 13), according to the edition of the  $\gamma$  version prepared by STONEMAN, *Il Romanzo*, op. cit., II, 198.

20 The Greek text is reproduced according to the edition of the  $\gamma$  version prepared by STONEMAN, *Il Romanzo*, op. cit., II, 196–198. The translation is from *The Greek Alexander Romance*, R. Stoneman (ed. and trans.), London 1991, 169–170.

4 οἱ δὲ ἀπελθόντες τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν εἶπον· «ὑπέικειν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ σῶζεσθαι χρεῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἐλπίς σωτηρίας. 5. ἔξω γὰρ φύσεως ἀνθρώπων ὁ Μακεδόνων στρατός· ὡς γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν φοβερὸς καθέστηκεν ὁ θάνατος, τοῖς Μακεδόσι οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ λίαν εὐκαταφρόνητος. 6. Οἶμαι δὲ τούτους ἐριστικῶς ἔχειν τὸ θανεῖν, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι πρὸς ἀναγκαῖον τι χρῆμα τούτους ἀπέρχεσθαι. ἐξέστησαν γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ φάραγγι τῇ μεγάλῃ ὡς ὑποβρύχιον ἑαυτοὺς ποιήσαντες οἱ τῶν Μακεδόνων παῖδες· ἅμα γὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐκέλευσεν, τὸ ἔργον ἐτελέσθη. 7. Καὶ οὐ τοσοῦτον ἡμᾶς ἢ τοῦ θανάτου ἐθρόησε τόλμη, ὅσον τὸ μὴ κεδρᾶναί τι προσδοκῶντες οὕτως εὐχερῶς πρὸς τὸ θανεῖν ἠυτομόλησαν. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ κέρδος ἐλπίσωσι, οὐκ ἂν τις ἀντιστῆναι δυνήσεται. 8. Λοιπὸν γὰρ ἡμεῖς, ἅπερ ἐθεασάμεθα, εἶπομεν ὑμῖν· γενέσθω δὲ τὸ δοκοῦν ἡμῖν πρὸ τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρον καταλαβεῖν καὶ πᾶσα ἀκυρωθήσεται ἄστατος βουλή». 9. ὡς οὖν ταῦτα ἤκουσαν, Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ὑπέικειν κελεύονται. 10. Ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς οὖν στολαῖς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ τούτων ἱερεῖς ἐνδυσάμενοι καθυπαντῶσιν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ σὺν παντὶ τῷ πλήθει αὐτῶν. Τούτους δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ἰδὼν ἐδεδίει τοῦ σχήματος· καὶ τούτους μηκέτι προσεγγίσει αὐτῷ ἐκέλευσεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀναστρέφεσθαι. 11. Προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ ἕνα τῶν ἱερέων λέγει αὐτῷ· «ὡς θεοειδὲς ὑμῶν τὸ σχῆμα· φράσον δὴ μοι καὶ τίνα ὑμεῖς σέβετε θεόν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν θεοῖς τοιαύτην εὐταξίαν εἶδον ἱερέων». 12. ὁ δὲ φησὶν· «θεὸν ἡμεῖς ἕνα δουλεύομεν, ὃς ἐποίησεν οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ὀρωμένα τε καὶ ἀόρατα· οὐδεὶς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐρμηνεῦσαι ἀνθρώπων δεδύνηται». 13. ἐπὶ τούτοις Ἀλέξανδρος ἔφη· «ὡς ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ἄξιοι θεραπευταὶ ἄπιτε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ἄπιτε· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἔσται μοι θεὸς καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη μου μεθ' ὑμῶν· καὶ οὐ μὴ διεξέλθω ὑμᾶς καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὅτι θεῷ ζῶντι ὑμεῖς δεδουλεύκατε». 14. Λαβόντες δὲ χρημάτων πλήθη ἔν τε χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργύρῳ ἤγαγον πρὸς τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον. ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἠθέλησε λαβεῖν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· «ἔστωσαν ταῦτα τὰ δῶρα καὶ ἐμοὶ ἀφωρισμένος φόρος κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ λήψομαι ἐξ ὑμῶν οὐδέν».

(4) They went away and told their leaders: "It would be best to save our skins and yield to Alexander; otherwise there is no hope of safety. (5) The Macedonian army is of superhuman nature. While we are afraid of death, the Macedonians are not at all; they simply despise it. (6) It seems to us that they make death a matter of competition, so that you would think it was actually a necessity to them. The sons of Macedon surprised us in a ravine and poured arrows down like rain: no sooner had Alexander given the orders than it was done. (7) It was not their bravery in the face of death that astonished us, so much as their lack of expectation towards death. If there is profit to be made as well, no one will be able to resist them. (8) Well, we have told you what we saw: now you can make up your minds how to deal with Alexander when he arrives; let all indecision be put aside."

(9) When the leaders had heard this, they gave orders to surrender to Alexander. (10) The priests dressed themselves in their priestly robes and went out to meet him, together with a multitude of followers. When Alexander saw them, he was frightened at their appearance, and ordered them to approach no further but to return to the city. (11) Then he summoned one of the priests. "Your appearance is like that of gods," he said. "Tell me, what god do you worship? I have never seen priests of any of our gods dressed like this." (12) "We serve one god," the priest replied, "who made heaven and earth and all that is visible and invisible. No mortal man can discover him." (13) "You are worthy priests of the true god," responded Alexander. "Go in peace. Your god shall be my god and my peace shall be with you. I shall not treat you as I have done other nations, because you are servants of the living god." (14) Then they brought quantities of gold and silver to Alexander. He was reluctant to accept it. "Let these gifts, as well as the tribute I decreed, be dedicated to the Lord God. I myself will take nothing from you."

Furthermore, some other details separate this later episode from the one described by Josephus: here there is no mention of Jerusalem; of the High Priest and his particular robes; of the Book of Daniel, which linked Alexander clearly to the Hebrew Bible; or of the key role played by the dream Alexander has in order to decide not to attack the Jewish people. In this later version, it is the spies' narrative that deters the Jews from attacking, or even defending

themselves from Alexander, whose army is indifferent to death. Alexander is apparently impressed by the appearance of the priests but is not following any command directly sent by God, which had made him, in the Josephus version, closer to the model of the biblical king.

### **The innovation in the East Slavic *Alexander Romance***

In the first version of the AR in Slavic, the East Slavic version inserted in the chronicles, the episode of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem is one of its most remarkable innovations. The East Slavic version was initially made from a translation from Greek of one of the versions (either  $\beta$ , or the L recension deriving from it) that did not include the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem. In contrast to the later Greek versions mentioned above, the East Slavic version introduces the visit to Jerusalem in the First Book, before Alexander defeats Darius, and not in the Second, after the defeat and death of the Persian king. Furthermore, the entry of Alexander into Jerusalem is included in most variants of the East Slavic Alexander, but not in exactly the same way.

Although in one of the most popular versions, the first one edited by Istrin in 1893, the digression consists mainly of only one interpolated text extracted from Georgios Hamartolos' *Chronicon*,<sup>21</sup> in other versions, this is only one of the texts used to describe, and possibly better understand, the interpolation of the entry of the Macedonian king into Jerusalem. In other versions of the AR in East Slavic, including the one present in the Troitskiy khronograph, edited by T. Vilkul, the episode of the entry into Jerusalem is accompanied by an introductory text, extracted from the *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodios of Patara, and a concluding text of rather obscure origin about the cities and places conquered by Alexander. In at least one other version, the second version of the Hellenic and Roman Chronicle, another text – an epitome of Epiphanius of Salamis' *De Gemmis* – is used as an interpolation within Hamartolos, as a further explanation of an item of clothing of the High Priest of the Temple of Jerusalem. The choice and disposition of all these excerpts clearly betray an effort on the part of the East Slavic scribes to connect Alexander of Macedon with the history of the Jewish people. They also offer valuable information on the texts available and the compositional techniques that were followed in Kyivan Rus'.

Aside from the number of texts used to build up this long and innovative interpolation, there is at least one other important difference between all East Slavic versions. The one in which the only text used is Hamartolos (the first version of Hellenic and Roman Chronicle, as edited by Istrin) places it after chapter I.35, after Alexander has been to Memphis in Egypt and destroyed Tyre in Syria. This is exactly where Josephus had placed it, because it is during the

---

21 The text corresponds to the majority of chapter 19 of the first book. It was published by Istrin as part of his first redaction of the Aleksandriya (V. ISTRIN, *Aleksandriia russkikh khronografov*, Moscow 1893, 38–43).

siege of Tyre that Alexander requests that the Jews in Jerusalem help him, which they refuse to do due to a previous non-aggression pact made with Darius as subjects of the Persian empire.<sup>22</sup> This fact triggers the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem, initially to retaliate against the rebellious Jews, though later, when he sees the priest, he changes his mind. In the other versions, however, the entry of Alexander into Jerusalem is placed even earlier, before he starts his campaigns in the Levant: that is, at the end of chapter I.33, just after he receives the oracle of Serapis after founding Alexandria;<sup>23</sup> this is more in accordance with the chronology of facts offered by the *Excerpta*. In other versions (the Troitskiy khronograph and the second version of the Hellenic and Roman Chronicle), the text of the entry into Jerusalem, borrowed from Hamartolos, is preceded by a text connecting the lineage of Alexander to Byzas, the founder of Byzantium, and, therefore, to the Byzantine emperors (see Appendix 1):

And in this strange way, from that time the patronymic “Macedonian” was added to his name. And he is called Alexander the Great, the very same Alexander who commanded his army to get ready by the gates. And so he went to see the king Byzas, in the city of Byzantium, a European country. He got himself into a small boat and went to Byzantium. And there were very big gates. And Alexander was victorious. And Byzas sent to him presents from the city and asked him to sign the peace. And he granted it to him with the help of his brave soldiers. And this is what happened after the death of Alexander. When his mother Olympias found out, she left Macedonia. In a land beyond the sea the king Phol ruled Ethiopia. And he sent a general of his, named Germanicus, to the sea in boats to bring her with him. And following orders of the king Phol, he took her together with four<sup>24</sup> thousand to king Byzas. And he married her. Rome. And thanks to her the princely line of Rome was begotten from her.

Alexander took the presents from king Byzas and with the brave men decided to abandon the city of Byzantium because he was thinking about king Darius and the Persian land. And so Alexander took the route to the east. And crossing the sea like leopards he arrived with his daring soldiers in the Syrian land, and in the great Antioch.<sup>25</sup>

22 In the Troitskiy khronograph, as explained later, it is for the conquest of Antioch, and not Tyre, that Alexander demands help from the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

23 T. VILKUL, Aleksandriia khronograficheskaia v Troitskom Khronografe, *Palaeoslavica* 17/1, 2009, 165–210.

24 The original Greek text, chapter 9 of the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodios (GARSTAD, op. cit., 28), speaks about *τριάκοντα χιλιάδας Αιθίοπων*; this is, thirty thousand Ethiopians, and not four thousand. One of the possibilities for this confusion is the existence of a Glagolitic intermediary text. In Glagolitic number 30 will be ꙗ (ГЛ҃ГВ), the only other letter that reproduced the sound /g/ apart from ꙗ (ГЛАГВЛН), whose numerical value was 4, in Glagolitic. Four is the numerical value of Д in Cyrillic, and therefore if an intermediary Glagolitic could be proposed, it could certainly explain this change. See A. A. GIPPIUS – S. M. MIKHEEV, Nadpisi-graffiti tserkvi Blagoveshcheniia na Gorodishche: predvaritelnyi obzor, *Arkhitekturnaia archeologija* 1, 2019, 35–54.

25 Translation mine.

This text, which reflects the beginning of chapter 9 of the *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodios of Patara, is one of the few examples in which Alexander is forcibly converted into a half-brother of Byzas, the founder of Byzantium, which therefore unites the lineages proposed by Daniel in his biblical vision.<sup>26</sup>

In these versions (the Troitskiy khronograph and the second version of the Hellenic and Roman Chronicle), the visit happens before the siege of Tyre, and therefore before Alexander requests troops from the Jews in Jerusalem, who refuse to cooperate and trigger his anger. Initially, his visit to the city was made in order to punish them for refusing him aid in the said siege of Tyre, and therefore in this text something had to be added to justify the visit of Alexander to the Judean capital. The scribe does not seem to have found any anecdote to hand other than the impossible connection to Byzas, which he wrongly thought to refer to a visit by Alexander to Byzas (in the original text it was Germanicus who visited Byzas *after the death of Alexander*). He was clearly hearing bells but did not know where from.

In order to record the very visit, absent from the  $\beta$  version that was used as the base text for the first East Slavic translation, the entry of Alexander into Jerusalem is taken word-for-word from the description given by Georgios Hamartolos, a motif he himself had taken from Josephus. Hamartolos describes the reign of Alexander in chapter 19 of the Book I of his *Chronicle*.<sup>27</sup> The text by Hamartolos constitutes the second building block of the East Slavic narration of Alexander's entry into Jerusalem.

It is not, however, exactly the same interpolation in all the variants of this first East Slavic version. The narration starts a few lines into chapter 19 of Book I of Hamartolos:

---

26 On the genealogy of Alexander, and its relation to the Syriac tradition, as well as his role as saviour of the world described by Pseudo-Methodios, see S. TORRES PRIETO, A Hellenic Emperor at the Kievan Court: Alexander the Great and Apocalyptic Kingship in East Slavic Historiography, *Ruthenica* 15, 2019, 45–65.

27 According to the edition prepared by Carl de Boor, this is chapter 19 (*Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, C. de Boor (ed.), Leipzig 1904, 25, 13–39, 10). In Migne's PG, however, the long chapter 19 of De Boor's edition corresponds to chapters 17 (*Περὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἀλεξάνδρου*), 18 (*Περὶ τῆς στολῆς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*), 19 (*Περὶ τῆς βασιλείας Κανδάκης*), 20 (*Περὶ τῶν βραχμάνων*), 21 (*Περὶ Σηρῶν*), 22 (*Περὶ Βάκτρων*), 23 (*Περὶ Χαλδαίων*), 24 (*Περὶ Βρετανῶν*) and 25 (*Περὶ Ἀμαζόνων*) (PG CX, 68–81). The East Slavic interpolation corresponds in De Boor's edition to 26, 5 and finishes in 33, 5, and in Migne's edition corresponds to chapters 17 and 18, finishing a few lines before the end of chapter 18. The East Slavic text is adapted from the text provided by Istrin in his edition (see supra n. 21), without accentuation. This translation from the Greek Hamartolos is mine.

<p>καὶ τὴν Τύρον παραλαβὼν, πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλε πρὸς Ἰουδαίους αἰτούμενος κατὰ Περσῶν συμμαχίαν. οἱ δὲ μὴ καταδεξάμενοι Δαρεῖον δεδαικότες ὡς ὑποχείριοι καὶ συνθήκας ἔχοντες μὴ πολεμεῖν αὐτῷ, θυμωθεὶς Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπήει τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ.</p>	<p>И таже Тоурз павнибз, слы посла кз Иудѣвмъ проса помощи на Прзсаны. вни же не приаша рѣчи его Дарья са боиачи, яко под роукою его вачу. и сзвѣтъ имоуще не воевати на нь. разгнѣвавз жеса Александрз и иде на жидовскоую.</p>	<p>And having taken Tyre, he sent ambassadors to the Jews, requesting help against the Persians. They did not agree to his request, because they were subjects of Darius, with whom they had signed a pact, so they could not fight against him. Alexander was enraged and went against the Jews.</p>
<p>ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἰαδδοῦς τὴν ἱερατικὴν ἐσθήτα περιθέμενος κατὰ θείαν ἀποκάλυψιν πρὸς ἔκκληξιν καὶ πίστωσιν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐξῆλθεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>[Wъ шествѣи алѣксандрове вѣ иерсалимѣ. слово сѣ.] Архиереи же Аддусъ вѣ иервнскыа ризы велечеса бжїимъ ѿкровенїемъ подивление и вѣронманїе Александроу изыиде противоу емоу.</p>	<p>But when he saw Jaddus dressed in his priestly garment, as he had seen in his divinely inspired vision, a believing Alexander went in awe to meet him.</p>

The redaction of Hamartolos, though very close to Josephus, differs in a couple of relevant points. In Josephus' account, both Jaddus and Alexander had dreams (*ὄπνος*) where theoretically the Lord “talks” to both of them: in the case of the High Priest telling him to adorn the city and not be afraid, and in the case of Alexander telling him to cross the sea and conquer Asia. In Hamartolos, a much later narrator, the dream has been changed to a divine vision or revelation (*κατὰ θεϊαν ἀποκάλυψιν*), which only Alexander receives. The East Slavic version uses the same wording *бжїимъ ѿкровенїемъ*.

A detailed description of the robes of the High Priest (which Migne's edition marked with a new chapter) commences here, after which Hamartolos will recuperate the narration by Josephus:<sup>28</sup>

<p>Ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ τοιαύτη στολῇ κοσμούμενος. ποδήρη μὲν ἤμφιέννυτο, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἱμάτιον περιεχρυσωμένον ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς μέχρι ποδῶν, καὶ ζώνη περιεζώννυτο ἐκ πορφύρας καὶ βύσσου καὶ ὑακίνθου καὶ χρυσοῦ πεποικιλμένη καὶ περικεκαλλωπισμένην. περὶ δὲ τὰ κράσπεδα ροῖσκους εἶχεν ἔρραμμένους</p>	<p>и вѣ бо архиерѣи и палѣи и такомъ одежди оукрашавѣи. подирьєю вблагашеся. есть же сказанное одежда позлащенна ѿ главы даже и до ногу. и поясомъ препоисаса ѿ прапруды и висса и ѿ акочнфа и златомъ испещренъ и оукраченъ. вѣ вскрилїи же имаше пришвины,</p>	<p>For the priest was clothed in a robe of old [time]. He was clothed down to the feet, and the cloth was covered in gold from head to the feet. And with a sash made of purple and fine linen and hyacinth and gold and beautifully embroidered and adorned. Around the rim the tunic had pomegranates embroidered all around it,</p>
--	--	--

28 Hamartolos lifts all his detailed description from the Book of Exodus. In LXX, the detailed instruction of God to Moses on how to make the priestly robes appears in chapter 28, while an almost identical description of the final robes is given in chapters 36 and 39.

<p>καὶ ἀναμεταξὺ αὐτῶν χρυσοῦς κώδωνας [καὶ ἐποίησαν, γὰρ φησιν, κάτωθεν τοῦ ὑποδύτου λώματα ὡς ἐξανθούσης ῥοᾶς ἐξ ὑακίνθου καὶ πορφύρας καὶ κοκκίνου καὶ βύσσου κεκλωσμένης, καὶ ποιήσαντες κώδωνας] ἐκ χρυσοῦ καθαροῦ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοὺς ἀνά μέσον τῶν ῥοίσκων ἐπὶ τὰ λώματα τοῦ ὑποδύτου κύκλω. ἐπενδύετο δὲ καὶ ἄλλον χιτῶνα ἐκ βύσσου καὶ ὑακίνθου καὶ πορφύρας καὶ κοκκίνου καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ παντοίων χρωμάτων περιωραῖσμένον καὶ καθυφασμένον καὶ μέχρι τῶν μηρῶν κατερχόμενον καὶ ζώνη ὁμοία τῇ πρώτῃ κατασφιγγόμενον, ὅπερ ἐπωμὶς καὶ ἐφούδ προσηγορεῖτο.</p>	<p>и промежу их златын колоколы. сътвориша оубо подолоу под влакомъ затоку, яко цвѣтца трѣсны ѿ акинфа и прапруды и ѿ ѳервіи висса съсканъ и сътворивше колоколы ѿ злата ѳиста и пришвени промежи трѣсномъ по втоскамъ подвлаченымъ вкругъ. влацашеса въ дроугую одежду ѿ вѣса, и ѿ акинфа и ѿ прапруды, ѳрѣвіи, злата, и ѿ всакыа красоты оукрашенъ, и водоу же до бедры исходиму и поасъ подобенъ къ пръвому подалоу състегновенну, еже и наплечникъ и ефудъ наречѣтса</p>	<p>and little golden bells were stitched in-between. “And they made,” as they say, “on the hem of the undergarment below little pomegranates as of a flowering pomegranate tree, from blue and purple and scarlet and twisted linen. And they made bells of pure gold and put the bells on the hem of the undergarment all around between the little pomegranates.” And they wore under another tunic of fine linen of hyacinth and purple and scarlet and gold and interwoven with all colourful adornments going down as far as the knees, and with a similar sash to fast tightly the most important, which is called shoulder-strap or ephod.</p>
---	--	---

It is very probable that here lies the reason for the whole East Slavic interpolation, and the subsequent interpolation in the second version of the Hellenic and Roman Chronicle. The mentioning of the “ephod,” a problematic term in the translation of the Septuagint, seems to be of particular interest to East Slavic scribes of later versions. The term *ephod* seems to describe at least three different realities in the Hebrew Bible: first, a priestly garment – maybe initially a simple linen tunic that was later applied to the shoulder-strap used to hold the breastplate – which only the High Priest of the Temple of Jerusalem could wear with the twelve stones, which represented the twelve tribes of Israel; secondly, maybe some sort of self-standing idol figurine, perhaps cast in gold, that was kept inside the temple; and, thirdly, a small box or coffer where the twelve stones were kept and perhaps carried. To complicate matters further, the Septuagint is inconsistent in rendering the term into Greek: it was translated as *ἐπωμὶς*, something worn over the shoulders, a shoulder-strap, particularly in Exodus<sup>29</sup> and Leviticus.<sup>30</sup> It was calqued into Greek as *ἐφούδ/ἐφώδ* in Judges<sup>31</sup>

29 Ex 25, 7; 28, 4 6 12 15; 29, 5; 35, 9 27; 39, 2 7 8 18 19 20 21 22.

30 Lev 8,7. There is one only exception in 1 Samuel (1S 21, 10).

31 Jud 8, 27; 17, 5; 18, 14 17 18 20.

and Samuel.<sup>32</sup> It was seldom translated as *ἱερατεία*, priesthood, in Hoseas 3, 4; as *ποδήρης*, long robe, in Exodus 28, 31; or simply as *στολή*, robe or cloth, in the Second Book of Samuel and the First Book of Chronicles.<sup>33</sup>

While many things could be said about the different times and environments of composition of the Pentateuch (which includes Exodus and Leviticus and where clearly the Greek *ἔπωμις* was preferred), by contrast to the time and compositional context of the historical books (Judges and Samuel where the calque is used), what might be more relevant for our present purposes is that, regardless of which type of object was referred to, or indeed how it was translated, it was always something closely connected with priesthood and oracular divination. This is clearly the part that interested Hamartolos, judging from the contents of the rest of Book I, and also what possibly interested the East Slavic scribe who decided to lift the text and insert it in the narrative of the life of Alexander. It is more than possible that the Slavic scribe, as indeed Hamartolos himself, recognised the repeated passage in Exodus about the priestly robes that had to be made for Aaron, according to God's instruction to Moses, but failed to find in the text of the Septuagint the term "efod" that Hamartolos just equated with the *ἔπωμις*. The text continues thus:

<p>διὸ καὶ Ἀκύλας ἐπένδυμα αὐτὸ κέκληκεν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐπεπόρπουον σαρδόνυχες καθ' ἑκάτερον τῶν ὤμων, χρυσίῳ δοκίμῳ περιεχόμενοι, καὶ ἄλλοι ἰβ' λίθοι, μεγέθει καὶ ἀλλεῖ διαφέροντες καὶ ἀνθρώποις δυσπόριστοι, οἵτινες ἐπὶ στήτων δ' ἐκατέρωθι προσκείμενοι καὶ ὡσαύτως χρυσῶ διακρατούμενοι καὶ τριάδα λίθων τοὺς στήτους ἔχοντα θαυμασίον τι χρῆμα τοῖς ὀρώσιν ἐξεφαίνοντο. ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος στίχος εἶχε σαρδόνυχα, τοπάζιον, σμάραγδον, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἀνθρακα, ἴασπιν, σάπφειρον, ὁ δὲ τρίτος λιγύρον, ἀμέθυστον, ἀχάτη, ὁ δὲ τέταρτος χρυσόλιθον, ὀνύχιον, βηρύλλιον, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις πατριαρχῶν ἐγκεκόλαπτο τὰ ὀνόματα, ἐκάστου λίθου ἴδιον ἔχοντος ὄνομα φυλάρχου.</p>	<p>ТЪМЪ И АКОУЛАН ПОНДИТОМУ ИМЕНОВА, К НЕМОУЖЕ ПРИГВОЖДЕНН ВЫША САРЪДОНИХ НА ВБОУ РАМОУ, ЗЛАТОМЪ ЧИСТЫМЪ ПРИКОВАННА ВИКРОУГЪ И ИНА ВЪ КАМЕНІИ, ДОБРОТОЮ РАЗЛИЧИИ И ЧЛКОМЪ НЕДОУМВЕННА, ИЖЕ ЧЕТЫРМИ СТИХИИ ВБАПОЛЫ ПОЛОЖЕНИ И ТАКО ЗЛАТОМЪ ПРИКОВАННИ, И ТРОИЦА КАМЕНЬНА СТИХИИ ИМУЩА, ЧЮДНО НЪКОЕ СЪЖАНИЕ ЗРАЦИМЪ ЯВЛАШЕСА. ПРЪВЫИ ЖЕ СТИХИИ ИМУЩЕ САРДОНИКЪ, ТОУМЪПАЗЪ, ИЗМАРАГДЪ. ВТОРЫИ ЖЕ АНФРАКСЪ, ИСЪПНДЪ И САМФИРЪ. ТРЕТІИ ЖЕ ЛЕГОУРИНЪ, АМВСТОФΟΥНЪ И АХАТИНЪ. ЧЕТВЕРТЫИ ЖЕ ФРУСОЛОФОНЪ, ИНУХИИНЪ, ВИРИЛИИНЪ, И НА ВСЪХЪ ТЪХЪ ПАТРІАΡΧОВЪ ИМЕНА НАПИСАННО, НА КОЕМЪЖДО КАМЕНИ СВОЕ ИМОУЩІЮ ИМА СТАРЪШИИНЪ РОДУ.</p>	<p>Wherefore, due to Aquila, we call this one upper garment (ἐπένδυμα), unto which were pinned down onyxes encased in excellent gold from both shoulders, and twelve other stones, noteworthy in size and beauty, and not easy for men to procure, which are disposed in four rows on either side and fastened to it with gold, and the triad of stones that the rows have revealed to those who have seen them to have been of an astonishing quality. So then, the first row has sardius, topaz and emerald, the second one carbuncle, lapis lazuli and jasper, and the third ligurion, agate and amethyst, and the fourth chrysolite, beryl and onyx, and in all of them engraved the names of the patriarchs, each stone should carry the name of the chief of each tribe.</p>
---	---	--

32 1S 2, 18 28; 14, 3; 22, 18; 23, 6 9; 30, 7.

33 2S 6, 14 and 1Ch 15, 27.

And this is the point where the second version of the Hellenic and Roman Chronicle inserts, without transition, in all manuscripts but one (A) the text of one of the Greek epitomes of Epiphanius of Salamis’ *De Gemmis*, which will be discussed below. In the other versions, the text continues according to Hamartolos. In the second version, a heading “About the ephod” is added afterwards, precisely *after* Epiphanius’ and before the rest of the text of Hamartolos’ interpolation.

<p>συνῆν δὲ τῷ ἐφρούδ περίτμημα σπιθαμῆς μὲν τὸ μήκος καὶ σπιθαμῆς τὸ εὖρος τετράγωνον περὶ τὸ στήθος, τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ [οἷς καὶ τὸ ἐφρούδ] κάλλει διηνηθισμένον, ὅπερ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐβραϊστί μὲν ἐφρούδ [καὶ φώεσσιν] ὠνομάζετο, ἑλληνιστί δὲ λόγιον καὶ δῆλωσις προσηγορεύετο, δι’ οὗ ὁ θεὸς μέλλουσι πολεμεῖν νίκην πρόδηλον προέλεγεν.</p>	<p>БЫСТЬ ЖЕ С НИМЪ У ЕФУДЪ ΟΥΛΟΜΟΚЪ ПΛΑΔЬ ВЪ ВЪСОТЫ, Δ ΠΛΑΔЬ ВЪ ШИРИНОУ, НА ΥΕΤΥΡΙ ΟΥΓΛΥ НА ΠΡЪΣΕΧЪ, ΚЪ Τ΄ΒΜЖ В ΝΕΜЖЕ И ΕΦΟΥΔЪ ΔΟΒΡΟΤΟΥ ΟΥΚΡΑШЕНЪ, ΤΣΙ ΕΟΥΔΥΔЪ ΕΒΡ΄ΒΙΣΚΥΙ ΔΕΕΣΙ ΝΑΡΙЦАЕТСА, ΕΛΛΙΝΙΣΚΥ ЖЕ СЛОВЕСНОΕ ΙΑΒΛΕΝНОΕ ΝΑΡΙЦАЕТСА. Τ΄ΒΜЪ ΟΥΒΟ ΕΓ΄ΧΟΤΑΨΙΜЪ ВΟΕΑΤИ И ΠΟΒ΄ΔΙΤИ ΠΡ΄ΒΔΙΑΒΛΑΑ ΓΛΑША</p>	<p>And it will be joined to the ephod by a square piece of cloth the length of a span and the width of a span around the torso, the beauty of which will wonder. [About the ephod] This is indeed what the Hebrews call ephod or phoessin, and the Hellenes call an oracle or a command, through which the god announces the foreseen victory in war to those destined.</p>
--	---	---

And this is the point of the ephod: to foretell the military victories to those chosen by God. It should not be forgotten that this is still part of the digression introduced by the East Slavic scribe in connection to Alexander. Did he infer that this is what caught the attention of the Macedonian when he saw the High Priest in Jerusalem and entered the Temple? Did he mean that Alexander managed to conquer the Persian empire, which he had not yet done in this account, because he could “ask” the ephod when he saw it in Jerusalem, and he was subsequently victorious *despite being pagan*? The text of Hamartolos continues:

<p>τοσαύτη γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ λίθων ἀπέστιλβεν αὐγή, μήπω τῆς στρατείας κεκινήμενης, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ ἀδαμαντίνου λίθου σημασίας ποιοῦντος, ὡς τῷ πλήθει τυγχάνειν γνώριμον τὸ παρῆναι τὸν θεὸν εἰς ἐπικουρίαν αὐτοῖς. ἐν μέσῳ γὰρ εἶχεν ὡσπερ ἀστέρα ὀλόχρυσον καὶ ἑκατέρωθεν αὐτοῦ σμαράγδους ἔχοντας ἀνὰ ἕξ ἐγγεγραμμένας τάς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταξύ τῶν δύο σμαράγδων λίθον ἀδάμαντα. ἠνίκα γοῦν ἔμελλεν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπερωτᾶν τὸν θεόν, ἐδέσμει αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐπωμίδι κατὰ μέσον</p>	<p>ТОЛИКО ВО СΟΥΨИМЪ НА ΝΕΜЖЕ КАМЕНЕМЪ БЛИСТАШЕСА ЗАРΑ, НЕ ΟΥΒΟ ВΟЕМЪ ΠΟΔВИΓШИМСΑ, ΠΑΥΕ ΑΔΑΜΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ ΚΑΜΥΚΟΥ ЗНАМЕНІА ТВОРАЦІЮ, ІАКО Τ΄ΒΜЪ ΡΑΖУМ΄ВТИ ΠΟΛΟΥΥΕΝІΕ ВΟЕМЪ, ΔΑ ΒΟΥΔΕΤЬ ΒΟΓЪ С НИΜΙ НА ΠΟΜΟΨЬ. ΠΟСРЕДИ ВО ИΜΑШЕ ЗВ΄ΣДУ ВСОУ ЗЛАТОУ, ВБАΠΟΛΥ ЖЕ ΕΡΟ ΙΖΜΟΡΑΓΔΥ, ИΜΟΥΨΑ СΤΙΧИ ВБАΠΟΛΥ ΠΟ ШЕСТИ, ΝΑΠΙΣΑΝΝΑ Β΄Ι ΚΟΛ΄ΒН΄ И ΙΛ΄Β΄. ΜΕЖДУ ЖЕ ВВОЮ ΙΖΜΑΡΑΓДУ ΚΑΜΥΚЪ ΑΔΑΜΑΝΤΙΝЪ. ΕΓΔΑ ΟΥΒΟ ΧΟΤΑΨЕ ИΕΡ΄ΒИ ВЪΠΡΟСИТИ ΒΓΑ, ΠРИΒΑΖЫВАШЕ</p>	<p>And this is so because from those stones, and especially the hardest one, shines brightly a beam that makes a sign, whenever a warrior is on the move, so that he can find out in advance about how God is going to help them in war. In the middle of the pectoral there is a star of solid gold and it has emeralds on each side on top of each of which are engraved the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, and between those two emeralds there are diamonds. Well, whenever the priest is about to address a question to the god, he fastens</p>
---	--	---

τοῦ στέρνου καὶ ὑποτιθῶν  
 τὰς χεῖρας ὑποκάτωθεν  
 εὐρίσκειτο ἐξηπλωμένον  
 ταῖς παλάμαις αὐτοῦ  
 καθάπερ πυξίον. ὅθεν φησὶν  
 ὁ **Σαοῦλ** πρὸς τὸν ἱερέα  
 βουλόμενος εἰς τὸν πόλεμον  
 θᾶπτον παρατάξασθαι·  
 συνάγαγε τὰς χεῖράς σου  
 καὶ ἄρον τὸ ἐφοῦδ. καὶ  
 οὕτω λοιπὸν ἀφορῶν εἰς  
 τὸ ἐφοῦδ ἤρῳτα τὸν θεόν,  
 τὸ ἐρώτημα προσέχων  
 ἀκριβῶς τε καὶ μᾶλλον εἰς  
 τὸν ἀδάμαντα λίθον, ὃς  
 ἐναλλάττων τὴν χροιάν  
 ἐκ θείας μεταβολῆς καὶ  
 ἀλλοιώσεως ἐδήλου  
 προφανῶς τὰ τῶ λαῶ  
 ἐσόμενα. μέλας μὲν  
 γὰρ γινόμενος θάνατον,  
 ἐρυθρὸς δὲ σφαγὰς,  
 λευκὸς δὲ διαλλαγὴν  
 τοῦ θεοῦ προσήμαιεν.  
 καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις ἦσαν  
 καὶ γράμματα ἐκ χαλκοῦ  
 καθαρωτάτου πεποιημένα  
 καὶ ἐκτετυπωμένα ἐκάστου  
 στοιχείου τοῦ παρ' Ἑβραίων  
 ἀφραβήτου, ἅπερ δὴ  
 προσάγων ὁ ἱερεὺς τῶ  
 κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπιτίθων ἐν τῶ  
 ἐφοῦδ καὶ οὕτω διερωτῶν,  
 εὐθύς ἀνωρθοῦντο [θεῖα  
 κινήσει] τὰ στοιχεία  
 δηλοῦντα σαφῶς τὴν  
 ἐπίνευσιν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ τὴν  
 ἀνάνευσιν. οἷον, εἰ μὲν ἦν  
 τὸ ἐρώτημα καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα  
 κατὰ  
 γνώμην θεοῦ, ἀνωρθοῦντο  
 μόνα [τὰ δηλοῦντα τὸ ναί,  
 εἰ δὲ παρὰ γνώμην αὐτοῦ  
 ἐτύγχανεν, ἀνωρθοῦντο  
 μόνα τὰ σημαίοντα τὸ οὐ.  
 ὡσαύτως γε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν  
 ἄλλων ἀποκρίσεων τοῦ  
 κυρίου τῶν διὰ τῶν δῆλων  
 γινομένων προδήλως καὶ  
 διαφόρως συνέβαινεν, εἴ  
 γε πάντως εὐδόκιμοι αὐτῶ  
 ὑπῆρχον· εἰ δὲ ὠργισμένος  
 ἦν αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς  
 διὰ τῶν δῆλων τούτων  
 ἀπεκρίνατο οὔτε μὴν διὰ  
 θείων ἀποκαλύψεων ἢ  
 προφητείων.

на плеченицю посреди  
 пръсѣи, и подкладая  
 руцѣ постръзѣтѣ под нимъ,  
 върѣтостаса длани его,  
 яко дщници. тѣмъ вѣща  
**Саула** къ иерѣю, хота  
 о напрано врань в плъхити.  
 съжми руцѣ свои, и възми  
 ефодъ. таѣе и тако зра  
 на ефодъ въпрошаше,  
 въпросъ внимаа истинно  
 паѣе на дамантинѣ камцѣ,  
 иже пременуѣа разниѣа  
 боудуѣаа нѣкаа повѣдаа,  
 прѣдѣавлаа боудуѣаа  
 людемъ хотаѣаа быти.  
 аѣе ѣрънъ боудаше, то  
 смерзѣтѣ. аѣе ѣръленъ,  
 то кровопролитіе. аѣе ли  
 вѣлъ премѣнѣу ѣвлѣицѣю  
 бѣу. и к тѣмъ баху  
 грамоты ѿ мѣди ѣнстыа  
 створенны, изовражена  
 комоуждо стихіа, соуѣю  
 азъвоуквинкоу ѿ еврѣи,  
 еже приноса иерѣи къ бѣу,  
 покладая их на ефодъ,  
 таѣе въпрошаа, авне порсти  
 станаху вѣіемъ движеніемъ  
 или немановеніемъ ѣкоже  
 будаше въпроси и веѣи по  
 воли бжѣей, прости сами  
 станаху проповѣдающе,  
 аѣе тако естъ хоѣетѣ  
 быти, аѣе ли по неволи его  
 бывааше, прости станаху  
 сами, знаменавѣюще, еже ни.  
 тако же и ма ны въпросы  
 глѣа тѣхъ разумѣти  
 хотащнимъ быти, и ѣвѣ  
 разниѣно събывашеса, аѣе  
 ли всема оугодно ему быша.  
 аѣе ли гнѣвъ имъ быеть,  
 ниѣтоже имъ быеть ѿ  
 тѣхъ ѣвленіи ѿвѣтоваше,  
 ни бжїимъ ѿкровеніемъ,  
 ни прорѣствіемъ тѣмъ  
 и Саула видѣвъ плазкъ

it down with the shoulder-  
 strap in the middle of the  
 torso and placing his hands  
 underneath places his palms  
 fully inside the wooden box.  
 Whence they said that **Saul**  
 turned to the High Priest  
 because he wanted to know  
 in which order to go quicker  
 to war: "Place your hands  
 together and lift the ephod."  
 And thus he questions God  
 about the future turning to  
 the ephod by putting the  
 question exactly and most  
 particularly towards that  
 adamant stone, which alters  
 its appearance from divine  
 intervention, and those  
 alterations will reveal visibly  
 the fate of the people. And  
 so if it becomes black, it  
 means death, if red, blood, if  
 white it foretells peace with  
 God. Because before these  
 letters were made from  
 the purest metal and each  
 melted according to how  
 the alphabet was instructed  
 to the Hebrews, so that  
 when the priest questions  
 the Lord and puts on this  
 ephod and asks him, right  
 away after crying out to  
 the divinity the manifested  
 instructions start to roll out  
 wisely the agreement or  
 disagreement of God. That  
 is, if there is a question  
 and a sentence according  
 to God's knowledge, the  
 manifestation only will be  
 yes, if it happens that they  
 are against his knowledge, it  
 is cried out that the signals  
 say no. Therefore, in all  
 instances the responses  
 of the Lord through those  
 manifestations come out  
 carrying his forecasts, if in  
 all respects the honoured  
 ones are devoted to him. But  
 if he is irritated with any of  
 them, then he will respond

ὄθεν φησίν· εἶδε Σαούλ τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν ἀλλοφύλων καὶ ἐφοβήθη, καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ σφόδρα, καὶ ἐπηρώτησε διὰ κυρίου, καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ κύριος [καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐνυπνίοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς δῆλοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ.] καὶ τότε εἶπε Σαούλ τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ· ζητήσατέ μοι γυναῖκα ἐγγαστήριμθον. ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐφόρει τελαμῶνα χρυσόνημον ἧτοιμίτραν καὶ κίδαριν λεγομένην, ἐν ἧ πέταλον χρυσοῦν ἐπέκειτο πρὸς τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾧ γράμμασιν ἱεροῖς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ προσηγορία ἐντετύπωτο, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐδήλωσε τὴν θεῖαν ὀνομασίαν ταύτην πρὸς Μωϋσέα λέγων· ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν. τοῦτο δὲ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ἄφραστον μὲν ὀνομάζεται, ἀπειρήται γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο διὰ γλῶσσης προσφέρειν, γράφεται δὲ διὰ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων, ὄθεν καὶ τετράγραμμον αὐτὸ λέγουσιν, καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαρείται μὲν ἰαβέ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ αἰαί. τῆς οὖν ἱερατικῆς ἐσθῆτος ἡ τετράριθμος χροιά σύμβολον τῶν τεσσάρων ἐτύγχανε στοιχείων, ἐξ ὧν τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν, ἅπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μυστικῶς τε καὶ συμβολικῶς περιβαλλόμενος καὶ εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσερχόμενος δι' αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου τόν τοῦ παντός δημιουργόν τε καὶ κύριον ἐξίλεοτο. ἡ μὲν γὰρ βύσσος ἀντὶ τῆς γῆς, ἡ δὲ ὑάκινθος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀέρος, ἡ δὲ πορφύρα ἀντὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, τὸ δὲ κόκκινον ἀντὶ τοῦ πυρός. καὶ ἦσαν ἄλλα μὲν τὰ φαινόμενα, ἄλλα δὲ τὰ νοούμενα.

иноплеменикъ, и оужасеса сердце его, и въпроси гдѣ, и не ѡвѣсти ему гдѣ въ проявленіи пророчѣхъ, и ѡвѣста не бысть ему. и тогда рече Саулъ предъстоицимъ предъ нимъ. ищите ми женоу ѡреволоживеноу. на главѣ же носаше клобоуицъ златыми нитми, юже митроу и кидаръ глѣтъ, ѡ негожъ платъ лежаше златъ на тѣмани его, и на немъ грамотами сѣыми бжѣи привѣтъ изовразиса, якоже имаше бжѣе има, къ Моисеви глѣ. азъ есмь сын. се ѡ еврѣи неизреchenно нарицается. ѡиатъ во са то ѡ ницъ, да языкомъ не износится. въсписано во естъ четыреми сточухи, тѣмъ и четверограмотноу его глѣють. наричють же его Самаране авѣи Иудѣи же аиа и воартѣскою одеждею четверочисленое различие. Притча четыремъ стихіамъ бысть, ѡ негоже вселескаа оуставлена быша, ихже архирѣи таино притоуно вълаγашаса, и въ сѣла входа, и тѣми ѡ всего мира вседръжителѣ и гдѣ оумолаше. ибо висъ протнвоу земли, иакинзѣъ же протнвоу аерѣ, прапроудъ же протнву водѣ, ѡрзвленіе же протнвоу огню. и баχου ина видима и ина же разоумѣваемаа.

nothing to them through these manifestations, neither through divine revelations nor through prophecies. Whence it is said that when Saul saw the camp of the allophytes and was afraid and his heart was greatly dismayed. And he inquired of the Lord, but the Lord did not respond to him, neither by his dreams, nor by his manifestations not by the prophets, in neither form did he respond. So then Saul says to his servants: "Find me the woman ventriloquist." And on his head he wore the golden band and the diadem and the turban, in whose golden plate over the forehead, it is written in sacred letters the name of God, exactly as it was revealed this divine name to Moses when he said: "I am who I am." Though this [name] is ineffable among the Hebrews, they deliver to them saying it by means of their language, and write it by these four elements, for this reason they say it with the tetragram, among the Samaritans they call it iavé, and among the Jews aeia. And the priestly robe carries these four colours as a symbol of these four elements, of which all things are composed, of which the High Priest is the mystic and the symbolic carrier into the sancta sanctorum, by means of which he appeases the creator and lord of the universe and all things below it. Because the fine linen corresponds to the land, and the blue hyacinth to the sky, and the purple to the water and the scarlet to fire. And for all the other things that occur, there are also names.

<p>καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἔνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν χρυσίῳ περικεκαλυμμένη τὸν ὄροφον εἶχεν ἐξ ὑφασμάτων ποικίλων καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων κατασκευασμένον χρωμάτων. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀλουργόν, τὸ δὲ ῥοδοειδές ἢ κοκκοβαφές, τὸ δὲ ὑακίνθῳ προσεοικὸς, ἢ τε βύσσος τὴν λευκὴν εἶχε χροιάν· ἄπερ δὴ τῶν τεσσάρων ἦν στοιχείων, ὡς ἔφην, αἰνίγματα. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὑακίνθος τῷ ἀέρι προσέοικεν, τὸ δὲ ῥοδοειδές ἢ κοκκοβαφές τῷ πυρί, τὸ δὲ ἀλουργὸν δηλοῖ τὴν θάλασσαν (ἐκείνη γὰρ τρέφει τὴν κόχλον, ἐξ ἧς τὸ τοιοῦτον γίνεται χρώμα), ἢ δὲ βύσσος τὴν γῆν· ἐκ ταύτης γὰρ φύεσθαι λέγεται. ὁ μὲντοι θεὸς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι παντοδαπὸν περιτέθεικε κόσμον τὸν μὲν λαὸν καταπλήττοντα τῷ διαφόρῳ τοῦ σχήματος, αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς ἱερέας διδάσκοντα, ὅπως χρῆ τὴν ψυχὴν ὠραΐζειν, καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτῇ κόσμον περιτιθέναι.</p>	<p>ТРАКО ВО И СКИНІА СВІДѢТЕЛНАА ВНОУТРѢ ОУВО ПОКРОВѢ ИМѢАШЕ, И У ИСТКАННЫХЪ ИСПРЕСТРЕНА І ОУСТРОЕНА. УВО ЖЕ БАШЕ ПРАПРУДНО, ДРУГОЕ ЖЕ УРЪМНО, ИЛИ ВЪ УЕРВИ УМОУЕНО. ИАКИНФЪ СВОЕ ЖЕЛЪЕННЕ, ВОУСЪ ЖЕ ИМѢАШЕ СВОИ БѢЛЫ УБРАЗЪ. ІАЖЕ БЫСТЬ УЪ УЕТЫРЕН СТОУХИИ ИМОУТЬ ПРИТЪА. ИВО ИАКИНДЪ КЪ АЕРОВИ ПРИЛОЖЕНЪ, УРЪМНЫЙ ЖЕ ИЛИ УРЪБИНО УУРЪВЛЕНЪ КЪ УГНЕВИ ПРАПРУДНОЕ ЖЕ ІАВЛАЕТЪ МОРЕ. ТО ВО ПИТОУЕТЪ КЪ ХЛУ, У НЕІА ЖЕ ТАКОВОЕ УРЪВЛЕННЕ БЫВАЕТЪ. ВОУСЪ ЖЕ ВЪ ЗЕМЛИ, У НЕІАЖЕ ВО ПРОЗАБАЕТЪ, ИВО БГЪ ІЕРЪУМЪ УЪ ВСАКЫА КРАСОТЫ УБЛЪУЕНЪ, ДА СА ЛЮДИЕ УЮДАТ, САМЪМЪ ЖЕ ІЕРЪА НАΟΥЧИ, ІАКО ДА ПОДОБАЕТЪ ДІШЮ ОУКРАСИТИ.</p>	<p>For example, the tabernacle of the Tables of the Decalogue is embroidered with gold inside and outside and has a cover of a cloth richly woven in a geometric design of multiple colours. Because there is purple, and rosy, and scarlet-dyed and hyacinth-like and the fine linen is white-coloured as the skin. And all of these stand for the four elements that, as I said, were obscure. Therefore, the hyacinth resembles the sky, and the rosy and the scarlet-dyed the fire, and the purple reveals the sea (since that one produces the shell from which this colour is obtained), and the fine linen the earth, from which it is said it grows. And so God prescribes to these priests in all sorts of ways the order that the believing multitude should comply with, and shows these priests in which ways it is necessary to lead your life and prescribe the rule of virtue in it.</p>
---	---	---

After this long explanation about the ephod and its uses, Hamartolos paraphrases, occasionally copying some sentences word-for-word, the paragraphs in Book XI of Josephus' *Antiquitates* relating to the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem:<sup>34</sup>

34 In italics in the English translation is the text that, in the original Greek, coincides word-for-word with the text by Josephus above.

<p>Οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ μετὰ τοιαύτης στολῆς τε καὶ δόξης μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἱερέων καὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ πλήθους ἱεροπρεπῆ καὶ διαφέρουσαν τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνῶν ποιησάμενος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τὴν ὑπάντησιν εἰς τόπον ἐπίσημον ἔστη, ἔνθα μάλιστα ἡ περικαλλῆς τοῦ ναοῦ πρόσοψις ἐξεφαίνετο. καὶ τὸ μὲν πλῆθος πόρρωθεν ἰδῶν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν λευκαῖς στολαῖς, τοὺς δὲ ἱερεῖς προεστῶτας ἐν βυσσίναις μετὰ πολλῆς εὐταξίας καὶ σεμνότητος, τὸν δὲ ἀρχιερέα ἐν ὑακίνθῳ καὶ διαχρύσω κόσμῳ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τὴν κίδαριν ἔχοντα καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἔλασμα, ᾧ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὄνομα ἐπεγέγραπτο, καθὼς εἴρηται, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ξένη θέα καταπλαγείς ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρματος εὐθύς καταπηδῆσας καὶ προσελθὼν μόνος προσεκύνησε τὸ θεῖον ὄνομα καὶ τὸν ἀρχιερέα ἠσπάσατο, ὃν πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι μιᾶ φωνῇ σὺν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ γνησίως ἀντησπάσαντο. τῶν δὲ γε τῆς Συρίας βασιλέων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν καταπλαγέντων καὶ διεφθάρθαι τὴν διάνοιαν Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑπειληφόντων, καὶ Παρμενίωνος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ μᾶλλον θαυμάσαντος καὶ ἀγανακτήσαντος διότι καθάπερ τις τῶν ὑπὸ κῶν πεσῶν προσεκύνησεν, εἶπεν Ἀλέξανδρος· οὐ τὸν ἀρχιερέα προσεκύνησα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ θεὸν τιμώμενον κάμοι τὴν βοήθειαν κατὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ὑποσχόμενον. ἡνίκα γὰρ τὴν κατὰ Περσῶν διεισοῦμην στρατεῖαν, καὶ οὐκ ἐτόλμων διὰ τὸ μέγεθος</p>	<p>ТАКО И НЫНѢ ВЪ ТАКОВОИ    ѡДЕЖДИ И СЛАВѢ ОУ    ДОБРОДѢТЕЛЬНОУ    КРАСОТѢ Ю ОУКРАСИТИ.    И С ПРОЧИМИ ИЕРѢИ    И ГРАДСКОМУ МНОЖЕСТВУ    ИЕРѢИЛѢПЪСЪТВЕНО,    И РАЗЛИЧНЕ ѿ ИНѢХЪ    ЯЗЫКИ СЪТВОРИВЪ    АРХИЕРѢИ ВЪ СТРѢТЕНІЕ НА    МѢСТЕ ПОСИВИЪ СЪА, ИДѢЖЕ    ПРЕКРАСОТА ЦРКВЬНАА    КРАСОТА РАЗЛИЧНАА ВИДИМА    ВЫША. ВИДѢВЪ ЛЮДИ    ИЗДАЛЕЧѢ АЛЕКСАНДРЪ    ВЪ РИЗАХЪ БѢЛЫХЪ, ЕРЪЕМ    ЖЕ ПРѢДСТОЯЩИМЪ ВЪ    ВОУСИНѢХЪ, РЕКШЕ ВЪ    ЗЪБЛЕНАХЪ, СЪ ВЕЛИКОМЪ    ЧИНОМЪ ѡБЛОЖЕНСТВІЕМЪ    І АЪПОТЮ, АРХИЕРѢИИ ЖЕ    ВЪ АКИНОѢ И ВЪ ЗЛАТѢ    КРАСОТѢ, И НА ГЛАВѢ КИДАРЬ    ИМОУЩА, И ЗЛАТЫИ НА НЕМЪ    ПЛАТЪ, НА НЕМЪЖЕ И БЖІЕ    ИМА НАПИСАННО, ТАКОЖЕ    РЕЧЕНО БЫСТЬ, ПО ДИВЕНЪМЪ    ВИДѢНІИ ОУДИВИСА    АЛЕКСАНДРЪ И С КОЛЕСНИЦА    СКОУИВЪ И ПРИШЕДЪ ЕДИНЪ    ПОКЛОНИСА БЖІЮ ИМЕНИ.    И АРХИЕРѢА ЛОБЗА, ТАКО ИСИ    СЪ АРХИЕРѢИМЪ ІЮДѢИ    ЕДИНОГЛАСНО ЕГО. ЦѢЛОВАША.    ЦРЕМЪ ЖЕ СУРЬСКИМЪ    И ПРОЧИМЪ ОУДИВИВШИМСА,    ВРѢДНИТСА МНАЦИМЪ    ЧЮВСТВІИ АЛЕКСАНДРОВѢ    И ПАРМЕНИЮ СТРАТИГУ ПАЧЕ    ЧЮДИВШАСА И НЕГОДОВАША    НА АЛЕКСАНДРА, ЗАНЕ    ТАКО ПРОСТЕЦЪ ПОКЛОНИСА    И ѿВѢЩА АЛЕКСАНДРЪ.</p>	<p>Thus clad in those garments, and among other priests and the people of the city, shining forth in honour and glory, the High Priest was clearly visible and, standing in that place, inside the exceeding beauty of the temple, was revealed to the eyes. (331) For when Alexander while still far off saw the multitude in white garments, the priests at their head clothed in linen, with great order and solemnity, and the High Priest in a robe of hyacinth-blue and gold ornament, wearing on his head the mitre with the golden plate on it on which was inscribed the name of God, when Alexander, panic-struck, asked about that foreign god, and, leaping down straight from the chariot, he approached alone and prostrated himself before the Name and first greeted the High Priest. (332) Then all the Jews together greeted Alexander with one voice, together with the High Priest sincerely came against him, and surrounded him, but the kings of Syria and the others were struck with amazement at his action and supposed that the king's mind was deranged. (333) And Parmenion, the general, very surprised and vexed asked for what reason he kneeled throwing himself down before his subjects, Alexander said, "It was not before him that I prostrated myself but the God whom he serves and who promises</p>
---	--	--

<p>τῆς δυναστείας αὐτῶν, ὥφθη μοι κατ' ὄναρ κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦδε τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ὁ θεὸς καὶ θαρρεῖν μοι παρεκελεύαστο καὶ τῆς προθυμίας σπουδαίως ἔχεσθαι λέγων· εἰς σέ καταλήξω τὴν Περσῶν δυναστείαν. διὸ, τοῦτον θεασάμενος ἐν τοιαύτῃ στολῇ καὶ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους ὑπομνησθεὶς ὤψεως εἰκότως προσεκύνησα. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν πρὸς τὸν οἰκειακὸν Παρμενίωνα καὶ τὸν ἀρχιερέα δεξιωσάμενος, τῶν ἱερέων παρεπομένων, εἰς τὴν πόλιν Ἱερουσαλήμ παρεγένετο μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων δεχθεὶς εὐφροσύνης. [7] οἱ δὲ γραμματεῖς τὴν βιβλον τοῦ Δανιὴλ προσκομίσαντες, τὴν προφητείαν αὐτῷ διηρμήνευον, ἣν ὁ προφήτης προηγόρευσεν, ὡς δεῖν τινὰ τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν βασιλείαν Περσῶν χειρῶσασθαι. ὃς ἐπὶ τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἠσθεὶς καὶ περιχαρὴς γενόμενος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν ἀνελθὼν θύει μὲν τῷ θεῷ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ὑφήγησιν, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀξιοπρεπῶς τιμῆσας, καὶ λαμπροῖς καὶ μεγίστοις ἀναθήμασι τὸν ναὸν διακοσμήσας κατὰ Περσῶν ἐκίνησεν.</p>	<p>не архирѣвѣви поклонихса, но ѿ него бѣа чѣтома, мнѣ же помощь на противныа давъшаго. егда на прѣсаны оумыслих воину и не дрѣзовахъ зане многа сила их, явимиса въ снѣ въразомъ симъ архирѣвѣмъ бгѣ и дрѣзнуоти ми повелѣ на споспѣшествіе прѣити въскорѣ, глѣ ми. тобою развращио прѣскоюю силоу. тѣмъ его видѣвъ въ такои одежди и видѣнїи по сномъ поманувъ, соуцаго сего поклонихса. и си рекъ къ своему Парменїи, архирѣа за десницу емъ, иерѣвѣмъ послѣдствуюцимъ, въ градъ Иерусалимъ вииде, съ многымъ веселиемъ ѿ Иудѣи прѣимъ. книгоуна же и книги даниловы прѣимша, прорѣствїа протлѣковаша ему, ихже проркъ прежде възгла, яко подоваеть нѣкотороу Макидонаниноу црствїе приати прѣское. Александръ же, въ чюевствїа си прїимъ и радъ вывъ, въ црѣвъ пришедъ, жрѣтвоу принесе бгѣ по архирѣвѣоу глѣ. томоу же архирѣвѣо и вѣвмъ иерѣвѣмъ достоинѣвно почтивъ, свѣтлыми великыми врачїнами оукрасивъ, на прѣсы подвижеса.</p>	<p>aid against one's enemies. Because when I was thinking over the military campaign against the Persians and I did not dare to challenge the greatness of their sovereignty, this God appeared to me in a vision represented as this High Priest and he instructed me to have courage and told me how to achieve my purpose diligently: that is how I will end the rule of the Persians. And that is the reason why seeing this one in these robes and remembering what I saw in that dream, I kneel before this one when I see him." When he said these things to Parmenion, one of his generals, he greeted the High Priest and, accompanied by other priests, entered the city of Jerusalem amidst the welcome offered by the Jews with much merriment. The scribes brought up the Book of Daniel which included the prophecy about him, in which the prophet foretold how it was deemed that someone from Macedonia will be apt to conquer the kingdom of the Persians. He took great pleasure on hearing this and became exceedingly glad and went into the temple to sacrifice to the God as the High Priest instructed, and this High Priest and all the other priests moved against the Persians honoured with all possible dignity and decorated profusely and brightly the temple.</p>
--	--	---

The paraphrasing of Josephus stops here. Some differences between both texts are clear: any mention of the shrine of Zeus in Macedonia is suppressed, and Alexander is acclaimed by the people of Jerusalem and all the priestly class. Then an obscure anecdote is added about a Jew who joins the army of Alexander and condemns publicly the employment of necromancy to try to foresee the future:

<p>Ἰουδαίων δέ τινας πρὸς συμμαχίαν λαβῶν, ἐν οἷς ὑπερέχων ἦν τις ὀνόματι Μοσόμαχος, ἄριστος κατὰ ψυχὴν καὶ τοξότης εὐστοχώτατος, ὃς βαδίζόντων αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Βαβυλῶνα ὁδόν, καὶ μάντεώς τινος ὀρνιθευομένου καὶ πάντας ἐπέχοντος, ἠρώτησε τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς παραμονῆς τοῦ λαοῦ. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ μάντις δεικνύων τὸν ὄρνιν λέγει· ἐὰν μὲν ἀσάλευτος μείνῃ, προσμένειν συμφέρει πᾶσιν· ἐὰν δὲ ἀναστάς εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν πέτηται, προάγειν, εἰ δὲ ὀπισθεν, ἀναχωρεῖν αὐθις. καὶ ταῦτα Μοσόμαχος ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ μάντεως καὶ λάθρα τόξον ἐλκύσας βάλλει τὸν ὄρνιν. ἐφ' οἷς ὁ μάντις χαλεπήνας καὶ οἱ τῇ πλάνῃ ταύτῃ δεδουλωμένοι, λαβῶν εἰς χεῖρας νεκρὸν τὴν ὄρνιν τοιάδε ἔφη· τί μοι μέμφεσθε, κακοδαίμονες; πῶς γὰρ οὔτος μὴ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν προγινώσκων, τὸ ὑμέτερον συμφέρον προανήγγειλεν; εἰ γὰρ ἠδύνατο προειδέναι τὸ μέλλον, οὐκ ἂν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον ἦλθε φοβούμενος μὴ τοξεύσας αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνῃ Μοσόμαχος. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ κατησχύνθησαν σφόδρα.</p>	<p>жиды же на брань съ собою поимъ, въ нихъже бысть мoughъ именовъ Мосомахъ, богаты и добръ дѣлю, и стрѣлецъ добръ. градоуцимъ же имъ на вавилонскыи поуть, и нѣкоемоу влѣхвѣицию прѣе, вса оудрѣжаше, въпрошаше бо, еа ради вины прилѣжно прѣбывають въ него. и ѿвѣща влѣхвѣ, показавъ на прѣу, глѣ. аще не подвижетса пта, прѣбывати на томъ мѣсте вѣмъ. аще ли вѣставши напредѣ подетитъ то прѣчь ити. аще ли вѣспать подетитъ, вѣскорѣ вѣзвратитиса. и се Мосомахъ слышавъ ѿ влѣхва, скоро лоукъ свои принесе, оустрѣли прѣтоу. тѣмъ влѣховъ оулютовавъ си оуцини въ влѣзни тои работни. прѣимъ въ роуцѣ мрътвѣ прѣу, Мосомахъ тако рече. что ради на ма гнѣваетса словѣсници. како бо и сии пта своего спсѣна не проповѣдуши, вашу плѣзоу проповѣдаше. аще бо можаше вѣдати прѣжде хотѣцимъ выти, оубо на се мѣсто не бы пришла, воѣциса, да не оустрѣлатъ еа и оуморитъ Мосомах. и се рекъ к нимъ, посрамившася вси сѣло.</p>	<p>Some Jews joined the army, among which there was one named Mosomachos, a man of extraordinary character and an accomplished archer who, when he was marching on the way to Babylon, took complete hold of a soothsayer who used birds, and asked him the cause of people's need of endurance. And the magician responded holding a bird that if he waited without moving, then all things continue to be profitable, but that if they are forced to fly forward, they move forward, and if backwards, they go back again. When Mosomachos listened to all these things, he threw an arrow at the bird. The magician, angry at those things, grabbed with his hand the dead bird and said to the those subjugated by this deceit: "Why on earth are you complaining to me, you miserable people?" And Mosomachos replied: "How therefore is your lot announced beforehand without knowing this magic? Because if it was possible to know in advance the threat, wouldn't you leave this place right away in fear that Mosomachos could kill you with an arrow?" And when the others heard him, they were all severely ashamed.</p>
--	---	--

At this point, the East Slavic versions continue with either chapter I.34 (Alexander in Egypt visits Memphis) if the long Hamartolos interpolation was added after chapter I.33, or chapter I.36 (first exchange of letters with Darius) if it was added after chapter I.35. If they added this interpolation earlier, those very same versions add at the end of chapter I.35 another brief text that sometimes is entitled as "On the cities" (Ὁ γράδεχ in Hellenic and Roman Chronicle 2).<sup>35</sup>

35 Такоже во вѣхъ градѣхъ наченъ воевати ѿ асина и памфилиа. и вѣрѣтѣна до сикелна великаго островѣ и рима, и калавриа. доже и до оузантинѣ оустремлашася на вѣсточныа грады акы левъ или рѣци левпаръдъ неоукротимыи звѣрь. лова брашна вѣхитити. такъ же баше и съ

Curiously, later versions of the Greek AR – for example, version  $\gamma$  – include between chapters 35 and 36 an extremely brief account of Alexander’s passing through Syria.<sup>36</sup>

### The second interpolation in the second version

The long interpolation within the Hamartolos interpolation in the second version of the Hellenic and Roman Chronicle is not, however, an unknown text in East Slavic. It is one of the epitomes of the short tractate of Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 310/320–403), *De Gemmis*. Though originally composed in Greek (*Ἐπιφανίου ἐπισκόπου Κύπρου πρὸς Διόδωρον ἐπίσκοπον Τύρου περὶ τῶν ἰβ’ λίθων ἐν τοῖς στολισμοῖς τοῦ Ἀαρὼν βιβλίον*, usually shortened to *Πρὸς Διόδωρον*),<sup>37</sup> the text in its entirety has only been preserved in Latin,<sup>38</sup> Georgian,<sup>39</sup> and – putting all the surviving fragments together – possibly in Armenian.<sup>40</sup> The tractate seems to have been written to Diodoros of Tarsus (d. before 394), the influential and controversial bishop and theologian, shortly before his death.<sup>41</sup> The tractate, written apparently in response to a petition from Diodoros to Epiphanius, consists of four main sections: first, an individual description of

---

но оутробоу млстивоу кз вѣбмз. подобенз моужьствомз звѣри. грады бо взимаа не вѣдаше жены и дѣтти но избираа ѿ нихъ воа. поимаше съ собою на брань. а въ градѣ посадиныкы своа посажаа. оу инѣхъ же градъ дань взимаа вса бо вселенаа трепеташе. слышаще слово ево. The text is provided according to Vilkul’s edition (VILKUL, *op. cit.*, 191–192). On this particular text, see: T. VILKUL, Prolog v Aleksandrii Troitskogo Khronografa. Tekstologiya i geografiia, *Slavistica Vilnensis* 60, 2015, 35–49.

- 36 Tatiana Vilkul has analysed extensively Alexander’s entry of Jerusalem according to Hamartolos, which she understands as a “control text” that can shed light on the relations between chronography and chronicles, see T. VILKUL, «Vshestvie v Ierousalim» Aleksandra Make-donskogo. «Khroniika» Georgiia Amartola v «Aleksandrii Khronografichnii», *Ukrainskii istorichnii zhurnal* 5, 2011, 162–178.
- 37 This is the title provided by Robert P. Blake in his own edition. See note 42.
- 38 This text was already edited by Foggini in 1743, and it has been reprinted in PG 43, 321–366.
- 39 The Georgian and Armenian versions were edited and translated by Robert P. Blake, together with the Coptic fragments edited and translated by Henri de Vis and published together as *Epiphanius De Gemmis. The Old Georgian version and the fragments of the Armenian version*, London 1934. I deeply thank Nina Garsoian for her insightful comments on the translations from Greek into Armenian in this matter.
- 40 On the complex and rich Armenian tradition, see M. STONE, An Armenian Epitome of Epiphanius’s “De Gemmis,” *The Harvard Theological Review* 82/4, 1989, 467–476. I thank Jost Gippert for directing me to this article.
- 41 Blake noted in his edition (*op. cit.* xiii) that it must have been written before 394, the year when Epiphanius visited Jerusalem and presumably gave a copy of it to Jerome, who renamed the tractate as *De Gemmis* and quoted it profusely in his own commentary on Isaiah. As there is no reference to the Origenist crises of 394 (when Epiphanius formally requested from John, bishop of Jerusalem, the condemnation of Origen and his teachings) and their subsequent escalation, it was indirectly assumed, at least by Blake, that it was written before that year. This argument, however, becomes flimsy in view of the fact that two of the most significant works by Epiphanius, the *Ancoratus* (375) and the *Panarion* (376) were actually detailed refutations of Origen’s teachings that Epiphanius regarded as heretical. In his anti-Arian

each stone on the breastplate of the High Priest (*humeralis* in the surviving Latin text), as it was commanded by God to Moses to make for Aaron (Exodus 28); second, a description of the order in which the stones needed to be arranged; third, the allegorical interpretation of the stones in connection to the twelve tribes of Israel; and, finally, the hierarchy of the tribes.<sup>42</sup>

In Greek, apart from scanty fragments, only two main epitomes have survived. The first (PG 89, 203–304) covers mainly section one, and the intervention of the anonymous epitomiser is not too disruptive stylistically; rather, he shortened or abridged without much intervention in the text but left out almost completely by summarizing heavily at the end sections two, three, and four. The time and place of this epitome is unknown. It was also preserved in Armenian (according to Blake’s edition, corresponding to Epitome B).

Anastasios of Sinai (d. post-700) probably had the original text in front of him when he used parts of it in his famous *Quaestiones et Responsiones*. Despite traditionally being called the second Greek epitome, it is really two abridged excerpts intended to respond to two different questions: Questions 40 and 45 (PG 89, 585–589 and 595–597, respectively). Anastasios’ Question 40 is entitled *Τί ἦν τὸ ἐφρουδ, δι’ οὗ ἐπηρώτα ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸν Θεόν;* (“What was the ephod by which the priest put questions to God?”), and the answer, after quoting Exodus and a passage by John Chrysostom, turns to Epiphanius’ description of the gems (the first section of his tractate) in a more abridged form than that of the anonymous first Greek epitome. Nothing is said about their properties, their order on the breastplate, the relation of the stones to the twelve tribes, or any hierarchy among them at all. Anastasios’ second question, Question 45 (identified wrongly by Blake as 46), is entitled *Πόθεν οἱ Σαμαρεῖται τὴν προσηγορίαν ταύτην ἐσχήκασιν;* (“From where did the Samaritans receive their name?”), and, after a brief introduction, Anastasios quotes Epiphanius’ story of mount Somoron and Semer, and how the name “Samaritans” means “custodians,” an anecdote lifted from the fourth section of Epiphanius’ tractate (in the Latin version, PG 43, 354–362). There is still another excerpt, also lifted from Epiphanius’ fourth section of the tractate, to be found in Procopius of Gaza, in section VI of his *Catena* on the Octateuch on Deuteronomy (Migne, PG 87, 905–908) in relation to an explanation of mounts Garizim and Gaebal.<sup>43</sup>

---

views, he coincided with Diodoros of Tarsus, to whom he dedicated his tractate. *De Gemmis* is much more in line with the content of his other big work, *Περὶ μέτρων καὶ στάθμων* (On weights and measures), both belonging to what could be called biblical archaeology.

42 A translation of the full tractate into English from the Georgian version is available in BLAKE, *op. cit.*, 99–172, 183–193 (the lacuna of the Georgian is supplied by the Latin text); the parallel translation of both Armenian epitomes, as well as the edition of the Armenian texts prepared previously by L. Alishan, are given on pages 196–213.

43 Aside from the first one, that aimed at some form of summary, the other three can hardly be called epitomes; they are summaries or paraphrases of very specific sections of the original work by Epiphanius. Both excerpts in Anastasios are also found in Armenian, and this has contributed to the idea that they jointly formed a second Greek epitome. But the use of only

The one that interests us is the text extracted by Anastasios for responding to his Question 40. This is the text that was inserted by the East Slavic scribe within the interpolation of Hamartolos in order to explain the stones in the *ephod*. Even more interesting, this text was previously known in East Slavic letters from the very beginning. The *Izbornik* of 1073 included some of Anastasios of Sinai's *Quaestiones*, and among them this Question 40, which included the excerpt of Epiphanius of Salamis (ff. 152v–154r).<sup>44</sup> There are minor alterations between the text included in the *Izbornik* and the text included in the AR, which are highlighted in Appendix 2.

## Conclusions

This episode of the entry of Alexander into Jerusalem is very enlightening in many respects but, as usually happens, it answers some questions and opens others. It becomes increasingly clear that the *Alexander Romance*, despite the fictional character of its Greek original, was probably considered as historical, or at least pseudo-historical, in Early Rus'.<sup>45</sup> The East Slavic AR was itself an interpolation within the Chronicle of John Malalas, and it is itself “interpolated” by another historical work, the chronicle of Hamartolos. The reason for this, of course, it is that he is perceived as being a biblical, or quasi-biblical, king. In other words, Alexander would not have existed as early as we find him in East Slavic historiography if it were not for Josephus and Pseudo-Methodios, who had already appointed him saviour of the world by enclosing the impure peoples of Gog and Magog. If Alexander had already entered the narrative of apocalyptic eschatology via Pseudo-Methodios, with Josephus he enters the history of biblical kings, or at least of the kings who are linked to the protection of Jerusalem and its Temple, all of whom are from the House of David from Solomon onwards. It is almost inconceivable that Josephus' *Antiquitates* were unknown in East Slavic before the AR was translated and interpolated in Malalas. The chronology of the inclusion of the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem at the same point, more or less where it is introduced by Josephus, is key in this respect.

---

one of its “parts” in East Slavic, unknown to Blake and other Armenists at the time, would reinforce the idea that they travelled independently as parts of Anastasios' work, and not jointly as a second Greek epitome.

44 The *Izbornik* of 1073 has a complex codicological history, and at least three different foliations. All particulars can be found in S. O. SHMIDT, *Svodnyi katalog slaviano-russkikh rukopisnykh knig, khраниashchikhsia v SSSR XI–XIII vv.*, Moscow 1984, 36–40. The *Izbornik* is available online at the site of the National Russian Library (RGB) here <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01003546378>. On the history of Epiphanius' tractate in Russian literature, see I. I. MAKEEVA, *Istoriia knigi o dvenadtsati dragotsennykh kamniakh Epifaniiia Kiprskogo v russkoi pismennosti, Cyrillomethodianum* 12, 1988, 67–74.

45 The chronicle of Georgios Cedrenos also recorded many of the episodes from the AR, from the adventures with the Amazons or the visit to the Brahmans to his exchange with Queen Candace.

As discussed above, it is thanks to Josephus that Alexander enters the Temple of Jerusalem at all, thus fulfilling the prophesy of the Book of Daniel. The idea of the anointed king who is victorious against his enemies thanks to the aid received from God is also a key concept of biblical theology. So it must have seemed to subsequent East Slavic scribes who situate Alexander's visit to the Temple even earlier in the order of his victorious campaigns, before Egypt and before Syria. It must have seemed that winning over pagan land without the help of God, as Alexander had done so far in conquering Greece, is more or less acceptable, but making him victorious in the Holy Land *before* acknowledging the existence of the only Christian God was out of the question. The texts of the *Alexandrian World Chronicle*, which were also known in East Slavic in their Greek versions, reinforce this idea of a converted pagan king who is therefore victorious.

The episode of Alexander in Jerusalem also sheds light on the compositional techniques used by East Slavic scribes. Despite what might seem a cumulative random order, there is purpose, there is aim, there is choice, and there is narrative. The version that uses only Hamartolos after chapter I.35 is a translation from the  $\beta$  Greek version. The others are in fact translations of the slightly later so-called manuscript L sub-version, a variant of  $\beta$  that includes the episodes of the water of life and the diving bell. So we have possibly two different Greek originals, two sets of texts used for narrating the visit to Jerusalem (which they have in common Hamartolos), and two different internal logics for the visit: we have, in fact, two different interpolations, two different narratives that might not be mutually dependent.

Alexander is clearly of interest to the East Slavic scribes, as he was for the whole of medieval Europe, because he is a pagan king who becomes key to the salvation of the world (Pseudo-Methodios *dixit*) and who can become victorious if he converts and sacrifices according to the rules indicated by the priests. Very tempting, for all. Alexander has to enter Jerusalem before defeating the Persians not only because Daniel had already said so in his prophecy, but also because he had to convert, even before entering Memphis and destroying Tyre, according to some East Slavic versions. If Alexander had managed to defeat Darius before entering Jerusalem, as the later version  $\gamma$  of the Greek AR suggested, what is the point? If a king can be victorious without converting, why would he need converting? The admission of the existence of a true God before victory is a *sine qua non* of any political theology, at least any in which Alexander was deemed to be used as an example. In fact, the other version of the AR that would become popular as fiction much later in East Slavic and early Russian literature, probably translated from Serbian, has precisely that order of events: a much later visit to Judea with the single aim of acknowledging the existence of the true God by an already Christian Alexander. One could surmise that that is also precisely the reason why the second East Slavic version is considered literature, and this one is really not, at least not by the East Slavic scribes who inserted historiographic narratives.

And now some of the questions: why use Hamartolos if Josephus was probably available? Why dwell on the description of the stones that added nothing to the narrative? Why include the final episode of Mosomachos taken from Hamartolos that seemed to discourage, precisely, divination through material objects? Why should priestly divination, which had been practiced by biblical kings and clearly so impressed the Macedonian king, be relevant in an East Slavic historiographic account? Many, if not all, of these questions remain without answer.

What emerges more clearly, however, is the compositional technique used by the scribes who keep adding, like Russian dolls, more episodes embedded in other episodes, embedded in other episodes. It also reveals a profound knowledge of all the sources available, of all their resources, from which they selected and chose the text that says what they want to say without them saying it. It is a technique as far removed as possible from the conventional and proverbial author's voice. As such, this syntagmatic compositional technique, in which building blocks are added, deleted, or moved around, defies most attempts at traditional critical editions. It seems East Slavic scribes were so modern in their approach that one should really wonder whether Lawrence G. Tesler was indeed the first developer of Ctrl + X, Ctrl + C and Ctrl + V.

Susana Torres Prieto  
IE University (Segovia)  
IE University  
C/ Cardenal Zúñiga, 12  
40003 Segovia (Spain)  
*susana.torres@ie.edu*

APPENDICES

Appendix A: The lineage of Alexander according to Pseudo-Methodios' *Apocalypse*, chapter 9.

The text of the *Apocalypse* from which clearly takes inspiration reads as follows:<sup>46</sup>

<p>9, 1. Τελευτήσαντος τοιγαροῦν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ &lt;πρώτου&gt; βασιλέως &lt;Ἑλλήνων&gt; ἐβασίλευσαν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ· οὐ γὰρ ἔγημε ποτέ. Χουσήθ δὲ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ· ἀνέλυσεν ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ πατρίδι εἰς τὴν Αἰθιοπίαν.</p>	<p>1. So then when Alexander the &lt;first&gt; king of &lt;the Greeks&gt; died, his four servants reigned in his stead. For he never married. Chouseth his mother returned to her own country, Ethiopia.</p>
<p>2. Βύζας οὖν ὁ κτίσας τὸ Βυζάντιον ἀπέστειλεν ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ πρὸς τὸν Φὸλ βασιλέα τῆς Αἰθιοπίας Γερμανικὸν τὸν αὐτοῦ στρατηγὸν καὶ εἰρήνευσε μετ' αὐτοῦ, γράψας αὐτῷ περὶ Χουσήθ τῆς μητρὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὅπως ἂν αὐτὴν λάβῃ ἑαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ βασιλεύσῃ αὐτῆν.</p>	<p>2. Byzas, therefore, after he established Byzantium, sent his general Germanicus by sea to Phol, the king of Ethiopia, and made peace with him, and wrote to him concerning Chouseth, the mother of Alexander, how he would take her as his wife and appoint her queen.</p>
<p>3. Δεξάμενος οὖν Φὸλ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰ γράμματα παρὰ τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ καὶ ἑωρακῶς τὰς παρ' αὐτοῦ φιλοτιμίας καὶ δεξάμενος ἄγαν εὐφράνθη· ἀνέστη οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ συναγαγὼν ἐξ ὅλων τῶν εἰδῶν Αἰθιοπίας, λαβῶν δὲ ἅμα καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ Χουσήθ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Βύζαν ἔχων μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τριάκοντα χιλιάδας Αἰθιοπῶν. Καὶ ἐδεξιώθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Βύζα ἕξω &lt;πέραν&gt; τῆς θαλάσσης ἐν Χαλκηδόνι μετὰ πλείστης θυμηδίας. Δέδωκε δὲ καὶ δωρήματα ἀάμπολλα τοῖς συνοῦσιν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἰσῆλθε Φὸλ εἰς Βύζαν καὶ δέδωκε καὶ αὐτὸς φιλοτιμίας μεγάλας καὶ δωρεὰς μεγίστας κατὰ βασιλικὴν μεγαλοψυχίαν.</p>	<p>3. So when King Phol took the letter from Germanicus and observed the honors paid by him and received them, he was quite delighted. Accordingly, he himself arose, gathered together &lt;examples&gt; of all the sights of Ethiopia, and taking along his daughter Chouseth as well, made his way to Byzas, bringing thirty thousand Ethiopians with him. And he was welcomed by Byzas with much gladness of heart outside &lt;across&gt; the sea at Chalcedon. And he gave numerous presents to those who were with him, and Phol approached Byzas and himself gave him great honors and very great gifts in keeping with kingly magnanimity.</p>
<p>4. Καὶ ἔλαβεν Βύζας ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν Χουσήθ τὴν θυγατέρα Φὸλ βασιλέως Αἰθιοπίας, ἧς ἦς ἐτέχθη αὐτῷ θυγάτηρ, ἣν καὶ ὠνόμασεν ἐπ' ὀνόματι τῆς πολέως Βυζαντίαν, ἣν καὶ ἔγημε Ῥωμύλος Ἀρμέλαος βασιλεὺς Ῥώμης.</p>	<p>4. And King Byzas took Chouseth the daughter of Phol, the king of Ethiopia, and from her a daughter was born to him, whom he named Byzantia after the name of the city, and Romulus Armelaus, the king of Rome, married her.</p>

The disposition of the texts in the three main variants of the first East Slavic version appears below:

	<b>Troitskiy Khronograph (ed. Vilkul)</b>	<b>Hellenic-Roman Chronicle 1 (ed. Istrin)</b>	<b>Hellenic-Roman Chronicle 2 (ed. Tvorogov)</b>
<b>Chapter I.33: Alexander at the Sarapeum</b>	<p>ѣко серапионъ есть . его же то искаше . и великын градъ здадоху мастери . прилѣжно ѣюдены вельми</p>	<p>ѣко Серапионъ есть . повелѣнїе же градское тако баше , ѣкоже повелѣ Александръ . дѣлаху же град и днѣ ѿ дни пребываше .</p>	<p>ѣко Серапионъ есть , егоже тѣи сказа . Повелѣнїе же градское тако баше , ѣкоже повелѣ Александръ . И сздѣловдоху же мастери великын град прилѣжно и вельми ѣюдены и день от дни пребываше .</p>
<b>First Interpolated text: Lineage from king Phol of Ethiopia (indirectly inspired by Ch. 9 of Pseudo-Methodios) (translation above)</b>	<p>и приложи ѿтолѣ има макидонъи въ свое има . и нарече ю Александрѣа . великаа самъ же Александръ . повелѣ во емъ своимъ готовитиса на брань . идашеть бо на цера воуза . въ градъ воузантїю европскыа страны . всѣдъ же в лодѣа . приде въ оузантїю . и бывши велици бранї . повѣди Александръ . и посла к нему воузъ , изъ града дары . проса оу него мира . и дасть емоу в помощь храбрьхъ силныхъ . то же оузъ церь по смерти Александрове . оувѣдавѣдавъ мѣрь его алоумъ/пиадоу идоущоу изъ макидонъи . въ ѿчина моурьскоу землю . баше бо дѣщи фола цера . ефинпска . и посла воеа и герьманїка своего . на море в кораблїхъ . поатъ ю за са . по повелѣнїю фола цера . вѣда же с нею моуръ д . тысяща фолъ церь же воузъ поимъ ю . вда еи за вѣно . римъ . да сего ради боляр римьстни гнѣвахуся на нь : - Александръ же вземъ дары оу воуза цера . и моужа храбрьна поимъ ѿнде ѿ града . воузантїна мысла w дарни цери . земля перьскыа . и оустремиса Александръ къ вьстокоу . и ѿтолѣ прескочи море . акы пардоуся . дерзостью вола землю соурьскоу . и пришедъ въ великую антиохїю .</p>	NOT EXTANT	<p>И приложи оттолѣ имя Македонни въ свое имя и нарече имя Александрѣ великаа . И самъ убо Александръ повелѣ вземъ своимъ готовитиса на брань : идяше бо на царя Буза въ градъ Взузантїю свѣропскыа страны . Въсѣдъ же в лодна и приде въ Взузантїю . И бывши брани велицѣ , и повѣди Александръ . И посла к нему Бузъ из града дары , проса у него мира , и да ему помощь мужа храбрьи и силны . Тзи же Буз царь , по смерти Александровѣ , увѣдавъ матеръ его Алумпиаду , идущу изъ Македонни въ отчину свою , въ Мурьскую землю баше бо дши Фоля царя , вѣда же с нею миръ 4000 фолъ . Царь же Бузъ поимъ ю , и вда еи за вѣно Римъ . Да сего ради боляр римстни гнѣвахуся на нь . Александръ же , вземъ дары у Буза царя и мужа храбрьи поимъ , отиде от града Взузантїа , мысля о Дарьи , цари земли Прзскыа . И авие устремиса Александръ въстоку , и оттолѣ море прескочи , акы пардоуся , дрззостїю воюа землю Сурекую . И пришедъ въ великую Антиохїю , посылаше бо послы къ иудеомъ , проса помочи у нихъ на прѣсяны</p>

Appendix B: Text of Epiphanius of Salamis' *De Gemmis* according to Anastasios Sinaita Quaestio 40, edited by Tvorogov (1999), 104–105 (underlined are the main differences with the *Izbornik* of 1073 text according to the manuscript published by Morozov in 1880):

12 колѣну. Посрѣди же прѣси камень адаманитъ знамениа твоя, имѣя одесно б камении драгихъ, а ошюе б. От нихже есть первыи камень, нарицаемыи сардионъ вавилонскыи, учерменъ есть, акы кровъ. Ражаеть же ся в Вавилонѣ на земли, яже есть къ Асуромъ, презрачнѣи же есть, имѣя силы цѣлєвныа въ собѣ, имъже лѣкують врачєве отокры и язвы, от желѣза бывающаа, помазающе. Вторыи пазион, добръ же паче анфракса камыка, ражаеть же ся в Пазѣ градѣ индѣистѣм. Остримъ же по врачєвнѣи ослѣ, не черьвленъ, испущает по образу сокъ, нъ акы млеко. Наполнить же чаша многы, остряи еликоже хочеть, то ни мѣроу, ни тѣломъ не охудѣет. На потребу же от него вземлемое на оцныа болѣзни и на водныа труды пиемо, и иже ся неистовують от вина морскаго. Третьи измарагдъ, зеленъ убо есть, в горахъ убо индиискыхъ копающе варвари сѣкутъ. Сила же его есть лице видѣти в немъ. Четвертыи же анфракс, зѣло чєрменъ есть образом. Бывает же въ Халкидонѣ лювиницѣм, иже нарицается Африкии. Глаголютъ же, яко не денью, нъ ноцию обрѣтают и, издалеча бо, акы дублица или акы уголь искрами мегчеть и единъ час не престанет. Разумевше же имущии его, яко тѣи есть анфраксъ, и идут на блескъ его и обрящут и. Носим же кацѣми любо пизами, да обзвиетъ, блескъ его внѣ ризъ сиает. Пятый самфиръ, багрянъ есть, ражаеть же ся въ Индѣи и въ Ефиопии. Остримъ же, отокры и напрыщения цѣлить, съ млеком помазаем по оцреннымъ мѣстом. И на горѣ, иже даныи Моисѣю законъ на камыцѣ самфирѣ глаголется быти. Шестыи, асписъ, зеленъ есть, обрѣтает же ся на устьехъ Фермодонты рѣкы и на Амафуннистѣм Кипрѣ, требѣ же есть въ Епиликси. Седмыи же, аурингъ, акы учермень есть, обрѣтает же ся въ утрении варвари суриисцѣи, и Скуфию же, Готфѣ и Давнии. Да ту убо внутрь великиа Сквѣиа в пустыни есть дєбрь велика зѣло и глубока и чєловѣкомъ невходна, стѣнами каменными обоуду оградившися, да тѣм с горы приникши кому люво, акы съ стѣны немощно дозрѣти дна дєбри тѣи, нъ и от глубины мракъ есть, акы пропасть велика нѣкая. Посылаемии же от ближнихъ ту царь осужденници нудьма, заклавше агньца и одравше кожа, смещут с горы от камениа в пропасть дєбри тоа, и прилѣпает камение на мясехъ тѣхъ. Орли же убо, в камении томъ живущє, на воно мясную сходятъ в пропасть и възносятъ агньца, лпяшимъ камением. И егда изыядят орли мясо, камение останет врѣху горы. Осужденници же, смотревше, гдѣ орли възносятъ мясо, и идут, и такъ сии налѣзут камение и приносятъ. Аурингъ имат же дѣиство сице, намещем бо на уголи огненыа, сам не врежаеться, нъ уголи ыгашает. Не тѣчию же се, нъ взем нѣкто камыкъ и обвив въ понявицу нѣкакю и дрѣжа рукою надъ угольми, сам от руку си сѣжжеть, понявица же без вреда пребывает. Спроста глаголютъ же, ражающимъ женам на потребу есть. Осмыи, ахахисъ, акы синь есть. Обрѣтают же и того въ скуфѣхъ тѣхже. Остримъ же и помазаем по лицу, уськание възстапляет скорпинино и ехиднини. Девятый, амефус, акы пламение зѣло, в горахъ же обрѣтается лювинискыхъ, на краихъ морскыхъ. Десятый, хрусолуфъ,

акы злато есть, обрѣтает же ся въ кладѣчнѣмъ камени, ꙗкѡ краи Архимениды  
Вавилонскыя. Вавилон бо и кладязь тыи каменыи Архимениду нарицают. Остримъ  
же сыриць боляцимъ чревомъ рачитель есть, рекше цѣлитель. Первыи на IO,  
вирилионъ изѣкръ убо есть. Бывает убо при врезѣхъ горы, нарицаемыа Таура.  
Вторыи на IO, онухионъ русъ есть. Обрѣтаеть же ся и тѣ в тоиже горѣ. Бѣдаху же  
камени сии образующе 12 племени.