

THE MONASTERIES OF THE HOLY MOUNTAIN  
IN PAUL OF ALEPPO'S  
*TRAVELS OF MAKARIOS, PATRIARCH OF ANTIOCH*

IOANA FEODOROV

(Institute for South-East European Studies, Bucharest)

I am presenting hereafter a neglected text concerning the monasteries at Mount Athos in Paul of Aleppo's journal of his travels in 1652-1658, when he accompanied his father, Patriarch Makarios III Ibn al-Za'im, to Moldavia, Wallachia, Russia and the Cossaks' lands. My article includes the first English translation of Paul's list of names of the monasteries at Mount Athos. Connections between the Holy Mountain and the Rumanian Orthodox Church, as well as the rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia, are also evoked. Closing comments refer to Paul's interest in the Athonite monastic communities and the major significance of his work for Christian Arabic literature.

Key-words: Paul of Aleppo, Mount Athos, *Travels of Makarios, Patriarch of Antioch*, Christian Arabic literature.

In a detailed journal that he kept for seven years, Paul Ibn al-Za'im, known as 'Paul of Aleppo' (Ar. *Būloṣ al-Ḥalabiyy*), recorded his journey through Eastern Europe as a companion of his father, Makarios III, Patriarch of Antioch. Paul had been invited by his friend, deacon Ġibrā'īl Ibn Quṣṭantīn aṣ-Ṣāyeġ, to write down everything he saw and heard, for the enlightenment of the Syrian Christians. The following considerations mostly refer to the Syrians' travels on Rumanian territory, which roughly covered four years, recorded in *Ms. Ar. 6016*, the copy of Paul's *Travels* preserved at Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Paris) on fol. 27v-64r and 262r-295v.<sup>1</sup> My purpose in this survey is to draw attention to a neglected text in Paul of Aleppo's work – a list of names of the Athonite monasteries – and to his references to the Holy Mountain in the previously mentioned texts.

The Syrian delegation left Damascus on 9 July 1652, spent ten weeks in Constantinople and reached the Rumanian lands by boat, arriving in Constantza in January 1653. They crossed the Danube at Galatzi and took a first trip through Moldavia until November that year, when they were compelled by the Cossack and Tatar threat to turn towards Wallachia. In June 1654 they crossed the border of Moldavia heading for Kiev, later moving on to Kolomna and Moscow. Back in Iași in August 1656, they spent two months in Moldavia, and then visited the monasteries

<sup>1</sup> These are the parts that I have edited and translated into Rumanian for a forthcoming volume. A survey of the text referring to the Syrians' journey to Moscow, which is also in preparation as a joint project with Russian researchers, will surely add new elements to the topic discussed here.

of Wallachia, mostly in the region of Oltenia. They travelled to Bucharest and spent some time at the court of Mihnea III Radu, newly appointed prince of Wallachia (1658–1659), with whom Makarios established a long-lasting relationship<sup>2</sup>. Forced to delay their departure by the Tatars' attacks and the Ottomans' military actions in neighbouring Transylvania, they left Rumanian lands on 13 October 1658, from Galatzi. They sailed South on the Black Sea along the coasts of Dobruja and Bulgaria. Reaching Sinope in November, they stopped for the winter and, crossing Anatolia in spring, arrived in Aleppo in April 1659, then back in Damascus on 1 July 1659.<sup>3</sup>

Born in 1627, the fourth generation of Christian hierarchs in the Al-Za'im family, Paul was educated in the Greek-Orthodox spirit and ordained deacon in 1647. As a hierarch of the Patriarchate of Antioch and a secretary to his father Makarios III (in office 1647–1672), Paul was knowledgeable in Greek-Orthodox culture, church literature and ritual. An inquisitive and truthful writer, Paul provided a wealth of information on all aspects of the societies that the Arab hierarchs encountered in their journey: history, politics, social behaviour and private life, ethnic structure, celebrations, architecture, language, literature, music, etc.<sup>4</sup> All during his travels he noted in minute detail all similarities as well as variations that he found in church services and rituals, which he usually explained in terms of the Rumanians' closer attachment to the Greek Orthodox tradition<sup>5</sup>. His journal bears testimony to the attachment of Rumanian rulers and hierarchs to Greek culture and their constant concern with the Christian communities' condition in the Ottoman Empire. Financial help from Wallachia started around 1360 for Koutloumousiou and the Great Lavra (with Nicolae Alexandru and his son Vladislav I Vlaicu), in 1433 for Zographou

<sup>2</sup> In his article *The Orthodox Arabs – Sources for the Russian Department of Embassies in the XVII<sup>th</sup> Century* (in *Arab, West Asian and North African Countries (History, Economics and Politics)*, 4, Moscow, 2000, pp. 308–309, in Russian), Konstantin A. Panchenko reports an episode of 1659, after the Patriarch's return to Syria: at his request, Mihnea III rescued Peter Hristophoros who had been imprisoned by the Pasha of Silistra while on a mission from Patriarch Makarios III to Moscow.

<sup>3</sup> For details see Basile Radu, *Voyage du Patriarche Macaire d'Antioche. Étude préliminaire. Valeur des manuscrits et des traductions*, Imprimerie polyglotte, Paris, 1927, pp. 3–13; Ioana Feodorov, *Un lettré melkite voyageur aux Pays Roumains: Paul d'Alep*, "Kalimat al-Balamand, Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines", Beirut, 1996, 4, pp. 55–62; Hilary Kilpatrick, *Journeying towards Modernity. The "Safrat Al-Batrak Makâriyûs" of Bûlus Ibn Al-Za'im Al-Ḥalabî*, in *Die Welt des Islams*, XXXVII/2, 1997, pp. 156–177.

<sup>4</sup> See Ioana Feodorov, *Ottoman Authority in the Romanian Principalities as Witnessed by a Christian Arab Traveller of the 17<sup>th</sup> century: Paul of Aleppo*, in *Authority, Privacy and Public Order in Islam, Proceedings of the 20th Congress of L'Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants, Cracow, Poland 2004*, Peeters, Leuven, 2006, pp. 307–321; *eadem*, *Images et coutumes des Pays Roumains dans le récit de voyage de Paul d'Alep*, in *Tropes du voyage. II – Les rencontres, Colloque organisé par l'INALCO-CERMOM, Paris, 11–12–13 déc. 2008*, L'Harmattan, Paris, forthcoming.

<sup>5</sup> 'Du point de vue de la liturgie, ils ont conservé des particularités par rapport aux Grecs, que le diacre Bûlus, accompagnant son père Makâriyûs III, patriarche d'Antioche, dans son voyage vers Constantinople en 1652, relève à partir de Brousse (*Bursâ*)', in Bernard Heyberger, *Les chrétiens du Proche-Orient au temps de la Réforme catholique (Syrie, Liban, Palestine, XVI<sup>e</sup>–XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, Rome, 1994, p. 17.

(with Prince Alexandru Aldea, son of Mircea the Ancient), and around 1500 for Vatopedi and Dionysiou (with Radu the Great)<sup>6</sup>. Rumanian princes granted estates, revenues of *metochia*, relics, and works of art to the monasteries of the Holy Mountain, Trebizond, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and St. Catherine in Mt. Sinai<sup>7</sup>. Paul's notes confirm their wish to follow the Byzantine emperors of old (*imitatio imperatorum*) by contributing to the building effort in the Mount Athos monasteries. Paul probably learned more about the Wallachian rulers' donations in 1651, when accompanying Patriarch Makarios in a tour of his diocese and the Jerusalem area. The next year, heading towards Moldavia, the Syrian hierarchs travelled together with Ioan Slugerul (*qasab-bashi*, responsible with the meat provisions at court), who had been sent by Prince Vasile Lupu of Moldavia to pay the huge debts of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. While visiting the new monastery of Polovragi, in Wallachia, the Arab hosts learned that it had been granted ownership of the whole village around it, together with several mills, orchards and other estates, 'like the nobles around here are accustomed to do, as we were constantly told' (fol. 272v). Towards the end of his journal Paul states: '(...) Because the fervour [of the people] in these lands for building monasteries is very great and they bequeath to them magnificent endowments such as villages, estates, vineyards, gardens, mills, Gipsy serfs, a. o.' (fol. 280v)

In spite of the evident importance of this outstanding Christian Arabic text, no complete and accurate edition or translation has been published to this day. The most reliable and complete manuscript available at this time is the above-mentioned *Ms. Ar. 6016*, preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, dated end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, which comprises 311 fol. recto/verso. Two other copies are accessible at this time: the British Library *OMS Add 18427-18430*, 380 fol. recto/verso, dated 1765, acquired by Frederic Earl of Guilford in Aleppo in 1824; and *Ms. B1230* (previously recorded, at Musée Asiatique, as *Ms. 33* in the Collection of Patriarch Gregorius IV of Antioch), 366 fol. recto/verso, dated around 1700, now preserved at the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts – Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg Branch. The excerpt that I am presenting henceforth is located on fol. 278r, 278v and 279r in the manuscript of BnF; on fol. 62r, 62v and 63r in that of the British Library; and on

<sup>6</sup> Anca Popescu, "Muntele Athos și românii" – punctul de vedere otoman, in *Închinare lui Petre Ș. Năsturel la 80 de ani*, Brăila, 2003, especially pp. 154–157.

<sup>7</sup> Besides the essential work by Petre Ș. Năsturel *Le Mont Athos et les Roumains. Recherches sur leurs relations du milieu du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle à 1654*, Rome, 1986, useful sources are: Ralph H. Brewster, *Athos: the Holy Mountain*, in „The Geographical Magazine”, London, II, 4, Febr. 1936, pp. 259–286 (with 32 photos and two maps); Marcu Beza, *Urme românești în Răsăritul ortodox*, București, 1937 (with 383 ill. and 30 col. pl.); *idem*, *Heritage of Byzantium*, London, 1947, pp. 39-42; Teodor Bodogae, *Ajutoarele românești la mănăstirile din Sfântul Munte Athos*, Sibiu, 1940; F. Dölger *e.a.*, *Mönchsland Athos*, München, 1945 (with 183 photos and a map); P. Lemerle, P. Wittek, *Recherches sur l'histoire et le statut des monastères athonites sous la domination turque*, *Archives du droit oriental*, III, Paris, 1948; *Închinare lui Petre Ș. Năsturel la 80 de ani*, Brăila, 2003; *The Romanian Principalities and the Holy Places along the Centuries*, E. Băbuș, I. Moldoveanu, A. Marinescu (eds.), București, 2007.

fol. 1v, 2r and 2v of Book 36 in the copy of St. Petersburg. The text is marked in all these copies by means of a title placed in the right margin: '*An şifat 'asmā' duyūrat al-Ġabal al-Muqaddas*, 'About the variety [and] names of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain'. This fragment had an inauspicious fate in the few translations of Paul's work that were published since the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

All but one of the scholars who focused their attention on one or several manuscripts of Paul's work produced partial versions, some abounding in ambiguities, inaccuracies or plain mistakes. Several of the most interesting parts were misinterpreted or simply left out, for various reasons that jeopardize the scientific thoroughness which Paul's work unquestionably deserves. Undoubtedly one of the main obstacles is the language factor: few researchers of Arabic literature of the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries are proficient all at once in Middle Arabic, Greek and the target-language of their translation – French, English, German, Polish, Russian, Rumanian, etc.

The BnF manuscript was used as a main source by Vasile Radu, a Rumanian Orthodox priest who, working in Paris in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, undertook to produce an accurate edition and commented French translation of the *Travels* based on the comparison of this copy with the two other mentioned previously<sup>8</sup>. Radu only reached folio 86r in the manuscript of BnF, *i.e.* he edited and translated nearly one third of the most reliable copy (91 fol.). Obviously, he did not include in his edition the list of Athonite monasteries, since it is part of the report of the Syrians' second journey through Rumanian lands, after returning from Russia.

The most frequently cited version remains (for lack of a better choice) the abridged English translation of Francis C. Belfour, *The Travels of Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, written by his Attendant Archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic*.<sup>9</sup> Without going into a detailed criticism of this seriously flawed version, it is worth mentioning that the translator, who only used the copy now preserved in the British Library, acknowledged in the opening pages: 'It has been impossible satisfactorily to 'decipher' some of the Greek words: I have been surprised at the hallucination which their Arabic appearance has sometimes occasioned me' (*idem*).

When reaching the part under scrutiny here, Belfour left out the whole note, moved to the next paragraph, concerning the story of a Jew's baptism, and simply inserted a footnote, declaring: 'Here follows a list of the Convents of the Holy Mountain, which the Translator has thought it needless to insert' (Vol. II, Part the Eighth, 1836, Book XV, Sect. X, p. 368). This does not come as a surprise considering that this same translator complained, in the *Preface* of his work, about the 'perpetual recurrence of Church Ceremonies' and, referring to the abridged version of their description, declared further on: 'but much, I fear, to the weariness of those who shall undertake to read them, from the aversion, which our English

<sup>8</sup> Basile Radu, *Voyage du Patriarche Macaire d'Antioche, texte arabe et traduction française*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, R. Graffin, F. Nau (eds.), Firmin-Didot et C<sup>ie</sup>, Imprimeurs-Éditeurs, Paris, XXII, fasc. 1/1930 ; XXIV, fasc. 4/1933; XXVI, fasc. 5/1949.

<sup>9</sup> Vol. I–II, London, 1829–1836, prepared 'under the auspices and at the expense of the Oriental Translation Committee' (Vol. I, Part the First, 1929, *Preface*, p. V).

habits and pure practices of religion produce in us, to the tedious forms of unmeaning and superstitious ceremonial'<sup>10</sup> (Vol. I, Part the First, 1829, *Preface*, p. VI). Belfour's difficulties in finding the proper word for many Rumanian, Greek, Turkish and Russian terms also accounts for the choices he made, all through his work, in abridging and condensing Paul's story. By relying only on the partial translations by Vasile Radu and Francis Belfour, recent scholarship overlooked Paul of Aleppo's interest in the Mount Athos monasteries, as reflected by this list and other related comments mentioned hereafter.

Since she only reprinted extracts from Belfour's version, 'selected and arranged', Lady Laura Elizabeth Ridding obviously did not include the fragment I refer to in the volume published in 1936 (London, Oxford University Press).

For his Russian version of Paul's journal, *Puteshestvie antiohijskago Patriarha Makarij v Rossija v Polovine XVII veka, opisannoe ego synom, arhidjakonom Pavlom Alepiskim* (Moscow, 1896–1898, 4 vol., new edition Moscow, 2005, 1 vol.), G. Mourqos worked on a copy dated 1859, preserved in Moscow (with later copies in St. Petersburg). As translated on pp. 586–587 in the 2005 edition, the note concerning the monasteries at Mount Athos is almost identical, in the manuscript that he used, with the BnF corresponding fragment. In translating the list of monasteries hereafter I am indicating the few differences in the Russian version of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru included in her Rumanian version, which was mostly based on the works of F.C. Belfour and Vasile Radu<sup>11</sup>, an excerpt of the final part of the *Travels (Călători străini despre Țările Române*, VI, 1976, p. 160–307). However, after the opening phrases (with the introductory word *hāšiyya*, 'note', improperly translated *Adaos*, 'addition'), she followed Belfour's example (or simply his version), leaving out Paul's list of the monasteries at Mt. Athos. Instead she inserted a note, same as Belfour but in the same paragraph, between brackets: '<Follows the list of these monasteries with some explanations>'

In her Polish version *Ukraina w połowie XVII w. w relacji arabskiego podróżnika Pawła, syna Makarego z Aleppo* (Warsawa, 1986), Maria Kowalska used Vasile Radu's edition and a brief additional part of *Ms. 6016* of BnF, up to fol. 94. She did not include the journey to Rumanian lands; therefore the note on Mount Athos is also missing.

A recent translation into Ukrainian by Mikola Riabyi, *Krayna Kozakyyi* (MSP "Kozakyyi", Kiev, 1995, 85 pp.), also overlooks the above-mentioned fragment, since it only includes the part referring to the Syrians' voyage through the 'Cossaks' Land'.

Hence, the following version of Paul's list of Athonite monasteries is its first translation into English and the second translation after the 19<sup>th</sup> century Russian

<sup>10</sup> A century later, while visiting Mt. Athos, Ralph Brewster remarked: 'Everywhere the monks are extraordinarily kind and friendly; and although it is more tactful to attend in each monastery at least once the ancient and venerable service, it is by no means necessary, and one may do as one likes' (*op. cit.*, 268).

<sup>11</sup> See Virgil Căndea, *Sources byzantines et orientales concernant les Roumains*, in "Revue des études sud-est européennes", XVI, 1978, no. 2, pp. 309–310.

version of G. Mourkos, which, unfortunately, did not get the attention it deserved from the general public and the foreign scholars.

In the BnF manuscript the list of Athonite monasteries begins at the end of a line, after the habitual division mark (an ornamental inverted heart). It comprises 35 lines in *nashī* writing, in black ink, introduced by the word *hāšīyya* ('note'). This word is often used to mark the beginning of an explanatory paragraph, meant to help the reader understand the topic that Paul is discussing. As for all foreign or otherwise important words in the journal, a line is placed above the word *hāšīyya*. After a brief introduction, the author provides a record of the names of Mount Athos monasteries, between division marks, assigning a number to each. Most names are followed by brief comments. The note ends abruptly with the word 'awd<sup>an</sup>' ('resuming'), while the following lines refer to the Christian baptism of a Jewish gatekeeper (Rom. *portar* transferred into Arabic script as *būrṭāriyy*) who was charged by Prince Constantin Șerban to accompany the Patriarch and his suite while journeying in Wallachia. On the first page of the list (fol. 278v) the Greek name of the monastery appears to the right of the number, while on the next page, probably for lack of space, the Greek name is given on the left, after the division mark.

Beginning as a new paragraph introduced by the word *hāšīyya*, the text in the manuscript of St. Petersburg is identical to the previous one with few exceptions: the title-mark is written in red ink, in the right margin, while Greek names are written on the left on the first page of the list (fol. 2r) and on the right on the second (fol. 2v). Also, a few of the sentences come in an inverted order.

In the manuscript of the British Library the text starts at the end of a line, bottom of fol. 62r, and bears the title-mark in red ink on the following page, where the list actually begins. Number-words are written in red ink, while Greek names are missing completely. All other elements are similar to those in the previous manuscripts.

Considering that the three above-mentioned copies of Paul's *Travels* are nearly identical both in content and form, my translation hereafter is based on fol. 278r, 278v and 279r of *Ms. Ar. 6016* of Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, which was the main source for Vasile Radu's edition and translation. I provided facsimiles of the two folios that enclose the list of monasteries, 278v and 279r, in the closing pages of this contribution.

### LIST OF MONASTERIES OF THE HOLY MOUNTAIN

"Writer's note about the variety [and] names of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain.

There were twenty-four great monasteries, but four were ruined, so that twenty remain, as their honourable fathers and heads told us. //

The first one is the monastery of Lavra, or safe 'coenobium' (*kīnōbiyōn*), dedicated to Athanasius the Athonite.

The second is the monastery of Vatopedi, *i.e.*, 'of the bramble bush', dedicated to the Annunciation [of the Blessed Virgin Mary].

The third is the monastery of Chilandari, so named because on its site there were one thousand beehives<sup>12</sup>. It is dedicated to the Ascension of the Lord (*sic!*). It is in the hands of Bulgarian monks.

The fourth is the monastery of Iveron, or 'the monastery of the Georgians', because they sent [people] to build it in the times of the Byzantine emperors. It is dedicated to the Dormition of the Lady. Here is their famous icon *Portaitissa*.

The fifth is the monastery of Dionysiou, dedicated to the Beheading (*sic!*) of St. John the Baptist. A fragment of [His head] is kept there.

The sixth is the monastery of Simonos Petras, so named because it is built on top of a high cliff. They say that the winds make the monks' *kellia* tremble. It is dedicated to the Ascension of the Lord (*sic!*).

The seventh is the monastery of Docheiariou, named after the one who built it, and it is dedicated to the Archangel Michael, because he made a great miracle here: one of the young people found a treasure and showed it to two monks. So they went and tied up the stone that concealed the treasure around the young man's neck, drowned him in the sea and took hold of the treasure. But when he cried up to St. Michael, he rescued him and took him back to the church, his clothes all dripping with water. The monks cried over him and, though they had wanted at first to take the treasure for themselves, they placed it in the monastery.

The eighth is the monastery of Koutloumousiou, so named because when Emperor Nicephorus [II Phocas] built it, the master scholar was a Turk, and when it was finished he gave it his name. It is dedicated to the Transfiguration of the Lord. When the construction was completed he said 'Thanks to the Lord, Koutloumousiou, *i.e.* it is finished'.

The ninth is the monastery of Esphigmenou, so called because it is located in a narrow place. It is dedicated to the Ascension of the Lord.

The tenth is the monastery of Xiropotamou, so called because in its vicinity there is a dry river. It is dedicated to the Forty Martyrs.

The eleventh is the monastery of Pantokrator, or 'Ruler of all'.

The twelfth is the monastery of Stavronikita, so named because it depends on the Patriarchate of Constantinople, *i.e.* it is a *stavropegia*.

The thirteenth is the monastery of Philotheou.

The fourteenth is the monastery of Zographou<sup>13</sup>, 'painted in the name of Saint George', for this icon of Saint George was brought here from one of the monasteries in the land of Palestine, and it is very famous. It is in the hands of Bulgarian monks//

The fifteenth is the monastery of Saint Panteleimon the Martyr.

The sixteenth is the monastery of Konstamonitou.

The seventeenth is the monastery (*sic!*) of Protaton, so called because it is old, from the times of Emperor Constantine, same as the Vatopedi monastery.

The eighteenth is the monastery of Gregoriou.

The nineteenth is the monastery of Saint Paul, in the hands of Bulgarian monks.

<sup>12</sup> Ar. *'alif kūrāt nahl*. Mourqos translates "one hundred beehives".

<sup>13</sup> Mourqos: "*i.e.*, 'the painter's'".

The twentieth is the monastery of the Russians<sup>14</sup>, also in the hands of Bulgarian monks.”

Given the vast bibliography concerning the Holy Mountain, the following comments only refer to the Arabic features of the text and the data recorded by Paul of Aleppo, here and in other references in the specified parts of the *Travels*, in order to assess his knowledge of Athos and the information that he gathered while journeying in Eastern Europe. Hopefully, researchers proficient in the Greek language and Byzantine studies will provide more elaborate comments and clarifications regarding these texts.

At the time of Paul’s journey to Wallachia and Moldavia the Lavra, which had just recovered from a period of decline, with only five or six monks left, was flourishing again after Patriarch Dionysos III bequeathed it all his property in 1655. Following a short period of idiorrhythmic life, the Lavra had returned to coenobitic monasticism in 1579. Paul does not mention the Rumanian presence here because the Greek *kellion* of St. John the Baptist, depending on the Great Lavra, only became a *skete* inhabited by Rumanian monks in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Paul gives the traditional explanation of the name *Vatopedi*, derived from the Gr. *vatos* = ‘bush’ and ‘*paidion*’ = child: Emperor Theodosius I founded the monastery out of gratitude to the Virgin Mary for rescuing his son Arcadius who, shipwrecked off the shores of the Holy Mountain, was found safe and sound, sleeping under a bramble bush. Ar. ‘*ullayqa*, translating Gr. βᾶτος, is the name of the bramble or common blackberry, Lat. *Rubus fruticosus*.<sup>15</sup> ‘The Burning Bush’ is expressed in Arabic using this same word, ‘*ullayqa Mūsā* (lit. ‘The Bush of Moses’).<sup>16</sup>

In recording the name of the monastery of Chilandar Paul mentions just one of the many explanations that were put forward for the word *chilandari*. They all comprise the Gr. word *chilioi*, ‘a thousand’, with reference to the tradition of the thousand pirates who wished to pillage the monastery and ultimately killed each other in the thick mist. Another version speaks of one thousand monks who were killed by iconoclasts under the walls of this settlement<sup>17</sup>. Apparently, the closest one to a historical interpretation is that the name *Chilandari* comes from the founder of the earliest monastic settlement in the area, Chilandarios or Chilandaris. The monastery is dedicated to the Presentation of the Mother of God. Paul substantiates the information that at the time of his voyage the monastery was mostly inhabited by Bulgarians, after a long period of thriving under Serbian administration<sup>18</sup>.

The author places the foundation of the monastery of Iveron in the last quarter of the tenth century, few years after those of Lavra and Vatopedi. Without

<sup>14</sup> Mourqos: “the Russik monastery”.

<sup>15</sup> I thank Dr. Nikolaj Serikoff (Wellcome Library, London) who provided me details on this point.

<sup>16</sup> Mihai Țipău kindly drew my attention that a bush called *Rubus Sanctus* grows on Mt Sinai: this may well be another name for the same variety of plant.

<sup>17</sup> Jean Biès, *Athos, la montagne transfigurée*, Paris, 1997, p. 33.

<sup>18</sup> The Serbs became predominant again after 1896 when the King of Serbia, Alexander I, visited Chilandari and decided to support the monastic community.

mentioning the origin of the name *Iveron*, i.e. *Ivir* (Georgia), he refers to the Georgians, *al-'Akrāg*, a more familiar word for the Syrian Christians. The Arabic word *al-Bawwāba*, for the Gr. *Portaitissa*, is the feminine version of *bawwāb*, literally meaning 'gatekeeper' or 'porter'. This word is also interpreted, in religious discourse, as 'the Gate', to reveal the theological interpretation of the image of the Virgin Mary as Intercessor with the Lord for the sinners' salvation, 'The Gate to Heaven'. Patriarch Nikon asked the monks of Iveron to make a copy of the *Portaitissa* and bring it to Moscow, where Paul and the Syrian delegation were able to worship it. Paul wrote several pages about this icon and the monastery of Iveron in an earlier chapter of his journal, happy to have seen the copy and the gestures of veneration that it received (rich ornaments and jewel decorations). To explain its name, Paul recorded the tradition that the miracle-working icon requested to be placed at the entrance of Iveron, on the archway, to protect the monastery (the monks actually built a *paraklis* to host it).<sup>19</sup>

The name *Simonos Petras* is actually composed of the founder's name, Saint Simon, who lived a hermit's life on the Holy Mountain in the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and the word *petras*, referring to the rock on top of which he built the monastery. It seems that he first named this settlement the 'New Bethlehem'. The monastery is actually dedicated to the Nativity of Christ, in commemoration of the vision that St. Simon had, just before starting the foundation – a star shining above the rocky cliffs on the night of Christmas.

When mentioning the monastery of Docheiariou, Paul refers to the task of *docheiaries* (in charge with the provisions) that Euthymios, founder of the monastery – presumably a disciple of St. Athanasios the Athonite – had fulfilled at the Great Lavra. First dedicated to St. Nicholas, the monastery was re-dedicated to the Holy Archangels Michael and Gabriel (celebrated on November 8<sup>th</sup>), in gratitude for a miracle that they performed there.

The information recorded by Paul tends to date the foundation of the monastery of Koutloumousiou in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, which is only one of the theories regarding this date. The oldest and most widely accepted explanation for the name of this monastery is that it was founded at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century by a Turk called Koutloumous, baptized Constantine. This version was also embraced by Porfirij Uspensky, who studied the archives of the Holy Mountain in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Sotiris Kadas recently stated that the Turkish word *koutloumous* was translated in a document preserved in the monks' library as 'the Saint who came from Ethiopia'<sup>20</sup>.

Paul echoes the traditional explanation for the name of Esphigmenou, thus recorded in the *Proskinetarion (Pilgrim's Book)* of the Holy Mountain by John Comnenos (1701): 'It is called *Esphigmenou* because it lies bounded by three small hills and is wedged against the shore' (Kadas, *op. cit.*, p. 127).

Paul's note about Xeropotamou is not entirely accurate: the name of this monastery presumably comes from the surname of its founder and first abbot, Paul

<sup>19</sup> See Vera Tchentsova, *Documents grecs des métoques roumains du Mont Athos et des patriarchats orientaux conservés à Moscou à la lumière d'une analyse paléographique*, in *The Romanian Principalities and the Holy Places...*, pp. 165–170.

<sup>20</sup> S. Kadas, *Mount Athos. An illustrated guide to the monasteries and their history*, Athens, 1980, p. 69.

‘Xeropotaminos’, who lived as a hermit close to a dried river before starting the foundation of the first monastic settlement.

There are several traditions about the naming of Stavronikita, none specifically connected to the one reported by Paul (Kadas, *op. cit.*, mentions three on p. 113). Dating from the time of its foundation, probably at the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, the name is much older than its statute as a *stavropegia*. Its reopening as a monastery in 1536 by Gregorios Giromereiatis brought the number of monasteries on the Holy Mountain to twenty. The second founder of Stavronikita, Patriarch Jeremiah who continued after 1540 the work of his late friend Gregorios, named the monastery patriarchal and stavropegiac.

The Arabic explanation for the name *Zographou* is accurate to a certain point. According to tradition, three brothers from Ohrid founded a settlement there and, hoping that the Lord enlightens them as to the most appropriate patron saint, placed a wood panel inside the church for the night. The next day the icon of St. George had appeared on the panel; therefore the new monastery was dedicated to him. For the rest of his explanation, Paul probably refers to a much later event.

As for the seventeenth monastery, the author refers to the church of the *Protaton* at Karyes, the oldest on the Holy Mountain, built in the first half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and dedicated to the Dormition of the Virgin Mary. Paul possibly evokes here Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos, who issued in 1046 the second *Typicon* of Karyes, the official seat and residence of the *Protos*, an office which exists since the 6<sup>th</sup> century.

The information about the monastery of St. Paul does not seem accurate, since by the time of this report it had been inhabited mostly by Serbian monks, following the generous support of Serbian princes in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Since the monastery of Saint Panteleimon (known as *Rossikon*, ‘of the Russians’) was mentioned on the fifteenth position, the last settlement mentioned by Paul, ‘the monastery of the Russians’, may well be the large Russian skete of Saint Andrew or *Saray*, a dependency of the monastery of Vatopedi. In Paul’s list, the Greek name of this monastery is *Oi Ρούσοι*, *i.e.*, ‘The Russians’.

Replaced with the Protaton in Karyes and ‘the monastery of the Russians’, two settlements are missing from Paul’s report: Karakalou and Xenophontos. Destroyed by the pirates, Karakalou was rebuilt in the 16<sup>th</sup> century by Petru Rareș, prince of Moldavia, and was much helped by Georgian rulers during the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Xenophontos, one of the oldest settlements on Mount Athos, was flourishing at the time when the Syrian hierarchs were travelling through Eastern Europe, as proven by the rich wooden iconostasis, delicately carved and decorated with arched frames enclosing the icons, that is dated to this same period.

The Greek insertions in all surviving copies of the *Travels* are worth a separate survey, especially from a philological point of view. Information could thus be obtained as to the identity of the Arab copyist and their knowledge of Byzantine culture. The probable sources of Paul’s information may also be grasped after this philological scrutiny: the form *Iversko* for Iviron may suggest a Slavic source. The Greek names of monasteries in Paul’s list appear to have been transferred by the copyist from Arabic, considering the way some of them are written: *Chiliandariou*,

*Kourtoumich, Xiropotam*.<sup>21</sup> We need to remind here that Arabic avoids words with more than three consonants and finds it difficult to assimilate long names imported from foreign languages. The Greek form of *Vatopediou* is repeated in the comments concerning the Protaton, while the Greek name of this church is absent. The reduced form *Simenou* for Esphigmenou is most likely accountable to the hypercorrectness of the copyist: he thought that the prefix *es* comes from an assimilation of the Arabic article *al-* (which is pronounced *as-* when followed by the consonant *s*) and therefore it should be removed when transferring the word to Greek script.

The order of the monasteries as presented by Paul does not match the current hierarchy of the Holy Mountain. Changes in hierarchy were recorded throughout the life of the monastic settlements, e.g., Koutloumousiou was placed twentieth in the Athonite hierarchy in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, then seventeenth in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, eventually resting now on the sixth place. Dan Ioan Mureșan discussed the lists of monasteries drawn by two monks of Chilandar in 1489 and 1550 – they each present a different hierarchy<sup>22</sup>. Based on the latest *Typikon* at the time of Paul's journey through Eastern Europe, historians of the Mount Athos monasteries will be able to establish if the information provided by Paul was accurate at the time of his report. The exactitude of his reports on the Holy Mountain and the *metochia* that were ceded by Rumanian rulers to the Eastern monasteries will provide further elements for his portrait as a historian of the post-Byzantine world.

As reflected in his notes, Paul and the other Syrian hierarchs became increasingly aware of the importance that Athos held in the Orthodox countries they visited. The Holy Mountain was a beacon of spiritual light for all Orthodoxy, a 'genuine Byzantine relic'<sup>23</sup> that focused the attention of all supporters of Eastern Christendom. Through the Athonite Academy and the continuous example of asceticism and devotion, it was considered a hub of religious education and a prime source of teachers, preachers and hierarchs for all of Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Near East. In the Levant (*Bilād al-Šām*) the high clergy were often of Greek origin, while the monks' learning was basically Greek, allowing them to communicate freely with Orthodox Christians of other countries, like the Rumanians (incidentally, one of the chief reasons for their journey to these lands). Sylvester of Cyprus, the first Patriarch elected in the Greek-Orthodox Antiochian Church after 1725, when the separation of the Catholics occurred, had been educated in an Athonite monastery, which explains his strong feelings against supporters of the Roman creed<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>21</sup> I am grateful to Andrei Timotin and Mihai Țipău for helping me grasp the peculiarities of the Greek names.

<sup>22</sup> Dan Ioan Mureșan, *Le Mont Athos aux XV<sup>e</sup>–XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles. Autour de quelques descriptions d'époque*, in *The Romanian Principalities and the Holy Places...*, pp. 81–121.

<sup>23</sup> '...cette véritable relique byzantine parvenue presque intacte jusqu'à notre époque' (*idem*, p. 81); '...a survival of the Byzantine Empire in the 20th century' (R. H. Brewster, *op. cit.*, p. 259).

<sup>24</sup> Patriarch Sylvester of Antioch was a guest of the Moldavian and Wallachian courts several times between 1727 and 1733. He was supported by Prince Ioan Mavrocordat (1743–1747) in printing books in Arabic in the workshop of St. Sava monastery in Iași. See Ioana Feodorov, *The Romanian Contribution to Arabic Printing*, in *Impact de l'imprimerie et rayonnement intellectuel des Pays Roumains*, București, 2009, pp. 41–61.

During the second part of the voyage in Rumanian lands, back from Russia, Paul's references to the Holy Mountain, Sinai and the Eastern Patriarchates are mostly connected to the gifts – *metochia*, estates, villages, cattle, lakes, forests, buildings and vineyards that produced incomes – which they received from Rumanian rulers and court dignitaries<sup>25</sup>. As the Syrian hierarchs were keen on obtaining a steady income for the benefit of their community back home, Paul often brings up the topic of donations. Thus, he notes that the monastery of St. George near Iași was a *metochion* of the monastic community of Mount Sinai, while the rich monasteries Galata and Barnowski depended on the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The Syrian guests stayed for a while in the monastery of St. Sava, a *metochion* of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Gheorghe Ștefan, prince of Moldavia, turned the newly-built monastery of Bogdana into a *stavropegia* of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and endowed it with many estates. The monasteries of Stănești and Segarcea in Wallachia were ceded to the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Near Craiova, a large city in Oltenia west of Bucharest, they visited the monastery of St. Nicholas in Bucovăț, a *metochion* of St. Varlaam in Rumelia, from whence every three years a new abbot and monks came over. After their arrival in the city of Bucharest, the Syrian hierarchs lodged in, attended mass or visited monasteries and churches that depended on the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the St. Sabbas monastery, the monastery of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai, and the monastery of the Dormition in Ioannina.

The monasteries of the Holy Mountain are also mentioned when relics are concerned: in the new church at Golia in Iași they were shown a blackened fragment of the Holy Cross brought from Mount Athos and preserved inside a big golden cross at the altar; at Bistrița, in the hills of Oltenia, they learned that the relics of St. Michael, bishop of Synnada, were regularly borrowed from the Great Lavra when Rumanian lands were struck by the grasshopper plague. While visiting the Metropolitan Palace in Târgoviște (no longer standing) the Arab travellers saw on its frescoes a representation of Mount Sinai: 'All these walls were wonderfully painted with all the creatures of the earth and sea, the image of Jerusalem and its monasteries, that of the Lord's Mountain, Sinai, as a whole, then the picture of the Holy Mountain, its 24 monasteries and the sea, all of this in clear detail.' (fol. 54v)<sup>26</sup>

Paul also notes that the monasteries of the Holy Mountain were endowed by Rumanian princes, legal papers properly drawn out and incomes duly sent to them, in a well-planned and reliable way. Among other churches and monasteries in Iași, they visited Trei Ierarhi, ceded to the Holy Mountain by Prince Vasile Lupu, and Golia, which depended on Vatopedi. The Syrian delegation was hosted at the monastery of Hotărani that had been bequeathed to Dionysiu. They also stopped at the Wallachian monastery of Clocociov, which depended on the monastery of Koutloumousiou.

<sup>25</sup> In 1859, after the union of Moldavia and Wallachia under the reformer Alexandru Ioan Cuza, a fifth of the Rumanian lands were owned by the 71 monasteries, 25 sketes and 14 churches that depended on monasteries of the Eastern Christendom (Mt Athos, Constantinople, Trebizond, and the Holy Land). See Marin Popescu-Spineni, *Procesul mănăstirilor închinat*, București, 1936, p. 9.

<sup>26</sup> Curiously, Paul does not refer to the canons of the Holy Mountain when mentioning that in the monastery of Cozia, in Wallachia, 'no female is allowed to enter, not even the females of animals, not one of them. This was the decree of the late Mircea voivod, who erected it.' (fol. 270r)

Headed by a Greek abbot, the community there comprised Greek monks from the Holy Mountain. They visited the church of The Holy Trinity in Bucharest, restored by Radu Mihnea who bequeathed it to the monastery of Iveron, in memory of the years that he had spent there. Encouraged by everything that he had witnessed, Patriarch Makarios wished that he could be granted the monastery of Căluieu and the mill attached to it, which impressed the Syrians with their sturdy building and safe location up in the mountains, hidden from the view: 'This monastery we wished to take in order to bequeath to the Patriarchate of Antioch, like other monasteries and estates were donated to other Patriarchates' (fol. 280r).

A few conclusions can be drawn regarding Paul Ibn al-Za'im's references to the monasteries of the Holy Mountain.

Some of the data in Paul's diary is the outcome of conversations and readings during his journey, while some is eye-witness information, written down right after his visits to monasteries and churches, or when back in Syria. The types of details that he is interested in committing to memory, for himself and his Arab readers, are consistent throughout the journal: etymology of common words and names, brief historical data, ethnic factors, explanations for all facts that may have been new or unusual to the Syrian Christians, lists of places, names, and items<sup>27</sup>. For his list of monasteries, the information that Paul considered worth noting is connected to: the origin of the name, story of its foundation, dependency, exceptional facts in its history. This list is inserted at the end of his travelogue, while he was writing about his visit to Hotărani in Oltenia, a monastery depending on Dyonisiou, most probably because he was preparing to return home and he wanted to remember and organize the data that he had heard repeatedly.

A good part of the details that Paul provides in the list is imprecise or incomplete. Given that the author was on Rumanian territory at the time of his report, one would have expected at least some hints to the Rumanian presence on the Holy Mountain. The most surprising fact is that Paul does not insert in his list any information regarding the Rumanians' substantial support to the monasteries of Mt. Athos, as early as the 14<sup>th</sup> century, by granting countless donations and monastic revenues. Travelling in Rumanian lands the Syrian hierarchs were surely informed about the generous acts of the princes, boyars, and outstanding figures of the Rumanian Orthodox Church towards the monasteries of *Agion Oros*. The Syrian delegation was hosted by the Wallachian prince Mihnea III Radu in May 1658, when he issued a document confirming donations previously made to Xenophontos by the boyar Barbu Craiovescu in 1519–1520<sup>28</sup>. However, no mention is made of the Rumanian benefactors who paid for the erection, maintenance and enlargement of Athonite buildings, whose letters of bequest are preserved in archives and whose portraits were placed among those of the founders, in gratitude for their significant

<sup>27</sup> Impressed with the number and variety of relics owned by the Patriarchate of Moscow, he asked for a list, for 'who could have memorized so quickly a thousand names of fragments and relics?'

<sup>28</sup> Ion Rizea, *Les boyards Craiovești, protecteurs du monachisme athonite post-byzantin*, in *Études byzantines et post-byzantines... V*, București, 2006, p. 427.

contribution to the continuity and welfare of monasteries such as Koutloumous, Zographou, Chilandar, Vatopedi, and Docheiariou. Incidentally, many of these rulers were mentioned by Patriarch Makarios III in a brief chronicle of the Rumanian rulers inserted in his miscellany *Mağmū' laṭīf*, mostly written in the company of his son Paul, during their Eastern European journey<sup>29</sup> (Vladislav I Vlaicu, Basarab Laiotă, Vlad the Monk, Radu the Great, Radu Mihnea, Stephen the Great, Vasile Lupu, etc.).

Paul clearly had no written source at hand when drawing the list, nor could he check his information from other sources. This suggests that, as for other notes that break the flow of his report, he may have actually inserted the list of monasteries in his journal after he returned home. The data that Paul records with extreme concision seems to have been obtained not from his Rumanian hosts, but from Greek monks and hierarchs, whom the Syrians met at court or in monasteries and churches they visited. Hosted at the courts of great Rumanian rulers – Vasile Lupu and Gheorghe Ștefan in Moldavia, Matei Basarab and his successor Constantin Șerban in Wallachia – the Patriarch and his suite had the opportunity to meet several outstanding Greek scholars, such as the famous Paisios Ligarides. Also, together with the ‘seven heads of monasteries of Wallachia who were travelling to Moscow’ (fol. 62v), a few Greek hierarchs accompanied Patriarch Makarios and his suite from Moldavia to Russia: Jacob, of the monastery of the Holy Virgin in Melos, Sabbas, of the monastery of the Ascension in Balamand, and some abbots from Ioannina.

Paul’s knowledge of the Athonite monasteries was undoubtedly much enriched during his journey through Eastern Europe. Although not an easy task, considering the scarcity of contemporary sources, future research may indicate the Greek or Ottoman texts about the Holy Mountain that were available to Syrian Christians in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>30</sup>. Be it concise and inaccurate to a certain point, the information recorded in Paul’s journal reflects his interest for the monastic life on the Holy Mountain. After seven years of voyage through the Eastern Orthodox world, while preparing to leave Rumanian lands and head home, Paul declared: ‘Our desire to visit the Holy Mountain was fervent, for they had sent [word] and invited our Father the Patriarch and they were very eager for him to visit them. (...) We could have travelled home from there, on a Christian boat on the Mediterranean Sea. But this was not possible at the time.’ (fol. 293r)

<sup>29</sup> Ioana Feodorov, *La chronique de Valachie (1292–1664). Texte arabe du Patriarche Macaire Za'im. Introduction, édition du texte arabe et traduction française*, in “Mélanges de l’Université Saint-Joséph”, Beirut, 1995, LII (1991–1992), pp. 3–71.

<sup>30</sup> F. Reichert and G. J. Schenk (ed.), *Athos. Reisen zum Heiligen Berg (1347–1841)*, Stuttgart, 2001; Anca Popescu, *op. cit.*, pp. 151–157. It is symptomatic, however, that Bernard Heyberger does not mention any books or manuscripts that refer to this topic in his article *Livres et pratiques de la lecture chez les chrétiens (Syrie, Liban), XVII<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, in “Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée”, 1999, no. 87–88, pp. 209–223.

دير لا فراه اي كينوبيون وسبق وهو على اسم اثنا سيونس اتس	فالأول	بن صفة اسمًا ديورة لجبل المقدس دعوه
دير فاطموي ابي العليقه وهو على اسم البشار	الثاني	Καροπαρι
دير شيلنداري اي انه كان طيق مكانه الف كورة حل وهو على اسم الصعود الالهي	الثالث	Χιλανδάρη
دير ايفارسكو اي دير الكراخ لانهم ارتسلوا عرويه في زمن ملوك الروم وهو على اسم نياح كسبره وبه ايقونتها المشهوره بالبوابه	الرابع	Ιβάρσσο
دير ديونسيوس وهو على اسم قطع راس يوحنا المعمدان وبه قطعته منها	الخامس	Διονύσιου
دير شيمون باطرا اي انه من بني علي راس صخره رقيه وذكروا ان للوحي بر جفا القلالي كثيره وهو على اسم الصعود الالهي	السادس	Σημόν βατρα
دير دوشياربوه اي باسم الادي ابنتاه وهو على اسم مار يوحنا اليبس الملاك وذلك لانه عمل عبيده عظيمه به لان احد علمانه وجدلته فدل عليه من الرهبان فضار بطوانته الحجر لانه كانت على قم الكنز في عنق الصبي وخنقوه في البحر واخذوا الكنز فمالها صاح بما رجعها يسيل انقذه وجابه الي الكنيسته وتيا به تعمر مائه وبلت به اويك الرهبان ويعود ان اراد ان ياخذوا الكنز لانفسهم وضعوه في الدير	السابع	Δουσιάρβου
دير قوقلميش اي كان يكيضوش ملك لما ابتناه كان راس المعالي تركه فلما انتهى فسمي عليه بهذا الاسم وهو على اسم التجلي الالهي فلما انتهت من عمارته قال شكروا لله قوقلميش اي انتهت	الثامن	Κουκουλμίσ
دير تيماون اي انه مكانه ضيق وهو على اسم الصعود الالهي	التاسع	Τιμωνίου
دير كشار وبوطاي اي لان بقربه نهر ناشف وهو على اسم الاربعة شاهده	العاشر	Καροπαρι
دير بنضوكراطوس اي الضابط الكل	الحادي عشر	Πανζουκράτος
دير مصطفر ونيكيطا اي انه وقف على بطركية القسطنطينيه اي مصطفر ويحيى دير فيلوتا اي	الثاني عشر	Μακρίμ
دير الزوغرافس اي المصون على اسم مار جرجس وذلك لان هذه ايقونته تراه مار جرجس جاتهم من احدى ثوره بلاد فلسطين ولها خير عظيم وهو بيد رهبان البغار	الرابع عشر	Ζωγράφου

١٥٦

279

παυλελελελελε	ديبر مار بنديلا هونت الشاهد	الخامس عشر
καταμαστονη	ديبر كاستا مونيت	السادس عشر
κατακα	ديبر بروطاطو، ابياته قديم من زمن قسطنطين ملكك	السابع عشر
βαποπαυδ	مع ديبر فاطوبا دي	...
Γερσορου	ديبر غري يخور يوش	الثامن عشر
παυλου	ديبر الكفديش يواص ما بيدري هيبان البلغار	التاسع عشر
οιελσσι	ديبر الروتس ما بيدري هيبان البلغار ايضا	العشرون

عن انثاسي القبايجي  
كان يهودي وراثة  
ومجادلنا  
اليهود

عوداً، كان البورطاري ادي بعينه بيبيك معنا، اصله حاخام يهودي مواعفة في زمن المروم  
مقي وبوضه ووصار جميع دين للخايه، وراينا منه امور واصطلاحات وحكايا ونيك ونواحدس  
لا توصرف من حملها انه اخبرنا عن اصله، ان اصل ابيه من حلب، يهودي من بيت عبود، وجاء ابوه  
سكن اسطنبول، وهو جاهد في الارض يتاجر، الى ان اهداه الله، قال، والله ما حاجات كثيره مع  
يهود، وراهدا كثير منهم في الايمان، كما شاهدنا ذلك منذ، ولانه في احد الايام، جار حيا يهودي  
في صور غشت، ولما نظرناه، فلنا له باسهمزاه، اتفرق ان تفديه، فقال نعم، فجار بنا الى وهو اتيابه  
في الكون راحد شيدنا البطلك، وعلمه الحقيق دله، وياتر ارقه نادما، ولما الا، ارجوا من قريته ان  
تجدي، لاني انكر الله، اذ قد اهداني على يد هذا الميستي، عن انثاسي يهودي، فحينما من ذلك كثيرا،  
ثم ان شيدنا البطلك ارسله ليح لعند بيبيك، وثم امر وعمدناه، وانعم عليه بيبيك، بنعم وافهم،  
وكتبه عسكري بعورقه، وزوجه، ايضا قال لليهود انهم جيني، وخواهم لكنيستهم، وهم لابسين  
الميلسان، يلتفت براسه نحو المشرق، ويشكح ويقول من من ايردا، ورايدي هكذا، اذ دخل بيبيك،  
ويدار المغرب، ويقول، وانيجر في هيكل قدسك، ويندس للقبلة، ويقول، بخوقك يا رب، والشمال  
اهري بيك عدلك، فهذا مثال الصليب بعينه، واذا لك الصبي يهودي يدي عمدناه في كرا يونا، هو  
اعوراه، واوعظ عليه، قال، سالت جاعه من اليهود يوما، انتم تقولون انكم من نسل داود  
ياقي، واسياطكم انقطعت، فقولوا لي حنا بن يقا ياقي، قال، وسالوني يوما قائلين لي عن  
لما نديدا، انكم يا نصاري، تقولون ان كل قربانه يوحسد بعينه، ويوجدة الكنايس  
الوقف خلايق، فكلمهم ياكلون جسده وحده، فاجابهم ان جسدهم يشبه لمرايه، فان كانت  
صحيه، ينظر الانسان بها وجهه، وان تلسرت قطع قطع، هكذا ينظر في كل قطعه وجهه ايضا،

Fol. 279r, Ms. Ar. 6016 of Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris.