

DEAN SAKEL

The Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη of Ioannikios Kartanos and the Chronicle of 1570

Abstract: The article demonstrates the dependence, limited though it is, of the Chronicle of 1570 on the Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη of Ioannikios Kartanos. This is of relevance to the Chronicle of 1570 in helping to define the problem of the origins of its biblical sections. For Kartanos, who still lacks a meaningful place in the history of Greek literature, it underlines its importance as a historically oriented text of the period.

In his pioneering statements on the *Chronicle of 1570*, Konstantinos Sathas ‘hazarded a guess’ that its biblical material derived from the Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη of Ioannikios Kartanos.¹ The latter work first appeared in 1536 and was reprinted on several occasions over the following decades; it offers a rather unconventional account of the biblical story together with an extension covering history up to 1534 CE.² Half of Kartanos is derived from an early modern-era Italian ‘Pauper’s Bible’, while most of the remainder comes from Byzantine chronicle accounts, the principal one being the twelfth-century Chronicle of Michael Glykas.³ The *Chronicle of 1570* first appeared in 1570 and had an extensive history thereafter in both manuscript and print. It follows the structures and content of Byzantine chronography more faithfully than Kartanos.⁴ A noticeable feature is its strong biblical element, with interest in the classical world being limited, in which it shares a close relationship with Kartanos.⁵

Two Byzantine world chronicles have been shown to have acted as sources to the *Chronicle of 1570*, these being the Chronicle of Kedrenos (from the turn of the twelfth century) and the *Historia Imperatorum* (perhaps from around the turn of the fifteenth).⁶ The borrowings from both of these works are mostly to be found in the post-biblical sections of the *Chronicle of 1570*. On the latter’s biblical portions F. H. Marshall noted points of convergence with the *Palaea Interpretata*.⁷ This work,

¹ K. N. SATHAS, Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη. III. Venice 1872 (reprint Athens 1972), ιε’: ‘Καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον (τμήμα τοῦ συμπλη-
ματος) περιλαμβάνον τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν ἱστορίαν, ἀγνοῶ πόθεν ἐλήφθη· εἰκάζω ὅτι ... ἐλήφθη ἐκ τοῦ Ἄνθους τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ
Νέας Διαθήκης τοῦ Κερκυραίου Ἰωαννικίου Καρτάνου’.

² Ἰωαννίκιος Καρτάνος. Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη. Editio princeps, reprint with prolegomena by Eleni KAKOULIDOU-PANOU.
Thessalonica 2000 (hereafter KARTANOS). The full title of Kartanos’ work is: Τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἔστι ἡ παλαιὰ τε καὶ νέα δια-
θήκη, ἣτοι τὸ ἄνθος καὶ ἀναγγαῖον αὐτῆς. ἔστι δὲ πᾶν ὠφέλιμον καὶ ἀναγγαῖον πρὸς πᾶσα χριστιανόν.

³ The Italian work on which Kartanos is based is the *Fioretto di tutta la Bibbia historato*. This source was identified by Ph.
MEYER, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche im sechzehnten Jahrhundert*. Leipzig 1899 (reprint Amsterdam
1965), 167. For the identification of the Chronicle of Michael Glykas as a source (of close to a third of Kartanos’ text), see D.
SAKEL, Glykas and Kartanos, in: *Homenaje a la Profesora Olga Omatos*. Vitoria 2007, 725–732.

⁴ On this work in general, see Th. PREGER, *Die Chronik vom Jahre 1570* (‘Dorotheos’ von Monembasia und Manuel Malaxos).
BZ 11 (1902) 4–15, and recently D. SAKEL, The Chronicle of 1570: The Original Version. *BZ* 106 (2013) 143–152. For an
appreciation of the Byzantine chronicle tradition, see C. MANGO, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*. London 1980,
189–200 and IDEM, *The Tradition of Byzantine Chronography*. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988–89) 360–372.

⁵ This feature is nonetheless the norm by later Byzantine times: E. JEFFREYS, *The Attitude of Byzantine Chronicles towards
Ancient History*. *Byz* 49 (1979) 199–238.

⁶ For a general statement on the sources of the Chronicle of 1570, see G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, I (*BBA* 10). Berlin
1958, 412–414. On the *Historia Imperatorum* cf. the ongoing edition by F. IADEVAIA. Messina 2000.

⁷ F. H. MARSHALL, *The Greek original of the Slavonic Palaea Interpretata*. *BNJ* 4 (1923) 257–264; also IDEM, *Old Testament
Interpretation in Mediaeval Greek and Slavonic Literature*. *Church Quarterly Review* 97 (1924) 71–85.

which exists only in Slavonic (and for which the earliest manuscript dates from the fourteenth century), consists of an exposé of the Old Testament story replete with explanations that serve to present the Old Testament as a prefiguration of the New. It has been suggested, based on the sophistication of its arguments combined with a unity of purpose from beginning to end – features which seem to argue against it being an original Slavic work –, that some untraced Byzantine exegetic text lies at its core.

But let us return to Kartanos, and to the suggestion that it was used as a source by the Chronicle of 1570. The two works do share a close relationship. Both have a generally similar historical theme, and both are sixteenth-century vernacular works that enjoyed a wide circulation in their time. Meyer had, however, been quick to point out that they shared no direct dependence.⁸ The recent edition of Kartanos goes one step further; it states that no connection is to be expected given the different thematic orientations and modes of exposition of the two.⁹ In truth, however, a connection does exist, with Kartanos having acted as a source for the *Chronicle of 1570*, though only in a sporadic and mostly fragmentary way, as I shall demonstrate below.

To say something further about the two works; the *Chronicle of 1570* is a highly multifarious text, with numerous witnesses diverging variously outside a core content common to all. The form that is generally representative of the distinctive structure and content of the variants as a whole exists in several variations, one of which is that present in the published version, the *Vivlion Istorikon*.¹⁰ It is to this form that reference to the *Chronicle of 1570* has traditionally been made, and it is to this form that all the above statements apply.

In terms of the wider manuscript tradition of the Chronicle of 1570, a version that diverges substantially from the core form is of interest here. Athos, Iviron 171 contains tracts unique to the work at seven different points in its biblical portions, the overwhelming proportion of which derive from Kartanos, as I shall demonstrate below.¹¹ These borrowings are substantially more extensive than those that form part of the standard form of the *Chronicle of 1570*, and they are witness to an even wider interest in Kartanos as a potential source for this work.¹²

⁸ MEYER, *loc. cit.* Surprisingly we find Sathas' claims being restated in more recent times: S. STANITSAS, Τὸ Χρονικὸ τοῦ 1570 καὶ οἱ παραλλαγές του – Τὰ Χρονικὰ Ψευδο-Δωροθέου καὶ Μανουὴλ Μαλαξοῦ. *Peloponnesiaka* 16 (1986) 593–635, at 599.

⁹ ΚΑΡΤΑΝΟΣ 53: 'δὲν ἔχει καμμιά σχέση με τὰ θέματα τοῦ Καρτάνου καὶ κυρίως με τὸν τρόπο ποὺ τὰ ἐκθέτει αὐτός. Ἐτσι πιστεύω ὅτι μποροῦμε νὰ ἀποκλείσουμε κάθε σχέση μ' αὐτό'. Here she speaks of a possible debt to Kartanos of (some anterior form of?) the Chronicle of 1570. In similar fashion, regarding its similarities to the Chronicle of Glykas, it is said that the latter 'φυσικά, ἀποτελεῖ πάλι ἔμμεση πηγὴ' (p. 55).

¹⁰ On the *editio princeps* of the *Vivlion Istorikon*, see: É. LEGRAND, *Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au dix-septième siècle*, I. Paris 1894 (reprint Bruxelles 1963), 290–298.

¹¹ On the manuscript, see S. P. LAMBROS, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, II Cambridge 1900 (reprint Amsterdam 1966), 46. Iviron 171 contains a full-length version of the Chronicle (from Creation up to the year 1571). For the biblical portions, it contains the core text of the Chronicle of 1570 in abbreviated form. This abbreviated version (i.e. version without the additions from Kartanos and elsewhere) was present in two sister manuscripts, the imperfectly preserved Athos Panteleemonos 266 and the now lost Kalavrytensis, Megalou Spelaiou 105. On these manuscripts, see respectively LAMBROS, *op. cit.* 345; and N. A. BEES, *Κατάλογος τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Χειρογράφων Κωδίκων τῆς ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ Μονῆς τοῦ Μεγάλου Σπηλαίου*. Leipzig – Athens 1915, I 100. Pantel. 266 lacks its beginning; nonetheless the nature of the relationship with Iviron 171 becomes evident from the final addition from Kartanos, which we shall see below (198–199), and also from the first (194–195), in the context of which 'standard' Chronicle of 1570 text reenters Iviron 171. This is at a point different from that in the mainstream Chronicle of 1570 and in the context provided in Kartanos. The case present in Pantel. 266 represents evidence that there is reuse at the time the Kartanos additions are introduced, and that this material was absent from the abbreviated chronicle represented by Pantel. 266 and Megalou Spelaiou 105. Thus we can remain fairly confident that we know what was added on the occasion of writing of the variant present in Iviron 171, despite not having available its 'standard chronicle base' (given the present-day state of Pantel. 266 and the loss of its sister manuscript).

¹² The author of the Chronicle of 1570 was the Constantinopolitan literatus Manuel Malaxos. He wrote the Chronicle and reworked it throughout the 1570s. See for now in particular SAKEL, *The Chronicle of 1570* (as note 4). The variants as a whole are evidently either his work or that of his associates and/or students working with him or independently of him (especially

Until now, Kartanos has not been associated with the Byzantine chronicles.¹³ Indeed, it is evident from the literature that the work lacks any meaningful place in the history of Greek letters.¹⁴ It has been seen as a translation into the vernacular of the Bible (in spite of the fact that it is almost exclusively derived from elsewhere).¹⁵ Kartanos has been viewed as the bearer into Greek of the Western-style book of sermon, a move (ostensibly) meant to address the ‘religious and secular orientation’ that the historically minded Byzantine chronicles (ostensibly) lacked; this however is said to have met a dead-end.¹⁶ It has never been noticed that republication of Kartanos ceased (fifth edition, 1567) at precisely the same point in time as circulation of the *Chronicle of 1570* began. The latter seems to have filled a void in historical literature in the vernacular that Kartanos had, till then, somehow occupied.¹⁷

We shall first establish the *Chronicle of 1570*’s debt to *Kartanos* in the case of the more conventional form of the Chronicle, through the *Vivlion Istorikon*, before moving on to *Iviron 171*. I have made minor rectifications to the orthography and accentuation of both versions.

The passage early on in the Chronicle on the origins of fresh water does seem to be from Kartanos (who, besides, is here reproducing Glykas):

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 3	<i>Kartanos</i> 45r
Καὶ τούτη ἡ θάλασσα ἀπὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἦταν γλυκεῖα, ἀμὴ διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὸ νερὸν ἀκίνητον ἀλμύρησεν καὶ εἶναι ἀλμυρὸν, πλὴν αἱ βρύσες ὅλες καὶ τὰ ποτάμια καὶ τὰ φρέατα ὅπου εἶναι γλυκέα ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ διὰ τὸ κινᾶει τὸ νερὸν ἀπὸ τόπους στενοῦς γλυκαίνεται, καὶ εἶναι γλυκὴ καὶ τὸ πίνουν οἱ ἄνθρωποι.	Καὶ τούτη ἡ θάλασσα ἀπὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἦτονε γλυκεῖα, ἀμὴ διὰ τὸ εἶναι τὸ νερὸν ἀκίνητον ἀρμύρισεν, πλὴν δὲ οἱ βρύσες ὅλες καὶ τὰ πηγᾶδια ὅλα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ κινούμενον τὸ νερὸν καὶ τρέχοντας ἀπὸ τόπους στενοῦς γλυκαίνεται, καλὰ καὶ ἔρχεται ἀπὸ τὴν θάλασσαν.

Similarly, though perhaps less securely, there are the rivers of Paradise:

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 4	<i>Kartanos</i> 66r
Καὶ ποταμὸς εὐγενεν ἀπὸ τὴν Ἑδὲμ ποτίζων τὸν παράδεισον, καὶ ἀπ’ ἐκεῖθεν ἐχώριζεν εἰς τέσσαρας ποταμούς, καὶ ὁ ἕνας ἐλέγετο φυσῶν,	Καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτὴν τὴν Ἑδὲμ ἐβγαίνει ἕνας ποταμὸς καὶ ποτίζει τὸν παράδεισον καὶ ἀπόκει ἐβγαίνει καὶ διαχωρίζεται εἰς τέσσαρα μέρη καὶ εἰς

following his death). There is evidence of the original chronicle’s source material being reused as the variants were written. Kartanos represents no special case here.

¹³ The debt to Glykas was shown only recently (note 3 above) and has not influenced thinking on the work.

¹⁴ For past literature on Kartanos, beginning with the statements by Krumbacher, see prolegomena to KARTANOS.

¹⁵ E. ΚΑΚΟΥΛΙΔΟΥ-ΠΑΝΟΥ, ‘Ο πρώτος μεταφραστής τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς στὴ δημοτικὴ γλῶσσα Ἰωαννίκιος Καρτάνος 1536, in: *Eisegeseis D’ synaxeos orthodoxon biblikon theologon*. Thessalonica 25–28 October 1986, 221–228. Kartanos speaks of making available ‘Holy Writ’ in the vernacular from a selection of texts and does not care to name his Italian source. A quick look at the work shows that by ‘Holy Writ’ he means something much wider than the Bible.

¹⁶ E. ΚΑΚΟΥΛΙΔΟΥ-ΠΑΝΟΥ, Ἰωαννίκιος Καρτάνος. Συμβολὴ στὴ δημόδιη πεζογραφία τοῦ 16^{ου} αἰώνα. *Thesaurismata* 12 (1975) 217–256, at 219–220; 220: ‘Δὲν ὑπῆρξαν πρόδρομοι, ἀλλὰ δὲν τὸν ἀκολούθησαν οὔτε μιμητὲς στὸν ἐλληνικὸ χῶρο’. Nonetheless, chronicles oriented towards the sermon did exist in Byzantine times, the *Chronicle of George the Monk* being the most pertinent case in point.

¹⁷ For the place of the *Chronicle of 1570* within the Byzantine chronicle tradition, see in particular C. MANGO, *Discontinuity with the Classical Past in Byzantium*, in: *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, ed. R. Scott – M. Mullett. Birmingham 1981, 48–57, at 54 (reprint C. MANGO, *Byzantium and its Image*. London 1984, no. V). A selection of sermons from the final portions of Kartanos was included as a supplement to the *Thesaurus of Damascenus Studites* after reproduction of the complete work of Kartanos had ceased (see KARTANOS, prolegomena).

<p>ὁ ὁποῖος γυρίζει τὴν γῆν Εὐλάτ. Ἐκεῖ εἶναι τὸ χρυσάφι. τὸ δὲ χρυσάφι τῆς γῆς ἐκείνης εἶναι καλόν. Καὶ εὐγένει καὶ ὁ ἄνθραξ, καὶ ὁ λίθος ὁ πράσινος ἀπ' ἐκεῖ. Καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ποταμὸς λέγεται Γεών. Οὗτος γυρίζει ὅλην τὴν γῆν τῆς Αἰθιοπίας. Καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ τρίτος λέγεται Τίγρις. Κατεβαίνει δὲ μέγα ρεῦμα καὶ βρυχᾶται καὶ περικυκλεῖ τὴν γῆν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ... Ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος λέγεται Εὐφράτης καὶ ὑπαγίνει ἀπὸ τὴν Βαβυλῶνα, καὶ εὐγάλει λίθους πολλῆς τιμῆς θαυμαστοὺς καὶ ὠραίους.</p>	<p>τέσσαρας ἀρχάς. Καὶ ὁ πρῶτος τὸν λέγουν Φυσῶν καὶ τοῦτος ἔναι ὁποῦ ὑπάγει τὸν γύρον ὅλην τὴν γῆν τῆς Εὐλάτ καὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον ἔναι τὸ χρυσάφι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ χρυσάφι τῆς γῆς αὐτηνῆς ἔναι πολλὰ καλόν καὶ ἐκεῖ εὐρίσκεται ὁ ἄνθραξ καὶ τὸ λιθάρι τὸ πράσινον, ἤγουν τὸ σμαράγδι. Καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ δεύτερος τὸν κρᾶζουν Γεών καὶ τοῦτος περικυκλώνει ὅλην τὴν γῆν τῆς Αἰθιοπίας. Καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ τρίτος τὸν λέγουν Τίγριν καὶ τοῦτος ὁ ποταμὸς ὑπαγαίνει ἀπὸ μπρὸς ἀπὸ τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους ... Καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος τὸν λέγουν Εὐφράτην καὶ τοῦτος ὑπάγει ἀπὸ τὴν Βαβυλῶναν καὶ ἐβγάνει λιθάρια ἀτίμητα.</p>
---	---

There follow (*Vivlion Istorikon* 19–20) the two most easily identifiable and most secure borrowings from *Kartanos*. Both deal with the figure of Lamech, on his family and his killing of Cain; these derive from *Kartanos*, chapters 53 and 55. I present for comparison the concluding portion of the combined tract. One notices the omission of details in the *Chronicle of 1570*, which leads to a more focused account.

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 19–20	<i>Kartanos</i> 87r–87v
<p>Καὶ ἔσοντας νὰ εἶναι ὁ Λάμεχ μέσα εἰς τὸν λόγγον μὲ τὸν σύντροφόν του, τὸν ὁποῖον εἶχεν ὀδηγὸν διὰ νὰ σκοτώσουν κανένα μετὰ ζῶον, ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν ἄκρην τοῦ λόγγου ἐγροίκεσεν ὁ ὀδηγὸς κτύπον μέγαν, καὶ ἐπίστευσεν ὅτι εἶναι ζῶον. Καὶ τοῦτος ἦτον ὁ Κάϊν. Καὶ οὕτως ἐσίμωσαν καὶ πιάνει ὁ Λάμεχ τὸ δοξάρι καὶ ὁ ὀδηγὸς τὸ βάλλει ἴσα ἐκεῖ ὁποῦ ἦτον ὁ Κάϊν. Καὶ βαρεῖ το καὶ δίδει ἢ σαγιτέα εἰς τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ Κάϊν καὶ τὸν ἐσκότωσε. Καὶ ἔγινε ἡ ἐκδίκησις τοῦ Ἄβελ. Καὶ ἀπὸ τὸν κτύπον ἐγνώρισεν ὁ Λάμεχ ὅτι τὸν ἐσκότωσε καὶ ἐλυπήθη πολλά. Καὶ θυμωθεὶς ἔδωκε καὶ ἐσκότωσε καὶ τὸν ὀδηγόν. Καὶ τὸ κορμὶ τοῦ ἀλιτηρίου Κάϊν ἔμεινεν εἰς τὸν λόγγον ἄταφον. Καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν κεφαλὴν του εὐγῆκε μία βρύση βρωμερὴ καὶ εὐγεναν σκουλήκια ὁποῦ ποτὲ δὲν ἐφάνησαν. Καὶ εἶχαν τέσσαρα ποδάρια καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ τους καὶ τὰ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἦσαν μεγάλα ὡσάν ζῶου. Καὶ λέγουν τινὲς ὅτι ἀπ' αὐτὰ τὰ σκουλήκια ἐγεννήθησαν οἱ σκῦλοι.</p>	<p>Καὶ ἔσοντας νὰ εἶναι μέσα εἰς τὸν λόγγον μὲ ἕναν του σύντροφόν του ὁποῦ ἐκοίταζε ἐκεῖνος τὰ ζῶα καὶ ἔβανέ τον ἀγνάντια τοῦ ζῶου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ἐσκότωνε, ἔτσι ἐγροικᾶ ἕναν κτύπον μέγα εἰς μίαν μερίαν τοῦ λόγγου καὶ ἐπίστευε ὅτι ἔναι τίποτε ζῶον, καὶ ἐκεῖνο ἦτονε ὁ Κάϊς. Καὶ ὁ Λάμεχ ὑπαγαίνει εἰς τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον ὁποῦ ἤκουσε τὸν ἔκτυπον καὶ ρίχνει καὶ σκοτώνει τὸν Κάϊν μέσα εἰς τὴν καρδίαν. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπῆγε ὁ Λάμεχ μὲ τὸν σύντροφόν του διὰ νὰ ἰδοῦν ἐκεῖνο ὁποῦ ἐσκότωσαν, καὶ ἠύρισκουν καὶ ἦτον ὁ Κάϊς καὶ δι' αὐτὸν ἔκλαπεν πολλά. Καὶ ἔπειτα πιάνει τὸν σύντροφόν του ὁποῦ τὸν ἐβοήθη καὶ μὲ τὸ δοξάρι ὁποῦ ἐβάστανε τοῦ ἔδωσε τόσες εἰς τὸ κεφάλι ὅσο ὁποῦ τὸν ἐσκότωσεν. Καὶ μὲ τούτην τὴν αἰτίαν ἔγινεν ἡ ἐκδίκησις τοῦ Ἄβελ, διὰ ἀπόφασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ κορμὶ του ἔμεινεν εἰς τὸν λόγγον καὶ δὲν ἐθάφτη. Καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν κεφαλὴν του ἐγεννήθη μία βρύση καὶ τρέχουν σκουλήκια ὁποῦ ποτὲ δὲν τὰ εἶδαν, ὁποῦ εἶχαν τέσσαρα ποδάρια καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ τους καὶ τὰ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἦσαν ὡσπερ ἐνοῦ ζῶου, καὶ πολλοὶ λέγουνε ὅτι ἀπὸ ἐκεῖνα τὰ σκουλήκια ἐγεννήθησαν τὰ σκυλῖα.</p>

Kartanos is used at the start and evidently some way into the reign of King David:

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 98	<i>Kartanos</i> 194v–195r
Μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Σαοῦλ ἐγένετο βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ Δαβίδ. Καὶ ἔκαμε πολλοὺς πολέμους μετὰ τῶν Παλαιστίνων καὶ τέλος ἐνίκησεν αὐτοὺς νίκην μεγάλην. καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἔπαυσαν οἱ Παλαιστῖνοι τὸν πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν Ἑβραίων. Καὶ ἀφ’ οὗ ἔπαυσαν οἱ πόλεμοι, ἦνρε καιρὸν ἡσυχίας ὁ Δαβίδ καὶ ἔκαμε τὸ Ψαλτήριον.	Ἄφοῦ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Σαοῦλ, ὑπῆγεν ὁ Δαβίδ ... καὶ ἔκαμαν τὸν βασιλέαν ἀπάνω εἰς τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Καὶ ἔστοντας βασιλεὺς ἔκαμε πολλοὺς πολέμους κατὰ τῶν Παλαιστίνων ... ὅπου ἐνίκησεν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, καὶ ἀπ’ ἐκείνην τὴν ὥραν ... ἔπαυσαν τὸν πόλεμον οἱ Παλαιστῖνοι μετὰ τοὺς Ἑβραίους. Καὶ τότες ὁ Δαβίδ ἦνρε καιρὸν ἡσυχίας καὶ ἄρχισεν νὰ κάμει τοὺς ψαλμοὺς ὅπου ἔχομεν τοῦ Ψαλτηρίου ...

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 99	<i>Kartanos</i> 197r–197v
καὶ ἀκούσασα ... ἢ Βηρσαβεὲ ὅτι ἐσκοτώθη ὁ ἄνδρας της, ἔκλαυσε πολλά. καὶ τότε ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπῆρεν αὐτὴν διὰ γυναῖκα του εἰς τὸ ὄσπῆτι του καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν. Καὶ οὕτως ἔστειλεν ὁ θεὸς Νάθαν τὸν προφήτην εἰς τὸν Δαβίδ καὶ ἠλεγξέν τον διὰ τὴν μοιχείαν καὶ τὸν φόνον ὅπου ἔκαμε, καὶ πῶς ὁ Θεὸς ὀργίσθη αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ὁ Δαβίδ ἀκούσας οὕτως ἔπεσε κατὰ γῆς κλαίων εἰς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ προφήτου καὶ ἐβόα ἡμαρτον.	καὶ ὅταν ἔμαθε ἡ Βηρσαβεὲ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνδρός της ἔκλαψε πολλά. Καὶ εἰς ὀλίγες ἡμέρες τὴν ὑπῆρε ὁ Δαβίδ διὰ γυναῖκα του καὶ ἔκαμε ἕναν υἱόν ... δὲν ἄρесе τοῦ Θεοῦ ... ἀλλὰ ἔστειλεν τὸν Νάθαν τὸν προφήτην εἰς τὸν Δαβίδ ... Καὶ τότες οὖν ὁ Δαβίδ ἔπεσε εἰς τὴν γῆν κλαίγοντας ... εἰς τὰ ποδάρια τοῦ Νάθαν καὶ ἔκλαπεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.

The Pauline quote within the description of Solomon’s temple may have come from Kartanos, viz.: *Vivlion Istorikon* 102 (καὶ θέλεις νὰ τὸ εἶδῃς ... τοῦ ἀνεσπέρου ἀύλου φωτός); *Kartanos* 200v–201r (Καὶ θέλεις νὰ τὸ ἰδεῖς ... τοῦ ἀύλου φωτός τοῦ Θεοῦ).

Further fragments may have been integrated within this description as a whole (e.g. on the dimensions of the Temple; *Vivlion Istorikon* 101; *Kartanos* 200r). These can only be studied meaningfully within the context of a fuller investigation of the sources of these sections of the *Chronicle of 1570*. To give but one example:

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 104	<i>Kartanos</i> 206r
Ἀμὴ ἔκαμάν αὐτὸν ... καὶ ἐπροσκύνησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὠργίσθη ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὠρισεν ὅτι νὰ μερισθῇ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ. Καὶ οὐχὶ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτοῦ διὰ ὄνομα Δαβίδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. Μόνον μετὰ τὸν θάνατόν του	Καὶ αὐτὲς τὸν ἔκαμαν νὰ ἐπροσκύνησεν τὰ εἰδῶλα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς ὄρισεν ὅτι νὰ μεριστεῖ ἡ βασιλεία του, καὶ ὄχι εἰς τὸν καιρὸν του, διὰ ὄνομα τοῦ Δαβίδ τοῦ πατρὸς του, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν θαντὴν του ...

Kartanos has been used in the closing portions of Solomon’s reign (on Solomon’s change of character and evidently for the quote from Andrew of Crete), viz.:

Vivlion Istorikon 104–105 (καὶ ὅσον ἦτον καλὸς ... ἀγάπην τῶν γυναικῶν; καὶ τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ ... ψυχὴ προσαφομοίωσας.); *Kartanos* 203r (Καὶ ὅσον ἦτον καλὸς ... διὰ τὲς γυναῖκες; καὶ ὁμολογεῖ το ... ψυχὴ, προσαφομοίωσας).

The Chronicle's text on the Division clearly derives from Kartanos, as may the concluding lines of the reign of King Roboam:

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 105–106	<i>Kartanos</i> 206v
Μετὰ τοῦτον ἐβασίλευσε Ῥοβοὰμ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Καὶ διὰ τὴν πολλὴν αὐτοῦ αὐθάδειαν καὶ κακίαν ... ἔχασε ἀπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν του ὁποῦ ὄριζε τὰ δέκα σκῆπτρα τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἔκαμαν ἐκεῖ βασιλέα τὸν Ἱεροβοὰμ ... Ὅμως ὁ Ῥοβοὰμ ἐβασίλευσεν εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ χρόνους δεκαεπτὰ καὶ ἀπέθανε. Καὶ ἐτάφη πλησίον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.	Μετὰ τὴν θανὴν τοῦ Σολομῶντος ἔμεινεν βασιλεὺς Ῥοβοὰμ ὁ υἱὸς του εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Καὶ διὰ τὴν πολλὴν του αὐθάδειαν καὶ κακίαν ἔχασε τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ δέκα φυλῆς τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἔκαμαν βασιλέαν τὸν Ἱεροβοὰμ ... Μόνος ὁ Ῥοβοὰμ ... ὁποῦ ἐβασίλευσεν δεκαεπτὰ χρόνους εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐτάφη πλησίον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ...

The Chronicle's statement on the founding of Byzantium may have come from Kartanos, but it may also have come from elsewhere, not least Kedrenos (*Vivlion Istorikon* 118; *Kartanos* 210r; *Kedrenos* I 197).¹⁸

The Nektanabo story is almost certainly derived from Kartanos.¹⁹

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 145	<i>Kartanos</i> 311r–2r
Ἀμὴ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ὡς λέγουσιν αἱ ἱστορίαι, δὲν ἦτον υἱὸς τοῦ Φιλίππου, μόνον τοῦ Νεκτεναβοῦ. Ὁ ὁποῖος Νεκτεναβὸς ἦτον βασιλεὺς τῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἔσοντας ὁποῦ ἔχασε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ παλάτι τοῦ βασιλέως Φιλίππου ὡς δοῦλος καὶ μάντις. Καὶ μὲ τὰς τέχνας τῆς μαγίας του ἔκαμε καὶ ἐκοιμήθη μὲ τὴν βασιλίσσαν τὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα, διότι δὲν ἔκαμε παιδί. Καὶ ἐγκαστρώθη καὶ ἔκαμε τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον.	Τοῦτος ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος οἱ ἱστορίαι λέγουσιν καὶ ἀναφέρουσιν ὅτι ἦτον υἱὸς τοῦ Νεκτεναβοῦ βασιλεὺς τῆς Αἰγύπτου ... καὶ ἔσοντας νὰ χάσει τὴν βασιλείαν ἔφυγεν καὶ ὑπῆγε νὰ στέκει εἰς τὴν κούρτην τουτουνοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Φιλίππου ... ἦτον πολλὰ διδάσκαλος καὶ μέγας ἀστρολόγος, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Φίλιππος δὲν ἔκανεν παιδία ... ὁ Νεκτεναβὸς μὲ τὴν τέχνην του μὲ τὴν ἀστρολογίαν ... ὑπῆγε εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν νύκτα ... καὶ γκαστρώνεται καὶ κάνει ἕναν υἱὸν ὀνόματι Ἀλέξανδρον.

The account of Nero's death and the fate of his corpse (*Vivlion Istorikon* 191–192) is close to *Kartanos* (336v–337r), but details differ. To quote one portion:

<i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 191–192	<i>Kartanos</i> 336v–337r
Ἔλαβον δὲ τινὲς τοῦ ὀσπιτίου αὐτοῦ δοῦλοι τὸ μικρὸν αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ ἔθαψάν το ἀπὸ κάτω εἰς ἕνα δένδρον εἰς τὸ ὁποῖον ἐκατοικοῦσαν πολλοὶ δαίμονες. Καὶ πολλοὶ ἄνθρωποι ξένοι ὁποῦ ἐπερνοῦσαν ἀπ' ἐκεῖ δὲν ἤξευραν περὶ τῶν δαιμόνων καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτούς. Καὶ ἐπέρασε τοῦτο τὸ κακὸν πολὺν καιρὸν ἕως οὔ ἐγένεν ἕνας πάπας ἁγιώτατος. Ὁ ὁποῖος ἐσύναξεν	Καὶ τὸ κορμί του τὸ ἔθαψαν ἀποκάτω εἰς ἕνα μέγα δένδρον, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ δένδρον ἐκατοικοῦσαν πολλοὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἔκαναν πολλὴν ζημίαν τῶν ξένων ὁποῦ ἀπερνοῦσαν ἀπὸ ἐκεῖνο τὸ δένδρον καὶ ἔκαναν πολλοὺς καὶ ἀπεθνήσκαν ἀπὸ τὸν φόβον τους, καὶ ἔκανάν το τοῦτο πολὺν καιρὸν, ἕως οὔ ὁποῦ ἐγένεν ἕνας πάπας ἁγιος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ αὐτὸς εἶχεν κάμει μεγάλην δέη-

¹⁸ Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope ab Immanuele BEKKERO suppletus et emendatus, 2 vols. Bonn 1838–1839.

¹⁹ Published by PREGER, *Chronik* 12, note 2 from Parisinus gr. 1790.

<p>ὄλους τοὺς ἱερωμένους καὶ ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν. Καὶ ἔκαμαν δέησιν πρὸς Θεὸν μετὰ λιτανείας μεγάλης. Καὶ οὕτως ἔκοψαν αὐτὸ τὸ δένδρον καὶ τὸ ἐξερρίζωσαν. Καὶ ἤϊραν ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ μιὰρὸν κορμὶ τοῦ Νέρωνος καὶ ἔβαλαν φωτῖα καὶ ἔκαψαν αὐτό. Καὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦ δένδρου ἔκτισαν ἐκκλησίαν εἰς ὄνομα τῆς Θεομήτορος Θεοτόκου Μαρίας. Καὶ οὕτως ἐδιώχθησαν παντελῶς ἀπ' ἐκεῖθεν οἱ δαίμονες. Καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὀνομάσθη Θεοτόκος τοῦ λαοῦ ...</p>	<p>σιν πρὸς Θεὸν μὲ μεγάλην λιτὴν ὁμοῦ μὲ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, καὶ τότες ἔκαμεν καὶ ἔκοψαν αὐτὸ τὸ δένδρον. Καὶ ἠύρηκεν τὸ κορμὶ τοῦ Νέρωνος τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκεῖ μέσα, ὅπου τὸ εἶχαν πάρει οἱ διαβόλοι, καὶ ἔκαμε καὶ ἐβγάλαν τὸ ἀπὸ τὸ δένδρον ἐκεῖνο. Καὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον ἔκαμεν καὶ ἔκαμάν του μίαν ἐκκλησίαν, ὅπου τὴν κράζουν Θεοτόκον τοῦ λαοῦ. Καὶ οἱ δαίμονες ἐχάθησαν ἀπόκει.</p>
---	---

Much of the *Chronicle of 1570's* account of the Roman siege and conquest of Jerusalem (*Vivlion Istorikon* 193–195) seems to derive from Kartanos (337v–338v), though it is an agglomeration of sources that needs to be better investigated. To give one possible use of Kartanos:

<p><i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 194</p> <p>Ὅμως ἦλθεν ὁ Τίτος μὲ τὰ φουσάτα του ἔξωθεν τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἔκαμε χαντούκια μεγάλα καὶ βαθέα τὸ γῦρον καὶ ἐπῆρε τὸ νερόν. Καὶ ἐσφάλισεν αὐτοὺς μέσα. Καὶ ἔγινε μεγάλη καταδίκη ἐκεῖ εἰς τοὺς Ἑβραίους. Καὶ μήτε ψωμί, μήτε κρασί, μήτε νερόν, μήτε κρέας, μήτε ἄλλο κανένα πρᾶγμα νὰ φάγη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἠύρισκεν. Καὶ πλέον κρίσις καμία δὲν ἦτον εἰς αὐτοὺς, μόνον ἕνας τὸν ἄλλον ἔκλεπτε καὶ ἐδυνάστευε νὰ πάρη νὰ φάγη.</p>	<p><i>Kartanos</i> 338r</p> <p>Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Οὐεσπεσιανὸς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Τίτος ἔκαμαν καὶ ἔκαμαν τὸ γύρο τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ μεγάλα χαντάκια καὶ ὑπῆραν τους τὸ νερόν, καὶ ἐστάθησαν τόσον, ὅτι εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ δὲν εὐρίσκοτον μήτε ψωμί μήτε κρασί μήτε νερόν μήτε κρέας μήτε ἄλλο κανένα πρᾶγμα φαγούσιμον νὰ ἀγοράσουν, μήτε πλέον ἐκρατοῦσαν κριτήριον ἢ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐγύρευε ἕνας τὸν ἄλλον νὰ κλέφτει.</p>
---	--

The extraordinary passage showing Titus' army as crusaders, though close to Kartanos, has differences which need to be explained:

<p><i>Vivlion Istorikon</i> 193</p> <p>Καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Τίτος ὅλα τὰ φλάμουλα ἄσπρα. Καὶ εἰς τὴν μέσην εἶχεν κόκκινον μέγαν σταυρὸν ἀπὸ πάνω ἕως κάτω. Ὅμοίως καὶ κάθε εἷς στρατιώτης ἐβάστα δύο σταυροὺς κόκκινους ἀπάνω του. Ὁ ἕνας ῥαμμένος εἰς τὸ στήθος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ὀπίσω εἰς τὲς πλάτες.</p>	<p><i>Kartanos</i> 337v–338r</p> <p>... βασιλεὺς Οὐεσπεσιανὸς ἐβάσταιεν διὰ σημάδι τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ εἰς ὅλες του τὶς παντιέρες εἶχεν ἕναν σταυρὸν κόκκινον καὶ οἱ παντιέρες του ἦσαν ὅλες ἄσπρες, μόνον ὁ σταυρὸς ὅπου ἦτον κόκκινος.</p>
---	--

The following sections of the Jerusalem siege certainly derive from elsewhere: *Vivlion Istorikon* 193–194: ὅτι εὐγενεν ὥσπερ φωτῖα ... εἰς αὐτοὺς ὁ τίμιος σταυρός. *Vivlion Istorikon* 194–195: καὶ οὕτως τὸ ἔσφαξα ... καὶ τὸ ὑπῆγαν εἰς τοὺς πρώτους τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ. *Vivlion Istorikon* 195: ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν ὑπερθαύμαστον ναὸν ... κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου.

Such is the presence of Kartanos in the basic and distinctive form of the *Chronicle of 1570*. It is a very limited use, meant to supplement the till now largely unidentified origins of biblical portions of the *Chronicle*.

To turn to *Iviron* 171, where Kartanos has acted as the source for most of the material added throughout the biblical story. The core text of this portion of *Iviron* 171 (the text without these additions) is a copy of an abbreviated version of the *Chronicle of 1570* represented by the imperfectly preserved *Athos Panteleemonos* 266 and the now lost *Kalavrytensis, Megalou Spelaiou* 105.²⁰

Most of the first insertion, on the Lament of Adam, is material from a less conventional version of the *Chronicle of 1570* which remains unpublished.²¹ While included there at an earlier point in the account, it is inserted here, minus its final paragraph, following the Expulsion, which accords with the context of Kartanos.²² In order to break off the account and to return to the standard account of the *Chronicle of 1570*, the outcome of the affair in Kartanos is given in summary (italics). From the comparison it becomes evident how Kartanos is being moderately abbreviated, while some elaborating produces a more even account. The borrowings extend to Kartanos' chapter headings.

<i>Iviron</i> 171 46v–48r	<i>Kartanos</i> 76r–76v
<p>Πῶς ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ ἐστάθησαν νηστικοὶ ἡμέρας ἐννέα</p> <p>Ἦγον ἐβλέποντας ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ ἐπαρ- πονοῦτον ὅπου δὲν εἶχαν φαγὶν νὰ φάγουν. Καὶ ἐπεινοῦσαν πολλὰ. Καὶ εἶχεν γυρεύσει εἰς ὄλον τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον καὶ ὡσὰν τῆς Παραδείσου τὸ φαγὶν δὲν ἤρρισκεν νὰ φάγη. Τότε ἐγύρισε πρὸς τὴν Εὐὰν. Ἡ δὲ Εὐὰ τοῦ εἶπεν· Κύριέ μου, ἐγὼ χάνομαι ἀπὸ τὴν πείναν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐβλέπω καλὰ πῶς ὁ Θεὸς μᾶς ἐκατηράσθη καὶ εἶναι πολλὰ θυμωμένος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ αἰτίαν ἐδική μου, καὶ εὐκόλον εἶναι νὰ σὲ βάλῃ εἰς Παράδεισον ἐσένα, διότι ἀπὸ λόγον μου ἐδιώχθης καὶ ἐσύ. Τότε οὖν ὁ Ἀδὰμ λέγει τῆς Εὐὰς· Πλέον μὴν τολμῆσης νὰ εἰπῆς τοιοῦτον πράγμα, νὰ μὴν σοῦ πέψη ὁ Θεὸς περισσότερον κακὸν ἀπάνω εἰς τοῦτο ὅπου ἔχομεν. Καὶ τοῦτο ὅπου λέγεις ἐσύ, σηκώσου νὰ ὑπᾶμε νὰ εὕρωμεν φαγὶν νὰ φᾶμε νὰ μὴν ἀποθάνωμεν.</p> <p>Πῶς ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ ἤθελαν νὰ νηστεύσουν</p> <p>Λέγει ἡ Εὐὰ· Ὡ κύριέ μου, ἄς κάμωμε ἐκεῖνο ὅπου θέλεις. Καὶ ἦσαν τότε νηστικοὶ ἐννέα ἡμέρας, διότι δὲν ἤρρισκεν φαγὶν ὡσπερ ἐκεῖνο τοῦ Παραδείσου. Μόνον ἤρρισκεν φαγὶ ἀπ' ἐκεῖνο ὅπου ἔτρωγαν τὰ ζῶα. Καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ εἶπεν· Αὐτὰ</p>	<p>Πῶς ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ ἐστάθησαν ἐννέα ἡμέρες νηστικοὶ ὅπου δὲν εὕρισκαν νὰ φᾶν. Κεφ. λα'</p> <p>Ἦβλέποντας ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ ἐπαρπονοῦτον ὅπου δὲν εἶχεν νὰ φάγη καὶ ἐπεινα πολλὰ καὶ εἶχεν γυρέψει ἐπτά ἡμέρες εἰς ὄλον τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον καὶ τέτοιον φαγὶ δὲν ἤρρισκεν νὰ φάγη ὡσπερ ἐκεῖνο τοῦ Παραδείσου, γυρίζει εἰς τὴν Εὐὰ καὶ τότες ἡ Εὐὰ τοῦ λέγει· Ὡ κύριέ μου, ἐγὼ ἔρχομαι νὰ ἀπεθάνω ἀπὸ τὴν πείναν. Σκό- τωσέ με, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἤβλέπω καλὰ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς μᾶς ἐκατηράσθη καὶ ἔναι πολλὰ θυμωμένος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ αἰτία ἐδική μου, καὶ εὐκόλον ἔναι νὰ σὲ βάλῃ εἰς τὸν Παράδεισον ἐσένα ἂν μὲ σκοτώ- σης, διότι δι' ἐμὲ ἐδιώχθης καὶ ἐσύ. Τότες οὖν ὁ Ἀδὰμ λέγει τῆς Εὐὰς· Μὴν τολμῆσης πλέον νὰ εἰπῆς τέτοιον πράγμα, νὰ μὴν σοῦ πέψη ὁ Θεὸς περισσότερον κακὸν ἀπάνω εἰς τοῦτο ὅπου ἔχο- μεν. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐγὼ δὲν ἤθελα κάμει ποτέ μου, νὰ βάλω τὸ χέρι μου εἰς τὸ κρέας μου ἀπάνω καὶ νὰ χύσω τὸ αἷμα μου, ἀμὴ ἀσηκώσου καὶ μὴδὲν στέκωμε ἔτσι, μόνον ἄς ὑπᾶμε νὰ εὕρω- με νὰ φᾶμε νὰ μὴν ἀπεθάνωμεν τῆς πείνας.</p> <p>Πῶς ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ Εὐὰ ἠθέλησαν νὰ νηστεύσουν. Κεφ. λβ'</p> <p>Λέγει ἡ Εὐὰ· Ὡ κύριέ μου, ἄς κάμωμεν ἐκεῖ- νο ὅπου θέλεις. Καὶ ἦσαν τότες νηστικοὶ ἐννέα</p>

²⁰ See note 11 above.

²¹ *Iviron* 171, 41v–46v. It is present, for example, in codex Alexandrinus, Bibliotheca Patriarchalis 97 (ff. 13r–15r). On this manuscript see: N. S. PHILIPPIDES, Κατάλογος τῶν Κωδίκων τῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Ἀλεξανδρείας. *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 38 (1939) 203–219 at 214–215; also in: T. D. MOSCHONAS, Κατάλογοι τῆς Πατριαρχικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης. Τόμος Α': Χειρόγραφα. Alexandria 1945 (reprint Salt Lake City 1965), 68–69.

²² The point of insertion of the Lament is at *Vivlion Istorikon* 17, just after Καὶ καταδικασμένους πολλὰ καὶ ὄνειδισμένους (here and below, I give the readings according to *Iviron* 171).

<p>ὅλα τὰ πράγματα τὰ ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τὰ ζῶα καὶ ἡμᾶς μᾶς ἔδωκεν φαγὶν οὐράνιον, καὶ ἄς κλαύσωμεν λοιπὸν πικρῶς καὶ μετ' εὐλαβείας ὀμπρὸς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μήπως μᾶς ἐλεηθῆ νὰ μᾶς δείξῃ τὸ φαγὶν ὅπου θέλομεν νὰ ζήσωμεν ἀπ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἄς κάμωμεν νηστείαν. <i>Καὶ ἔτζη ἐνήστευσαν ἀμὴ πάλαι ὁ διάβολος ἐγέλασε τὴν Εὐάν καὶ τὴν εὐγάλε ἀπὸ τὴν ἐντολὴν καὶ νηστείαν.</i></p>	<p>ἡμέρες, διότι δὲν ἤρρισκαν φαγὶ ὅπου ἔτρωγαν τὰ ζῶα. Καὶ ἡ Εὐᾶ λέγει· Τοῦτα ὅλα τὰ πράγματα τὰ ἔδωσε ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τὰ ζῶα καὶ ἡμᾶς μᾶς εἶχεν δώσει φαγὶ οὐράνιον, καὶ ἄς κλάψωμεν τὸ λοιπὸν πικρῶς καὶ μετ' εὐλαβείας ὀμπρὸς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μήπως μᾶς ἐλεηθῆ νὰ μᾶς δείξῃ τὸ φαγὶ ὅπου θέλομεν νὰ ζήσωμεν ἀπ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἄς κάμωμεν νηστείαν ...</p>
---	--

The second tract, at *Iviron* 171 50v–52r, contains most of Kartanos' chapter 51 (an interchange between God and Cain after the latter's murder of his brother), viz. 84r–84v (concluding: ἐγένεν καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ...).²³ The borrowing is basically faithful to the source except for the opening lines, which are paraphrased as follows:

<p><i>Iviron</i> 171 50v–51r</p> <p>Ἐπίστευσε οὖν ὅτι δὲν θέλει λάβει ἀπὸ τὸν Θεὸν τὴν ὄργην ὅπου ἔλαβεν. Καὶ ἐσυλλογίσθη κακῶς διότι ὁ Θεὸς καρδιογνώστης καὶ ἀληθινὸς ἐστίν. Τότε ὁ Θεὸς θυμωθεὶς κατ' αὐτοῦ λέγοντας Κάϊν, Κάϊν, ποῦ εἶναι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ὁ Ἄβελ; Καὶ ὁ Κάϊν ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν· Δὲν ἤξεύρω ποῦ εἶναι, μήνα φυλάσσω ἐγὼ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου;</p>	<p><i>Kartanos</i> 84r–84v</p> <p>... καὶ ἐπίστευσε ὅτι δὲν θέλει λάβει ἀπὸ τὸν Θεὸν τὴν ὄργην ὅπου ἔλαβεν, διότι δὲν ἐπίστευσε ὅτι τὸ ἤξεύρει, διότι ἐκεῖ μάρτυρας δὲν ἦτονε, καὶ ἐλογίσθη κακῶς, διότι ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς ἐστὶ καὶ καρδιογνώστης. Καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐθυμώθη κατὰ τοῦ Κάϊν λέγοντας· Κάι, Κάι, ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀδελφός σου ὁ Ἄβελ; Καὶ ὁ Κάϊν ἀπηλογίσθη καὶ λέγει· Ἐγὼ ἐδῶ εἶμαι, ἀμὴ ὁ ἀδελφός μου δὲν ἤξεύρω ποῦ εἶναι, μήνα φυλάγω ἐγὼ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου;</p>
--	--

The third borrowing brings together five different sections of one chapter in Kartanos. The numbers of the sons and daughters of Adam given in Kartanos replace those of the standard chronicle.²⁴ The figure of Cain has been omitted. The conclusion (in italics) is given in part at a later point in Kartanos (italics as well).

<p><i>Iviron</i> 171 54v–55r</p> <p>... καὶ ἀφῆκεν υἱοὺς τριάντα καὶ θυγατέρας τριάντα.</p> <p>Περὶ τὴν γενεαλογίαν τοῦ Σὴθ</p> <p>Καὶ ὅταν ἐγίνη διακοσίων χρονῶν ἐγέννησεν ἕναν υἱὸν ὀνόματι Ἐνώς. Καὶ ἦτον ἄνθρωπος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ζωὴ του καλή. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦτον ὁ πρῶτος ὅπου εἶπε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ Σαβαώθ, καὶ ἤρε φανερά τες προσευχῆς καὶ τὴν θεολογίαν καὶ νὰ γράφουν τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν</p>	<p><i>Kartanos</i> 87v–88v</p> <p>... Καὶ ἐγέννησεν τριάντα υἱοὺς καὶ τριάντα θυγατέρες ... Καὶ ὅταν ἦτον εἰς καιρὸν διακοσίων χρονῶν ἐγέννησεν ἕναν υἱὸν ὀνόματι Ἐνώς καὶ ἦτον ἅγιος ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἡ ζωὴ του καλή, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦτον ὁ πρῶτος ὅπου εἶπε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ Σαβαώθ, καὶ ἤρε φανερά τες προσευχῆς καὶ τὴν θεολογίαν καὶ νὰ γράφουν τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα ... Καὶ ὅταν ἦτον τοῦτος ὁ Ἐνώς χρονῶν ἑκατὸν ἔνε</p>
---	--

²³ The point of insertion is at *Vivlion Istorikon* 18: Ἐπειτα τὸν ἀφῆκεν καὶ ὑπῆγεν. The standard account recommences at *Vivlion Istorikon* 19: Ὅμως ὡσὰν ἔλαβεν τὴν κατάραν ὑπῆγεν καὶ ἑκατοίησεν ἐν γῆ Ναῖδ. The intervening account in the conventional work is absent (presumably as was the case in the acephalous *Pantel*. 266).

²⁴ *Vivlion Istorikon* 20 ... ἀφῆκεν υἱοὺς λγ' καὶ θυγατέρας κζ'; which is the point of insertion.

<p>Τριάδαν. Καὶ ὅταν ἦτον τοῦτος ὁ Ἐνὼς χρονῶν ἑκατὸν ἐνενηήντα ἐγέννησε τὸν Μαλελεήλ, καὶ Μαλελεήλ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰάρεδ, Ἰάρεδ ἐγέννησε τὸν δεῦτερον Ἐνώχ. Καὶ τοῦτος ἦτον ὁ πρῶτος ὁ προφήτης ὅπου ἐδίδαξε τὰ πράγματα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐβλέποντας ἀπάνω εἰς ἓνα ἀμάξι πύρινον καὶ ἐπῆρε τον εἰς τὸν Παράδεισον. Καὶ τοῦτος ὁ Ἐνώχ ἐμπροσθύτερα παρὰ νὰ παρθῆ εἰς τὸν Παράδεισον ἐγέννησεν ἓναν υἱὸν ὀνόματι Μαθουσάλα. <i>Καὶ ὁ Μαθουσάλας ἐγέννησε τὸν Λάμεχ, ἐγέννησε τὸν Νῶε.</i></p>	<p>νήντα ἐγέννησεν τὸν Καινάν, Καινὰς δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Μαλελεήλ, Μαλελεήλ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰάρεδ, Ἰάρεδ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν δεῦτερον Ἐνώχ. Καὶ τοῦτος ἦτον ὁ πρῶτος ὁ προφήτης ὅπου ἐδίδαξε τὰ πράγματα τοῦ Θεοῦ ... ὁ Θεὸς ἠβλέποντας τὴν ἀγίαν αὐτοῦ ζωὴν ἐβαλέ τον ἀπάνω εἰς ἓνα ἀμάξι πύρινο καὶ ὑπῆρε τον εἰς τὸν Παράδεισον ... Καὶ τοῦτος ὁ Ἐνώχ ἐμπροσθύτερα παρὰ νὰ παρθῆ εἰς τὸν Παράδεισον ἐγέννησεν ἓναν υἱὸν ὀνόματι Μαθουσάλα ... 95r: <i>Καὶ ὁ Λάμεχ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Μαθουσάλα ...</i></p>
---	---

The fourth borrowing, at *Iviron* 171 56v–65v, on the Story of the Flood and Noah’s drunkenness, is very extensive and derives from seven different portions of four chapters in *Kartanos* (69–71, 73). I give the first borrowing (with italics for text from the standard chronicle – viz. *Vivlion Istorikon* 20, 21, and bold for the text of *Kartanos* that is *not* reproduced). One can see how good *Kartanos* has been integrated into the standard account of the Chronicle:

<i>Iviron</i> 171 56v–57v	<i>Kartanos</i> 95v
<p>Τότε ὁ Θεὸς ἰδόντα τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ὅτι δὲν ἐπιστρέφονται, ἔστειλε τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν τοῦ Νῶε ὅτι νὰ κάμη τὴν κιβωτὸν διὰ νὰ γλυτώσῃ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ του καὶ τὰ παιδιά αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ νυφάδες του καὶ τὰ ζῶα του τὰ ἀρσενικὰ καὶ τὰ θηλυκὰ, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς θέλει νὰ στείλῃ μέγαν κατακλυσμὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν. Καὶ τότε ὁ Νῶε ἦτον τετρακοσίων χρονῶν καὶ πλέον.</p> <p>Πῶς ὁ Νῶε ἔκοψε τὰ ξύλα νὰ κάμη τὴν κιβωτόν. Καὶ παρευθὺς ἄρχισε καὶ ἔκοπτε τὰ ξύλα διὰ νὰ κάμη τὴν ἄρκλαν ἡγουν τὴν κιβωτόν. Καὶ ἄρχισε καὶ ἔκτιζε τὴν κιβωτὸν μεγάλην καὶ πλατεῖαν καὶ δυνταῖν καὶ καλὰ καρφωμένην. Καὶ τόσον πολλὴν καιρὸν τὴν ἐδούλευε ὅτι εἰς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι χρόνους τὴν ἐτελείωσε. <i>Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μᾶκρος τοῦ καιροῦ ὅπου τὴν ἔκτιζε ἦτον μήπως καὶ ἐπιστραφῆ ὁ λαὸς ἀπὸ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν ...</i></p>	<p>Λοιπὸν λέγω ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἠξεύροντας τὰς καλοσύνας τοῦ Νῶε καὶ τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ τῆν ἀγίαν, ἔστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον λέγοντάς του ὅτι νὰ κάμη τὴν κιβωτὸν διὰ νὰ γλύσῃ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ φαμελία του, ἡγουν ἡ γυναῖκα του καὶ τὰ παιδιά του καὶ οἱ νυφάδες του καὶ τὰ ζῶα τὰ ἀρσενικὰ καὶ τὰ θηλυκὰ, ὡσπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἠθέλησεν, διὰ νὰ μὴν χαθῆ ἡ σπορά. Διότι ὁ Θεὸς ἠθέλεν νὰ στείλῃ μέγαν κατακλυσμὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν. Καὶ τότε ὁ Νῶε ἦτον τετρακοσίων χρονῶν καὶ πλέον. Καὶ παρευθὺς τὸ νὰ ἤκουσε τὸν ὀρισμὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄρχισε καὶ ἔκοπτε τὰ ξύλα διὰ νὰ κάμη τὴν ἄρκλαν, ἡγουν τὴν κιβωτόν. Καὶ ἄρχισε καὶ ἔκτιζε τὴν κιβωτὸν μεγάλη καὶ χοντρὴ καὶ δυνταῖ καὶ καλὰ καρφωμένη. Καὶ τόσον πολλὴν καιρὸν τὴν ἐδούλευεν, ὅτι εἰς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι χρόνους τὴν ἐτελείωσεν. Καὶ ἔλαχε καὶ εἰς τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν εἶχε πολλὰς συγχύσεις καὶ ἀνακατώματα, ὅτι ὁ διάβολος τὸν ἔσκωπτε πολλὰ ...</p>

The standard Chronicle material is present up to the words: ἐνέπαιζον τοὺς λόγους τοῦ Νῶε (*Vivlion Istorikon* 21), which is the only principal reproduction of the standard work within the fourth borrowing. The second passage from *Kartanos* (*Iviron* 171 58r) and the third, which is extensive (58r–64r), are both effectively faithful to the source (which includes the titles of chapters 70–71); viz.: *Kartanos* 96r: Καὶ ἠξεύρετε ὅτι ἡ ἄρκλα ... ὁ ἓνας πήχας ἑπτὰ ποδάρια; and 96r–98r: Καὶ τὸ σκέπασμά της ... νὰ εὐρίσκει τροφήν. The intervening text in *Iviron* 171 (58r): ἦτον γοῦν τὸ μᾶκρος τῆς κιβωτοῦ τριά-

να πέντε χιλιάδες πῆγες has been paraphrased from the intervening lines in Kartanos (96r). The fourth to seventh passages from Kartanos, all small, are stitched together to lead on to a passage on Noah's shame (*Iviron* 171 64r–65v), which is otherwise absent from the tradition of the *Chronicle of 1570*.²⁵ It is unclear if this text begins with the opening phrase in the corresponding section of Kartanos (101v) (quoted in brackets below). If this is so, then the number of passages from Kartanos is eight. I give the text of *Iviron* 171 beginning with the borrowings of the third passage of Kartanos, where one finds a fragment from the standard chronicle (in italics). Once again the Kartanos material is well edited.

<i>Iviron</i> 171 64r–64v	<i>Kartanos</i> 98v, 99r, 100v (101v)
<p>Καὶ ὅταν ἐξεσκεπάσθη ἡ γῆς εὐγῆκεν ἔξω ὁ Νῶε μὲ ὄλην του τὴν φαμελίαν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐλευθερίαν ὀλονῶν τῶν ζώων, καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰ καὶ ὄρισέ τα τότες, ὅτι νὰ προβλέπη πᾶσα ἓνα διὰ τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ νὰ εὐρίσκη τροφήν. Ἐδὼ ἄρχισεν ὁ δεῦτερος καιρὸς.</p> <p>Καὶ ἀφοῦ εὐγῆκεν ὁ Νῶε ἀπὸ τὴν ἄρκλαν ἄρχισεν ὁ δεῦτερος καιρὸς καὶ ἐδούρησε δύο χιλιάδες διακοσίους σαράντα δύο χρόνους καλά, ἦγουν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἕως τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἀπέρασαν χρόνοι βσμβ. Ἐζῆσε δὲ ὁ Νῶε χρόνους χιλίους τετρακοσίους ἐνενηντα ἑπτὰ. Καὶ τοῦτος ὁ Νῶε ἦτον ὁ πρῶτος ὁποῦ ἐφύτευσε τὸ κλῆμα. Καὶ τὸ ἐφύτευσε εἰς τὴν Ρωμανίαν καὶ ἔκαμεν σταφύλια. Ἐστηψε δὲ ὁ Νῶε τὰ (στα)φύλια ἐκεῖνα τοῦ κλημάτου καὶ ἔκαμε κρασί καὶ ἔπιε ...</p>	<p>Καὶ ὅταν ἐξισκεπάσθη ἡ γῆς, ὁ Νῶε μὲ ὄλην του τὴν φαμελίαν ἐβγῆκε ἔξω ἀπὸ τὴν ἄρκλαν καὶ ἔδωσε ἐλευθερίαν ὀλονῶν τῶν ζώων καὶ εὐλόγησέ τα καὶ ὄρισέ τα τότες ὅτι νὰ προηβλέπη πᾶσα ἓνα διὰ τὴν ζωὴν του νὰ εὐρίσκη τροφήν ... Καὶ ἀφοῦ ὁ Νῶε ἐβγῆκε ἀπὸ τὴν ἄρκλαν ἄρχισε ὁ δεῦτερος καιρὸς καὶ ἐδούρησε δύο χιλιάδες διακοσίους σαράντα δύο χρόνους καλά ... ἔζησε ὁ Νῶε ... χίλιοι τετρακόσιοι ἐνενηντα ἑπτὰ χρόνους ... Καὶ ἠξεύρετε ὅτι ὁ Νῶε ἦτον ὁ πρῶτος ὁποῦ ἐφύτευσε τὸ ἀμπέλιον διὰ νὰ κάμη κρασί. Καὶ ἐφύτευσέ το εἰς τὴν Ρωμανίαν καὶ ἦσαν τὰ ἀμπέλια ἄσπρα καὶ μαῦρα, ἦγουν ἔκανεν τὰ σταφύλια ... (ἔζησέ τα ὁ Νῶε καὶ ἔπιεν ...)</p>

The fifth borrowing (on God's promise to Abraham and his age at the time) is by far the briefest. Kartanos has been integrated into the text of the standard chronicle which is here present in paraphrase (in italics) (presumably inherited from the version imperfectly preserved in *Pantel*. 266).²⁶ I give text omitted from Kartanos in italics.

<i>Iviron</i> 171 69v–70v	<i>Kartanos</i> 121v–122v
<p><i>Ὅμως ὡς ἐφάνη ὁ Ἀβραὰμ ἦτον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ φόβος τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπορεύετον εἰς τὰ θελήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ οὕτως τοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς: Εὐγα ἀπὸ τὴν πατρίδα σου καὶ ἀπὸ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου καὶ ἀπὸ τὰ πράγματά σου καὶ ἀπὸ τὰ πράγματα τοῦ πατρός σου, καὶ ἔλα εἰς τὸν τόπον ὁποῦ θέλω σοῦ δείξει. Καὶ θέλω σὲ κάμει κύριον εἰς ἔθνη μεγάλα, καὶ νὰ σὲ εὐλογῆσει, καὶ νὰ εἶσαι εὐλογημένος. Καὶ ὅσοι σὲ εὐλογοῦν θέλω τοὺς εὐλογῆσει, καὶ ὅσοι σὲ καταροῦ</i></p>	<p>Καὶ μίαν ἡμέραν λέγει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ: Ἔβγα ἀπὸ τὴν γῆν σου καὶ ἀπὸ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου καὶ ἀπὸ τὸ σπίτι τοῦ πατρός σου καὶ σύρε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην ὁποῦ σοῦ θέλω δείξει ἐγὼ καὶ θέλω σὲ κάμει εἰς μεγάλο ἔθνος πρῶτον καὶ θέλω σὲ εὐλογῆσει καὶ θέλω μεγαλύνει τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ θέλεις εἶσαι εὐλογημένος καὶ θέλω εὐλογῆσει ἐκείνους ὁποῦ σὲ θέλουν καλολογεῖ καὶ ἐκείνους ὁποῦ θέλουν σὲ κακολογουν θέλω τοὺς κατηρασθῆ. <i>Καὶ εἰς ἑσένα θέλουν εὐλογῆ</i></p>

²⁵ The standard account recommences at *Vivlion Istorikon* 22 (quoted again from *Iviron* 171): ἐγιναν ἀπέγκονες τοῦ Νῶε ἄνδρες ἄνδρεῖοι καὶ ὑψηλόφρονες Μεσρέμ καὶ Νεβρώδ.

²⁶ The entire passage quoted lies between *Vivlion Istorikon* 24–26 (according to *Iviron* 171): ... πρῶτοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων μόνον αὐτοὶ ἔκαμαν εἰς αὐτοὺς βασιλείαν | Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ὁποῦ ἑκατοικοῦσαν εἰς τὰ Σόδομα ...

<p>νται θέλω τους κατηρασθῆ. <i>Καὶ ἔτσι ὁ Ἀβραὰμ εὐγῆκε ἀπὸ τὴν πατρίδα του, ἡ ὁποία ἦτον ἡ γῆ τῶν Χαλδαίων, καὶ ἦλθεν μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Σάρας καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ἀνιμιοῦ αὐτοῦ Λῶτ καὶ μὲ ὅλα του τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ μὲ ὅλα του τὰ ζῶα, καὶ βίον καὶ ἄλλα πράγματα ὅτι ἦτον πολλὰ πλούσιος. Καὶ ἦλθε εἰς τὴν Χαναὰν καθὼς τοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός.</i> Ἦτον δὲ τότε ὁ Ἀβραὰμ χρονῶν ἑβδομήντα πέντε. Ὅμως ὡσὰν ἔμεινεν ὁ Ἀβραὰμ εἰς τὴν γῆν Χαναὰν ὑπῆγεν ὁ ἀνεμιὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ αὐτὸς Λῶτ καὶ ἐκατοίκησεν εἰς τὰ Σόδομα.</p>	<p><i>θῆ ὅλες οἱ φυλὲς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Καὶ ἔτσι ἐβγῆκεν ὁ Ἀβραὰμ ὡς καθὼς τοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, καὶ ὑπῆγε μετ' αὐτὸν ὁ Λῶτ. Καὶ ὁ Ἀβραὰμ τότες ἦτονε χρονῶν ἑβδομήντα πέντε ...</i></p>
---	---

The sixth borrowing serves to conclude the account of the standard Chronicle on Lot's attempt at forgiveness for sin and on the Tree of Salvation.²⁷ Here Kartanos supplements the account with new aspects to the tale; viz. *Iviron* 171 82r–83v: Καὶ ἦτον τὸ βουνὸ ἀγνάντια ἀπὸ τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ. ... Καὶ τοὺς ἔστρεψε μαζί καὶ ἐχάρη. = *Kartanos* 132r–133v: ... βουνὸν ἀγνάντια ἀπὸ τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ ... καὶ ἔστριψέ τους ἀντάμα.²⁸ At this point the Chronicle reproduces standard text: 83v–84r: Καὶ παρευθὺς ἔδραμεν εἰς τὸν θεῖον αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῦ ... Τοῦτο τὸ ξύλον εἶναι ὅπου θέλει κόψει καὶ νὰ ἀφανίσῃ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν. Borrowing from Kartanos then recommences: *Iviron* 171 84r–84v: Καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ δένδρον λέγουν ὅτι ἔκοψαν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι ... ὃ τρισκατάρατον ξύλον. = *Kartanos* 133r–133v: ... καὶ ἐκεῖνο τὸ δένδρον λέγουν ὅτι ἔκοψαν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι ... ὃ τρισκατάρατον ξύλον. Kartanos thereupon provides an alternative version on the origins of the Tree of the Cross (that it grew from a seed planted by Seth in the dead Adam's mouth), before concluding with the original version (133v–134r). *Iviron* 171 84v–85r attacks this alternative version before reproducing freely Kartanos' phrases about the spot where the branches sprouted (in italics):

Καὶ λέγουν πάλιν ἄλλοι ὅτι ὁ Σῆθ τὰ εἶχεν φυτεύσῃ ὅπου ἐπῆρε τὸν σπόρον ἀπὸ τὸν παράδεισον καὶ τὰ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ ἐκεῖνα ἐξεφύτευσαν. Ἀμὴ αὐτὸ εἶναι ψέματα. Ἀμὴ ἐκεῖ ὅπου ἐφύτευσεν ὁ Λῶτ τοὺς τρεῖς δαυλοὺς εἶναι τὴν σήμερον μοναστήρι τῶν Ἰβήρων καὶ ὀνομάζεται εἰς τὸν Σταυρὸν κάτω εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

The final borrowing (on the Joseph story) at first reproduces virtually all of Kartanos, ch. 103 in two stages; viz. *Iviron* 171 88r–90v: Εὐρίσκεται δὲ γεγραμμένον ὅτι ὁ Ἰωσήφ ... Καὶ ἔτσι τὸν ἔβαλαν εἰς ἓνα λάκκον. = *Kartanos* 145v–146v: Εὐρίσκεται γραμμένον ὅτι ὁ Ἰωσήφ ... Καὶ ἔτσι τὸν ἔβαλαν εἰς ἓναν λάκκον. Standard material follows (90v–91r): Καὶ ἔκαμεν τρία ἡμερονύκτια ἐκεῖ ... τὸν ἐπῆραν οἱ Ἰσμαηλίται εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον.²⁹ Most of the concluding portions of Kartanos, ch. 103 follow (*Iviron* 171 91r): ... καὶ ἡ μάνα τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ἡ Ραχήλ ... καὶ ἔσφαζαν ἓνα κατζίκι ... = *Kartanos* 146v: ... ἡ μάνα του ἡ Ραχήλ ... καὶ ἐσκότωσαν ἓνα κατσίκι ...; followed by text from the standard Chronicle according to the abbreviated version: *Iviron* 91v–96v: ... καὶ τὸ αἱμάτωσαν ... καὶ ἀκρίβεια πολλή.³⁰

²⁷ The account is absent from the *Vivlion Istorikon* and remains unpublished (replaced in *Vivlion Istorikon* 31 with the words τοῦτο μήτε ἡ θεία γραφή τὸ λέγει μήτε ἡ ἐκκλησία τὸ παραδέχεται). For the text, see e.g. *Alexandrinus* 97, 26v–28r.

²⁸ The borrowing is, however, without the sentence on the nature of the tree because this has been dealt with previously through the Chronicle's standard account.

²⁹ *Vivlion Istorikon* 35. This replaces the two lines in Kartanos between the two borrowings (146v): καὶ μόνον ἔρχονται οἱ πραγματευτάδες καὶ ὑπᾶν καὶ πουλοῦν τον ἐκεῖνων διὰ τριάντα ἀργύρια καὶ ὑπῆραν τον εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον. Καὶ διότι ... (ἡ μάνα του ἡ Ραχήλ etc.)

³⁰ *Pantel*. 266 1v–3r (cf. *Vivlion Istorikon* 35–39).

Enmeshed within this is text from Kartanos 148r–148v in heavy paraphrase. It is unclear how the sum of fourteen years of imprisonment has been arrived at; only the final two years are included in the standard work (*Vivlion Istorikon* 38), while Kartanos gives eleven (148r) and two (148v) respectively, and a total of thirteen (149r).³¹ The remainder of Kartanos, ch. 104 is reproduced in full, except for the concluding twelve lines; *Iviron* 97r–105v: Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὃ βασιλεῦ ... ἦλθαν υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τὴν Αἴγυπτον. = Kartanos 149r–152v: ... καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃ βασιλέα ... ἦλθαν υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τὴν Αἴγυπτον Thereupon the standard account recommences according to the abbreviated version.³²

Thus, in *Iviron* 171 we find extensive use of Kartanos which contrasts with the very limited borrowings present in the more standard form of the *Chronicle of 1570*. The interest in *Iviron* 171 is to provide ‘original’ text that supplements, and at times replaces, the conventional material, and so to produce a new and rather unique variant of the Chronicle. To this end, the extensive borrowings from Kartanos have served the chronicler well.

In the above we have detailed the presence of Kartanos in the Chronicle of 1570 – limited in the case of its mainstream form (with a debt that remains to be precisely defined), but substantial in the case of one of the variants. For Kartanos this demonstrates an acknowledged place in the history of Byzantine chronography (which had already emerged with the identification of the Chronicle of Glykas as one of his principal sources). For the *Chronicle of 1570* it leaves us still having to identify the basic source of its biblical portions.

³¹ *Iviron* 171 95v: Ἐκαμε δὲ ὁ Ἰωσήφ εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν μέσα χρόνους δώδεκα, ὅταν ἔβαλαν τὸν κεραστὴν μετὰ τὸν ψωμῶν. Καὶ ἀπότης εὐγῆκεν ὁ κεραστὴς ἕκαμεν ἀκόμη ἄλλους δύο χρόνους. Ὅπου γίνονται ὅλοι χρόνοι δεκατέσσαροι ὅπου ἕκαμεν ὁ Ἰωσήφ εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν.

³² *Pantel*. 266 4r (cf. *Vivlion Istorikon* 43).

