

**THE CHRONICLE OF GEORGE HAMARTOLOS\***  
**AN OLD RUSSIAN MS OF THE 14th CENTURY**

**Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Knjazevskaia**

The *Chronicle*, composed in the second half of the 9th c. in one of the (sub)-urban monasteries of Constantinople by a monk who calls himself ἁμαρτωλός *sinful*<sup>1</sup>, contains the history of the world from the creation until the year 842. Its Slavic translation, which includes a continuation until the year 948, was very widely diffused in Rus'<sup>2</sup>. This paper provides a detailed description of its oldest known copy.

**Cod. Moskva, RGB, F.173 (MDA-fund.) 100<sup>3</sup>**

This MS, called *Troickij* after its former repository<sup>4</sup> or *Tverskoj* after its presumable place of origin<sup>5</sup>, is an in-folio volume (ca. 305 x 225 mm), now containing 271 parchment and 2 paper folia. Two folia at the beginning and 5 in

---

\* This paper was translated from the Russian and edited by William R. Veder.

<sup>1</sup> K. Krumbacher. Vizantijskie istoriki i xronisty. In: V.N. Beneševič (ed.) *Očerki po istorii Vizantii*, Vyp. III. S.-Peterburg 1913:70-71; O.V. Tvorogov in: D.S. Lixačev (ed.) *Slovar' knižnikov i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi*, Vyp. I. Leningrad 1987: 467-470; A.P. Každan (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. 2. New York-Oxford 1991:836 (s.v. *George Hamartolos*).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. O.V. Tvorogov. *Drevnerusskie xronografy*. Leningrad 1975:9-12 (notes), and O.V. Tvorogov. Naxodki v oblasti drevnerusskoj xronografii. *Pamjatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytija* 1974 g. Moskva 1975:25-28.

<sup>3</sup> Predvaritel'nyj spisok slavjano-russkix rukopisej XI-XIV vv., xranjaščixsja v SSSR. *Arxeografičeskij ežegodnik za 1965 g.* Moskva 1966: 212 (Nr. 411). The MSS collection of the Moscow Theological Academy was deposited in the MSS Department of the RGB in 1931; cf. G.I. Vzdornov. *Iskusstvo knigi v Drevnej Rusi*. Moskva 1980: 44-53.

<sup>4</sup> Arximandrite Leonid (Kavelin). *Svedenija o slavjanskix rukopisjax, postupivšix iz knigoxranilišča Troicko-Sergievoj Lavry v biblioteku Troickoj duxovnoj seminarii v 1747 godu (nyne naxoditsja v biblioteke Moskovskoj duxovnoj akademii)*. Moskva 1878, Vyp.1, Nr. 8:15-18.

<sup>5</sup> Established by Arxim. Leonid (Kavelin). Bibliografičeskie razyskanija v oblasti drevnejšego perioda slavjanskoj pis'mennosti IX-X vv. *COIDR* 1890/3, Otd. 3:16; cf. G.V. Popov, A.V. Ryndina, *Živopis' i prikladnoe iskusstvo Tveri XIV-XVI veka*. Moskva 1979:12-13, 17, 18, 20-22, 48-60, 70, 90-92; Vzdornov 1980 (note 3 above).



the middle of the MS are now lost, one of them, between ff.7 and 10, was replaced in the 16th c. by the two paper folia. The parchment part has a two-column layout, generally with 28 lines per column, with uncial lettering; the paper folia have a single column layout with semi-uncial lettering. F.17v and 18r contain two full-page miniatures; f.160v (previously 152v) is blank. 127 columns contain illustrations to the text.

The text is preserved as follows:

[\*] First folio lacking, presumably bearing the title *КРИНИЦА ИСТИННАГА КНИГЪ СИХЪ НАПИСАНИЕ ДѢЯНИИ • ОУСТАВЛЕНИЕ И ВРЕМЕНЪ ВѢЩА ... СРѢЧЬ ГРОНОГРАФЪ НАРИЦАЕМЪ ГЕОРГИА МНИХА*<sup>6</sup>

[1] f.1a: Table of contents (first folio lacking)

[2] f.15a: Preface *КНИГЪ БРЕМЕНЪИИ И ОБРАЗЪИИ ГЕОРГИА МНИХА*, set off from the text by the two full-page miniatures ff. 17v-18r

[3] f.18c: Book 1 of the *Chronicle*, entitled *ВРЕМЕННИКЪ ВЪ ПРОСТѢ ѿ РАЗЛИЧНЫХЪ ЖЕ ХРОНОГРАФЪ ЖЕ И СКАЗАТЕЛЬ СЪБРАНЪ ЖЕ И СЛОЖЕНЪ ГЕОРГИЕМЪ ГРЪШНИКОМЪ МНИХОМЪ*

[4] f.34a: Book 2 of the *Chronicle*, entitled *НАЧАЛО ВРЕМЕНЪИИ КНИГАМЪ ГЕОРГИА МНИХА*

[5] f.131b: Book 3 of the *Chronicle*, entitled *НАЧАЛО РОМѢСКИХЪ ЦѢРТВИИ*

[6] f.213a (previously 205a): Book 4 of the *Chronicle*, entitled *ВРЕМЕННИ ѿ ХРЕСТІАНЪСКИХЪ ЦѢРЕХЪ И КОНСТАНТИНЪ ВЕЛИЦЫМЪ ЦРИ*

The MS is unfinished: in the four columns ff.113cd-114ab, space is left for eight illustrations, which were not, however, executed; on ff.150-160 (previously ff. 266-273 and 150-152) space is left for initials, which were not filled in; the text ends with the mention of the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553) on f.271d, where 12 lines are left unwritten.

### Studies

The MS, known to scholars since the beginning of the 19th c., was given a place of prominence by V. M. Istrin<sup>7</sup>, who established the relationships of the MSS and concluded that our MS most closely reflected the original, being the

<sup>6</sup> This is the title in Cod. St.-Peterburg, NB Ermitaža, Rk. 9.3.1 (cf. note 9 below).

<sup>7</sup> V. M. Istrin. *Knigi vremennyja i obraznyja Georgija mnixa. Xronika Georgija Amartola v drevnem slavjanorusskom perevode, T. I. Tekst.* Petrograd 1920; *T. II. Grečeskij tekst prodolženija Amartola. Issledovanie.* Petrograd 1922; *T. III. Grečesko-slavjanskij i slavjano-grečeskij slovari.* Leningrad 1930.



sole copy of the «primary redaction». The latter conclusion was corrected in 1972 by O.V. Tvorogov, who found two other MSS to contain this text: [a] Codd. Moskva, GIM, Sin. 1008 and 732 (end. 15th–beg. 16th c.), the first corresponding to ff.1-212 of our MS and the second to ff.212-273 with its continuation until the year 948<sup>8</sup>; he also identified a third, found by V. P. Budaragin: [b] the parchment Cod. St.Peterburg, NB Ermitaža, Rk. 9.3.1. (beginning 15th c.)<sup>9</sup> + Moskva, RGB, F. 178 (Muzejn.) 10277 (22 ff.)<sup>10</sup>. Substantial fragments of the same text have been discovered by A. A. Turilov in [c] the parchment Cod. Moskva, GIM, Čud. 21 (end 14th c.)<sup>11</sup>.

Istrin's publication effectively replaced the MS. Historians, linguists and literary scholars started to refer to pages and lines of the edition rather than the MS, and neither in the reviews of Istrin's edition<sup>12</sup>, nor in the considerable body of studies of the *Chronicle*<sup>13</sup>, did the MS itself play any significant part. Yet Istrin had failed to properly treat the questions of dating the writing and the illustration and localizing them. He only made a brief statement: «The MS was written by two hands: the first ends on f.152 (now 160), leaving the verso blank; on f.153 (now 161) another hand takes over until the end. On palaeographic grounds, both hands belong to the 13th-14th c., but it would be

<sup>8</sup> The date of Tvorogov's discovery is given by T.N. Protas'eva. *Opisanie rukopisej Sinodal'nogo sobranija (ne vošedšix v opisanie A.V. Gorskogo i K.I. Nevostrueva)*, Č. II. Moskva 1974:123; cf. also the two works by Tvorogov 1975 cited in note 2 above.

<sup>9</sup> Previous signature Rk. 7 Nr. 265577/1967; cf. A.A. Turilov. *Predvaritel'nyj spisok slavjano-russkix rukopisnyx knig XV v., xranjaščixsja v SSSR*. Moskva 1986:374, Priloženie, Nr. 72

<sup>10</sup> Turilov 1986: Nr. 1736. The MS belonged to the collection of A. I. Sukaladzev; facsimile of one folio in *Rukopisnye sobranija Gosudarstvennoj biblioteki im. V. I. Lenina. Ukazatel'*, T. I. Moskva 1983:37.

<sup>11</sup> F.161v-174g, 223b-226a, 227a-230a, 238b-256b, and 257a-271a; cf. M. V. Ščepkina et al. *Opisanie pergamentnyx rukopisej Gosudarstvennogo istoričeskogo muzeja*, Č. I. Rukopisi russkie. *Arxeografičeskij ežegodnik za 1964 god*. Moskva 1965:197-198.

<sup>12</sup> M. Weingart. *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře církevněslovanské*. Bratislava 1923: 61-142, 500-521; N. N. Durnovo. K voprosu o nacional'nosti slavjanskogo perevodčika Xroniki Georgija Amartola. *Slavia* 4.3(1925):446-460; P. A. Lavrov. Georgij Amartol v izdanii V. I. Istrina. *Slavia* 4.4(1926):657-683; and the reply in Istrin 1930 (note 7 above):v-ix.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the bibliography in Popov et al. 1979 (note 5 above):9-12, 17, 20-22 and Vzdornov 1980 (note 3 above):44-53.



difficult to give a more precise dating»<sup>14</sup>.

Istrin's dating was presumably based on that by Archimandrite Leonid<sup>15</sup> (13th c.) and by A. I. Nikol'skij<sup>16</sup> («half» of the 14th c.). Yet the studies show a much wider range of dating<sup>17</sup>: before 1294 (Svirin, Lazarev), end of the 13th c. (Ajnalov, Klepikov, Uxova), mid 14th c. (Sreznevskij), 14th c. (Sobolevskij, Volkov, Jagić, Lixačev, Snegirev), and even beginning 15th c. (Stroev); some are based on specific historical considerations, but most are given without further argumentation. The localization, too, is based on indirect evidence alone.

Only art historians perused the MS itself in their studies of the illuminations of the *Chronicle* and, quite naturally, touched upon the codicological and palæographic data of the MS. The first of them was A. I. Nekrasov, who claimed different datings for different parts of the MS: he assigned part I (ff.1-152) to the end of the 13th–beginning of the 14th c. and part II (ff.153-273) to the second half of the 14th c., assigning different dates to the illuminations as well<sup>18</sup>. The results of his work were exploited by O. I. Podobedova, who studied the MS in the framework of the historical events in and the cultural relations of the principality of Tver'. She claimed part I to have been begun in 1304–1307 (including the miniatures) and part II to have been finished ca. 1360–1380<sup>19</sup>. More importantly, she claimed to discern, within part II, two different hands, one on ff.153-204 (now 161-211) and another on ff.205-265 (now 212-273)<sup>20</sup>. G. I. Vzdornov contributed an analysis of palæographic features to the dating of the MS in the 14th c.<sup>21</sup>, and finally G. V. Popov pro-

<sup>14</sup> Istrin 1920 (note 7 above):ix.

<sup>15</sup> Leonid 1878 (note 4 above):15.

<sup>16</sup> In a paper, entitled «Slavjanskaja pergamentnaja rukopis' Xroniki Georgija Amartola, xranjaščajasja v biblioteke Moskovskoj duxovnoj akademii za No. 100», presented at the St.-Peterburg Archæological Institute on 7 Feb 1897; cf. the summary in *Arxeologičeskie izvestija i zametki, izdavaemye Imperatorskim Moskovskim arxeologičeskim obščestvom* 7-8(1897):260-261.

<sup>17</sup> Bibliography cf. note 13 above.

<sup>18</sup> A. I. Nekrasov. *Vozniknovenie Moskovskogo iskusstva*. Moskva 1929:199.

<sup>19</sup> O.I. Podobedova. *K istorii sozdanija tverskogo spiska Xroniki Georgija Amartola*. Moskva 1963:22; eadem. *Miniatjury russkix istoričeskix rukopisej*. Moskva 1965:22.

<sup>20</sup> Podobedova 1963 (note 19 above):7.

<sup>21</sup> G. I. Vzdornov. *Iljustracii k xronike Georgija Amartola. Vizantijskij vremennik* 30(1969):208-209; cf. also Vzdornov 1980 (note 3 above):44-53.



vided an in-depth codicological analysis of the MS<sup>22</sup>. He established the limits of four main hands, as well as their «apprentices» or «aides», the quire structure, and used the correlation of hands and quires, as well as palaeographic features to date the MS to the first half of the 14th c. Subsequently, he refined his argumentation and assigned the origin of the MS to Tver' in the years 1318–1350<sup>23</sup>.

### The Restoration

In 1982, the MS was transferred to the Book Restoration Department of the Institute of Restoration Sciences (VNIIR) for overall restoration under the direction of G. Z. Bykova, who kindly granted us permission to examine it while under restoration<sup>24</sup>. The book was taken from its binding, the folia were cleaned and, where necessary, flattened and repaired, the pigments and inks of the illuminations and writing were fixed, and the binding restored. The last quire (ff.266-273<sup>25</sup>) was returned to its original place after f.149 and the folia after it were renumbered.

We could actually compare the various parts of the MS and study their distinctive features at all levels (writing, decoration, ruling, quires, parchment, preservation, etc.) in conjunction. As a result, we are in a position to confirm, correct or complement the conclusions of previous research. We concentrate on the parchment parts, leaving aside the paper folia. We refer to the MS by its new foliation<sup>26</sup> and to the columns by the letters *a-b* (recto) and *c-d* (verso).

### Writing

The text of the *Chronicle* is written in regular, well proportioned uncials,

<sup>22</sup> G. V. Popov. Zametki o tverskoj rukopisi Xroniki Georgija Amartola (pozdnějše dodelki i voprosy rekonstrukcii pervonačal'nogo oblika kodeksa). *Vizantijskij vremennik* 39(1978):141-144 (marred by a misprint on p.144, where the limits of hand D are given as ff.205-239 instead of 205-260).

<sup>23</sup> Popov et al. 1979 (note 5 above):22.

<sup>24</sup> We express our gratitude to her and her collaborators, especially Ju. F. Serov, for their consultations and their help in the perusal of the materials under restoration.

<sup>25</sup> This quire was misplaced already at the time of the first description of the MS by Leonid 1878 (note 4 above).

<sup>26</sup> New ff.150-157 = old 266-273; new ff. 158-160 = old 150-152; new ff. 161-273 = old 158-265.



Part I (ff.1-7 and 10-149) was written by three hands: A (ff.1-7, 10-61), B (ff.62-70d, 149cd), and C (ff.71-149ab, assisted here and there by hand B). They obviously had had their training together and worked in one scriptorium. They can be dated to the first half of the 14th c. They write **ж** with a small top in four strokes (1-2 lower diagonals connected high up, 3 mast, 4 top, most often forming a blotch at the intersection); **и** **ѡ** **ю** with a high connecting line slanting upward or running along the top of the line (in **ѡ** it also slants upward but always ends in the tongue of **ѡ**); an «anchor» **Ѣ** with the tongue extending upward; **ѣ** with a short bar on the top of the line, the mast rising above it; **н** now with a connecting line slanting down from the top of the left mast, now with a (more archaic) long line slanting down from below that top; they prefer narrow **ѣ** and **ѥ**; write **Ѧ** with inclined masts (sometimes with «shoulders» on either or both sides of the bag); and **ѧ** with a «v» instead of a «T» in the middle. Individual features are the following:

<sup>27</sup> Popov 1978 (note 22 above) and 1979 (note 5 above).

<sup>28</sup> However, younger forms with a shallow cup or simple fork do occur.

<sup>29</sup> With the exception of some crossed descenders in  $\phi$ .



Hand B writes very regular letters of 5 mm high. It knows the ligature *oy*, but uses it more rarely than A; the top of *ѣ* and *ѧ* has a very fine serif; *Ѯ* has a fine mast pressed against an oval eyelet; *ѿ* has a lower bar much bolder than the upper and a long rounded tail; *Ѡ* has a fork instead of a cup; *ѡ* has the intersection at a higher point than A, and the legs are wider spread. In addition, hand B uses a trema above *ï* and *ŵ*. In conjunction with his skillfulness, the fact that B began to write a quire that was finished by hand C, and that he himself finished the work of C, suggests that B may have been the chief of the three scribes, who, in that case, would have been responsible both for the overall layout of the text on the limited quantity of parchment available and for reserving sufficient space for the illustrations.

Hand C is the least attentive or skillful of the three hands. It allows *и* *п* *п* and the two masts of *м* to vary considerably in height; allows crooked masts in *и* *п* *ш* *щ*; allows variation in the forms of *ѿ* (both narrow and short-tailed, and broad and long-tailed); it knows the ligature *oy*, but uses it even less than B; it writes *ѣ* with a serif to the left of the bar, *ѡ* with the legs far apart, and *Ѡ* with an asymmetrical fork. In addition, it uses a «micron» above *і*, but a trema above *ŵ*.

Part II (ff.161-273) was written by two hands: D (ff. 161-212 and 269-273) and E (ff.213-268), which use the same character set as A-C (they lack only the ligature *oy* and prefer *ѣ* *ѡ* to the digraphs *кѣ* *пѣ*). They lack the archaic features of *и* *п* *ѡ* *Ѡ* *ѡ* noted in part I. The letter *ж* is almost without a head; *н* is written with a connecting line that slants from the top of the left mast only ever so slightly; *ѡ* has a very high intersection and the legs are widely spread; *Ѡ* has only the smallest of forks, mostly asymmetrical; *ѡ* has a very high connecting line to the top of *ѣ*, separate from its tongue. This makes it possible to date them to a more recent time, closer to the middle of the 14th century. The forms of their letters or their orthography show no distinctive features. Hand D writes quite regular letters 4 mm high, while hand E writes somewhat less accomplished letters, decreasing in size from 6 mm (ff.213-236) to a mere 4 mm (f.268).

Part III (ff.150-160) was also written by two hands: F (ff.150-157) and G (ff.158-160). Their writing has all the features of the traditional uncials of the middle of the 14th c., known from liturgical MSS; it differs from part II by the features of the «new stylish writing»<sup>30</sup>. This makes it younger still and

<sup>30</sup> V.N. Ščepkin. *Russkaja paleografija*. Moskva 1967:116sq.



would allow us to date it after the middle of the century. Hand G writes more freely, but with smaller size letters, than F; yet it preserves a number of archaic features:  $\rho$  with a small eyelet,  $\varphi$  with a deep central cup, and  $\epsilon$  with the connecting line serving also as the tongue of  $\epsilon$ . Individual features of G are  $z$  with a rounded retroflex tail,  $m$  with parallel masts and a bag descending below the line, and  $\Delta$  with a «T» as its central element.

### Ink and Cinnabar

The inks used to write the text are not identical either in colour or tint. The major part of the MS has ink of a brownish colouring (ff.1-160 and 213-268). On ff.1-61 (hand A), the ink is badly faded, and no conclusion is possible as to its original colour. In columns 168a (second half) and 168b, the ink is so light that it appears to be diluted; very light brown ink was used also to write the text ff.213-268 (hand E). On ff.161-212 and 269-273 (hand D), the text is written in thick black ink, saturated with soot and, therefore, according to G. Z. Bykova, better resistant to moisture.

Cinnabar was used for rubrics, major and minor initials, as well as for consecutive numbering of the text divisions. Part I is outstanding for its lavish use of cinnabar: hand A uses it for numerous initials and numbers; hands B and C use it sparingly, like hands D-E in part II (four and a half lines plus major initials, some of them apparently inserted later). Hands E-F in part III do not use any cinnabar at all, but leave the space left for cinnabar initials unfilled.

### Decoration and Initials

Apart from the illustrations, the *Chronicle* has very modest decoration. No headpieces or endpieces highlighting the major divisions of the text are preserved<sup>31</sup>. The ornamentation, in fact, only consists of column endings and major and minor initials. The major decorated initials, usually placed in the margin, do not differ in design from the text uncials; they are all in the tradition of twelfth to fourteenth-century book decoration and contain no datable features. Polychromed initials occur only in three cases:  $\text{I}$  (f.24d, hand A) and  $\text{N}$  (f.102d, hand B or C), with cinnabar contours filled in with green, and  $\text{P}$  (f.259v, hand D), with ink contours filled in with cinnabar; in all three cases, pigments of the illuminations were used. The minor initials

<sup>31</sup> The now lost first (or covering) folio could have contained such a headpiece.



are most frequent; they are drawn in cinnabar, both solid and in outline, not taller than one line, and placed in the margin<sup>32</sup>; they, too, do not differ in design from the text uncials and do not contain any datable features<sup>33</sup>. The following features are distinctive for the three parts of the MS:

Column endings, framing the last word of a column, are an exclusive feature of part I: hand A uses them most often in the columns ruled with 28 lines in the shape of a hand with leaves (ff.17b, 19d), a simple funnel of dots and flourishes (ff.17b, 19d, 20b, 28d, 29b), or a dotted frame (ff.1b, 6b, 7b, 12a, 19b). The fact that they are most often found in the first quires suggests that at that time considerations of economy played no role. Hand C uses a dotted frame (f.116a) only once.

Monochrome decorative initials occur in both parts I and II. In part I, hand A drew four richly decorated initials, in the Russian style of the 12th-14th c., all of mediocre quality: **М** (f.15a, with anthropomorphic elements), **К** (ff. 16a, 18b), **А** (f. 34a), and two more sparingly decorated initials **В** (ff. 18c, 26d). In part II, the initials are different in style: hand D drew one decorated initial in Byzantine style, an elongated **В** (f.166c) in carefully braided fine lines; hand E drew eight decorated initials in old Byzantine style: **В** (ff.213c, 255a), **Б** (f. 213d), **Г** (f.216a), **И** (f.219a), **П** (f.264a), **М** (f.266d), **С** (f.267a). No decorated initials occur in part III.

Minor initials are found only in parts I and II: hands A-C prefer outlined initials without additional decorative elements, while hands D-E prefer solid initials, often adding flourishes to their stems.

### Page Layout

The prickings for ruling, apparently made not with an awl, but presumably with a knife, have poorly survived trimming, which has also seriously affect-

<sup>32</sup> They are also used for the rubrics on f.18c (hand A) and f.213a (hand E).

<sup>33</sup> They can, however, as to their form and distribution be compared to the initials of the *Merilo Pravednoe*, Cod. Moskva, RGB, F.304 (TSL) 15, also presumably of Tver' origin. The solid initials cannot be qualified as «fine», as suggested by Ju. A. Nevolin. *Opisanie ukrašenij južnoslavjanskix i drevnerusskix illjuminirovannyx rukopisej po XIV v. vključitel'no*. In: *Metodičeskoe posobie po opisaniju slavjano-russkix rukopisej dlja Svodnogo kataloga rukopisej, xranjaščixsja v SSSR, Vyp I*. Moskva 1973:166, 176 (Priloženie 1, tabl. XI).



ed the proportions of the margins<sup>34</sup>. The column ruling with an upper and a lower line<sup>35</sup> over the entire width and four vertical lines over the entire height of the folio, the column length (26 cm<sup>36</sup>), width (8.5-9 cm<sup>37</sup>) and spacing (1.9-2 cm<sup>38</sup>), as well as the ruling in the columns (27 lines at 8-9 mm inter-vals) is in general similar throughout the MS. Yet there are differences between the three parts.

Part I and III seem to have been trimmed over the prickings, as almost none survive<sup>39</sup>; in part II, the prickings are well preserved, indicating that this part must have been made up of smaller size leaves. Part I has ruled columns with up to 30 lines<sup>40</sup>; the difference from folia ruled with 28 lines is almost unnoticeable, because the intervals are evenly reduced by up to 1 mm. Part II draws an extra vertical line over the entire height at 6-8 mm to the right of the first line recto and uses the space between them to position small initials.

### **Quire Makeup and Numbering**

The quire makeup and numbering, first studied in detail by G. V. Popov, can now be complemented by G. Z. Bykova's observations during restoration. The 273 folia of the MS form 36 quires, most of them originally quaternions, 19 in part I<sup>41</sup>, 13 in part II<sup>42</sup>, and one in part III. 2 quires in part II contain an extra folio, the 28th (ff.208-212, added f.211) and 36th (ff.269-273, added

---

<sup>34</sup> Upper margin: mean 15 mm, minimum 7-9 mm (ff.10-29, 40), maximum 19-20 mm (ff.62, 69, 142, 145), in some cases tapered (e.g. f.82); lower margin: minimum 25 mm (ff. 36, 142, 145), maximum 40 mm (ff. 1-6, 109, 245); outer margin: minimum 15 mm (ff.62-69, 153), maximum 28-32 mm (ff.49, 142).

<sup>35</sup> In a very few cases, line 2 and/or line 27 are also drawn over the entire width.

<sup>36</sup> In a very few cases shorter by up to 4 mm.

<sup>37</sup> 7,5 cm on f. 246 and 249, 9, 8-10 cm on f.62-69.

<sup>38</sup> 1,6 cm on f. 49, 1,7 cm on f. 48, 213 and 245.

<sup>39</sup> Prickings, if surviving, are at the lower edge of the folio (e.g. ff. 7, 10-11, 29, 35).

<sup>40</sup> 29 lines on ff. 30-37, 54-55 and 60-61; 30 lines on ff. 38-53.

<sup>41</sup> The first quire lacks 1 folio at the beginning (and probably one single covering folio before it); the second lacks 1 folio between ff.8 and 9, replaced by 2 paper folia in the third quarter of the 16th c. (watermarks like Briquet #12324 of 1553-1554 and Laucevicius #25/10 of 1570), and another between ff.14 and 15; the third lacks the two central folia between ff.18 and 19. The defects were noted by Istrin 1920 (note 7 above).

<sup>42</sup> The 22nd quire lacks one folio (cut out) between ff.173 and 174. The defect was noted by Istrin 1920 (note 7 above).



f.269<sup>43</sup>), and to the single quire in part III (the 20th), three leaves (one double and one single, inserted in it) were added. The irregularity is evidently related to the fact that on these quires a given portion of text had to be finished before a new book could start on a new quire.

Parts I and III of the MS preserve traces of the original quire numbering, contemporaneous to the writing, in the inner corner on the bottom of the recto and the verso of the quire<sup>44</sup>; no trace of it is evident in part II, probably because its leaves were of smaller size.

### Parchment

The parchment of the three parts has much in common. It is well and evenly made, but from hides of mediocre quality with numerous lesions, which in the process of preparation produced tears and holes. The general rule, to use the least affected parts and to do as much repair as necessary in the first and the last quires of a MS, has generally been observed. The material has a «velvety» quality because it was uniformly smoothed on both sides<sup>45</sup>, which makes it difficult to distinguish hair and flesh sides<sup>46</sup>. The size of the leaves is approximately equal<sup>47</sup>, but this is due to, perhaps repeated, trimming for binding. Nevertheless, some features distinguish the three parts.

Part I is made up of parchment of somewhat better quality hides than part II. The leaves are almost uniform in thickness<sup>48</sup> and contain few, if any, original defects, which the scribe avoided by writing around them; most damage to the material was inflicted after writing, especially in the lower corners. Part II is made up of parchment of low quality hides, with many original defects, but with much less damage inflicted after writing than in part I. Part III has the best parchment<sup>49</sup>, without any original defects.

<sup>43</sup> Popov (1978:144, note 22 above) surmises that this quire could have been a quinion, of which the last folio was lost.

<sup>44</sup>  $\bar{\Delta}$  (f.7v),  $\bar{\text{B}}$  (f.15v),  $\bar{\Gamma}$  (f.21v),  $\bar{\Delta}$  (ff.22, 29v),  $\bar{\text{Z}}$  (f.53),  $\bar{\text{H}}$  (f. 61v),  $\bar{\Phi}$  (f.69v),  $\bar{\text{I}}$  (ff. 70, 77v),  $\bar{\Delta}$  (f.78),  $\bar{\text{E}}$  (ff.110, 117v),  $\bar{\text{J}}$  (ff. 126, 133v),  $\bar{\text{H}}$  (f.134, 141v),  $\bar{\Phi}$  (ff.142, 149v),  $\bar{\text{K}}$  (158, 160v).

<sup>45</sup> This is a usual feature of West-European parchment.

<sup>46</sup> Only a few leaves preserve the typical dark spots of hair roots.

<sup>47</sup> The single ff. 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 21 are narrower by about 2 mm, the paper ff. 8-9 by 5 mm.

<sup>48</sup> Folia 62-69 (quire 9) are slightly thicker, ff. 120-123, 128-131, and 135-140 slightly thinner than the rest.

<sup>49</sup> Only ff.150-157 are somewhat thicker and more yellow than the rest.



### Binding

S.A. Klepikov described the old binding of the MS as follows: «Leather binding of the second half of the 16th c. (group B). Simple decorative pattern. Frame of one single and one double row of blind tooling with identical roll stamp. Small centerpiece and four braided medallions in the corners»<sup>50</sup>. We should add that the boards measured 327 x 237 mm (upper) and 326 x 240 mm (lower), respectively, i.e. slightly protruded over the edges of the book; that they were pared to be 2-3 mm thicker on the edges than in the middle or at the spine (4 mm); that the upper board preserved the metal catches for the clasps; and that the lower board, besides the holes of nails to fasten the ties, preserved four copper bosses, three of them droplets and one pyramidal<sup>51</sup>. We should also correct the dating of the binding to the first half of the 17th c.: the sewing threads were twisted into rather thick cords, a feature precisely of that century. Moreover, the papers pasted to the inside of the boards<sup>52</sup> contained data from the 17th c., the upper a fragment of a 17th c. scroll with the names of Timofej Andreevič Vitovtov and Mikita Dmitriev (flourished ca. 1612<sup>53</sup>), the lower indications from the *Typikon* in 17th c. cursive writing

<sup>50</sup> T. Uxova (comp.) Katalog miniatjur, ornamenta i gravjur sobranij Troice-Sergievoj Lavry i Moskovskoj duxovnoj akademii. *Zapiski Otdela rukopisej GBL* 22(1960): 183.

<sup>51</sup> Ju. F. Serov in his restoration preserved as much as possible of the old binding; he also restored the ties and clasps.

<sup>52</sup> The pastedowns have been removed and separately bound to make both sides accessible. They were covered with white 19th-century endpapers and flyleaves. The upper endpaper bears a green label with the shelf number «100» and the ownership mark of the Fundamental Library, a note of the librarian K. Popov, a label with the number ψλς (736) ΓΛΑΒΑ χλμ (640, i.e. the signature in the MDA catalogues of 1723 and 1729, where the MS is called κρινιλλα β λιλιαχ) and the Arabic numerals «46» and «100», as well as a badly legible cursive note «Xronograf mnixa Georgija». The flyleaf bears the stamp of the MDA library, the number «100», a note «Iz bib-ki Moskovskoj duxovnoj akademii», a paper label with a brief description of the MS in a chancery hand of the 19th c., a number of badly legible notes in blue pencil (one of them reads «127 malyx miniatur i dve bol'six» with a reference to ff.113-114). The lower flyleaf contains in the upper right hand corner of its recto side a note «Rukopis' vozvraščena O. M. Bodjanskim 11 ijulja 1854 g.» and, in the center, a note that ff.266-273 are misbound and should follow f.149.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. S. B. Veselovskij. *D'jaki i pod''jačie XVI-XVII vv.* Moskva 1975:95, 153; also mentioned is an otherwise unknown «Bogolep stroitel'».



G. Z. Bykova established two different sets of saw cuts for binding in the back of the book block. Parts I-II have narrow incisions, which part III lacks; they are older than the deep triangular excisions found in all three parts<sup>54</sup>. This means that parts I-II were at first bound together without part III, and that the second binding was especially made for the MS in its present size. The second set of saw cuts was reused in the 19th c. to rebind the MS using the covers of the second binding.

### State of Preservation

Part I was in bad state of preservation; many folia were covered with brownish stains<sup>55</sup> and their lower outer corners damaged; in many places the text was damaged by moisture and redrawn by later hands<sup>56</sup>. The first three quires (incomplete, ff.1-21) were the worst preserved: most of the folds were torn and the folia were loose<sup>57</sup> or lost<sup>58</sup>. The next five quires (ff.22-61) were only slightly better preserved. Part II was in a much better state than part I, but here, too, the effect of moisture<sup>59</sup>, dirt<sup>60</sup>, and wear and tear<sup>61</sup> were noticeable; worst preserved were ff.269-273, where f.273 suffered the most, being covered on both sides with greenish blotches of dirt and having lost much of its lettering on the verso<sup>62</sup>, a sure sign that for some time this was the last folio of a book block left without binding. Part III (to our mind later than either A or B) is undoubtedly the best preserved; it is without later tears in the parchment, and the text is undamaged<sup>63</sup>, although it, too, shows some traces of moisture damage.

---

<sup>54</sup> As well as in the paper part IV, cf. note 29 above.

<sup>55</sup> Folia 15v, 17, 18v, 19, 22v, 23, 24-v, 26v, 29v, 30-v, 31, 32.

<sup>56</sup> Folia 7v, 22, 23, 27, 29v, 32, 33v, 37, 39v, 44v, 51v, 55.

<sup>57</sup> Folia 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 21.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. notes 41 and 42 above.

<sup>59</sup> Folia 164, 165, 167, 198.

<sup>60</sup> Folia 207v, 208, 250.

<sup>61</sup> Folia 182, 172, 173, 178. Only 1 leaf, between 173 and 174, was lost in this part.

<sup>62</sup> The 1 lines left unwritten in column d were filled in by a later hand, akin to hands of the late 14th century.

<sup>63</sup> F. 257v, left blank, is as well preserved as the others, a sure sign that it became the last in the MS at a relatively recent date (like f.1r, it bears a stamp of the Moscow Theological Academy).



### Foliation

Before the restoration, in the 19th c. the folia were numbered twice, first in pencil, then in ink. Neither gives an indication that the seven folia now lacking<sup>64</sup> were extant at the time of numbering. The foliations show the following divergences: ff.12-15 (ink) bear the pencil numbering «14, 15, 12, 13», which means that at first the single folia 14-15 were misplaced; ff.150-157 (pencil) bear the ink numbering «266-273», which means that at first this quire was not misplaced. This also serves to indicate that the MS was rebound between the pencil and the ink numbering.

### Conclusions

All evidence taken in conjunction, we can safely conclude that the MS of the *Chronicle* of George Harmatolos was produced in three successive stages: first part I (ff.1-149, including its initials), followed somewhat later by part II (ff. 161-273), and later again by part III (ff.150-160), written in two stages, first ff.150-157, and later ff.158-160. Comparison of the lettering to Russian book hands of the 13th-14th century allows us to date both parts I and II to the first half of the 14th c. and certainly not later than its middle. We consider it most probable that hands A-C belong to the first quarter of the century, and hands D-E to its second quarter. Hands F-G are younger than A-E, but not much; most probably part III was written in the two decades after the middle of the century. The MS was at first bound containing only parts I and II; part III was added in a second binding, most probably with the specific purpose of filling the gap between the other parts.

### Appendix 1:

#### Codicological Structure and Dislocation of the Illustrations

Each box represents a quire with in the center its bifolia (from outer to inner), numbered as after restoration (\* – lacking; \*2 replaced by paper folia 8-9); to their left and right are shown the number and the place (recto or verso) of the miniatures on each folio.

---

<sup>64</sup> Cf. notes 41 and 42 above.



1		*1	7	
		1-3	6-4	
2		*2	15	
		10	*3	
		11-12	14-13	
3		16	21	1r1v
	1r	17	20	1r2v
	2v	18	19	1r
		*4	*5	
4	1r	22	29	1r1v
	1v	23	28	
	2r1v	24	27	
	1r2v	25	26	3r1v
5	1r	30	37	
	1r	31	36	
		32	35	1r
		33	34	
6	1r	38	45	
		39-41	44-42	
7		46	53	
		47	52	1r
		48	51	1v
		49	50	
8	1v	54	61	
		55	60	
	1r	56	59	1v
		57	58	
9	1r	62	69	
	1r1v	63	68	
	1r1v	64	67	
	1r	65	66	
10		70	77	
	1v	71	76	
	1r	72	75	2r2v
	2r	73	74	2r

11		78	85	1v
		79	84	
	2v	80	83	
	1r	81	82	
12		86-87	93-92	
	1v	88	91	1r2v
	2r1v	89	90	
13		94	101	1r
	1v	95	100	1v
	1r	96	99	
		97	98	
14	1v	102	109	
		103	108	2r
		104	107	1v
		105	106	
15	1r	110	117	1v
	1v	111	116	1v
	1r	112	115	2r
		113	114	
16	1r1v	118	125	1r
	1r	119	124	
	1r	120	123	1r
	2r	121	122	1v
17		126-27	133-32	
		128	131	1r1v
	1r1v	129	130	1r
18		134-36	141-39	
	1v	137	138	1r
19		142	149	
	1v	143	148	
	1v	144	147	
	1r	145	146	
20		150-53	157-54	
21		158	*6	
		159	160	1r



22	2r	161	168	
		162	167	
		163	166	1r2v
	1r	164	165	1v

23		169-70	175-74	
		171	*7	
		172	173	
24		176-79	183-80	
25		184	191	
		185	190	1v
		186-87	189-88	
26		192-93	199-98	
	1r	194	197	
	1v	195	196	
27		200-03	207-04	
28		208	212	
			211	
		209	210	
29	1r1v	213	220	
		214	219	1v
		215	218	1v
	1v	216	217	1v
30		221	228	
		222	227	1r
		223	226	1v
		224	225	
31		229-30	236-35	
		231	234	2v
		232	233	1r1v
32	1v	237	244	
	1v	238	243	
		239-40	242-41	
33		245	252	1r1v
		246	251	1v
		247	250	1r

		248	249	1v
34	1v	253	260	
	1v	254	259	1r
		255	258	1v
		256	257	
35		261-64	268-65	

36		269	
		270	273
		271	272







УНАТЪЩАЩНОІА ЗІМАНУМ  
 ДНАІНАІ ПРАДОБРОДѢТЕЛѢ  
 НЪІННАІТЪІРЪ. НЕ ПОСЛОУША  
 МНАІАДІИ МЕСТОІЕРАДІИАН  
 ЗЛОМІАВІИ ПЛОМЪІ. КДѢ  
 ОУБОУТѢДОБРОДѢТЕЛНМН  
 ПАСТІРЪ. ВЕЩАУЕМІЮДН  
 НЕ ПОСЛОУШАМЪІМН МЕСТОШН  
 ІЦА. ИЛИ ТО ВЕДНТЕ МІКОУПН  
 И ПРІКОІЛОВА ПАСОЛН. ИМН  
 УТМЕШНѢХЪ МЕРЗОСТН ТА  
 ИОВУМѢТѢ ОУІТРАДАТН МНО  
 ГЫМІ ПРІТОЦПЛЕИМН МѢ  
 БІЗОУМНЪІХЪ. ЛН ПАКЪІ РЕЩІ  
 ШІА ІКОГОЗЛА ІЗЛѢВЕННМ  
 Н БОУТ ПОМЪІСАТІИ МІТІА БО  
 ИМОУТНАГОІИМОУЖАМІНІ  
 МЪІ ПРАВЕДНАГОІАХНІРѢСА  
 ИЛИН. КАКО МІА ПРІПЕНОМБЕ  
 СПОРУНОЖИВОУМЪІА ІЗЛІТА  
 ПЛОЩАШЪ ЗЛОКІА ЗАІТОЦПЛЕ  
 МЪІМЪІ БѢДОУПНМІТА. ТИБО  
 НЕ ПРІСТАІТА ПЛАУЩАМІКО  
 РЕАЩА ДОБРО ПЗАТНО. ИМѢ  
 РЫМЪІ ЗАІТОЦПЛЕИМН МѢ. АН  
 ШАНЦАННМІА. АНІА МНОГЫ  
 СІВІСІА ХОМЪІА ІТРЕПЕТОМЪІ  
 ОУПНТНІЕІГДА І ПЛАКАТНІА

И ПЕЩНІА ШІА ТЪІХН  
 ХЪ. ПОШЕОМЪІА ПЛАКОЕ  
 НАКАЗАННІА ГЛАЩЕ ПОВІ  
 МОУНТІА ВОМЕЛІАШІ  
 МЪІН ПОКАРАНТІА ТН  
 БОБДАТѢ ШІА УТВѢ  
 ШІА ІКОІЛО БОХОТАЩЕ  
 ВЪЗДАТН. АЩЕ І ТАКО  
 ВМНТІА ІМОУТН  
 ОУУМНЪІХЪ РАДІИ НЕ ПО  
 АНМОУЩНХЪІСА СІГРЕ  
 ШЕННІЕ БѢДОУПНМІА  
 ІКОДРЕАЛѢНО ІЗЛОШ  
 ПОЛОУІНН. ИТО ПАУЕ  
 ІНХЪІЛОХВАЛНТАГОДА  
 СІА ПІВѢЛНУА ІА СІА НЕ  
 ЗБѢДЫАДАІТА ПІАМ  
 ПОХВАЛНТА. ИМОУТО  
 ШМО СЛОВНТА МѢІНЕВѢ  
 ІПОМННАМ ІКОМНОЗІ  
 АМНОГЫІАХОНДІА ІМНЕ  
 ПАСЛОУШАМІВІА МІТНАІ  
 МѢЛЛЕАЩЕ ПЛАУЕ КДѢ ПО  
 ІТННХЪІ МІБЕІННМІІ  
 ПОГОУЕИШ. А. ОУАІА НІ  
 ШКАНАНО. МОУПЕЛѢ  
 ННІМЪІ. ІРНОНІЗЛОМ  
 НТЪІБОНТ КДѢВІА







Hand D (f. 164v)











