The Short Greek Recension of the *Barlaam and Joasaph*

Basil Lourié
Institute of Philosophy and Law, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Editor-in-Chief, Scrinium

Key Words: *Barlaam and Joasaph; Short Greek recension; translation; Byzantine literature*

Introduction \ Abstract

The legend about Barlaam and Joasaph was known in many recensions, both Christian and Islamised, where, nevertheless, the plot was basically the same. However, in 1996, Inmaculada Pérez Martín noticed a story whose plot was quite different, whereas Barlaam and Joasaph themselves remained recognisable (Pérez, M. I., 1996, p. 175). Since then, Robert Volk has published the text from the unique manuscript, codex F 16 (= gr. 82) of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome, ff. 303^{r} – 306^{r}.[1] After 2006, there was no study dedicated to this hagiographical document, except my own 2011 article that touched it rather tangentially (Lourié, B., 2011, pp. 134-141).

Unfortunately, the text has a large lacuna, seemingly in the most interesting part, which begins shortly after the culmination of the intrigue and ends at the very end of the story. At least, one folio is lost, but perhaps more.

In my opinion that I substantiate elsewhere (Lourié, B., 2022), this text is crucial for understanding the proliferation of the Christian recensions of the legend of Barlaam and Joasaph. I call it "short Greek Recension." Such a nomenclature could be useful when dealing with the early recensions of the legend preserved in different languages, even though it could be misleading in the properly Byzantine context, where are a number of abbreviated recensions (epitomes and synaxarium entries) derived from the most known long Greek one. My present communication is aimed at providing an outline of the short Greek recension with a commentary.

[1] As "Appendix IV. Narratio de Barlaam et Iosaphat filii regis Pythagorae" in Robert Volk (Volk, R., 2006, pp. 433-439, 436-439) will be referred to below by the page numbers in the text.

The text ends with a remark by the anonymous copyist stating that he wrote it on March 6, 1441 (p. 439, apparatus; cf. Volk's preface, p. 433). Both Pérez Martín and Volk characterise this copyist as "semianalfabeto, seguramente un monje, de origen latino" (Pérez, M. I., 1996, p. 175) His Greek does not meet the standards of a high-style literature and contains features of the vernacular.

The name of the prince, Ἰωσαφάτ instead of the normative Greek Ἰωάσαφ, made Volk think that this recension was influenced by Latin versions (p. 434). He did not say, however, that the Greek text is a translation from Latin. We will return to this question below for demonstrating that the present Greek text is a translation from Latin, but its lost Latin original was, in turn, a translation from Greek.

Synopsis of the Short Greek Recension

Below I summarise the content of what remains of the short Greek recension. I will add only minimal comments which highlight features relevant for hagiographical analysis (especially any mention of numbers that are always quite important in the present hagiographical genre which Hippolyte Delehaye called *épique*). I divide the text into numbered chapters. The line numbers throughout the entire text are provided by the editor. The Greek quotations follow, if not otherwise stated, the text established by Robert Volk and not the manuscript.

Title: Λόγος ἐκ τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Βαρλαάμ, ὃς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Πυθαγόρα καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν υἱόν του τὸν Ἰωσαφὰτ εἰς ἄσκησιν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Σινᾷ (p. 436.1-3) — "Sermon from (?) our holy father Barlaam that entered the house of King Pythagoras and took his son Josaphat to asceticism in Mount Sinai." The title implies that the text is attributed to Barlaam himself. In fact, the text runs as an account of Barlaam but not from the mouth of Barlaam himself. Λόγος ἐκ τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς instead of the expected Λόγος τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς could be best explained as a Latinism (ἐκ = *de*). Together with the name of the prince, Josaphat, this is an argument in favour of the Latin original beside our Greek.

In the title or within the text or in both places, an indication of the commemoration day would be expected. This is not the case with our recension that presents itself as an edifying tale (*narratio animae utilis*, the genre where hagiography severs its connexion to the liturgical calendar).

Chapter 1 (p. 436.4-6), on Pythagoras. He was a pagan king in an unnamed country. He was, nevertheless, benign (ἐλεήμων). He was childless and prayed to God (in singular!) for having a child, either male or female.

Chapter 2 (p. 436.7-14), birth of Josaphat and astrologers' prognosis that he will become a Christian and a monk. King's wife (here still unnamed) "conceived and gave birth" after **18 years** of king's prayers.

Chapter 3 (p. 436.15-437.26): the king decided to throw the child into the sea, but the king's grandees (μεγιστᾶνες) asked him not to do this. In their argumentation, they mention especially that this would cause an enormous affliction of the queen, while they do not call the queen by name. We should notice that, even without appearing in person, the queen is represented as an intercessor of the prince in front of his father. The grandees proposed to allow the child to grow up and, then, they promised to instruct him how to follow their religion. The king agreed.

Chapter 4 (p. 437.27-44): the child grew up and reached the age of **11**; the king invited his grandees asking them to fulfil their promise. Firstly, the grandees asked the king to order the queen[1] to leave the palace. The queen continues to be unnamed. Then, they asked the king to invite to the palace musicians and a number of handsome girls and boys of the same age as the prince. Finally, they asked to guard the palace with three watch regiments (καὶ βάλον καὶ καπικλαρίους τρεῖς φυλάσσοντας τὸ παλάτιον). The Latin borrowing καπικλάριος (from *clavicularius*, through κλαβικουλάριος) is normal for the Middle Byzantine Greek,[2] and, therefore, does not point to a Latin original. The king agreed, and the prince spent **12 years** in this manner.

Chapter 5 (p. 437.45-438.54): divine revelation through an angel to monk Barlaam in Mount Sinai—when the **12 years** were over. The angel ordered that he take Josaphat from the palace, because he will be "a chosen vessel" (Acts 9:15). There follows an instruction from the mouth of the angel, which is rather unusual: "And go out to a human grave and take one head with the jaw and demonstrate to him (καὶ ἄπελθε καὶ εἰς μνημεῖον ἀνθρώπου καὶ λάβε μίαν κεφαλὴν μετὰ τὴν σιαγόνα καὶ δείξε αὐτοῦ)." Barlaam answered that he is afraid of losing his own head. The angel instructed him further: "Go out and say to the guards: 'I have a request (θέλημα) to his father Pythagoras, and I bear a priceless stone to him' (Ἄπελθε καὶ εἰπὲ πρὸς τοὺς φύλακας, ὅτι 'θέλημα ἔχω εἰς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Πυθαγόρα, καὶ λίθον ἀτίμητον βαστάζω αὐτῷ')".[3] The use of pronouns

---

[1] And not only the queen: ἡ βασίλισσα <...> καὶ πᾶσα ἡ π..νεικεία αὐτῆς (the leaf is damaged). We will return to this phrase below.

[2] Cf. Erich Trapp, hrsg., *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität*, on-line edition at http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lbg/ (LBG), *s.v.* κλαβικουλάριος.

[3] My translation of the phrase θέλημα ἔχω εἰ ς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ is justified with its repetition in the next section. I understand θέλημα in one of its meanings in the late mediaeval Greek, "request" (αίτημα): Εμμανουήλ Κριαρά, *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημώδους γραμματείας. 1100-1669.* Τόμος ζ' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας, 1980) 94-95, at 95. The overall meaning of the sentence is of the kind "I have a request (a problem to resolve) for the king, and I would like to present a gift to the prince."

in this sentence would suggest a rather careless abbreviation of an earlier text: their antecedents are never indicated explicitly. The wording of this passage is inspired by Acts 9:15 (ὅτι **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς** ἐστίν μοι οὗτος τοῦ **βαστάσαι** τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων υἱῶν τε Ἰσραήλ "for he is a chosen vessel of Mine to bear My name before gentiles, kings, and the children of Israel"), thus alluding to a symbolical link between the priceless stone and the name of Christ. The angel assured that he will be with Barlaam who, therefore, has nothing to fear.

Chapter 6 (p. 438.55-57): Barlaam's journey. Chapter's text in full: "Thus, the elder, after having taken his mantle and his staff, put also a skull on (in?) his bosom. And the elder arrived at the palace (Ὧδε ὁ γέρων λαβών τὸ παλλίον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βακτηρίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ κρανίον ἔβαλεν ἐπὶ τὸν κόλπον αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν <ἐν> τῷ παλατίῳ ὁ γέρων)." This chapter looks severely abbreviated by a mediaeval editor. The skull appears as if *ex nihilo*. The Latin word παλλίον (*pallium*) in the meaning "monastic mantle" was borrowed in the early period of monasticism.

Chapter 7 (p. 438.58-63): Barlaam's dialogue with the guards. The guards asked Barlaam where he wishes to go addressing him ἀδελφέ ("oh brother"). Barlaam's answer repeats the instruction of the angel but with an alteration: Josaphat himself is called "king": "To king Josaphat, and I have a priceless stone to give him, and I have a request to his father Pythagoras (Εἰς βασιλέα τὸν Ἰωσαφάτ, καὶ ἀτίμητον λίθον ἔχω να δώσω αὐτῷ, καὶ θέλημα ἔχω εἰς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Πυθαγόρα)." This answer worked with the first and the second guards but not with the third. To the third, the elder said: "Brothers, I bear a priceless stone to him (Ἀδελφοί, ἀτίμητον λίθον βαστάζω αὐτῷ)." One can wonder whether this answer is much different from the previous, but Barlaam succeeded. Once more, we can suppose that something in the account was left out by a mediaeval editor. The particular purpose of the third guard became unclear. Josaphat will be called "king" and not "prince" also in the next chapter (where he is called "king" three times); he is never called "prince" throughout the text but only "king." It remains unknown whether there was any real θέλημα for the king from Barlaam's part, but one can suppose that, even in this respect, the text is somewhat abbreviated.

Chapter 8 (p. 438.64-75): the meeting between Barlaam and Josaphat, Josaphat's conversion. This scene is the culmination of the whole account—at least, in its preserved part. We will examine it in detail below. Even now, however, we must notice that the precious stone does not play any role in Barlaam's conversation with the prince and even is not mentioned at all. It is completely forgotten—in a sharp contrast with the precious pearl in the long Greek version where it is used by Barlaam as the starting point for his preaching. It could hardly be otherwise in the present scene, and, therefore, we have to suppose, at this place of our text, one more case of abbreviation.

Chapter 9 (p. 438.75-439.85): Josaphat's flight. Immediately after having received the Holy Spirit, Josaphat asked Barlaam about his monastery and, after having heard that it is on Mount Sinai, asked Barlaam to take him there. Barlaam said that he has no mean to escape the guard. Josaphat asked to cover him under Barlaam's monastic mantle (τὸ παλλίον), and Barlaam agreed. Then, Josaphat "…having put his dresses off, remained only in the pants (Καὶ ἐκδυσάμενος τοὺς χιτῶνας μόνον μετὰ βρακὸς ἦν)"; the reading βρακὸς is here restored by Volk from ὁρακὸς in the manuscript. This is another Latin loanword (from *braca* > βράκα) that was borrowed no later than in the Middle Byzantine period and, therefore, does not suggest that our text was translated from Latin. Barlaam put Josaphat on the right side of him and covered him with the mantle. They passed unnoticed through the guards and reached Mount Sinai.

This scene has a parallel in the long Greek recension: before Barlaam's departure to the desert, Joasaph asked him to leave "this stiff cloth and the coarse mantle, both as a memory of your spiritual fatherhood and as a phylactery for me against any satanic activity (τὸ ἐρρικνωμένον ἐκεῖνο ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸ τραχὺ παλλίον, ἅμα μὲν εἰς μνήμην τῆς σῆς πνευματικῆς πατρότητος, ἅμα δὲ εἰς φυλακτήριον ἐμοὶ πάσης σατανικῆς ἐνεργείας)" in exchange of his own dresses (Volk, R., 2006, pp. 205-206). Non-Christian recensions also contain a scene of a mutual exchange of clothes, but, in Christian recensions, it acquires a specific meaning. Putting on oneself a monastic dress, especially the mantle, means the initiation into monasticism: cf. the mantle (μηλωτή) of Paul of Thebes transmitted to Anthony the Great, which, in turn, goes back to the mantle of Elijah transmitted to Elisha (2 Kings 2).[1]

Chapter 10 (p. 439.86-94): Josaphat's flight is discovered. "Two days later (Καὶ μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας)," Josaphat's father noticed that there was no music to be heard from the palace. He thus decided that his son was either ill or dead. He entered the palace and discovered that his son had disappeared. "He interrogated the guards with great tortures" (καὶ μετὰ μεγάλων κριτηρίων ἐξέταζεν τοὺς καπικλαρίους) but in vain. "Only his (Josaphat's) mother Philippa saw in a dream in her bead that an eagle with golden wings saw and took him, and she went and told her lord. And after that, he stopped the tortures, and sent the army everywhere… (Μόνον δὲ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ ἡ Φιλίππα [ms. φηλήππα] εἶδεν κατ' ὄναρ ἐν τῷ κοιτῶνι αὐτῆς, ὅτι ἀετὸς χρυσοπτέρυγος εἶδεν καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐλθὼν καὶ ἐλάλησεν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτῆς. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔπαυσεν τῶν κριτηρίων καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν στρατὸν ἅπαν<τα>χοῦ)." Here, the text breaks. In this chapter, for the first time, prince's mother is called by name.

[1] On the meaning of monastic clothes, especially the mantle, see, e.g., (Wawryk, M., 1968).

Chapter 11 (after the break) (p. 439.96-99): the end of the story. Chapter's text in full: "'…11,' said to him. And one year later, Pythagoras his father died, and he was on Mount Sinai. And after having lived as a monk for 8 years, together with Barlaam [after the repose of] the father, he reposed in the Lord, to whom the glory in the ages of the ages. Amen (...ια' ἔφη αὐτῷ. Καὶ μετὰ χρόνον ἕνα ἀπέθανεν Πυθαγόρας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Σινᾷ [ms. ὁρινὰ corrected by Volk to ὄρει τῷ Σινᾷ]. Καὶ μονάσας χρόνους η' μετὰ Βαρλαὰμ [here I suppose an omission of some words by a *lapsus calami*, e.g., μετὰ θανάτου] τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐκοιμήθη ἐν κυρίῳ. Αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνον. Ἀμήν)". The phrase μετὰ Βαρλαὰμ τοῦ πατρὸς as we read it in the manuscript looks odd; it could be explained better if we read it as a chronological reference to the death of Pythagoras.

Number "11" appears in the final replica of a dialogue. We do not know who is speaking but, if the following text is not edited carelessly, we have to conclude that the addressee is Josaphat. One can suppose—but never demonstrate—that the objects whose quantity is eleven are years, simply because, in the previous text, years were numbered and not any other objects (with the unique exception of "two days" in chapter 10), and, moreover, a period of eleven years was mentioned in chapter 4 (Josaphat was eleven years old when his unusual education began). That it was this period that was mentioned in the dialogue is worth consideration, but it is far from sure. Anyway, without taking into account this number 11, the sum of the periods mentioned in the text is 50 (18 years before the birth of Josaphat + 11 years of his childhood + 12 years of his specific education + 1 year of his father's monastic life + 8 final years of prince's monastic life). This is a fundamental symbolism of the legend, which we have to examine below, and it can be excluded that it would have been broken by additional eleven years. Therefore, either these eleven objects are not years or we have here a mention of the eleven-year period of the prince's childhood.

The Present Text is an Abbreviated Recension of an Earlier Archetype

Some preliminary conclusions follow from the synopsis above. The most important is that the text available to us is not the original text of the legend, and the alterations of the latter are not limited to vernacular elements in the language. The text is severely abbreviated, sometime carelessly. The plot line related to the mother of the prince is especially affected being reduced to the very minimum.

A symbolism related to the number 50 could have, in hagiography, a calendrical meaning, giving that the earliest commemoration day of Josaphat, the 19th of May, was symbolically related to the Pentecost (Lourié, B., 2011). In our legend, the Pentecostal symbolism is transparent in the scene of conversion (chapter 8) and in the timespan of the events, fifty years (s. below). This fact would

suggest that the original form of our legend was not an edifying tale but a formal *vita* providing with the commemoration date(s), perhaps several different dates for different persons (e.g., one for Joasaph and a different one for Barlaam).

From Greek to Latin and from Latin to Greek

Apart from the prince's name, Josaphat, there are other factors suggesting a Latin original behind our text. One of them we have mentioned above: the title, where an excessive ἐκ obviously renders Latin *de*.

A recourse to Latin would help to clarify an obscure place in chapter 4: ἡ βασίλισσα <...> καὶ πᾶσα ἡ π..νειεία αὐτῆς. The damaged word is hardly recoverable as a genuine Greek word but is understandable as a relatively correct transliteration of mediaeval Latin *pronuncia*—προνειεία (the "ideal" Greek transliteration would be something like προν(ο)υνκία, but the iotacism equals υ, ι, and ει, and the nasal before a consonant could have been dropped out). Du Cange explains *pronuncia* as "Sententia, judicium, pronunciatum, nostris *Prononcé*," (Carolus du Fresne Du Cange, 1883-1887). but, among the meanings of the verb *pronunciare*/*pronuntiare*, there is "to announce beforehand, predict" (Niermeyer, J. F., 1976., p. 861). In the Greek original of the Latin, we can suppose a word like, e.g., προφαντορία "revelation."[1]

If our reconstruction is basically correct, we can interpret the whole phrase as a request to isolate the queen "with all her prophetic activity" from the prince. The queen appears as a recipient of a revelation later, in chapter 10. This is not to exclude that she had received another revelation earlier. *Pronuncia* in such a meaning was not a word easy to translate, and this would have been the reason why it remained untranslated.

To the Latin name of the prince, a Latin phrase in the title, and our considerations about the obscure place in chapter 4 we can add the fourth argument relating to the strange object named καψακ(ε)ία that we will discuss below. In Greek, we would expect not this feminine noun, otherwise unattested, but the neuter noun κα(μ)ψάκιον. Using the feminine, the translator from Latin into Greek could have calqued the gender of Latin *capsa* (or *capsula* or *capsella*) used by the Latin translator as the rendering of κα(μ)ψάκιον.

These four arguments provide a sufficient proof that our Greek text is a translation from Latin, whereas its lost Latin original was obviously translated from Greek.

"King Joasaph" and the (Indian) Man with a Skull

[1] Cf. LBG, *s.v.*, translated "Enthüllung."

The short Greek recension never calls Josaphat "son of the king," whereas calling him systematically "king" (βασιλεύς), which strikingly contradicts the fact that, according to the plot, he was certainly not a king. There are four such places: one in chapter 7 (quoted above) and three in chapter 8 (quoted below), and there is no other title that would have been applied to the prince throughout the story.

Obviously, the author of the short Greek recension used his source—that was some recension of the story of the wise councillor with the skull—without taking much care to fit it into the framing story.

The conversion of the king instead of the son of the king is a feature shared by several Arabic recensions (Lourié, B., 2022). The author of the Arabic original immediately preceding the longest Georgian recension opted for a compromise. This resulted in an amplification of the plot line with the abdication of Joasaph's father and Joasaph's enthronement. Most likely, this also resulted in a mechanical confusion, when the prince could have been addressed "king."

In the short Greek recension, a large part of the plot is lost for us. Therefore, we do not know whether it contained an episode where Joasaph became the king. Anyway, this recension was influenced by the tradition of king's conversion through the story of the man and the skull.

The story of the conversion of a king does certainly not go back to the biography of Buddha, but, nevertheless, it could be of Indian origin and transmitted to the Christians through the tangled paths common to the story of conversion of a prince. The very idea of a monk wandering with a skull is Indian. One can remind the Kāpālikas (whose name is derived from *kapāla* "skull") and Lākulas, the Śaiva (not Buddhist) movements of skull bearers.[1] The Greek short recension is explicit saying that Barlaam has had to take a skull from a human grave (that is, he certainly did not find it occasionally, as it would have been normal for a Christian story, but violated both Christian and Imperial prohibitions to disturb the graves). The Indian practice of skull-bearing implied motives of penitence and expiation, thus being similar, in this respect, to Christian monasticism. Some Indian movements enjoined that their adepts adorn themselves with a "hair jewel" (*śikhāmaṇi*) made of human bones. A description of an Indian ascetic would have inspired an image of a Christian ascetic with a skull and a "jewel" in another while still metaphorical sense of the word.

[1] Cf. Judit Törszök (Törszök, J., 2011, p. 355-361). I am grateful to Natalia Yanchevskaya for this reference and her consultations in Indological matters.

The Scene of Conversion (Chapter 8): An Outline

Let us begin with a translation of chapter 8 in full.

Ὧδε ἐλθὼν ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ καὶ εὗρεν τὸν βασιλέα τὸν Ἰωσαφὰτ καὶ ἀσπά<σαν>το ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐξενέγκας καὶ τὸ κρανίον ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ κλίνη παμμεγέθη<ς> καὶ ἔμπροσθεν<ν> αὐτῆς καψακία [ms. καψακεία] μεγάλη, καὶ ἔθ<η>κεν αὐτὴν <τὴν κεφαλὴν> ἐπάνω τοῦ καψακίου [ms. καψακείου].	Then, he [Barlaam] entered the palace and found king Josaphat, and they kissed each other. And he took out of the bosom the skull. And there was there a great bed and, before it, a big cabinet/box, and he put it <the skull> on the cabinet/box.
Καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ἐξέστη ὁ Ἰωσαφὰν καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν γέροντα· «Τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο;»	And having seen it, Josaphat became worried and said to the elder: "What is this?"
Ὧδε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ γέρων· «Κρανίον ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, ὦ βασιλεῦ.»	Then, the elder said to him: "A human skull is, oh king."
Καὶ λέγει πρὸς τὸν γέροντα <ὁ Ἰωσαφάτ>· «Τάχα, πάτερ, οὕτως μέλλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς γενέσθαι;»	And he <Josaphat> said to the elder: "Maybe, father, we too have to become like this?"
Λέγει πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα· «Ἐὰν ἑξακισχιλιοστὸν ἔτος ζήσῃς, οὕτως μέλλει γενέσθαι.»	He said to the king: "When you will live up to the six thousandth year, you will have to become like this."
Καὶ τότε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτόν.	And at this moment the Holy Spirit came upon him.

The description must be severely abbreviated, as we already know after having noticed that, in the conversation between Barlaam and Josaphat, the precious stone is completely forgotten. The scene looks strange, because it implies some rite, a kind of baptism when Josaphat received the Holy Spirit, while apparently without water.

In the wording alone, the striking parallel is the scene of the baptism of the eunuch of the Candace, queen of Ethiopia (Acts 14:39) according to the Byzantine *textus receptus* and many manuscripts and ancient translations (in the variant reading rejected by Nestle and Aland): when Apostle Philip and the eunuch came up out of the water, "the Holy Spirit came upon the eunuch" (πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐνοῦχον). Unfortunately, we have no access to the original Greek text of our legend for becoming able to decide whether this verse was quoted verbatim.

This possible allusion to "Ethiopia" (in fact, Nubia, the kingdom of Queen Candace) in our legend where the kingdom of Pythagoras remains unnamed can be considered as a link connecting our

legend with the long Greek recension of Barlaam and Joasaph, where the kingdom of Joasaph's father is Nubia.

There is no prayer before the coming of the Holy Spirit, and there is indeed no prayer mentioned at all during the whole meeting in the palace. I think that this is hardly a genuine feature of the legend but rather the result of abbreviating. We will return to the liturgical contents of this scene below.

Eschatology and Approximate Dating

The further discussion will be facilitated if we begin with dating. The place of origin of our legend is stated in its text almost explicitly. This is a monastery on Mount Sinai or rather the monastic agglomeration on Mount Sinai as a whole.

Sinai in our legend is represented as a monastic centre of global significance, which excludes an early date for its composition, that is, the sixth century (the principal Sinaitic monastery dedicated to the Transfiguration was established by Justinian between 548 and 565). The evident *terminus post quem* is the seventh century and rather the middle of this century than the beginning.

The key for dating the legend would provide one sentence in section 8. This is Barlaam's answer Ἐὰν ἑξακισχιλιοστὸν ἔτος ζήσῃς, οὕτως μέλλει γενέσθαι. It does not imply that Josaphat has had to live till the age of 6000. Such a supposition would contradict the plot, where Josaphat died after nine years of monastic life. Instead, it refers to the year 6000 Anno Mundi, the commonly accepted date of the end of the world. The audience of our hagiographer would have had to realise that Josaphat had already died, and therefore, the end of the world was imminent.

The date of the end of the world about AM 6000 was an almost complete consensus since the early third century, from Sextus Julius Africanus and Hippolytus of Rome, who "canonised" the chronology where Christ was born near AM 5500, and the world will continue to exist up to AM 6000. This consensus was naturally challenged near AD 500, during the reign of Emperor Anastasius (r. 491–518), and this led to appearance of other eschatological expectations postponing the date of the end to AM 6500 and even AM 7000.[1] Our legend, however, did not follow these calculations despite

[1] Cf. the most detailed dossier of the AM 6000 consensus in Wolfram Brandes (Brandes, W., 1997). For the shift from the 6000-year world history to other models, see Gerhard Podskalsky (Podskalsky, G., 1972, pp. 92-94). For a succinct introduction to the Byzantine and Western eschatological expectations respectively, with further bibliography, see Wolfram Brandes and Hannes Möhring (Brandes, W., 2021, pp. 284-299; Möhring, H., 2021, pp. 269-283). For the later eschatological calculations, see Agostino Pertusi (Pertusi, A., 1988) .

being substantially later than AD 500. By this time, the former consensus about AM 6000 did no longer exist, but the 6000-year eschatology did not become so easily falsified.

By this time, another consensus had formed—at least, in the Latin West. The date AM 6000 for the end of the world was preserved but the actual date Anno Mundi was shifted according to the chronology of Eusebius (proposed by him in the early fourth century), where Christ was born not in AM 5500 nor 5492 but in AM 5199.[1] This resulted in a date of the end of the world near AD 800,[2] whereas Eusebius himself did not make eschatological calculations. Eusebius' chronology became predominant in the Latin West thanks to the translation made by Hieronymus (Die Chronik des Hieronymus, 1956)[3]

As noticed by Juan Gil, the author of the seminal article on the topic, the eighth century was full of eschatological expectations in both East and West.[4] Indeed, there is a significant number of eschatological documents datable to the eighth century in Greek and in Syriac. Moreover, Eusebius's *Chronography* was also widespread in an Armenian version (that is preserved)[5] and in one or two Syriac version(s) (preserved in large excerpts only).[6] Its Greek original, however, was lost (one can

[1] Eusebius provided the data for the following calculation: 942 years backward from the birth of Abraham to the Flood plus 2242 years from the Flood to Adam, and, finally, 2015 years from Abraham to Nativity; the sum is 5199. For a possible *ratio* of this calculation, see Venance Grumel (Grumel, V., 1958, pp. 24-25). For a general introduction to the historiography and problems of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, see Alden A. Mosshammer (Mosshammer, A. A. 1979) and Richard W. Burgess , with the assistance of Witold Witakowski (Burgess, R. W., & Witakowski, W. 1999).

[2] For the western eschatological expectations before AD 800, see esp. Juan Gil and Richard Landes (Gil, J., 1978, pp. 215-247; Landes, R., 1988, pp. 137-211). Cf. also Brandes, (Brandes, W., 1997, p. 27).

[3] for the Nativity date 2015 years from Abraham, see p. 169, cf. p. 395 (list of witnesses).

[4] "De esta guise, aunque por caminos diferentes, las tradiciones apocalípticas de los bizantinos y los reinos bárbaros vienen a enlazarse : el finale de la centuria octava marca el comienzo del drama apocalíptico." (Gil, J., 1978, p. 245)

[5] The notice on Christ's birth in the year 2015 after Abraham: (Eusebius Pamphilius Caesarensis, 1818, 260/261). Cf. (Karst, 1911, p. 211). Cf., for an important but still unpublished new manuscript, Armenuhi Drost-Abgaryan (Drost-Abgaryan, A., 2016, pp. 215-229).

[6] Here, the birth of Christ is dated to year 2016 after Abraham, which seems to be a *lapsus calami*: (Amir Harrak. 2017, pp. 106-107). (Harrak considers 2015 as the correct date but ascribes the wrong date 2016 to the Latin version as well). Cf., for the Syriac tradition of Eusebius' *Chronography*, Paul Keseling and Witold Witakowski (Keseling, P., 1927, pp. 23-48, 223-241, 33-56, 24; Witakowski, W., 1999–2000, pp. 419-437).

wonder why[1]), and we do not know, in any language other than Latin, any explicit calculation of the date of the end of the world based on Eusebius' chronology. Dealing with the non-Latin texts containing the expectations of the end of the world near AD 800, it has so far been impossible to define whether a given author implied an Eusebian calculation or was simply affected by the external events related especially to the Arab invasions.

It is difficult to establish a *terminus ante quem* for our legend. Most likely, the legend belongs to the period when the Sinai was the main centre of Eastern monasticism, between the seventh and the eighth century. This supposition is corroborated by the eschatological chronology implying that the action takes place short before AM 6000. These two features make a late eighth-century date very plausible but still not certain.

Let us emphasise: the above considerations are applicable to the lost Greek legend from which the present short Greek recension has been produced through three procedures. I enumerate them in an arbitrary order: (1) abbreviation, (2) translation into Latin, and (3) translation back into Greek.

The Box in Its Oriental Sources

The *crux interpretum* for the whole scene in the prince's palace is how one understands the two principal objects of furniture, the big bed and the big cabinet or box. The word καψακία, even though going back to Latin (*capsa*), is, more or less, current in Byzantine Greek.[2] Yet this fact is not sufficient for identifying what the object is.

---

[1] One can suspect that the disappearance of the *Chronicle* by Eusebius in Greek was somewhat artificial—given its popularity in Latin, Syriac, and Armenian. Such a popularity in these languages' points to popularity also in the sixth- and seventh-century Byzantium, before the alienation of Byzantium from the Latin and Syriac cultures during the eighth century.

[2] The form καψακ(ε)ία does not occur in the dictionaries (LSJ, Lampe, LBG, Kriaras). The closest forms are those in LSJ: καμψάκιον and καψάκιον (insertion of /*m*/ before /*p*/ in loanwords was typical while not obligatory for Greek): Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars. [9th ed., 1940]. With a revised supplement 1996 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 873, *s.v.* κάμψα "basket, case," where for the derived words κα(μ)ψάκης are provided meanings "cruse, flask"; cf. also "cruse" for καμψάκης and "flask" for καψάκης in G. W. H. *Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961) 700 and 739 respectively. My translation "cabinet" is based on the data of the Supplement to LSJ and LBG. Cf. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones, R. McKenzie, *Greek-English Lexicon. Revised Supplement.* Ed. by P. G. W. Glare. With the assistance of A. A. Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 166, *s.v.* καμψάκιον in the meaning of γλωσσόκομον [with the reference to the *Lexicon* by Hesychius, 5th/6th

The mysterious box becomes less mysterious once it is seen against the background of the Oriental recensions. There, Barlaam goes to the prince having in hands a box for either books or his merchandise. Namely, according to the recensions:

Georgian long (Abuladze, I., (Ed.), 1957, p. 30): Barlaam arrived into the palace of the prince "holding a small casket as if some jewel was contained within it" (აქუნდა თანა მოთხე მცირე და აჩუენებდა მით, ვითარმცა თუალი რაჲმე ედვა მას შინი)."
Georgian short (Abuladze, I., (Ed.), 1957, p. 27): it is the most succinct but uses the same word for "casket": და აღიღო მოთხე მცირე "and took a small casket." მოთხე means some portable bag (Sardshweladse, S., & Fähnrich, H., 1999; Abuladze, I., 1973).
Arabic long (Gimaret, D., (Ed.), 1972, p. 34): فأخذ بلوهر سَفَطاً فيه له كُتُبٌ فقال سلعتي في هذا السفط "Bilawhar prit un coffret où il avait des livres, et dit: 'Ma merchandise est dans ce coffret" (Gimaret, D., 1971).
Arabic short (Ibn Bābawayh, 1984/1985, p. 591): فحمل معه سفطاً فيه كتب له ، فقال الحاضن: ما هذا السفط؟ قال بلوهر : في هذا السّفط سلعتي ; Barlaam "took with him a casket in which were books [*I read* كتوب]. The custodian said: 'What is this casket?' Barlaam (Bilawhar) said: 'In this casket is my merchandise.'" The key word in the Arabic recension is سَفَطٌ "casket," and it perfectly corresponds to its Georgian rendering მოთხე მცირე "small casket."

After this scene, the box/casket disappears even from these recensions. Nevertheless, we can, at least, recognise, in this object, the box used by Barlaam in our short Greek recension. There, however, the former box for books or jewels grew considerably attaining the dimensions of a table. What had happened to it? In order to find an answer, we need to examine the baptism and Eucharistic rites in the two Greek recensions and in another closely related hagiographical document, the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*. We will conclude that the box substituted a table used for an altar and appropriated the dimensions of the latter.

At the present stage, we have demonstrated that the short Greek recension goes back to the Oriental sources of the romance independently from the long Greek recension. The short Greek recension borrowed its "box" from Oriental recensions independently from the long Greek text, where this "box" is absent. This fact is fitting with our tentative dating of the archetype of the short

---

cent.; see now Kurt Latte, rec. et emend., *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon.* Editionem alteram curavit Ian C. Cunningham. Vol. IIa: *E–I* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker (SGLG), Bd 11/2a; Berlin/Boston: W. de Gruyter, 2020) 572: καψάκιον· γλωσσόκομον], and esp. 173, *s.v.* καψάριον "cupboard for clothes", cf., *ibid.*, καψάριος "*slave in charge of clothes*, esp. at baths"; cf. LBG, *s.v.* καψάριον "Garderobe." LBG, *s.v.* καμψίκιον "Kiste," inspired my translation "box."

Greek recension to *ca* 800. In other words, a popular presumption that the long Greek recension is the first text in Greek about Barlaam and Joasaph is false. This will shed new light on the discussion of the attribution of the long Greek recension, especially on the latest attempt to deny the authorship of Euthymius of Athos made by Alexander Kazhdan and the refutation of Kazhdan's attempt by Robert Volk. I will agree with Volk in the conclusion but not with all of his arguments.

Baptism and Eucharist: A Key to the Proliferation of the Christian Recensions

Chapter 8 of the short Greek recension contains an account of the Christian initiation of Joasaph. Normally, one would expect, at this place, a description of Joasaph's baptism, but, instead, we can discern only a reminiscence of the baptism of the eunuch of Queen Candace of "Ethiopia." Something is certainly omitted in the preserved recension of the text.

When we look for parallel scenes in the other Christian recensions, the situation becomes even stranger. The two Georgian recensions do not say a word about Joasaph's own baptism, despite the fact that they pay much attention to the baptism of his father and that of the whole country. Such an omission is striking and especially suspect when we consider the editorial machinations discernible in the short Greek recension. It would hardly have been difficult to work out when Joasaph was baptised, considering the fact that we are told, in the two Georgian recensions, of the baptisms of his father and the whole population of the country. At this point, one can suppose that, in the recensions preceding these Georgian texts, there were not mere mentions of Joasaph's baptism (such mentions would have been certainly preserved) but that its description was completely purged. Here a historian of the baptismal liturgies may begin to guess something, but for now we will try to stick to the intrigue.

Finally, in the long Greek recension, we can find a description of the entire initiation rite in two parts, the Baptism and the communion. It is however extremely short and provokes a number of questions immediately.

After one of the long Barlaam's speeches, the narration interrupts with the following (I divide the text in two parts but quote it in full):

Baptism	Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Βαρλαὰμ καὶ τὸ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον, τὸ ἐκτεθὲν ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν συνόδῳ, διδάξας τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως υἱόν, ἐβάπτισεν αὐτὸν *εἰς τὸ*	After having said this [*in the liturgical context, we have to understand the preceding Barlaam's speech as a catechetical sermon*] and having taught to the son of the king the Symbol of Faith proclaimed by the Council of Nicaea, he baptised him *in the name of the Father, and*

	ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ ὕδατος τὴν οὖσαν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦλθεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ χάρις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (p. 187.106-110).	*of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit* [Mt 28:19 *quoted here as a formula that is common to the most of baptismal rites*] in the font of water that was in his garden. And the grace of the Holy Spirit came upon him.
Communion	Ἐπανελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ κοιτῶνα καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἐπιτελέσας μυσταγωγίαν τῆς ἀναιμάκτου θυσίας μετέδωκεν αὐτῷ τῶν ἀχράντων τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστηρίων, καὶ *ἠγαλλιᾶτο τῷ πνεύματι* ὁ Ἰωάσαφ *δόξαν ἀναπέμπων* Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ (p. 187.110-113).	Then, having entered his bedroom and having performed the holy liturgy (mystagogy) of the bloodless sacrifice, he gave him a participation of the immaculate sacraments of Christ. And Joasaph *rejoiced by spirit* [Lk 10:21, *a variant reading*] *offering glory* [*a frequent liturgical formula, here alluding to the thanksgiving prayer common to the Byzantine Eucharist liturgies*] to Christ the God.

A historian of liturgy would be perplexed by the prayer of ordinations in the Baptism (we will discuss it below) and the Eucharist in the bedroom instead a more respectable hall. Only an allusion to the Byzantine Eucharistic thanksgiving prayer seems to be in place.[1] It is nevertheless remarkable too as an additional witness that the above passage is inspired with liturgical texts.

Some such questions could be answered with the help of the similar and, in some parts, identical description of the Christian initiation in another hagiographical romance, the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*. Recently, this romance having several intersections, often verbatim, with the long Greek recension of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* became one of the main obstacles for ascribing the latter to

[1] The end of the prayer after the communion in the liturgies of John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and the Presanctified Gifts, to be pronounced by the celebrant aloud: Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ("For Thou art our sanctification, and to Thou we offer glory, to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, now and forever and to the ages of ages").

Euthymius of Athos. This obstacle was not overcome completely by Robert Volk. I consider it insurmountable as long as we keep to the dogma of the inexistence of any Greek text about Barlaam and Joasaph earlier than the long Greek recension.

Below I hope to demonstrate that the initiation rite (consisting of two parts, the Baptism and the Eucharist) shared by the long Greek recension of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* with the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* belongs to their common source in Greek; this source was another romance of Barlaam and Joasaph, and its initiation rite was invented in order to replace the initiation rite in an even earlier Greek recension, a successor of which our short Greek recension is. In sum: the short Greek recension is indeed a late one, but its archetype was a seventh-century text, where the initiation rite contained elements absolutely inacceptable in Byzantium.

Barlaam and Joasaph and the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* (*BHG* 1744)

It was Paul Peeters who was the first to notice close parallels between the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* (*BHG* 1744) and the *Barlaam and Joasaph* (Peeters, P., 1931, La première traduction latine de Barlaam et Josaphat et son original grec. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 49., pp. 297-298). After him, Alexander Kazhdan recognised more textual overlapping (Kazhdan, A., 1988, pp. 1187-1209) and, finally, Robert Volk, in his critical edition of the long Greek recension, took even more of them into account in the critical apparatus. For Kazhdan, this *Life* provided a series of important arguments in his demonstration of an earlier date of the long Greek recension, incompatible with the lifespan of Euthymius of Athos. I agree with Volk in his final conclusion about the authorship of Euthymius. However, I cannot agree with his method of refuting Kazhdan's arguments based on the *Life of Theodore*.

Volk put forward his own hypothesis that both *BHG* 1744 and the *Barlaam and Joasaph* were written by Euthymius of Athos, because their Greek texts have much in common in both ascetical (especially monastic) inspiration and wording, sometimes coinciding even verbatim (Volk, R., 2009, pp. 84-85).

Indeed, such a turn of thought allows us to reject all of Kazhdan's arguments based on the *Life of Theodore*. However, Volk did not discuss why the consensus view did not allow Euthymius of Athos to be the author of the *Life of Theodore* as a whole. We have to discuss these matters before using the parallels from the *Life of Theodore* in our analysis.

The plot of the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* is constructed around the conversion to ascetic Byzantine Christianity and the following martyrdom of an ʿAbbāsid caliph. This is not true history

but it is a true historical—not only hagiographical—romance.[1] Its date is established by Peeters on the very firm basis as the second half of the tenth century (Peeters, P., 1930, pp. 65-91, 91)[2]. Its plot is similar to that of *Barlaam and Joasaph* but especially in those recensions where not a prince but a king is converted.

Near the beginning of the story, the *Life* includes an "inserted novel," the *Passio* of the Sabaite monk Michael. It is another hagiographical romance, where the scene is the court of an Omayyad caliph (during caliph's pilgrimage to Jerusalem) in the second half of the seventh century, and some peculiar historical features of this epoch are also recognisable (including the custom of Muslim pilgrimage to Jerusalem and still not to Mecca). For the author of the *Life of Theodore*, however, this story belongs to his own epoch, which results in blatant anachronisms.

This *Martyrdom of Michael of St Sabas* is known separately in a Georgian translation from the lost Arabic original (Georgian recension A of this *Passio*) (Kekelidze, C., 1918, pp. 165-174)[3] where it is narrated following the account of a Sinaitic recluse, Theodore Abukura (აბუკურა, from Arabic "Abū Qurrah").[4] The *Life of Theodore* deletes this reference to Abukura and makes the monk and martyr Michael a relative of its principal character Theodore of Edessa. Indeed, there are strong

[1] For the ninth-century realities in the *Life of Theodore*, see esp. A Vasiliev (Vasiliev, A., 1942–1943, pp. 165-225). Most of Vasiliev's arguments in favour of historicity of the *Life* are now considered unacceptable; cf. bibliography below (esp. articles by Gouillard and Griffith).

[2] Peeters, P., 1930, pp. 65-98. The most precise ground for dating is a high position of the Melkite hierarchy in Syria: under the Caliphate, before the Byzantine Reconquista of the 860s, such a position was occupied by the "monophysite" hierarchy, whereas the Melkite was oppressed. The narrative places the events under the common reign of Michael and Theodora (842–856), and, therefore, Sidney Griffith thinks that any date within the span of 181 years is possible (between 842 and 1023, the date of the earliest manuscript): (Griffith, S. H., 2001, pp. 147-169, 153, fn. 39). This is methodologically unacceptable, because we are dealing not with a chronicle but with a work of "epic" hagiography, where the action must be placed in the remote past. This means that, for the hagiographer, not only 842 but even 856 have long disappeared from the memory of living generations.

[3] A study with a Latin translation by Peeters (Peeters, P., 1930). Cf. English translation by Monica J. Blanchard (Blanchard, 1994)

[4] This Theodore Abū Qurrah is certainly not the historical Theodore Abū Qurrah (*ca* 740–*ca* 820), the famous Melkite theologian and the bishop of Ḥarrān, who has never been a Sinaitic monk; cf. esp. John Lamoreaux, (Lamoreaux, J., 2002, pp. 25-40). Nevertheless, I would not exclude an "act of appropriation" of such an authoritative figure by a Sinaitic hagiographer, as it was supposed by Peeters, s. below.

suspicions, first expressed by Peeters (Peeters, P., 1930, pp. 82-83), that the legendary figure of Theodore of Edessa[1] was inspired by the real figure of Theodore Abū Qurrah.[2]

The *Life of Theodore of Edessa* including the *Passio* of Michael is preserved in Greek (Pomialovsky, I. V., 1892), Arabic,[3] Georgian,[4] and Slavonic.[5] The Georgian and the Slavonic certainly and the Arabic most probably (according to the present consensus view) were translated from the Greek recension available to us.

According to the testimony of George of Athos, the hagiographer of Euthymius of Athos, "Abukura" was the title of the second of the two books translated from Georgian into Greek by Euthymius; another one was *Barlaam and Joasaph*. Understandably, the scholarly consensus (following Pavle Ingoroqva's 1939 article (Ingoroqva, P., 1939, pp. 249-254)[6] now identifies the "Abukura" translated by Euthymius with the *Passio* of Michael. Leila Datiashvili has provided an impressing comparison of many parallel fragments of the *Passio* in three recensions: the Georgian recension A, the Greek within the *Life of Theodore*, and the Georgian B (from the Georgian version of the *Life*). The Greek of Euthymius is an elegant metaphrasis of the Georgian A, whereas the Georgian B is a literal translation of its Greek original (Datiashvili, L., 1973, pp. 144-174). This Datiashvili's study showed that the Georgian A is the earliest recension of the *Passio*, and that its inclusion into the *Life of Theodore* is an interpolation in the Greek text, using the Greek metaphrasis from Georgian by Euthymius of Athos. Datiashvili did not mention even as a possibility that

---

[1] There are literary works ascribed to Theodore of Edessa, but it is not clear whether any of them existed already in the first millennium; cf. Jean Gouillard, (Gouillard, J., 1947, pp. 137-157). In sum, there is no historical trace of Theodore of Edessa earlier than his *Life*.

[2] The scholarly hypotheses available today seem to have exhausted the set of logical possibilities of connecting and disconnecting Theodore Abū Qurrah and Theodore of Edessa; cf. Nino Mghebrishvili (Mghebrishvili, N., 2012).

[3] Unpublished (edition in preparation by John Lamoreaux). Cf. Griffith (Griffith, S. H., 2001). The Arabic was available to me only through Vasiliev's translation of long excerpts in Vasiliev, "The Life," 193-197. The Arabic is not always a literal translation.

[4] Unpublished, but cf. Kekelidze's study with a publication of the part corresponding to the *Passio* of Michael (the so-called Georgian recension B of the *Passio*) (Kekelidze, K., 1960, pp. 18-40).

[5] The earliest recension is preserved in two manuscripts, unpublished. I will quote it according to the earliest manuscript (late 15th cent.): Russian State Library (Moscow), Undolsky's collection (found 310), No. 1081, ff. 1o3r-193v. It seems to me a literal translation of the Greek. The most popular (preserved in dozens of manuscripts) second recension was produced, according to Kirill Vershinin, without checking the Greek: (Vershinin, K., 2021, pp. 473-483, 474).

[6] Ingoroqva was followed by Kekelidze (კეკელიძე, "რომანი 'აბუკურა'") and other scholars.

Euthymius, wrote the entire text of the Greek *Life*. According to her, this was done "by some interested person" (ვიღაც დაინტერესებულმა პირმა), who thus produced a text with rough anachronisms and distortions necessary for putting the *Passio* into a narrative frame that was alien to it (Datiashvili, L., 1973, p. 173). Therefore, before Volk, nobody thought that Euthymius might have been responsible for such a less than perfect work as the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*.

For refuting Kazhdan, however, it was not sufficient to recognise that the lost separate Greek text of the *Passio* of Michael is the "Abukura" translated into Greek by Euthymius: all the textual intersections between the *Life of Theodore* and *Barlaam and Joasaph* lie outside the part of the *Life* corresponding to the *Passio* of Michael. Therefore, Volk took a further step.

An educated author such as Euthymius of Athos would hardly have produced a story about the conversion of a caliph, where the precise name of this caliph was indicated and the events were dated to a period described in detail by Byzantine historians. The educated men knew the chronicles. This is the **first but the major argument** against Volk's hypothesis about Euthymius' authorship of the entire *Life of Theodore*.

The **second argument** is from Peeters. The alleged author of the *Life of Theodore* represents himself as Theodore's nephew, Basil, a former monk of Saint Sabas and presently the bishop of Emesa. The name of the Sabaite monk Basil, as Peeters noticed, is taken from the separate *Passio* of Michael the Sabaite, where the narrator represents himself as a monk of Saint Sabas named Basil (while he does not claim to be the bishop of Emesa) (Peeters, P., 1930, p. 85)[1]. The hagiographer of Theodore of Edessa who made Michael the Sabaite a relative of Theodore seems to have forgotten this detail and, therefore, made him also a relative of his own. He states on different occasions that he is a nephew of one saint, Theodore, but he has never said that he is also a relative of another saint, Michael, that was, according to him, so close to Theodore. Such a negligence of the hagiographer reveals that the second Basil, the hagiographer of Theodore, is not the same person as the first Basil, the hagiographer of Michael, but the second hid himself under the name of the former, thus taking advantage of the preface of the *Passio* of Michael (where Michael's hagiographer Basil introduced himself and Abukura), which in his compilation is omitted (Peeters, p., 1930, p. 84). These considerations by Peeters are useful for discussing Volk's hypothesis. Euthymius of Athos carefully worked with the Georgian version of Basil's text for rewriting in Greek the *Passio* of Michael. If he had reworked his Greek version into a long hagiographical composition, the result would have been a smooth text of the quality of the *Barlaam and Joasaph*, without a single rough seam.

[1] Peeters called the first Basil the Sabaite also the bishop of Emesa, but without a support from the Georgian text.

Below, in my analysis of the initiation rites, I hope to demonstrate that the description of the same rite in the long Greek recension of *Barlaam and Joasaph* is more distorted than that in the *Life of Theodore*. This fact excludes the identity of the authors supposed by Volk, and, therefore, it will be an argument against his hypothesis, but not the third but the **fourth**. The **third argument** is already put forward by Kazhdan and left unaddressed by Volk. I recall it just now, because my own fourth argument allows for two interpretations: either Euthymius of Athos borrowed from the *Life of Theodore* or both were borrowing from a common source (or from different but closely related sources). To exclude the former interpretation, we have to turn to the argument by Kazhdan (Kazhdan, A., 1988, pp. 1202-1203).

The long Greek recension of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* often quotes from Agapetos the Deacon's treatise written for Emperor Justinian (r. 527–565); these quotations do not go back to a florilegium but to the authentic work by Agapetos.[1] The *Life of Theodore* quotes from Agapetos only once, and its quotation overlaps with one place of *Barlaam and Joasaph*; however, the hagiographer of Theodore introduced his citation with the phrase γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν ἱερῶν πατέρων λόγοις (p. 108) "it is written in the treatises of our holy Fathers." Agapetos has never been referred to as a saint, but it is obvious that the author of the *Life* quoted him from a source that he believed to be a work of a holy Father. This observation of Kazhdan is a decisive argument against Euthymius' authorship of the *Life of Theodore*.

Kazhdan considered the intermediary between Agapetos and the *Life of Theodore* to be *Barlaam and Joasaph*. His observation, however, is more compatible with the hypothesis of a common source. Let us compare the three texts (Table 1): (Agapetos Diakonos, 1995, pp. 33.9-13):

Table 1.

Agapetos, ch. 11	***Barlaam and Joasaph*, ch. 36**	***The Life of Theodore*, ch. 101**
Κύκλος τις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων περιτρέχει πραγμάτων, ἄλλοτε ἄλλως φέρων αὐτὰ καὶ περιφέρων· καὶ τούτοις ἀνισότης ἐστὶ τῷ μηδὲν τῶν παρόντων ἐν ταυτότητι μένειν. δεῖ οὖν σε,	Τὸν κύκλον πρόσεχε, εἴ *τις περιτρέχει τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων, ἄλλοτε ἄλλος φέρων αὐτὰ καὶ περιφέρων·* καὶ *ἐν τῇ τούτων ἀγχιστρόφῳ μεταβολῇ*	γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν ἱερῶν πατέρων λόγοις, ὅτι φύσει οὐδὲν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐστὶ βέβαιον, οὐδὲ ὁμαλὸν, οὐδὲ αὔταρκες, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἱστάμενον, ἀλλὰ *κύκλος τις*

[1] For Agapetos in the *Barlaam and Joasaph*, see Volk, *Einführung*, 135-138, esp. 137.

κράτιστε βασιλεῦ, ἐν τῇ τούτων ἀγχιστρόφῳ μεταβολῇ ἀμετάβλητον ἔχειν τὸν εὐσεβῆ λογισμόν.	*ἀμετάβλητον ἔχε τὸν εὐσεβῆ λογισμόν.*	*τῶν* ἡμετέρων *περιτρέχει πραγμάτων, ἄλλοτε ἄλλως* ἐπὶ μιᾶς ἡμέρας πολλάκις, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὥρας μεταβολάς.
A wheel of human affairs goes round, now taking them in one direction, now in another, and turning them around. And their inequality lies in the fact that none of the things present remains the same. In the face of this rapid changes, mightiest of Emperors, you must, therefore, maintain your pious way of thinking unchanged.	Consider the wheel of men's affairs, how it runneth round and round, turning and whirling them now up, now down: and amid all its sudden changes, keep thou unchanged a pious mind.	Therefore, it is written in the treatises of our holy Fathers, that, by nature, nothing human is firm, nothing even, nothing self-sustained, nothing self-standing, but some wheel of our affairs goes round, now taking them in one direction, now in another, changing (the direction) many times within one day and even (one) hour.

The wording of the *Life* is closer to the original wording of Agapetos. The *Life* preserves the composition of the phrase Κύκλος τις τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων περιτρέχει πραγμάτων (with a minimal change: κύκλος τις τῶν *ἡμετέρων* περιτρέχει πραγμάτων), whereas the *Barlaam and Joasaph* changes it drastically (Τὸν κύκλον πρόσεχε, εἴ τις περιτρέχει τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων). Therefore, it must be excluded that the *Life* borrowed from *Barlaam and Joasaph*, and only the hypothesis of a common source (or different but closely related sources) stands.

Finally, one more notice concerning Agapetos in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. He is abundantly quoted but only on two occasions (in describing the mode of government of King Joasaph, ch. 34, and in Joasaph's instruction to his successor King Barachias, ch. 36), without parallel places in the Georgian recensions. The description of the initiation rites for Joasaph is without Georgian parallels either but also has a parallel in the *Life of Theodore*. One can suppose that both Agapetos and the initiation rite go back to their common source in Greek, and this source was a story of conversion of a king (not a prince).

Where Barlaam Celebrated the Eucharist?

It is more convenient to begin our examination of the initiation rites from the Eucharist and communion. In this section, we will give a preliminary answer to the question where Barlaam

celebrated the Eucharist. The definitive answer will be given in the next section, where the data of the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* will also be considered.

The short Greek recension mentions a great bed in prince's room where he receives guests. This looks odd, and the focus of attention on this object of furniture made by the short Greek recension looks especially unmotivated. The situation becomes quite different when we understand that this is the great bed in the banquet hall for many guests.[1]

Another necessary furniture of the banquet hall is a table or several tables—but not cabinets or boxes. A table would be a potential altar for Barlaam. However, in Greek, any kind of table, both that in a banquet hall and the church altar, was to be called τράπεζα, which normally was to be translated into Latin as *mensa*[2] or, in some contexts, perhaps *tabula* [6] but never *capsa* or its derivatives. There can be a little doubt that, in the original text of the short Greek recension, Barlaam entered one of the front rooms of the palace, the banquet hall. Barlaam put the skull on the banquet table. This is an archetypical situation when the dead is put on the place used for the lavish foods.[3]

However, in the further edition(s) of the text, the table disappears. The only thing having the plain top remained the box, and this is why its dimensions, especially height, so rapidly grew. Perhaps, the respective editor imagined a kind of cupboard for clothes in the prince's bedroom—instead of a kind of table in prince's banquet hall.

In the long Greek recension, the bedroom of the prince is mentioned explicitly on an unexpected occasion—as the place where Barlaam serves the Eucharist for the prince. This is the only mention of the bedroom in the romance. In all other recensions, the Eucharist in never mentioned. The unique exception of the Arabic Christian recension that we have not discussed so far.

Why the author of the long Greek recension felt a need to mention the bedroom? My answer will be that he tried to follow his source describing the Baptism and the communion of the prince. It was ultimately the source where the initiation rite has had much in common with the rite described in the archetype of the short recension, while, in the short recension, the whole mise-en-scène of the conversation implies that Joasaph receives Barlaam in the bedroom. We have already seen that the two Greek recensions are not as different from each other as it seems at the first glance: let us recall that both are connected to Nubia (the long one, explicitly in its geography, the short one, implicitly in its wording alluding to the baptism of the eunuch of the queen of Nubia, Candace).

---

[1] For the furniture of the banquet halls, see Katherine M. D. (Dunbabin (Dunbabin, K. M. D., 2010).

[2] For Christian usage, see esp. Niermeyer and Albert Blaise (Niermeyer, J. F., 1976; Blaise, A., 1975).

[3] In the Russian culture, one verse of the ode of the great poet Gavrila Romanovich Derzhavin (1743–1816) became a proverb: *Гдѣ столъ былъ яствъ, тамъ гробъ стоитъ* "On the table used for (lavish) foods now stands a coffin" (*On the Death of Prince Meshchersky* ["O, Voice of time! O, metal's clang!"], 1779.

Both long and short recensions shared a misunderstanding of a description of the initiation rite, where, indeed, a bed must have been mentioned, but in the meaning of the great bed of a royal banquet hall. Some echoes of this description are discernible in a still unpublished Christian Arabic recension preserved in the manuscript Balamand 147 (13th cent.),[1] both in its text and in its miniature illustrating the account of Joasaph's communion. The text and its illustration are not exactly matching, and each of them has a value of its own.

In the text, immediately after having baptised Joasaph, Barlaam enters the prince's bedchamber (literally, "resting room," غرفه مصجعه), "and (Barlaam) constructed an unusual (?) altar" (وصنع هيكلًا محتيرا);[2] I do not know how to translate محتيرا in this context (Sminé, R. E., 1993, p. 189)[3] whereas هيكل, as it is clear from the context, means here "altar" and not "temple." The *Life of Theodore* will help us to understand that, originally, it was an "improvised" altar, but let us exhaust first the data of the Arabic manuscript.

In the short Greek recension, Barlaam also constructed some installation, a kind of altar. In the wording of the Balamand Arabic recension, we are certainly dealing with a result of similarly unsuccessful editorial attempts to harmonise different versions of the account. The Arabic translator looked for a compromise between the text of his Greek original (with its "bedroom") and another version of the story known to him previously (most likely, in Arabic), where the table for the altar was already in place, and there was only a need to prepare it for a different usage.

---

[1] For the most detailed, so far, study of this still unpublished manuscript, see Rima E. Sminé, (Sminé, R. E., 1993, pp. 171-229). In this article, all the miniatures are published but in a low quality black and white photograph. The same miniatures were published, also in black and white, several months earlier by Sylvie Agémian (Agémian, S., 1992, pp. 577-601). Finally, the entire set of miniatures was republished by Rima Sminé in colour within the catalogue of the Balamand manuscripts:
ريما سمين غنّاجة, "منمنمات قصة برلام ويواصف في مخطوط البلمند", المخطوطات العربية في الاديرة الارثوذكسية الأنطاكية في لبنان. الجزء الثاني. دير سيّدة البالمند (بيروت: قسم التوثيق والدراسات الأنطاكية, <1994>) 36-21.
(Sminé Ġannāğa, R., 1994, 21-36) (I am grateful for a copy of this publication to Carsten Walbiner). A digitalised copy of the manuscript is available in the Reading Room of the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library; I am grateful to Dmitry Morozov and Josh Mugler (Curator of Eastern Christian and Islam Manuscripts in HMML) for their help in obtaining a copy of the manuscript.

[2] Manuscript Arabic Balamand 147, f. 45v. In the bound manuscript the folios are in disorder, but they are enumerated as bound. Therefore, the text related to Joasaph's communion begins immediately after the miniature depicting Joasaph's Baptism, whereas the following miniature depicting his communion turned out at f. 38r.

[3] Sminé translates "and he made a special altar," while her translation, like mine, is obviously tentative.

The data of the respective miniature in the Balamand manuscript is even richer, because this miniature, as each miniature in this manuscript, has a proper caption depending on the tradition of the illumination and not on that of the text. The tradition of the illumination of this manuscript is mixed: it follows both the Byzantine models (the Byzantine illuminations for our romance are attested since the eleventh century) and some Middle Eastern traditions.[1] Anyway, these miniatures seem to be independent from the work of our translator into Arabic and, therefore, are to be treated as an independent witness of the literary (not only illustrative) tradition.

The upper room is an implicit reference to the Zion upper room and the Pentecost, thus in agreement with the Pentecostal symbolism of the short Greek recension, where the Holy Spirit came upon Joasaph when he was in the room and not in the baptismal waters. We will have to return to this moment in our examination of the baptism of Joasaph. Now, we may recall that the Pentecostal symbolism is a feature of the short recension also on the level of the plot, where the entire acting time is 50 years.

The illustration under the caption presents a chamber that is certainly not a bedroom (Fig. 1).

Fig. 1. Joasaph's communion. Ms. Balamand 147, f. 38r.

It is clear that this particular miniature follows a Byzantine model, and the building on the left, as similar buildings in several other miniatures of the same manuscript, represent the royal palace.

[1] Cf. conclusions by Sminé (Sminé, R. E. 1993).

The rather complicated construction behind the back of Barlaam is certainly the altar, but I would not dare to explain its liturgical arrangement (Sminé, R. E., 1993, p. 189)[1]. There are a number of Byzantine miniatures depicting Joasaph's communion,[2] but none of them put this scene in the interior of a bedchamber, whereas each of them, like the present miniature in the Balamand manuscript, is compatible with the interpretation of the place as an upper room. This means that there was a strong tradition to depict the Eucharist service and the communion of Joasaph as being performed in a more respectable and fitting place than a bedroom.

We have to conclude that the illumination tradition, from the very beginning, has never accepted the idea that Barlaam celebrated the Eucharist in the bedroom. Let us suppose, for the sake of the argument, that the artists preferred to depart from the text of the Greek long recension for purely artistic reasons. Even with this supposition, the witness of the caption of the Balamand manuscript indicates that a memory of the "real" place of this event was somewhat preserved. I call here "real" the location allotted to the Eucharistic liturgy by the recension of our romance where the scene with the Eucharist was first introduced. This place was not the bedchamber but a front hall of the palace, perhaps the upper room (العلّيّة = τὸ ὑπερῷον). However, in order to answer definitively in which room the Eucharist was celebrated according to the original version of this rite, we have to turn to the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*.

Baptism and Eucharist in the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*

In the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*, the caliph was baptised, by Bishop Theodore, together with his three faithful courtiers in the waters of Tigris.

Where Barlaam celebrated the Eucharist

The place for celebrating the Eucharist is called, in the *Life of Theodore*, τὸ ταμιεῖον "treasury." The *Life* mentions this chamber five times, and we can be sure that it was indeed a treasury but also the chamber for celebrating the Eucharist and for the most important conversations. The caliph asked Theodore to read out to him the Gospel when they entered εἰς τὸ ἐνδότερον <...> ταμιεῖον (p. 84) "in the most inner treasury" (ch. 81).

Perhaps the "upper room" of the Balamand Arabic manuscript of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* is not the perfect rendering of this "most inner treasury" but it is certainly not too bad.

---

[1] Sminé provides a tentative explanation of the details but without proving her interpretations.

[2] For them, the standard study remains that by Sirarpie Der Nersessian (Der Nersessian, S., 1937).

In the *Life of Theodore*, the chamber for the Eucharist is, in the same time, the place of the most important conversations resulting in the conversion of the caliph. In the short Greek recension, the hall where the conversion of Joasaph took place is also the place of the initiation rite, even though the scene with the Eucharist is absent from the preserved recension. In the long Greek recension, the sudden translocation of the scene to the bedchamber seems unmotivated. It was provoked by a misunderstanding of the scene in the banquet hall, which can be recovered from the short recension.

We need to bear in mind, from the above discussion, that the rites of Christian initiation described, on the one hand, in the *Life of Theodore* and in the long Greek and the Balamand Arabic recensions of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* and, on the other hand, in the short Greek recension of the latter are certainly related to each other even though they are quite different.

The rite of the *Life of Theodore* preserved the allusion to the baptism of the eunuch of Candace and the "unity of place" of the conversations that lead to the conversion and the initiation rite, it has in common with the short Greek recension of *Barlaam and Joasaph*. The short Greek recension preserved, from its source and against its own plot, the status of Joasaph as a king (he is addressed as the king by Barlaam and is never addressed otherwise).

The baptismal liturgy

The only possible conclusion is the following. The rite of the Christian initiation shared by the *Life of Theodore* and the long Greek recension of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* is an edited version of some earlier rite that was unacceptable for the editors, even if these editors were in Jerusalem under the Arab rule. Therefore, these editors made changes but artificial and unhelpful ones.

The artificial rite was constructed in the common source of the *Life* and the long recension of *Barlaam and Joasaph*. The two authors commit different errors in their accounts of the initiation rites (in the long Greek *Barlaam*, the absurd translocation of the action to the bedchamber is revealing, but the problems with finding the right position for the anointment are even more severe), thus allowing room only for the hypothesis of a common source.

The Initiation Rite Implied in the Short Greek Recension

Finally, we are in a position to undertake a liturgical reconstruction of the initiation rite, the remnants of which are preserved in chapter 8 of the short Greek recension. This rite must be the one that was unacceptable to the Jerusalem editors.

The main difference between the Melkite (dyophysite but non-Byzantine, regardless of whether monothelete or not) and the Maronite (Syrian monothelete) initiation rites, on the one hand, and

the Constantinopolitan and Jerusalem rites, on the other, consisted, in the first millennium, in the sequence of immersion and anointing with the myron. The most common sequence throughout the Christian world was immersion first and anointing second, but the ancient Syrian sequence was the opposite. By the seventh century, however, the major Syrian confessions adopted some compromises with the overwhelming custom, mostly through multiplication of baptismal anointments.[1] Two Syrian dyophysite rites, however, — not only the Maronite but also the Syrian Melkite, — remained faithful till the very late epoch, perhaps even up to the twelfth century, to the ancient custom of the pre-baptismal anointment with Myron (Mouhanna, A., 1980, pp. 119-130).[2]

The symbolism of the pre-baptismal anointment with the myron was the same as in all other rites (participation of the Holy Spirit), but the sequence was different. In the other rites, the coming of the Holy Spirit and the anointment as its symbolical expression must have been posterior to the immersion.[3] We have seen an attempt to "restore" this sequence in the "Jerusalem" rite preserved by the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* and the long Greek recension of *Barlaam*. This attempt was not especially successful, because it attached the coming of the Spirit to the water and not to the myron (indeed, it even introduced the formula of the ordination rites).

Some traces of the Eucharist are preserved in chapter 8. Namely, the image of the "box" that was in the hands of Barlaam was blended with the image of the table thus producing a big "box" that figures in the preserved text of the short recension. In its archetype, these objects were still different, and the table (τράπεζα) was used as the altar table (also called τράπεζα) for the Eucharist celebration. The rite of this archetype of the short Greek recension has had much in common with the "Jerusalem" rite, including the "unity of place" of the conversations and the Eucharist and allusions to the baptism of the eunuch of the queen of Nubia.

Between the anointment and the communion, there was certainly the baptism properly with an immersion and certainly somewhere outdoor. But where? In a river or in prince's garden? The long

---

[1] For this problem in general, see Gabriele Winkler and Sebastian Brock, also Baby Varghese (Winkler, G., 1978. §§. 24-45; Brock, S., 1981, §§. 249-257; Varghese, B., 1989). Here and below, I factor out the separate problem of the evolution of the consecrated oil itself and, therefore, the distinction between the holy myron and the consecrated oil of a lesser degree of holiness. I will use the term "myron" for the most holy species of consecrated oil, regardless of whether it was, for a given rite, unique or not.

[2] For the Syriac Melkite non-Maronite rite with a unique anointing before immersion: Sebastian Brock, (Brock, S. 1972, pp. 119-130).

[3] Cf., for the peculiar sequence even in the actual Syrian rites, where the gift of the Holy Spirit is not only posterior to the immersion but also preceding it, Varghese (Varghese, B., 1989, p. 304).

Greek recension of *Barlaam and Joasaph* seems to be closer to the short one than the *Life of Theodore*, and, therefore, the garden must be considered to be the most likely place.

Finally, we can propose our reconstruction of the initiation rite that was implied in the archetype of the short Greek recension (Table 3). The "Jerusalem" rite was constructed artificially for making it more compatible with the Jerusalem and/or Constantinopolitan liturgical customs. The literary work within which the "Jerusalem" rite was constructed became a common source of the *Life of Theodore of Edessa* and the long Greek recension of the *Barlaam and Joasaph*. We will discuss this source in the next section.

The Baptismal Rite in the Earliest Christian Recension

The proposed liturgical reconstruction leads us to the crucial question: was the archetype of the short Greek recension responsible for this Syriac initiation rite, or did its author find it in its source, that is, in an early legend of Barlaam and Joasaph?

The answer depends on the data of the earliest Christian recensions that are accessible to us through the two Georgian recensions only (the available Arabic recensions being Islamised and, therefore, irrelevant). They both meet us with a resounding silence about the baptism of Joasaph: it was not even mentioned, in a sharp contrast with the baptisms of his father and the people of the country. This does not look like a genuine feature. Against the background of the present liturgical reconstruction, the situation becomes clearer.

The silence of the two Georgian recensions about the very fact of Joasaph's baptism cannot be understood otherwise than as a deliberate omission. Such an omission must have had a reason, such as an unacceptable rite if it was described in their sources. Given that the two Georgian recensions, through their lost Arabic originals, go back to the early legends of Barlaam and Joasaph independently, this Syrian rite must have been contained in a very early recension.

In such an early period, the first half of the seventh century, a rite with a unique anointment before the immersion was not necessarily Monothelete. It would be most correct to call it simply Syrian non-Byzantinised. However, in the late eighth-century (or later) archetype of the short Greek recension, such a rite looks Monothelete.

Syrian Rites and the Two Syrian Legends in Greek

Our hypothesis that the short Greek recension implies a liturgical rite in Syriac is corroborated by the fact that, according to the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*, the initiation rite for the caliph and his companions also seems to have been performed in Syriac.

There is no sufficient reason to doubt either that the short Greek recension of *Barlaam and Joasaph* goes back to an archetype written in Greek. Above, on the basis of its implied eschatological calculation, we have evaluated its earliest possible date as shortly before AD 800. Nevertheless, its author has had an access to the Barlaam and Joasaph legends that were not accessible in Greek in his epoch. I mean both the hagiographic legend where "India" of the romance was localised in Nubia (and, from the same legend, the author received the "box" in Barlaam's hands) and the legend of the conversion of a king (where our author took the story with the skull).

The late eighth-century (or later) author of the legend that we know as the short Greek recension either was bilingual, able to use materials in Arabic for producing his own text in Greek, or he wrote in Arabic himself, and the Greek archetype of the present short Greek recension was a translation from Arabic.

I consider these two possibilities equally plausible, but they both imply almost the same *Sitz im Leben* for the respective legend, regardless of whether it was originally written in Arabic or in Greek. It was a Syrian Melkite multilingual community outside Byzantium, in the territory of the Caliphate, the liturgical language of which was Syriac. Therefore, I will continue to call this legend the archetype of the short Greek recension, without forgetting that there might have been some time-lag between the earliest form of this legend in Greek and its hypothetical Arabic original. It is very possible that this legend was created in a Monothelete milieu.

It is clear that this legend must have been written to replace another legend where Barlaam and Joasaph looked Monothelete due to their baptismal rite. According to the rules of hagiographical "wars," the only effective method of disproving a legend (and the respective hagiographical document(s)) is to create a new legend (document(s)) able to replace the former.[1]

It is most likely while not necessarily the case that the legend "against which" the "Jerusalem" legend was composed, was the archetype of the short Greek recension. There are several much less likely possibilities that we have to mention; they imply that the "Jerusalem" recension was destined to replace one of early recensions, where the peculiar Syrian baptismal rite was present still without connexion to the Monotheletism. These possibilities seem to me much less likely.

Without taking into account such rather unlikely scenarios, we can understand the two legends, the archetype of the short Greek recension and the "Jerusalem" legends, as two conflicting accounts of Barlaam and Joasaph created in Greek language using the earlier Christian legends available in Arabic within different (but dyophysite) Syrian milieux.

[1] "Rien n'élimine mieux un document que la création d'un parallèle destiné à le remplacer." Cf. (Esbroeck, M., van, 1989).

The "Jerusalem" legend represented the variant of the plot where the king and not the prince was converted. This does not mean that it influenced the longest Georgian recension (where the prince became the king for a short while), because the latter was a translation from Arabic, but, in Arabic, this variant of the plot was represented quite well. However, together with the longest Georgian recension, the "Jerusalem" legend was used by Euthymius of Athos to produce the long Greek romance.

Conclusions

Two main conclusions follow from the above.

The Greek text of the long Greek recension was produced by Euthymius of Athos not only on the ground of a long Georgian recension but with a recourse to a lost recension in Greek, which was also used by the author of the *Life of Theodore of Edessa*. At least, the rites of Christian initiation and the quotes from Agapios go back to this source.

This lost Greek recension was composed for replacing the (lost) archetype of the short Greek recension, which was composed by Monothelites, either Melkite or Maronite.

Appendix: Greek Antiquity in the Short Greek Recension

One can notice, in the short Greek recension, that it was saturated with motives of Greek culture and mythology. The most obvious are connected with the names of Joasaph's parents, Pythagoras and Philippa. I outline below some perspectives of future researches in this direction.

Philippa

The names of the secondary characters in "epic" hagiography were often borrowed from other legends. The name of St Philippa is rare and, therefore, informative in this respect. Philippa's role in the archetype of the short Greek recension cannot be completely recovered, but, at least, her prophetic dream described in chapter 10, about "an eagle with golden wings" that took Josaphat, closely resembles the myth of Ganymede.

In hagiography, St Philippa is known only as the mother of martyr Theodore of Perga. She is herself a saint.

There is also a Georgian version of this *Passio*, and its translation from Greek into Georgian is ascribed to Euthymius of Athos (Gabidzashvili, E., 2004, p. 213). Unfortunately, it is not published either and even almost unstudied.

Pythagoras

The name Pythagoras became associated with the name of Barlaam of our romance, but we do not know when and where. What we do know, that this association was a *fait établi* in the tenth-century Iran. It is witnessed by the tenth-century *Epistles of the Brethren of Purity* (*Rasāʾil Iḫwān al-Ṣafāʾ*)[1] — "one of the great works of Arabic literature about whose authors we know hardly anything." (Netton, I. R., 1991). The *Epistles* are certainly Iranian, while their exact place of origin is disputable, the personalities of the authors are concealed (even though many guesses were put forward). Their views were non-traditionalist Islamic, somewhat syncretistic between Islam and Christianity, while the latter had a *penchant* toward the Nestorianism (Netton, I. R., 1991, pp. 53-71). Their use of the *Barlaam and Joasaph* is intensive, but only a unique citation is attributed to Barlaam (Bilawhar) explicitly (Gimaret, D., 1971, pp. 36-38; Netton, I. R., 1991, pp. 89-92).

The *Epistles* of the Brethren of Purity corroborate our conclusion that the archetype of the short Greek recension was created outside Byzantium. In Byzantium, such an association between Barlaam and Pythagoras is unattested. It looks plausible that such an association was specific to Iran, but we have no data to define its *Sitz im Leben*.

References

Abuladze, I. (Ed.). (1957). Balavarianis kartuli redaktsiebi [The Georgian recensions of the Balavariani] (Dzveli kartuli enis dzeglebi, Vol. 10). Gamomtsemloba Sakartvelos SSR Metsnierebata Akademiisa.

Abuladze, I. (1973). Dzveli kartuli enis leksikoni [The dictionary of the old Georgian language]. Metsniereba.

Agémian, S. (1992). Deux manuscrits arabes chrétiens illustrés du *Roman de Barlaam et Joasaph*. *Revue des études arméniennes*, 23.

Amir Harrak. (2017). *The chronicle of Zuqnīn. Parts I and II: From the creation to the year 506/7 AD* (Gorgias Chronicles of Late Antiquity, 2). Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.

Agapetos Diakonos. (1995). *Der Fürstenspiegel für Kaiser Iustinianos* (R. Riedinger, Ed.; Vol. 1, pp. 33.9-13). Athens: Hētaireia Philōn tou Laou, Kēntron Erevnēs Byzantou. (Original work translated in Bell, P. N., 2009, *Three political voices from the age of Justinian*, pp. 103–104. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)

Barlaam and Joasaph. (1914). In S. J. Damscene (Trans. G. R. Woodward & H. Mattingly), *Barlaam and Ioasaph* (Loeb Classical Library, 34, pp. 555). London: W. Heinemann; New York: Macmillan.

[1] For the date of the first half of the tenth century, see Y[ves] Marquet, (Marquet, Y., 1986, pp. 1071-1076).

Blaise, A. (1975). *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs du Moyen-Âge / Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi praesertim ad res ecclesiasticas investigandas pertinens* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis). Turnhout: Brepols.

Blanchard, M. J. (1994). The Georgian version of the Martyrdom of Saint Michael, monk of Mar Sabas Monastery. ARAM, 6, 149–163.

Brandes, W. (1997). Anastasios ὁ Δίκορος: Endzeiterwartung und Kaiserkritik in Byzanz um 500 n. Chr. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 90.

Brandes, W. (2021). Traditions and expectations in the medieval Eastern Christian world. In M. Heiduk et al. (Eds.), *Prognostication in the medieval world: A handbook* (Vol. 1). Berlin/Boston: W. de Gruyter.

Burgess, R. W., & Witakowski, W. (1999). *Studies in Eusebian and post-Eusebian chronography* (Historia Einzelschriften, 135). Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Brock, S. (1972). A short Melkite baptismal service in Syriac. *Parole de l'Orient*, 3, 119–130.

Brock, S. (1981). The transition to a post-baptismal anointing in the Antiochene rite. In B. D. Spinks (Ed.), *The sacrifice of praise: Studies in honour of A.H. Couratin* (Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae", Subsidia 19, pp. 249–257). Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. (Reprinted 2013, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition*, 3rd ed., Piscataway: Gorgias Press)

Carolus du Fresne Du Cange. (1883–1887). *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (L. Favre, Ed.; Vol. 6, col. 530b). Niort: L. Favre.

Datiashvili, L. (1973). Tedore edeselis tskhovreba da abuk'ura [The life of Theodore of Edessa and Abukura]. In Dzveli kartuli mts'erlobisa da rustvelologiis sak'itkhebi [Questions of old Georgian literature and Rustavelology] (Vol. 5, pp. xx-xx). Metsniereba.

Die Chronik des Hieronymus. (1956). *Hieronymi Chronicon* (R. Helm, Ed.; 2nd ed., GCS, 47; Eusebius Werke, 7). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Drost-Abgaryan, A. (2016). The reception of Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 264–339) in Armenia. In F. Gazzano, L. Pagani, & G. Traina (Eds.), *Greek texts and Armenian traditions: An interdisciplinary approach* (Trends in Classics — Supplementary Volumes, 39, pp. 215–229). Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.

Dunbabin, K. M. D. (2010). *The Roman banquet: Images of conviviality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eusebius Pamphilius Caesarensis. (1818). *Chronicon bipartitum nunc primum ex armeniaco textu in latinum conversum adnotationibus auctum graecis fragmentis exornatum* (J. B. Aucher, Ed., pars II, pp. 260–261). Venice: Typis coenobii PP. Armenorum in insula S. Lazari. (Compare: Eusebius, *Die Chronik*, ed. J. Karst, 1911, Leipzig, p. 211)

Esbroeck, M. van. (1989). La Lettre sur le Dimanche, descendue du ciel. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 107.
Gabidzashvili, E. (2004). Kartuli natargmni hagiografia [Georgian translated hagiography]. Tbilisi.
Gil, J. (1978). Los terrores del año 800. In *Actas del Simposio para el estudio de los códices del Comentario sobre el Apocalipsis de Beato de Liébana* (Vol. I). Madrid: Joyas Bibliográficas.
Gimaret, D. (1971). *Le Livre de Bilawhar et Būḏāsf selon la version arabe ismaélienne* (Centre de recherches d'histoire et de philologie de la IVe Section de l'École pratique des Hautes Études, IV. Hautes Études islamiques et orientales d'histoire comparée, 3). Genève/Paris: Droz.
Griffith, S. H. (2001). The life of Theodore of Edessa: History, hagiography, and religious apologetics in Mar Saba Monastery in early Abbasid times. In J. Patrich (Ed.), *The Sabaite heritage in the Orthodox Church from the fifth century to the present* (OLA, 98). Leuven: Peeters.
Gouillard, J. (1947). Supercheries et méprises littéraires: L'œuvre de Saint Théodore d'Édesse. *Revue des études byzantines*, 5,24.
Grumel, V. (1958). La chronologie (Bibliothèque byzantine; Traité d'études byzantines, I). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.25.
Ibn Bābawayh. (1984/1985). *Kitāb ʾikmāl ad-dīn wa ʾitmām an-niʿmah* (ʿA. A. al-Ġaffārī, Ed., 1405 AH). Qum.
Ingorokva, P. (1939). motkhrobaꙍ abuk'uraꙍsi mikaelistvis sabats'midelisa anu 'abuk'uraꙍ' [The story of Abukura for Michael of Sabatsmideli or 'Abukura']. In *Mnat'obi*, No 10–11. (pp. 249-254).
Karst, J. (Ed. & Trans.). (1911). *Eusebius: Die Chronik* (GCS 20; Eusebius Werke 5). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
Kazhdan, A. (1988). Where, when and by whom was the Greek Barlaam and Joasaph not written. In G. Wirth (Ed.), *Zu Alexander der Große. Festschrift G. Wirth zum 60*. Geburtstag am 9.12.86 (Vol. 2, pp. 1187–1209). Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert. (Reprinted in Kazhdan, Authors and Texts in Byzantium (CS400), Aldershot–Brookfield: Variorum, 1993, ch. IX), esp. 1201-1203.
Kekelidze, K. (1960). romani 'abuk'ura' da misi ori redaktsia dzvel kartul mts'erobashi, [The Romance 'Abukura' and Its Two Recensions in the Old Georgian Literature,]. In: Etudebi dzveli kartuli lit'erat'uris ist'oriidan [Studies in the history of old Georgian literature] (Vol. 6, pp. 18-40). Tbilisis Sakhelmpits'o Universit'et'is Gamomtsemloba.
Kekelidze, K. (1918). Kartuli hagiograpiuli dzeglebi. Natsili I. K'imeni. T'omi I: Ianvris, tebervlis, mart'is, aprilis da maisis tvetis t'ekst'ebi [*Monumenta Hagiographica Georgica.* Pars prima. *Keimena.* Tom. I Januarium, Februarium, Martium, Aprilem et Majum menses continens]. Sakartvelost Rk'inigzis Sammart'velos T'ipo-Litografia.
Keseling, P. (1927). Die Chronik des Eusebius in der syrischen Überlieferung. *Oriens Christianus*, 23.

Gimaret, D. (Ed.). (1972). *Kitāb Bilawhar wa Būḏāsf* (Recherches publiées sous la direction de l'Institut de lettres orientales de Beyrouth, Nouvelle série, A. Langue arabe et pensée islamique, T. VI). Beyrouth: Dar el-Machreq.

Lamoreaux, J. (2002). The biography of Theodore Abū Qurrah revisited. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 56.

Landes, R. (1988). Lest the millennium be fulfilled: Apocalyptic expectations and the pattern of Western chronography 100–800 CE. In W. Verbeke, D. Verhelst, & A. Welkenhuysen (Eds.), *The use and abuse of eschatology in the Middle Ages* (Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, Series I / Studia XV). Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Lourié, B. (2011). India 'far beyond Egypt': Barlaam and Ioasaph and Nubia in the 6th century. In D. Bumazhnov, E. Grypeou, T. B. Sailors, & A. Toepel (Eds.), *Bibel, Byzanz und Christlicher Orient. Festschrift für Stephen Gerö zum 65. Geburtstag* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 187). Leuven: Peeters.

Lourié, B. (2022). Josaphat, son of Pythagoras: The short Greek recension and the hagiographical dossier of Sts Barlaam and Joasaph. In M. Deeg, B. Lourié, & A. Piras (Eds.), *The pervading power of a narrative: The story and history of the Barlaam and Josaphat legend*. Leiden: Brill.

Marquet, Y. (1986). Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ. In B. Lewis, et al. (Eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (New edition, Vol. 3, H–Iram, pp. 1071–1076). Leiden: Brill; London: Luzac & Co.

Mghebrishvili, N. (2012). "dzvel kartul natargmn hagiograpiul dzeglebshi mokhseniebuli abuk'urasa da teodore edeselis urtiertmimartebis sak'itkhisatvis"[To the question of mutual relationships between Abukura and Theodore of Edessa mentioned in the monuments of Georgian translated hagiography]. Spekali, 15, 8. https://doi.org/10.55804/jtsu-1987-8583-15-8

Mouhanna, A. (1980). *Les rites de l'initiation dans l'Église Maronite* (OCA, 212). Rome: PIO.

Mosshammer, A. A. (1979). *The chronicle of Eusebius and Greek chronographic tradition*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; London: Associated University Press.

Möhring, H. (2021). Traditions and Expectations in the Medieval Western Christian World. In M. Heiduk, K. Herbers & H. Lehner (Ed.), Prognostication in the Medieval World: A Handbook (pp. 269-283). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110499773-010

Netton, I. R. (1991). Muslim Neoplatonists: An introduction to the thought of the Brethren of Purity (Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ) (pbk reprint with corrections of the 1982 hardback ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Niermeyer, J. F. (1976). *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus: Lexique latin médiéval—français/anglais* (C. van de Kieft, Ed.). Leiden: Brill. 861-862, at 861.

Peeters, P. (1930). La Passion de S. Michel le Sabaïte. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 48.

Peeters, P. (1931). La première traduction latine de Barlaam et Josaphat et son original grec. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 49.

Pérez, M. I. (1996). Apuntes sobre la historia del texto bizantino de la Historia edificante de Barlaam y Josafat. *Erytheia*, 17, pp. 159–177.

Pertusi, A. (1988). *Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo: Significato e ruolo storico delle profezie sulla caduta di Costantinopoli in Orient e in Occidente* (posthumous edition, E. Morini, Ed.). Rome: Instituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo.

Podskalsky, G. (1972). Byzantinische Reichseschatologie: Die Periodisierung der Weltgeschichte in den vier Grossreichen (Daniel 2 und 7) und dem Tausendjährigen Friedensreiche (Apok. 20). Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, Reihe der philosophischen Fakultät, 9). München: W. Fink.

Pomialovsky, I. V. (1892). The life of our father among the saints Theodore the Archbishop of Edessa: According to two manuscripts of the Moscow Synodal Library [Žitie iže vo svâtyh″ otca našego Θeodora arhiepiskopa Edesskago. Po dvum″ rukopisâm″ Moskovskoj Svnodal′noj biblioteki] (Notices of the Historical and Philological Department of the Imperial Saint Petersburg University, Part 29). St Petersburg: Typography of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

Sardshweladse, S., & Fähnrich, H. (1999). *Altgeorgisch-Deutsch Wörterbuch* (Lexicographia orientalis, 5). Hamburg: H. Buske.

Der Nersessian, S. (1937). *L'illustration du Roman de Barlaam et Joasaph* (2 vols.). Paris: E. de Boccard.

Sminé, R. E. (1993). The miniatures of a Christian Arabic Barlaam and Joasaph: Balamand 147. *Parole de l'Orient*, 18, 171–229.

Sminé Ġannāğa, R. (1994). Miniatures of the history of Barlaam and Joasaph in the manuscript of Balamand. In The Arabic manuscripts in the monasteries of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch in Lebanon (Vol. 2, The Monastery of the Theotokos Balamand). Beirut: Department of Documents and Studies.

Törszök, J. (2011). Kāpālikas. In K. A. Jacobsen (Ed.), *Brill's encyclopedia of Hinduism* (Vol. 3, pp. 355–361). Leiden: Brill.

Varghese, B. (1989). *Les onctions baptismales dans la tradition syrienne* (CSCO, 512; Subsidia, 82). Leuven: Peeters.

Vasiliev, A. (1942–1943). The life of St. Theodore of Edessa. *Byzantion*, 16.

Vershinin, K. V. (2021). Pervaâ redakciâ slavânskogo perevoda Žitiâ Feodora Èdesskogo, [The first recension of the Slavonic translation of the life of Theodore of Edessa]. In A. A. Pichkhadze et al. (Eds.), Slova, konstrukcii i teksty v istorii russkoj pis′mennosti: Sbornik statej k 70-letiû akademika

A. M. Moldovana [Words, constructions, and texts in the history of Russian writing: Collection of articles for the 70th anniversary of Academician A. M. Moldovan]. Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istoriia.

Volk, R. (2006). *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Bd VI/2: Historia animae utilis de Barlaam et Ioasaph (spuria).* Text und zehn Appendices (Patristische Texte und Studien, 60). Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter.

Volk, R. (2009). *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. Bd. VI/1: Historia animae utilis de Barlaam et Ioasaph (spuria). Einführung* (Patristische Texte und Studien, 61). Berlin & New York: W. de Gruyter.

Wawryk, M. (1968). *Initiatio monastica in liturgia byzantina: Officiorum schematis monastici magni et parvi necnon rasophoratus exordia et evolution* (OCA, 180). Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum.

Witakowski, W. (1999–2000). The Chronicle of Eusebius: Its type and continuation in Syriac historiography. *ARAM*, 11–12.

Witakowski, W. (2021). Syriac eschatology in antiquity. In H. Marlow, K. Pollmann, & H. Van Noorden (Eds.), *Eschatology in antiquity: Forms and functions*. London/New York: Routledge.

Winkler, G. (1978). The original meaning of the prebaptismal anointing and its implications. *Worship*, 52(1), 24–45. (Reprinted 1997, in *Studies in early Christian liturgy and its context*, CS 593, Ashgate)