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ABSTRACT. The article deals with two Byzantine chronicles that were translated into Old Church Slavic in the Middle Ages on the Balkan Peninsula and were subsequently adapted in Rus’, where they served as the base and source of inspiration for indigenous East Slavic historical studies in universal history. It is about the works of Symeon Magister and Logothete, who probably wrote between the reign of Romanus I Lecapenus and the beginning of the reign of Basil II, and the Epitome historiarum of John Zonaras, covering history from the creation of the world to 1118, which is the most comprehensive Byzantine historical work and which, possibly, was completed ca. 1145. The aim of the article is to establish the chronology of the creation of the Old Church Slavic translations of both chronicles and the history of their dissemination in the Slavia Orthodoxa area (with a review of the state of research). The editions of the translations and unpublished manuscript material were examined (its excerpt is presented in the appendix). We were able to establish that the complete translation of the work of Symeon Magister and Logothete is preserved only in the Moldavian historiographical compilation of 1637, while the text of John Zonaras was translated by the Slavs several times and functioned in their literatures in many versions, none of which, however, is complete.
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The influence of Byzantine historiography on the historical writings of the Orthodox Slavs (Bulgarians, Serbs, inhabitants of Rus’) in the Middle Ages and the early modern era is a phenomenon that is widely confirmed in the source material and, at the same time, relatively well researched. There is no doubt that just a few decades after the creation of the Old Church Slavic language, i.e. at the turn of the 9th and 10th centuries, under the auspices of the Bulgarian rulers, Symeon I the Great (893–927) and his son Peter (927–969), the chronicles of Constantinopolitan authors, or historians from other parts of the empire who wrote in Greek, began to be translated into this language. Over the following centuries, these translations became for Orthodox Slavs the basic source of knowledge about universal history. It was understood as a continuum of events since the creation of the world (dated in the Slavia Orthodoxa area, according to the Constantinopolitan tradition, as 5508 before the birth of Christ), through the events told in the Old Testament, up to the history of the Roman Empire and its Christian continuation with its capital on the Bosporus, as well as the states and peoples neighboring it. For the South Slavs (especially for Bulgarians, described by the Byzantine authors), they were often the main point of reference in reflection on their own past. Their linguistic and cultural relatives from Kiev and Novgorod the Great were in a slightly different situation: unable to find sufficient information about the history of Rus’ on the pages of the chronicles translated from Greek, they, quite quickly (11th–12th centuries), began to write down/compile their own historical texts in their “image and likeness” (chronographs and letopisi), taking over many of the genre features of the Byzantine historiography.\(^1\)

In the current research on the Church Slavic translations of Greek historians and their influence on the literature of the Slavia Orthodoxa area, a certain disproportion can be noticed: most scholars usually focus on the influence of two Constantinopolitan chronicles: John Malalas (6th century) and George Hamartolus — often referred to as George the Monk (9th century).\(^2\) However, later texts are also

---


important for understanding the development of historical literature of the Southern and Eastern Slavs in the following centuries, including: works of Symeon Magister and Logothete (10th century) and John Zonaras (12th century). In this article, we will try to summarize the current state of knowledge about them and indicate directions for further studies.

1. THE CHRONICLE OF SYMEON MAGISTER AND LOGOTHETE

1.1. THE BYZANTINE ASPECT

The work of Symeon Magister and Logothete has been present in the field of interest of scholars since the 19th century. What is significant is that, despite this interest, the first critical edition of his text was published only at the beginning of the 21st century. What is more, it only covered the so-called Version A of his Chronicle. This is primarily a consequence of an unclear manuscript tradition and the existence of many variants of the text in Byzantine literature (it is worth remembering that in the 19th century, the work of Symeon was published several times, and erroneously attributed to, for example, Leo the Grammarian, Pseudo-Theodosius Melissenus or Pseudo-George, while Symeon himself was incorrectly credited with the authorship of the so-called Chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon). The starting point for contemporary research are the works published at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, authored by V.G. Vasilevskij, C. de Boor and S.P. Šestakov. In the second half of the 20th century and in the first decades of the 21st century, the discussion focuses, on the one hand, on the author himself, and on the other hand, on various variants of his work, the issues with the sources used by the historian, and the manner of their use. As for the first issue, there are still roughly two positions found in use today — some scholars identify the author of the Chronicle as Symeon the Metaphrast, a Byzantine hagiographer from the 10th century, others doubts this and distinguish the historian and the hagiographer.
separately. In the second line of considerations, important voices were expressed by, among others: A. Kazhdan, A. Markopoulos, W.T. Treadgold, A. Sotiroudis, J.M. Featherstone, S. Wahlgren, Juan Signes Codoñer. Polish scientists also joined the discussion on the indicated issues, usually recapitulating the findings of foreign researchers, including: W. Swoboda, T. Wasilewski and A. Brzóstowska.

The Greek original of the chronicle of Symeon Magister and Logothete has two complete translations into modern languages: into Russian by L.Ju. Vinogradov and English prepared by S. Wahlgren.

Trying to summarize the current discussion about this author, it should be stated that our knowledge about him is very poor. He, naturally, had the title of a magister and a logothete. He was probably active from the reign of Romanus I Lecapenus (920–944) to the beginning of the reign of Basil II (976–1025). In addition to the \textit{Chronicle}, he is credited with an epitaph for the deaths of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (959) and Stephen Lecapenus (963). Due to the titles he wears, as mentioned above, he is sometimes identified with the famous 10th century hagiographer, Symeon the Metaphrast (who died around 1000), author of the lives of saints and acts of martyrs. Some researchers suggest that the author of the \textit{Chronicle} originated from clerical ar-
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9 \textit{Хроника Симеона Магистра и Логофета}, transl. Л.Ю. Виноградов, П.В. Кузенков, Москва 2014.

10 \textit{The Chronicle of the Logothete}. 
istocracy. It is worth noting that he represented a trend of Byzantine historiography that was critical towards the Macedonian dynasty.

As for his Chronicle, it is known in two variants: redaction A, the older one, which presents a description of events from the creation of the world to the year 948, i.e. the death of Romanus I Lecapenus. It was written, for obvious reasons, after this year, perhaps after the death of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (959), which is mentioned in fragment 135.1 (taking into account that it is not an interpolation, as Wahlgren claims\(^{11}\)) or perhaps during the reign of Nicephorus II Phocas (963–969). The later, redaction B, contains a lecture on the history of Byzantium, expanded with additional details, up to the year 963. It was probably written during the reign of Nicephorus II Phocas (maybe in 968/969, according to W.T. Treadgold\(^{12}\)). The older version of the Chronicle of Symeon Magister and Logothete is consistent with the Georgius Monachus Continuatus in its redaction A, and with the records of Leo the Grammarian and Pseudo-Theodosius Melissenus. The younger version of the Chronicle is consistent with the redaction B of the Georgius Monachus Continuatus. There are also connections between the 6th book of Theophanes Continuatus (the so-called Text III) and the work of Symeon Magister and Logothete. It is believed to be a combination of two texts, namely the so-called Text IIIa (886–948) and Text IIIb (944–963). Text IIIa is to be a fragment of the B redaction of Symeon Magister and Logothete’s work. Text IIIb is to be based (although with some changes) on the A version. Separate textologically, although related in content, are the following works: the Chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon and the Chronicle of Symeon Magister and Logothete.

The question remains open whether Symeon compiled fragments of various texts or if he continued one (there is an opinion that he could have used some unknown chronicle as a source, covering the times from the creation of the world up to 842). His work uses different sources, depending on the period,\(^{13}\) e.g. for the early Byzantine era it was Theodore Lector’s Church History. There are also visible traces of knowledge of the works of John Malalas. For the 7th–8th centuries, the base source was Chronographia by Theophanes. For this particular period, the dependence of the Chronicle of Symeon Magister and Logothete on the works of George the Monk (Hamartolus) is rejected nowadays.\(^{14}\) In turn, for the times of Basil I (858–886) and Leo VI (886–912), according to the concept of A.P. Každan, the basis was a certain work entitled Life of Basil I, written in the circle of the patriarch Photius I (858–867, 877–886), supplemented with annalistic records regarding Leo VI.\(^{15}\) The last part of the work was based on oral tradition and the author’s personal observations.

---

\(^{11}\) Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon, 135.1.

\(^{12}\) W. Treadgold, The Middle, p. 206.

\(^{13}\) About Symeon’s sources: Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon, p. 118*-120*; cf. Хроника Симеона Магистра и Логофета, transl. Л.Ю. Виноградов, p. 20–22.

\(^{14}\) Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon, p. 119*.

\(^{15}\) А.П. Каждан, Хроника Симеона, p. 138–139.
For the Byzantine period, the content of his *Chronicle* was composed around the reign of individual emperors (one reign — one chapter), and — for the earlier times — around the leader of the people, who is the main point of the narrative.

The work of Symeon Magister and Logothete was a popular one, as evidenced by numerous preserved copies (according to Wahlgren: there are 29 Greek manuscripts of version A, 8 Greek ones of version B, 2 of the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon*, 11 of the *Chronicon Ambrosianum*), versions and references, as well as translations into the Church Slavic language. The oldest manuscripts come from the 11th and 12th centuries: BNF, Gr. 1711; BSB, Gr. 218; BNF, Gr. 1712.16

1.2. The Slavic aspect

Research on the РНБ F.IV.307 manuscript, which is the only preserved complete Slavic variant of the *Chronicle* of Symeon Magister and Logothete (excluding the fragments of the *Georgius Monachus Continuatus* corresponding to it, existing within several Church Slavic redactions of the *Chronicle* of George the Monk), was initiated in Russia already at the end of the 19th century by V.G. Vasilevskij.17 This scholar considered the manuscript in question to be a copy of a Bulgarian manuscript from the 14th century, containing a South Slavic translation of the Byzantine historian’s work. At the same time, it was established that it is a copy of a Moldavian historiographic compilation initiated by the metropolitan Anastasie Crimca (1608–1629) and completed on the orders of hospodar Basil Lupu in 1637. An important achievement in the study of this work and its sources was the publication of V.I. Sreznevski.18 He showed that the manuscript consists of two parts: the source base of the first one (fol. 1–254) would mainly be the Church Slavic translation of the *Chronicle* by Symeon Magister and Logothete, while the second one (fol. 254–325’) would be, in his opinion, a compilation, most probably based on the work of John Zonaras and other sources. V.I. Sreznevski also prepared a complete edition of the Church Slavic text (1905).19 The research undertaken at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries was continued by M. Weingart, G. Ostrogorski and A.P. Každan,20 concluding that the Slavic variant of Symeon’s work, preserved in the РНБ F.IV.307, textologically corresponds to the Greek manuscripts, containing a version of the work very close to the protograph. In 1971, a reissue was pub-
lished in London by V.I. Sreznevski, with an introduction by I. Dujčev and a reprint of an article by G. Ostrogorski. In the 1980s, the state of research on the Church Slavic translation of the text of Symeon Magister and Logothete was summarized by O.V. Tvorogov. A Slavic translation was also included in the studies of W.K. Hannah and S. Wahlgren. The latter researcher finally confirmed that the translation in question reflects the so-called version A of the Byzantine text. The Church Slavic variant was also included in the variants for translating the Chronicle of Symeon into Russian. When recapitulating the current state of research, it should be stated that Orthodox Slavs (both in the Balkans and Eastern Europe) did not have access to the full text of the work of Symeon Magister and Logothete for several centuries. Contrary to what is commonly believed, no comprehensive Church Slavic translation of the discussed Chronicle was ever created at the turn of the 10th and 11th centuries in Bulgarian lands — only the fragment including a description of the events from 842–963, known in the literature as the Georgius Monachus Continuatus (version B). Moreover, for many centuries, it was also erroneously considered an inherent part of the Chronicle of George the Monk. The historical work of Symeon Magister and Logothete, without abbreviations and omissions, was translated into the Church Slavic language in the Balkans only in the 14th century. This translation has survived to this day only in a Moldavian compilation from the beginning of the 17th century (РНБ F.IV.307, fols. 1–254). It can be assumed that this translation very faithfully reflects the Greek original of the Byzantine Chronicle.

21 В.И. Срезневский, Симеона Метафраста.
25 Хроника Симеона Магистра и Логофета, transl. Л.Ю. Виноградов.
2. CHRONICLE OF JOHN ZONARAS

2.1. THE BYZANTINE ASPECT

The inspiration for a scientific discussion on *Epitome historiarum* by John Zonaras was the publication of critical editions of this work. Researchers were especially interested in the issue of the sources used by the Byzantine author, and the way in which their message was adapted in his *Chronicle*. The starting point for these considerations were the works of W.A. Schmidt and E. Patzig. Interest in Zonaras was revived in the 1980s and 1990s. Researchers then studied the sources that John used in his narrative about particular centuries or periods of the reign of specific rulers. Important voices in this discussion included: M. DiMaio, B. Bleckmann and E. Trapp. D.A. Černoglazov commented on the issue of Zonaras’ sources and the way they were used, at the beginning of the 21st century, followed more recently by Ch. Mallan. In the 1990s, the issue of the manuscript tradition of Zonaras’s work was discussed by P.M.L. Leone. During this period, works on the language and style
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of Zonaras were also created, as well as, among others, on his sense of humor. In the 21st century, the knowledge on John Zonaras and his Epitome historiarum was summarized by: Th.M. Banchich, W. Treadgold and L. Neville. In Poland, M. Plezia and O. Jurewicz wrote about the state of research on Zonaras’s text. It is worth noting that this work, apart from the 19th century Latin translation, and the Modern Greek translation by I. Gregoriadis, has not yet been fully translated into any other modern European language.

Synthesizing our knowledge about the life of John (which is most likely his monastic name) Zonaras, it should be stated that it is fairly modest. He may have been born during the reign of Michael VII (1071–1078) or Nicephorus III Botaniates (1078–1081). W. Treadgold believes that this historian was most likely born around 1074. He came from a family that acquired wealth thanks to commercial activities, and entered the circles of the official elite in Constantinople. John made a career at the imperial court and in the judiciary offices. He held the office of imperial secretary (protoasekretis) and was a commander of bodyguards (droungarios tes vigles). He started a family and had offspring. It is possible that around 1130 he lost his wife and child(ren), which shocked him deeply and made him abandon his secular life and join the monastery of St. Glyceria, on a small island of the same name, located just over 70 km from Constantinople, in the Archipelago of the Princes’ Islands. Some scholars believe that the real reason why John joined the monastery was the loss of his position at the imperial court. There, after a few years, under pressure from his friends, he started working on his Epitome historiarum. The date of Zonaras’s death is unknown.

Epitome historiarum (‘Επιτομὴ ἱστοριῶν) covers the history beginning with the creation of the world and up to 1118. It is the largest Byzantine historical text in terms of size. It is possible that it was completed around 1145. At the end of the 17th century, Charles du Fresne, the modern publisher of Zonaras’s work, divided it into eighteen books. The Epitome comprises two main parts. The first twelve books, completed by the time of Constantine the Great (306–337), were prepared based on biblical accounts and the works of, among others, Herodotus, Xenophon, Arrian and Plutarch, Cassius Dio, Flavius Josephus, Eusebius of Caesarea and Theodoret of Cyrus. The
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source base for the remaining books included, among others: works of Procopius of Caesarea, John Malalas, John of Antioch, Theophanes (Chronographia is the main source for the period of the 7th–early 8th centuries), Nicephorus, George the Monk (or Pseudo-Symeon or George Cedrenus), John Skylitzes, Michael Attalaiates and Michael Psellus. \(^{46}\) Beginning with 1079, the Epitome became a work independent of other historical records, developed on the basis of the author’s personal knowledge, supplemented with information obtained from friends.

Zonaras wrote in an easy language, though *formal and atticing*. \(^{47}\) He avoided introducing long speeches, descriptions and digressions (as requested by his friends). He tried to make his story attract the reader’s attention. He discussed and shortened his sources rather than quoting them *in extenso*. He gave the events presented on their basis a new meaning, contemporary from his perspective, and did not shy away from comments. He sometimes contaminated source materials concerning specific issues, and sometimes left them in different versions. Sometimes, however, he tried to choose only one of them and then justify his choice. \(^{48}\)

Zonaras’s work was very popular. It has been translated into Church Slavic several times. There is also an Aragonese version. It has been preserved in over 72 manuscripts to this day. \(^{49}\)

2.2. **The Slavic aspect**

Interest in the topic of the reception of John Zonaras’s *Epitome historiarum* in the context of medieval writings of the Orthodox Slavs (both Southern and Eastern) dates back to the mid-19th century. We can find traces of it already in the correspondence of one of the forerunners of modern Paleoslavic studies, Pavel Józef Šafárik (1795–1861), with O.M. Bodianski (1808–1877). The latter scholar introduced one of the Slavic shortened redactions of the Byzantine historian’s work, the so-called *Paralipomenon*, into scientific circulation. In 1882, V. Kačanovskij published the text of the manuscript, \(^{50}\) which in 1918 was recognized by P.O. Potapov as one of the copies of the oldest Church Slavic translation of the chronicle of John Zonaras, created — as it was then believed — around 1170 in Bulgaria. In the following decades, further copies of this relic were discovered. \(^{51}\) In 1970, Angelica Jacobs published a critical edition of the Church Slavic variant of John Zonaras’s work, along with an extensive

\(^{46}\) Review of sources used by John Zonaras; ibidem, p. 393–397.

\(^{47}\) Ibidem, p. 392.

\(^{48}\) More on Zonaras’s working methods, see the works of D.A. Černoglazov cited in footnote 35.

\(^{49}\) P. Leone, *La tradizione manoscritta*.


commentary. At the same time, research was also carried out on the shortened version of the chronicle, the so-called Paralipomenon, created in Serbia at the beginning of the 15th century, and preserved in one Rus’ manuscript. Their culmination was the publication of the text by O.V. Tvorogov. At the end of the 19th century, P. Lavrov discovered and published another, South Slavic variant from the 15th century. In Russian Slavic studies, the research on the reception of John Zonaras’s work among the Slavs was conducted primarily in the context of his influence on medieval Rus’ historiography. O.V. Tvorogov recapitulated the state of research on the issue in the late 1980s. An overview of the latest studies on the chronicle of John Zonaras and its translations into the Church Slavic language can also be found in the encyclopedia entry authored by A.G. Bondač.

In the course of research conducted since the mid-19th century, it was possible to demonstrate that the work of John Zonaras was quite widely adapted in the medieval writing of the Southern and Eastern Slavs. This is evidenced by the appearance of several (3–4) variants of this work in the area of Slavia Orthodoxa. Although it was translated into the Church Slavic language and reworked many times, it was never adopted in the Slavic circle in its entire form, probably due to the large size of the original Greek text. Currently, it is usually assumed that the first Church Slavic translation of the chronicle was written in Serbia, around 1170, or in the 1330s/1340s. Precise dating is, unfortunately, made difficult by the ambiguity of the gloss, which appears in several Slavic manuscripts, and indirectly points to the year 1170, 1332 or 1344. The oldest copy of this translation, preserved only in the form of a single burnt page torn out from the codex, comes from the second half of the 14th cen-

52 A. Jacobs, Ζωναρας-Ζонара.
54 П. Лавров, Югославянская переделка Зонары, “Византийский Временник” 1897, vol. 4, p. 452–460.
tury (РНБ 182.94). The remaining copies are later, including: ÖNB Slav. 126 (15th–16th centuries); PBS 47 (15th–16th centuries); manuscript from the Hilandar Monastery on Mount Athos, MS 433 (1520–1530); БАН 24.04.34 (first half of the 16th century); РГБ 310.1191 (17th century). According to A. Jacobs, they contain only fragments of the Byzantine chronicle, covering the description of events from the years 324–337, 379–457, 491–518, 582–602, 780–802, 813–820, 829–912, 976–1028. The researcher also believes that a variant of the Church Slavic translation discussed here is the South Slavic redaction of the Chronicle published by P. Lavrov, preserved on the pages of a Serbian manuscript from the mid-15th century (from the collections of the Zograf Monastery on Mount Athos).

Most experts on the subject are now inclined to claim that around 1408, in the Hilandar Monastery on Mount Athos, an abbreviation of the work of John Zonaras (the so-called Paralipomenon) was made for the Serbian despot, Stefan Lazarević (1402–1427). Most likely, this is the only variant of the Church Slavic translation of the Byzantine historian’s text, which became widespread in the Eastern Slavic region. It has been preserved in one Rus’ copy from the beginning of the 16th century: РГБ 113.230(655), fol. 1–122. Fragments of the chronicle can also be found in the manuscript РНБ F.IV.307 from the beginning of the 17th century, which contains — as we mentioned above — the Church Slavic translation of the historical work of Symeon Magister and Logothete (fol. 254–325”). It is also worth noting that A.G. Bondač is of the opinion that taking into account all existing copies and Church Slavic variants of John Zonaras’s work, it is possible to reconstruct the full text of only the first six books of his Chronicle.

***

To sum up, the chronicles of Symeon Magister and Logothete (10th century) and John Zonaras (12th century) have been of interest to researchers for almost two hundred years. However, they have attracted the attention of Byzantine historians much more often than that of Paleoslavists. In-depth studies on the Church Slavic translations of these works and their impact on the historical literature of the Slavia Orthodoxa circle in the Middle Ages (both in its Southern and Eastern parts) would allow us to obtain a more complete picture of the historiography of the Orthodox Slavs in the 11th–16th centuries than before. After all, Symeon and John were — next to the Chronicle

60  A. Jacobs, Ζωναρας–Ζοναρα, p. 3–4.
61  П. Лавров., Югославянская переделка; A. Jacobs, Ζωναρας–Ζοναρα, p. 100.
63  V.I. Sreznevskij, Simeona Metafrasta i Logoteta, p. 144–186.
of Constantine Manasses from the 12th century — for many centuries, the basic source of knowledge about the history of Byzantium and the neighboring Balkan peoples after 843 (where the text of George the Monk ends) for East Slavic historiographers, introducing them, for example, to the fate of the Bulgarian state and its rulers in the 10th century. John Zonaras *Paralipomenon* was also an important source for the creators of a number of Old Rus’ chronographs. A separate, but no less important issue is the influence of the two chronicles discussed here on the historiography of Southeastern Europe in the early modern era, which can be evidenced not only by the above-mentioned Moldavian compilation of the metropolitan Anastasie Crimca and hospodar Basil Lupu from 1637, but also by a number of monuments of Ukrainian provenance, such as the *Hustyn Letopis* from around 1670.

---


66 А.А. Турлов, *Заметки*, p. 3–11.

ANNEX

THE CHRONICLE OF JOHN ZONARAS IN THE CHURCH SLAVIC TRANSLATION
(fragment of book XVI)

Manuscript РНБ 182.94, kept as part of the collection of Alexander F. Hilferding (1831–1872), in the Manuscript Department of the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg, the only surviving fragment of which is presented below, is probably the oldest existing copy of the Church Slavic translation of the chronicle of John Zonaras. This codex dates back to the second half of the 14th century. Linguistically, it contains features of the Serbian redaction. Unfortunately, only one of its cards has survived to this day, burnt and with frayed edges. However, a significant part of it is readable and contains a fragment of book XVI (12.24–13.12) of the Byzantine historian’s work (in the edition by Th. Büttner-Wobst: p. 443–447). The illegible parts of the text and distorted toponyms are reconstructed according to the manuscript БАН 24.04.34 from the mid-16th century (fol. 431–432), which is the basis for the edition of the Slavic version of the chronicle prepared by A. Jacobs (p. 240–242). The text segmentation repeats the arrangement in the editions of Th. Büttner-Wobst and A. Jacobs. The presented fragment contains a description of the reign of Emperor Leo VI the Wise (886–912), including his clashes with the Bulgarian ruler, Symeon I the Great (893–927).


[68] къ Доростолѣ
12. Symeon saved himself only by fleeing to Dorostolon, which is now called Dristra. The Bulgarians, who were kidnapped by the Hungarians, were redeemed by the emperor. Symeon, however, sent messengers to the emperor again, for peace. The emperor, believing them, sent Choirosphactes to make peace. And the wicked Symeon shut him up in prison, and went out against the Hungarians, and conquered them, and conquered their country. And then he sent messengers to the emperor Leo, saying: “If you wish to have peace with me, return the Bulgarian prisoners to me”. And the emperor released them, but Symeon made no peace. So the emperor wanted to take revenge for himself. He gathered eastern and western armies and sent them against the Bulgarians. And he gained nothing, and the Bulgarians defeated these troops nonetheless. And this is what happened with the Bulgarians.

And the emperor Leo lived with the daughter of Zaoutzes, whose name was Zoe, among the fields and vineyards. And there, the conspirators gathered to kill him. The daughter of Zaoutzes, hearing about this, woke the emperor from his sleep at night. And running to the palace, he saved himself. When Theophano died, he made this concubine, the daughter of Zaoutzes, empress, and married her. However, she enjoyed her reign for a short time: exactly one year and eight months. The emperor learned of another evil conspiracy against himself, initiated by a certain Basil, Zaoutzes’ nephew. He revealed the plot to Samona, a fugitive of Samona, from the house of Hagarenes. And he learned of this evil plan, and immediately went to the emperor and told him [about it]. [Leon] ordered [Basil] and his friends to be captured. Samona, who revealed this evil plot to him, was honored by the emperor with the rank of first guard [protospatharius].
13. So the emperor again had another wife, called Eudokia, beautiful and extremely sedate. And she didn’t spend much time [with him]. She conceived in her womb, and when she was about to give birth, both she and the boy died. The emperor Leo wanted her to give birth to a boy. Even in science and astrology he found [confirmation] that he should become the father of the boy and should have an heir to his imperial [throne]. For this reason he also took a fourth wife, whose name was Zoe Karbonopsina, but he did not crown her. And so he stayed with her until she gave birth to a boy. This boy was baptized by Patriarch Nicholas — because after the death of Patriarch Anthony, Nicholas became his successor. This boy was named Constantine by his father. And soon after his birth, the emperor crowned his mother as a Greek empress. And because of the fourth marriage, the patriarch cursed the emperor. In honor of his first wife, Theophano [Leon] built a bright church near the Holy Apostles. And he placed her remains there. And he also built another church dedicated to St. Lazarus. And he brought the remains of St. Lazarus of Cyprus, as well as those of Mary Magdalene, and placed [them] in this church, where they still lie to this day. And since all the ships had ceased to sail, and all the helmsmen were working on the constructions, the Saracens broke the truce and destroyed all Taormina, and took possession of Lemnos, and caused great destruction to the people who lived there.
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