Studia Ceranea 1, 2011, p. 191-204

Anna-Maria Totomanova (Sofia)

A Lost Byzantine Chronicle in Slavic Translation

A couple of years ago I started working on an understudied chronographic text identified as the *Slavic Version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos*. The work was introduced to the Slavic studies community thanks to the copy in the collection of V. M. Undolsky. In the manuscript it follows on immediately after the Chronicle of Hamartolos in its second redaction[1]. The similarity between this unknown to the scholarship of the time text and the Chronicle of George Synkellos was noted yet by Undolsky himself. V.M. Istrin contributed to the final identification of the text as a Slavic version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos. The scholar believed that the Slavic text contains an abridged redaction of the chronicle although nothing similar was found in the Greek copies of Synkellos' work he was familiar with[2]. Istrin reached the conclusion that the chronicle's translation appeared in Kievan Rus in the 14th century on the grounds of some cursory observations on the copy's language. The text has been preserved in five Russian copies of the 15th or the 16th centuries, manifesting no textological differences[3].

---

[1] Х. Трендафилов, *Наблюдения върху славянския превод на хрониката на Георги Синкел*, PBg 14.4, 1990, p. 102.

[2] В.М. Истрин, *Из области древне-русской литературы*, ЖМНП 1903, август, p. 401.

[3] Until the mid-1980s we were familiar with only four copies of this work: two from Moscow, kept in the Russian State Library (Undolskiy [cetera: Унд.] № 1289 of Moscow (III +488 f.), 1°, f. 405–488b and Egorov № 908 1°, (I+ 615 f.) f. 497–615.) and two Petersburg's copies, kept in the National Library of Russia (Sofijski [cetera: Соф.] № 1474, II+397 ff. 4°; f. 34–135a and Solovecki [cetera: Сол.] № 829/839, 4°, 656 f.; f. 2–221a). The first two date to the 15th century and the second two – to the 16th century (Х. Трендафилов, *op. cit.*, p. 102; О.В. Творогов, *Хроника Георгия Синкелла в Древней Руси*, [in:] *Исследования по древней и новой литературе*, Ленинград 1987, p. 217. Traditionally the copy of Undolskiy was believed to be the earliest and it lies in the basis of our edition too (cf. А.-М. Тотоманова, *Славянската версия на хрониката на Георги Синкел. Издание и коментар*, София 2008). Recently however another copy of the chronicle from Egorov's collection was introduced into science (Egorov 863), which has a dating (a marginal note of 1452) and is relatively earlier (Т.В. Анисимова, *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнерусских списках XIV–XV вв.*, Москва 2009, p. 89–93). Textologically Egorov 863 does not differ from the other Moscow copies of which only the Undolsky manifests petite deviations mainly expressed in omissions, word shuffles and lexical changes (Н.В. Бражникова, *Из наблюдений над списками славянского перевода Хроники Георгия Синкелла*, [in:] *Лингвистическое*

For decades now, the interest in this understudied Slavic chronicle has been more than sporadic and no researcher questioned Istrin's opinion that this was an abridged and probably draft version of Synkellos. To a great extent this was due to the limited text material adduced by Istrin[4], and for want of serious research and an edition of the work. As a matter of fact, most Slavic chronographic heritage researchers (M. Weingart, A. Meshterskiy, O. Tvorogov, M.D. Priselkov) merely repeat Istrin's hypothesis on the origin and the contents of the chronicle[5]. As regards the place and the time of the translation, however, the researchers are not that unanimous. M. Priselkov, like Istrin, bound the translation of the Synkellos' chronicle with the translation of Hamartolos. Unlike Istrin, however, he believes that the translation appeared in a much earlier age[6] and that it should be referred to the translation endeavors of Yaroslav in the 1040s in Kiev. Bulgarian scholar Y. Trifonov was the first[7] to suggest that judging by the chronicle's linguistic characteristics and by the information it contains, it was more likely to have been translated in Bulgaria in the tenth or eleventh centuries. Some 60 years later another Bulgarian scholar, Ch. Trendafilov, drew the attention to the fact that the historical account is situated between two chronological poles: the Creation of the world and the foundation of Constantinople – and features episodes from the Old-Testament and from the Roman history as well as from the histories of other nations. Thus where both the chronicle's scope and the selection of the episodes suggest an ideological purpose, meant to prepare the society for adopting Christian history[8]. This , which again leads us to the Bulgarian reality of the tenth and eleventh centuries. In support of his thesis Trendafilov quotes a number of lexemes of indisputable Bulgarian origin.

In my brief presentation I will try to share and illustrate my main conclusions on the publication and the research of the text. The Slavic chronicle proved to be a chronographic compilation about the events from the Creation of the world to the

источниковедение и история русского языка, Москва 2000, p. 106–118). The first notice of this translation see in: *Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописных книг XV в., хранящихся в СССР (Для сводного каталога рукописных книг хранящихся в СССР)*, сост. А. Турилов, Москва 1986, p. 100.

[4] This fact was also noted by Х. Трендафилов, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

[5] Cf. M. Weingart, *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře církevněslovanské. Přehled a rozbor filologický*, v Bratislavě, pars 1, 1922, p. 52–55; Н.А. Мещерский, *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской письменности IX–XV вв.*, Ленинград 1978, p. 85–87; О.В. Творогов, *Древнерусские хронографы*, Ленинград 1975, p. 9; idem, *Хроника Георгия Синкелла…*; М.Д. Приселков, *История русского летописания XI–XV вв.*, Санкт-Петербург, 1996, p. 65. Detailed review of the history of research of the Slavic text see in: Х. Трендафилов, *op. cit.*, p. 101–102.

[6] М. Д. Приселков, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[7] Ю. Трифонов, *Византийските хроники въ църковнославянската книжнина*, ИИД 6,1924, p. 169–170.

[8] Х. Трендафилов, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

founding of Constantinople, rather than an abridged version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos.

The first part, encompassing about two-thirds of the work's size (405a1 – 458b15 in Und. 1289), contains an excerpt from the Chronicle of Julius Africanus about the years from the Creation of the world to the Resurrection of Christ. The identification of Africanus as the author of this part of the chronographic compilation was made on the basis of different types of evidence, which could be summarized as follows:

The narrative in this part is completely based on the chronological and the Christological concept of Africanus, who interprets the world history from the Creation to the Resurrection as a fulfillment of God's providence in six days (millennia). This chronological treatment of world history differs from the Synkellos' concept presented in the second part of the work.

a. The story until Christ's birth, which encompasses Old-Testament history and part of the history of ancient Rome, Persia and the Hellenistic world, is built on 23 chronological observations, each containing Africanus' dates and calculations, where part of the chronologies agree with some preserved fragments of Africanus[9]. The chronological observations form the backbone of the account in the first part and manifest a frequency much higher than that of the chronologies in the second part (see Table 1).

Table 1

1.	406a18–20 Chronology from Adam to Enos	year 435
2.	406b24–25 Chronology of the Flood	2262
3.	407b1–6 Chronology of the migration of Abraham	3277 Abraham was 75-years old When he was 100 his son Isaac was born Isaac is 60 – Jacob/Israel Jacob/Israel entered Egypt at the age of 130 A total of 215 years until Jacob's entry in Egypt Jacob died in Egypt and after 70 years Joseph died
4.	411a6–14 Chronology of the death of Joseph	3563

[9] The fragments were identified after the edition of Routh (Julii Africani *Emmauntis, seu Nicopolis, apud Palaestinam episcopi, qui post initia saeculi tertii scripsit, reliquiae*, ed. M.J. Routh, [in:] *Reliquae Sacrae*, vol. II. Oxford 1846, p. 225–309), because the new edition of the fragments of Africanus was published only months prior to my book.

5.	412b21–413a16 Chronology of the Exodus and the 430 years of exile	3707 Moses was 80
6.	416b5–8 Chronology of the death of Moses	3747 The Exodus lasted 40 years
7.	417b20–23 Chronology of the death of Joshua of Nun	3772 Joshua of Nun – 25 years
8.	420b12–18 Chronology of the years of the judges	4292 490 judges and 30 old men
9.	421a7–11 Chronology of Eli, Samuel and Saul	90 (20 for Eli and 70 for Saul and Samuel)
10.	423b8–16 Chronology of the years of Saul	20 together with Samuel
11.	428a5–7 Chronology of the separation of the 10 tribes and the beginning of the Samaritan Kingdom	4468
12.	435a11–15 Chronology of the end of the Samaritan Kingdom	4750 lasted 283 years
13.	437b25 – 438a7 Chronology of the end of the Kingdom of Judah and the beginning of the Babylonian captivity	4872 122 years after the end of the Samaritan Kingdom
14.	440a26–440b3 Chronology of the end of the Babylonian captivity	4942 70 years of captivity
15.	440b21 – 441a2 Chronology of the restoration of the temple	46 years
16.	441a2–6 Chronology of Cyrus and the Persian Kingdom	4942 55. 1st Olympiad
17.	442a15–18 Chronology of the Regal period in Rome	5000 69 Olympiad
18.	443b10–19 Chronology of the end of the Persian Kingdom	5172 230 years
19.	443b19–444a7 Chronology of the Macedonian Kingdom and Antioch	+282 = 5454 to emperor Caesar + 300= 5472 to the death of Cleopatra + 264= 5436 to the capturing of Antioch 151 Olympiad – beginning of the Maccabees
20.	448b27–449a10 Chronology of the years of the Maccabees	5375 Death of Symon 163 Olympiad

21.	452b25–453a2 Chronology of the beginning of the Empire in Rome and the Antiochian chronology	5454 183.2
22.	457a2–9 Chronology of the beginning of Daniel's prophecy	4942 + 115= 5057 83.3
23.	457b25–458b15 Generalizing chronology from the Creation of the world to the resurrection	5531 Resurrection of Christ 202.2

b. All dates in the first part of the Chronicle follow the chronology of Africanus too. An exception is the date of the Universal flood, which was corrected later, but this correction is mechanical and not in line with the rest of the calculations made in relation to it.

Table 2

прѣнмьнаа лѣта	отъ ддама до еноса	435	
	потопъ	2262	
	обѣтъ авраамль	3277	
	съмрьтъ носифова	3563	
	исходъ	3707	
	съмрьтъ монсѣа	3747	
воєводамин	съмрьтъ иисоуса	3772	
	старьцн	+30	
	сждня	420	4292
	бестарѣншинньство	40	
	мнръ	30	
	нерен н сждня	90	4382
	црьствиа	490	4872
	плѣнъ	70	4942
	прьское цр̄ство	230	5172
	македонн	300	5472
	въскрьсенне х̄во	+59	5531

c. Apart from this main chronological scheme of the first part there is another chronological axis introducing Olympiad dating. The year of the first Olympiad coincides with the first year of the reign of Achaz, which is in line with Africanus' chronological concept.

d. The chronological interpretation of Daniel's prophecy about the seventy weeks follows Africanus too as the difference between the 475 solar years since the beginning of the prophecy (at the time of Nehemiah, i.e. the 20th year of Artaxerxes) to the Resurrection and the 490 years of the prophecy is explained with the difference between the solar and the lunar calendars.

To the chronography of Africanus' point the descriptions of the separate periods of universal history to the Resurrection as well:

a. The list of the judges of Israel and the duration of their government (490 years) also belongs to Africanus.

According to our version the list looks as follows:

Chousarsathom	8
Gothoniel	40
Aod	80
Aiglom	18
Jabez	20
Deborah	40
Madineans	7
Gideon/Hierobaal	40
Abimelech	3
Moabites	18
Thola	22 (23)
(Jair)	
Jephtae	6
Esebon	7
Elon (Malaon)	10
Abdon	20
Gentiles	40
Samson	20
Semegar	1

If we sum up the years of their terms minus the years of Jair, who is missing in our text, we will obtain exactly 400 years that together with the forty years of anarchy and the following thirty peaceful years gives 470. Since Africanus is explicit that the years of the judges, the anarchy and the peace are 490, the missing Jair must have been judging for 20 years, as Synkellos says. If the years of Thola are 23 as we've assumed,

it would leave only 19 years to Jair. This list of judges differs from the Synkellos' list but agrees with the supposedly Africanus' list, adduced by Gelzer and restored on the basis of the evidence of medieval chronographs[10]. It can shed additional light on the original text of Africanus.

b. The list of the kings of Judah and Israel and the periods of their reign also follow Africanus.

Kings of Judah:	
Rhoboam	17
Abia	3
Asa	40
Josaphat	25
Joram	8
Ochozias	1
Gotholia	8
Joas	40
Amesias	29
Ozias	72
Joatham	16
Achaz	16
Ezekias	8
Total	**283**

Kings of Israel:	
Jeroboam	22
Nadab	
Baasha	24
Elah	2
Zambri	7 days
Ambri	20
Achaab	22
Ochozias	2
Joram	29
Jeou	28
Joavhaz	17
Joas	19
Jeroboam II	41
Zacharias	9 months

[10] H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, Leipzig 1880–1898 [repr. New York 1997], I, p. 90.

Saloum	1 month
Manaem	10
Phakesias (Phakee)	2
Phakee	20
Osee	9

The total is 267 years, 10 months and seven days minus the years of Nadav, which are missing in our text but most Byzantine chroniclers give him 2 years[11]. If we assume this figure to be true we will obtain some 270 years for the Israelite kings. The difference between this result and the 283 years until the fall of the Kingdom of Israel should be attributed to the fact that between the reign of Jeroboam II and Zacharias and between that of Phakee and Osee there have been periods of interregna, which are not recorded in our chronicle[12].

c. The list of Persian kings and the duration of their reign (230 years). Here typical of Africanus is the identification of Cambyses with Nebuchadnezzar II.

Cyrus	31
Cambyses	9
Two brothers magoi	7 months
Artabanus	7 months
Darius the Great	36
Xerxes	20
Artaxerxes Longimanus	41
Xerxes II	2 months
Sogdianus	7 months
Darius Notus	19
Xerxes III (Cyrus)	42
Ochus (Artaxerxes)	22
Arses	4
Darius	6
Total	232 y. 11 m.

Exactly 230 years is the sum of the reigns of the rulers, who'd reigned for over one year. The order of the Persian kings agrees with that of Africanus restored by Gelzer, with only one discrepancy in the years of Cyrus and Cambysus – respectively

[11] H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 99.

[12] *Иллюстрированная полная популярная библейская энциклопедия*, ed. архимандрит Никифор, Москва 1891, p. 291. The periods of interregnum are defined 12 and 8 or 9 years respectively, which does not agree with our text.

30 and 8 years according to his sources[13]. The chronology of Persian kingdom quoted here is in line with Africanus' concept that the 115th year of the Persian reign coincided with the 20th year of the reign of Artaxerxes I, when he allowed for the restoration of Jerusalem (452a2-9) if we count only the years of the kings who've ruled for over one year (31+9+36+20+20).

d. The list of Macedonian rulers – from Alexander the Great to Cleopatra and the duration of their reign (300 years) also agree with Africanus' formulations.

The list of the rulers of the Ptolemaic dynasty and their years according to our chronicle looks as follows:

Ptolemy Lagus	114	(40)
Ptolemy Philadelphus	124	37
Ptolemy Euergetes	133	25
Ptolemy Philopator	139	17
Ptolemy Epiphanes	143	24
Ptolemy Philometor	149	11
Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon	152	23
Ptolemy Philopator II	158	
Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon	158	27
Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon	164	4
Ptolemy Lathyrus	165	16
Ptolemy Alexander I	169	
Ptolemy Alexander II	173	15 days
Ptolemy Lathyrus	173	3
Ptolemy Neos Dionysos	174	25
Cleopatra	182	22

e. The list of the Seleucids also belongs to Africanus.

According to our chronicle the order of the Seleucid rulers is as follows:

Seleucus	114	32 (33)
Antoichus Soter	124	19
Antiochus Theos	129	15
Seleucus Keraunos	(138)	4
Antiochus the Great	139	36
Seleucus Philopator	148	12
Antiochus Epiphsnes	151	12

[13] H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 103–104.

Antiochus Eupator		
Demetrius Soter	154	11
Alexander Balas	157	9
Demetrius II Nicator	159	
Diodotus Thryphon	161	
Antiochus Sidetes	161	6
Demetrius II Nicator	163	2
Alexander Zabinas		7
Antiochus Grypus	167	14
Antiochus Cyzicenus	171	3
Seleucus	171	
Civil war	172	
Tigranes of Armenia	177	14
Antiochus Dionysos	177	
Syria captured by Rome	179	

f. The list of the seven legendary kings of Rome and the duration of their reign (240 years) also refers to the chronography of Africanus.

Romulus	38	6th Olympiad
Numa	42	16th Olympiad
(Tullus Hostilius	33	26th Olympiad)
Ancus Marcius	23	34th Olympiad
Tarquinius Priscus	36	42nd Olympiad
Servius Tullius	44	50th Olympiad
Tarquinius Superbus	24	61st Olympiad
Total	**240**	

g. The description of the miraculous events accompanying Christ's death and Resurrection agrees with one of the most famous fragments of Africanus.

3. Our chronicle contains some important biblical narrative episodes missing altogether in Synkellos' chronicle:

a. The history from the Creation to the Flood.

b. The whole story based on the *Book of Ruth* with the genealogy of David, the whole account on Samuel, Saul and David after *Kings*.

c. Part of the story about Solomon.

d. Part of the story about Samson.

e. Part of the story about Jacob and Joseph.

4. The existing agreements between the first part of the chronicle and the Synkellos' text are due to the shared topics and sources:

a. We find complete conformity between the two sources when the text of Synkellos presents an excerpt from Africanus and partial when the former quotes a shared source, most often the works of Joseph Flavius.

b. In several cases (especially after the introduction of the additional Olympiad dating) our text does not correspond to the Synkellos' version but to that of Eusebius of Caesarea (mostly to the chronological canon translated by St. Jerome) and here the connection between the Slavic text and Synkellos' chronicle is more intricate: Eusebius' canon reflects rather correctly the text of Africanus whereas Synkellos often amasses these notices in his rubric Σποράδην where they remain outside the line of his main account.

The second part of the Slavic chronicle – from the Resurrection to the founding of Constantinople – contains excerpts from the Chronicle of Synkellos about the years until the reign of Diocletian (458b15–482b19 in Унд.1289) complemented with a couple of pages from the chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor (482b20–488b20).

The fitting of the two parts of the chronicle together – to the Resurrection and after it – is rather mechanical. The traces of editorial interventions within the Greek milieu are concentrated mainly on the similar presentation of the material in the parts of Synkellos and of Theophanes the Confessor. The only obvious substantial trace of editing is the correction of the date of the Universal flood – the year 2262 according to Africanus and 2242 according to Synkellos – but this was obviously done on the basis of the calculations of the years of the biblical patriarchs in the Septuagint, rather than to unify the two parts and has therefore not affected the chronologies related to the dating of Africanus.

Gelzer thinks that an excerpt from the chronography of Julius Africanus, exempted of its pre-olympic history of all ancient nations except the Judeans, has probably arisen on Greek soil and in the early ninth century has served as a source of a chronographic compilation used by the most eminent Greek chroniclers such as George Hamartolus, Leo Gramaticus and Cedrenus[14]. For the time being we are more inclined to believe that the Slavic chronicle has not been composed on Bulgarian soil but is a translation of the abovementioned hypothetical Byzantine compilation. It could have appeared only after 816 when Theophanes brought to completion his continuation of the chronicle of Synkellos.

The linguistic analysis reveals that the Slavic translation of the chronicle was made in the early Old-Bulgarian period, probably in the early tenth century. The following specific features support this conclusion:

1. The traces of Glagolitic letters show that the Slavic translation was made in a period when the first Slavic alphabet was in active use.

2. The ancient use of the sign for izhitsa (ypsilon) as a sing for a back labial vowel.

[14] H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, II, p. 297.

3. Some errors in the segmentation of the Greek text, which are typical of the earliest translations of the bible.

4. Ancient forms of second sigmatic aorist in first conjugation verbs with liquid consonant root, characteristic of the early Russian copies of Old-Bulgarian originals.

5. The adaptation of the borrowed Greek names or names borrowed through the mediation of Greek manifests substantial differences from the picture we see in the classical Old-Bulgarian texts.

6. The ancient and rare lexis featuring some coincidences with the lexis of the works of the classical Old-Bulgarian corpus, the early Russian copies of Old-Bulgarian originals and with the language of John Exarch.

The main reason for this particular chronographic compilation to be translated so early lies in its ideological purpose. No other text in the early Slavic literature renders in such a synthesized form and at the same time comprehensively the entire Old-Testament history. Such a work was of paramount importance for a neophyte nation that was only beginning to accumulate liturgical books after the arrival of the disciples of Cyril and Methodius to Bulgaria in 886 such a work was of paramount importance. To a great extent the translation of the chronicle was intended to compensate the lack of a complete translation of the biblical books. Moreover, the chronological concept of Africanus, on which the first part of the chronicle – from the Creation to the Resurrection – is based, was obviously introducing some sort of system in the confused chronology of the Byzantines and the Bulgarians. And so the translation was pursuing rather pragmatic goals, which distinguishes it from the translations of encyclopedic works in the Golden Age. At the same time, the chronicle also gave sufficient knowledge about the history of the Hellenistic world and Ancient Rome from the beginning of the Olympiads onward, which was obviously part of the training of the educated Byzantines. With the translation of the chronicle the Bulgarians received a complete history of Christianity from the Creation of the world to the founding of Constantinople, told in an accessible, comprehensible and concise form. The legendary-mythological beginning of the narration is synthesized in a wonderful way in the title of the chronicle itself **НА[Ч]ѦЛО БОГОСЛОВЛЕН[И]I И Ѡ ДѢЛЄ[Х] Б[Ж]ИИ[Х] И Ѡ ЧЮДЄСѢ[Х]** / ѥго ꙗже сътворн испєрва. и лѣтомъ оукаꙁанїє по рѧдꙋ. ѡ / црєхъ и прроцѣ до ха ѡ апл҃ѣ и мчнцѣ. и стлѣ. Not only was this chronicle suited for a neophyte nation, which had no written history of their own, but the translation of the text of Africanus fits but naturally in that part of the literary production of the Preslav literary center, which was obviously influenced by the authority of Patriarch Photius and his *Bibliotheca* containing commentaries on 279 books. Recently the Bulgarian researcher H. Trendafilov listed a total of 12 translated books among which the *Hexameron* by Basil the Great, translated by John Exarch; the *History of the Jewish War* by Josephus Flavius; the sermons of Chrysostom collected in Simeon's *Zlatostrui*; the *Christian Topography* by Cosmas Indicopleust, whose originals were part of or corresponded to analogical works in Photius' *Bibliotheca*[15]. Photius not only played an active role in the Christianization of Bulgaria, but he was also a spiritual and intellectual tutor and possibly teacher[16] of the future Bulgarian Tsar Simeon. Therefore it is no accident that the contents of Simeon's *Florilegium* of 1073 featured works, which had been of interest to Photius himself[17]. The Byzantine patriarch praised highly Africanus' chronography stressing that though concise in his style „he omits nothing worthy of record" although he described cursorily (ἐπιτροηάδην) the events from Christ to the reign of Roman Emperor Macrinus[18]. The last maybe explains why the Slavic men of letters did not choose to translate the chronicle of Africanus but opted for the compilation, where the second part described Christianity in much more detail until the summoning of the Council of Nicaea and the founding of Constantinople in the twentieth year of Constantine's the Great reign. Of course, this leaves room for speculation on whether the compilation itself could have been made on Bulgarian soil but until we can undoubtedly rule out the possibility of the existence of an analogical Byzantine compilation this should remain mere guesswork.

It is not accidental that this early Preslav translation (or compilation?) appeared in Russia in the fifteenth century, for this was the time when the Russian imperial idea and the concept of Moscow being the "Third Rome" was formulated; besides, all the extant copies of the chronicle are accompanied by a translation of the chronicle of George Hamartolus, the two Moscow copies (Унд. 1289 and Egorov 908) are placed in the chronographic miscellanies after extensive excerpts of the chronicle of Hamartolus and after the two St. Petersburg's copies (Соф. № 1474 and Сол. № 829/839) the world history continues following Hamartolus with an account on Constantine the Great. The earliest manuscript Egorov 863 is a borderline case since there the copy of the Chronicle is located after the Chronicle of Hamartolus like in the other two Moscow copies but afterwards the history continues following Hamartolus again with the same rubrics as the Petersburg's copies. The two Petersbourg's cop-

[15] Х. Трендафилов, *Младостта на цар Симеон*, София 2010, p. 23–32.

[16] В. Златарски, *История на българската държава през средните векове. Т. I. Първо българско царство*. 2. *От славянизацията на държавата до падането на Първото българско царство*, София 1971, pp. 280–282.

[17] П. Янева, *„Библиотеката" на патриарх Фотий и Симеоновият сборник*, [in:] *Медиевистичцни ракурси. Топос и енигма в кулкурата на православните славяни*, София 1993, p. 28–32.

[18] The exact English translation is as follows: Read the *History* of Africanus, who was also the author of the *Cesti* in fourteen books. Although his style is concise, he omits nothing worthy of record. He begins with the Mosaic cosmogony and goes down to the coming of Christ. He also gives a cursory account of events from that time to the reign of Macrinus, at which date, as he tell us, the *Chronicle* was finished, that is, in the 5723rd year of the world. The work is in five volumes (*The Library of Photius*, trans. J. H. Freese, London 1920, p. 34).

ies' content is more variegated than the Moscow's and features other annalistic, antiheretical and canonical texts.

Within the framework of the research project Concepts of History Across the Slavic Orthodox World the pursuit of Africanus' projections in the historiographic literature of Eastern Europe continues. A translation is under preparation – in Bulgarian and in English – of the part of Africanus to make the text accessible to a wider circle of researchers.

Abstract. Until recently the so-called Slavic version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos has not been paid proper attention. The attribution of Vasilij Istrin who in the beginning of the 20th c. identified the Slavic text as a translation from an abridged redaction of the Byzantine chronicle, was thoroughly accepted by the Slavic studies researchers. As a result, no great importance was attached to the Slavic text preserved in 5 copies from 15-16 cc. (of which Istrin knew only 4) because of the closed tradition of the copies and their relatively late date. My research linked to the publication of this unedited Slavic chronicle led me to the conclusion that the text referred to as the Slavic version of Synkellos by both Istrin and his successors is not a translation of the Greek Synkellos but rather a chronographic compilation. It was demonstrated that the first part of the compilation narrating the years from the Creation up to the Resurrection of Christ represents a vast excerpt from the Julius Africanus's Christian chronography and only the second part covering the years after the Resurrection up to the foundation of Constantinople contains the respective text of Synkellos plus a couple of pages from the Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor that was not translated in OCS. Both the discovery of a non fragmented text of Africanus and the conclusion that the Slavic translation was done during the 1st Bulgarian Kingdom in 10th c. raise a series of problems my contribution touches upon.

Anna-Maria Totomanova
St. Kliment of Ohrid Sofia University
15 Tsar Osvoboditel blvd.
1000 Sofia, Bulgaria
atotomanova@abv.bg