



# Forgeries of Old Rus Book Colophons in 17<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup>-Century Russia. Part 1

LYUBOV V. STOLYAROVA

**Abstract:** The purpose of the present paper is to study forged colophons in Old Rus books as a source on the development of palaeography in Russia: any forgery reflects the forger's notion of medieval writing, the level of knowledge of (and of interest in) the material form of written texts characteristic to both, the forger and his intended audience (those who were supposed to take forged inscriptions for genuine ones, and in fact did so). Firstly, some 17<sup>th</sup>-century cases of renovating older colophons are considered. Then the author turns to the forgeries created by collectors and antiquarians at the dawn of the formation of scholarly diplomatics and palaeography in Russia in the late 18<sup>th</sup> – early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The article studies the techniques and methods used by forgers to impart the greatest possible antiquity to forged written monuments (pseudo-archaization of graphics and vocabulary, semantic turbidity, combination of fantasy information with genuine data, modelling of pseudo-facts and creation of pseudo-copies based on paraphrasing and direct citation of originals). Falsifications are considered as a certain stage in the accumulation and systematization of knowledge about genuine monuments of Old Rus writing – an integral part of the development of historical science and special historical disciplines in Russia at that time.

**Key words:** Russia, Old Rus, historiography, palaeography, diplomatics, colophons, inscriptions, forgeries

Л. В. Столярова

**Подделки древнерусских записей на книгах в России XVII–XIX вв. Ч. 1**

**Аннотация:** Цель статьи – исследовать подделки записей на древнерусских книгах как источник по истории развития палеографии в России: любая подделка отражает

то, как фальсификатор представляет себе древнее письмо, уровень знаний о внешней форме старинных рукописей (и интереса к этим вопросам) как самого фальсификатора, так и тех, кто (по его замыслу и в действительности) примет подделку за подлинный древний документ. Вначале рассматриваются несколько примеров того, как древнерусские записи поновлялись в XVII в. Далее анализируются подделки, созданные коллекционерами и антикварами на заре формирования научной дипломатики и палеографии в России в конце XVIII – первой половине XIX в. Изучаются приемы и методы фальсификаторов, использованные ими для придания наибольших черт древности подложным памятникам письменности (псевдоархаизация графики и лексики, смысловая мутность, сочетание фантазийных сведений с подлинными данными, моделирование псевдофакта и создание псевдокопий на основе перефразы и прямого цитирования подлинников). Фальсификации рассматриваются как определенный этап в накоплении и систематизации сведений о подлинных памятниках древнерусской письменности в рамках развития исторической науки и специальных исторических дисциплин в России этого времени.

**Ключевые слова:** Россия, Древняя Русь, историография, палеография, дипломатика, записи на книгах, колофоны, надписи, подделки, фальсификация

**For citation:** *Stolyarova, Lyubov V.* Forgeries of Old Rus Book Colophons in 17<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup>-Century Russia. Part 1 // *Graphosphaera*. 2025. Т. 5. № 2. С. 129–144. URL: <http://writing.igh.ru/index.php?id=2025-5-2-129-144>

**DOI:** 10.32608/2782-5272-2025-5-2-129-144

© Л. В. Столярова 2025.

### Introductory Notes

Forging historical documents is an important issue for medieval studies. As it is well known, diplomatics emerged from a need to disclose forgeries. Palaeography developed as a scholarly discipline because special procedures were needed based upon the analysis of not only the text but also the material form of the documents. Certain cases of the usage of ‘practical palaeography’ are known as early as in the late 6<sup>th</sup> century. Gregory of Tours in his *Historia francorum* speaks *s. a.* 590 of Referendarius Otto who demonstrated that the signature (pretending to be his own) in a charter issued in the name of King Childebert II to Bishop Egidius of Reims was in fact spurious. This date is often celebrated as the birth of West European diplomatics. Pope Innocent III’s epistle of 1198 treated ways of telling spurious documents from genuine ones and was a reaction to the circulation of a quantity of forged papal bullae (Каштанов 1988. С. 28–29). Methods of scholarly palaeography were used for the first time by Jean Mabillon in his *De re diplomatica* (1681) who proved the authenticity of royal diplomae kept in Benedictine archives. Palaeography as a scholarly discipline, with its methods, subject, object and tasks, as well as the very name of this discipline, appeared in the

works of another Benedictine monk, Bernard de Montfaucon. Using genuine Greek documents, Montfaucon created palaeographical tables demonstrating the dynamics of letter shapes (1708). Based upon those tables, Montfaucon prepared the first scholarly descriptions of manuscripts (1715).

In Rus, the first cases of the use of ‘practical diplomatics’ (disclosure of forgeries, punishment of forgers) are attested in the 15<sup>th</sup> century (see: Каштанов 2014. С. 347–362). In 1487/88, the term “составная грамота” (‘composed, i.e. forged, charter’) is first attested. Court documents of the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> and the 16<sup>th</sup> century mention various ways of identification of forgeries. The method that was used most frequently was the criticism of the corroborative part of charters. For example, a charter in which *dyak* (clerk) and *poslukhi* (witnesses) were not mentioned was treated as suspicious. A primitive expertise of handwriting was used, based upon the ability of a witness or a scribe to tell his own writing from that of someone else (Каштанов 1988. С. 29).

The disclosure of the forged *Synod Acta against the Heretic Armenian Monk Martin* (“Соборное деяние на еретика арменина на мниха Мартина”, 1717, pretending to be a 13<sup>th</sup>-century text) and *Breviary of Metropolitan Feognost* (“Требник митрополита Феогноста”, pretending to be a manuscript of 1329) by Old Believers A. Denisov, M. Petrov, and L. Fedoseev is traditionally regarded as the birth of scholarly palaeography in Russia. However, methods of those Old Believers were basically the same as in the earlier ‘practical palaeography’.

Palaeography as a scholarly discipline, with its subject, object, and methods, was established in Russia in the second quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when first Russian descriptions of manuscripts were prepared by Aleksandr Vostokov, Konstantin Kalaidovich, Pavel Stroev, and others. It was at that time that the epoch of naive forgeries of Old Rus manuscripts ended: criticism of their material form became, at least, as important as the study of their content.

Forging of historical sources (charters, lives of saints, and many others) in 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century Russia has already become an object of scholarly interest. The greatest attention has been paid to forgeries provoked by the growing interest in the political history of Russia as well as to the problem of the existence of East Slavonic pre-Christian writing (see: Жуковская 1960. С. 142–144; Творогов 1990. С. 170–254; Зимин 2006; Данилевский 1999. С. 314–326, 387–388; Козлов 2001. С. 87–105, 215–217; Соболев 2002. С. 87–90; Зализняк 2011. С. 101–113; and other works). The best studied are fabrications of such well-known forgers as Aleksandr Sulakadzev, Anton Bardin, Nikolai Golovin (see: Пыпин 1898; Сперанский 1928. С. 182–184; 1956; Воробьев 1952. С. 122–127; Покровская 1958. С. 634–636; Изюмский 1984. С. 212–

223; Смирнов 1979. С. 200–219; Резников 1986. С. 135–150; Козлов 1996. С. 155–185, 265–267; and other works). Less studied are some other 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century mystifications of literary and documental texts. There is still no typology of them, nor has their connection with medieval and early modern forgeries, copies, and pseudo-copies been studied.

Perhaps, colophons in manuscript books were the first kind of non-documental texts which started to be forged. The **purpose** of the present paper is to study forged colophons in Old Rus books as a source on the development of palaeography in Russia: any forgery reflects the forger's notion of medieval writing, the level of knowledge of (and of interest in) the material form of written texts characteristic of both, the forger and his intended audience (those who were supposed to take forged inscriptions for genuine ones, and in fact did so).

### Some 17<sup>th</sup>-Century Cases

Already in the 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries, sometimes, inscriptions that certified something (e. g., donation or purchase of books), or notified something (e. g., names of scribes or owners of books) were amended or destroyed (Бакланова 1963. С. 198–199). In the 15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries names of previous owners, donators, sellers, or buyers of books were cut off, covered up with ink or pieces of paper, or erased. Usually, such amendment took place when a book changed owner, and there was no more sense in certifying its previous status. Certainly, inscriptions were amended or destroyed especially willingly if a book changed its owner illegally, that is, was stolen. Sometimes above-mentioned manipulations concerned *sanction*, the section of many colophons which threatened those who dare to steal the book (e. g., “кто сию книгу дерзнет вон изнести без священнического благословенья из церкви” – “who dare to take this book out of the church without priest's blessing”. – Протасьева 1980. С. 74, № 137 [84]) with curses and the Last Judgment. *Sanctio* and names of donators, owners, and / or commissioners of books most often were deleted simultaneously.

Let us take a closer look at some 17<sup>th</sup>-century cases. Sometimes new information was inserted into inscriptions without an intent to forge anything. For example, inscriptions could be renovated if they faded away, or written afresh repeating, more or less, the same text. In the course of such operations, some information often was corrupted, especially dates. A well-known example is the 17<sup>th</sup>-century inscription in f. 176 of Sviatoslav's Miscellany of 1076 (РНБ. Эрм. № 20) which announces the writing of the book in the year 6554 (i. e. 1046 A. D.). The genuine 11<sup>th</sup>-century colophon of scribe Ioann in f. 276v-277r contains another date: 6584 (1076). Letter *n* (i. e. 80) was

read by a 17<sup>th</sup>-century scribe as *н* (50). This resulted in •*сфнд*• (6554) instead of •*сфнд*• (6584).

Dates in non-genuine colophons deserve a special study. Up to *c.* 1800 (that is, in the period which preceded the emergence of scholarly palaeography as well as the growth of private collecting and antiquarianism) most of renovated or newly written colophons reproduced original texts quite accurately. Only formulaic and vocabulary could be modernized. In this respect, it is interesting to analyze an inscription written by a 17<sup>th</sup>-century cursive hand in a late 13<sup>th</sup>-century Gospel-book of the Synodal Typography Library (РГАДА. Ф. 381. № 15. F. 12v; Столярова 2000. С. 159–160, № 126):

Евангелие писал Иосие Иванов въ лета *сцз* году.  
Iosie Ivanov wrote the Gospel in the year 6907.

This inscription was published for the first time by Izmail Sreznevskii who dated the manuscript to the year 1399 (6907 from the Creation of the World) (Срезневский 1882. Стб. 287). Later scholars did not doubt this dating as well as the accuracy of the copy of the non-extant original colophon (Волков 1897. С. 55, № 66; Соболевский 1891. С. 16; Шумилов 1954. С. 58–59). Lidia Zhukovskaia and Nikolai Tikhomirov, however, noticed that the date 1399 is not corroborated by either palaeographical nor linguistic analysis of the main text of the Gospel. They dated the book to *c.* 1300, implying that the date in the 17<sup>th</sup>-century inscription is not trustworthy (Жуковская 1968. С. 221; Каталог 1988. С. 108).

The explanation lies in the usage of letters designating numerals 800 and 900 in 13<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts. As Aleksandr Vostokov, Nikolai Likhachev, Evfimii Karskii, Viktor Gardthausen, Rem Simonov, Lidia Zhukovskaia, and Vasilii Kalugin have shown, the scribes of (mainly) Novgorod and Pskov could use for 800 not *ω* (as it was traditional) but *ц*. In that case, for 900 *А* was used (Востоков 1865. С. 38; Лихачёв 1901. С. 292; Карский 1979. С. 216; Gardthausen 1913. S. 368–370; Симонов 1964. С. 23–25; Жуковская 1964. С. 38–39; Калугин 1990. С. 111; 1991. С. 5). The year-number *сцз* of the inscription designated, thus, not 6907 (1399), but 6807 (1299). The latter date perfectly corresponds to the data of palaeography and linguistics.

The formulaic of the 17<sup>th</sup>-century inscription supports the view that it is a modernized copy of a late 13<sup>th</sup>-century original, which probably read as follows: “[*Се*] Евангелие писал [*аз*], Иосие, [*сын*] Иванов в *лѣто* *сцз* году” (“[This] Gospel was written by [me], Iosie, [son] Ivanov in the year 6807”). Such a formulaic is known from the inscription of Elevferii (Oluferii), the second scribe of Zacharia’s Book of Paroemias of 1271 (РНБ. Q.n.I.13. F. 91).

### Forgeries of the Late 18<sup>th</sup> and Early 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries

Russian historiography would be incomplete if one were not to treat the numerous forgeries made by collectors of antiquities in the 18<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Although certainly a bad thing, those forgeries were one of the aspects of the study of the past which reflected the notion of the past of their time as well as palaeographical, philological, and historical observations of the forgers themselves. Fabrication of non-genuine inscriptions in Old Rus books reflected the emergence of historical science, of the popular interest in national history, of antiquarianism.

Information on events of the remote past contained in such forged inscriptions flattered forgers' vanity and excited their imagination. The absence of a genuine colophon in a book easily could be compensated by the composition of a new one, written in accordance with the forger's notion of Old Rus writing and national antiquities. The principle was formulated by Sulakadzev:

...восстановить памятники, об отсутствии которых сожалели историки.

...to reconstruct monuments the absence of which has saddened historians (Пышин 1898. С. 21).

While in the 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries new owners of books treated early inscriptions as something useless, 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century connoisseurs of antiquities tried to find in them new information about the past and proofs of the age of the books themselves.

Sulakadzev often accompanied colophons forged by him with bibliographical references to scholarly works and publications of sources. In a fragment of a parchment Gospel of the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the second column of f. 6v, Sulakadzev erased the main text to write, in red ink, incompetently imitating medieval Cyrillic writing, a colophon mentioning posadnik Pavel of Ladoga, posadnik Zhiroslav (“Zharoslav”) of Novgorod, a “Varangian abbot” Antonii, etc. (БАН. Арх. ком. № 159; the inscription is published: Пергаменные рукописи 1976. С. 24; see: Жихарев 1955. С. 436–438; Барсуков 1878. С. 237–239; Востоков 1873. С. 391–392).

Inscriptions in f. 3 and 4 (“Посадници Зуты” – “of Zuta, [wife of] posadnik”. – Пергаменные рукописи 1976. С. 24) and in f. 6v were commented upon by Sulakadzev on the lower cover of the cardboard binding of the Gospel, again in a writing imitating a medieval one (published in: Там же. С. 24):

Зута посадница была 6875 лета 1367 лета и поставила в Новеграде церковь Петра и Павла апостол камену в то лето. Софийск[ая] летопис[ь]. С.-[Петер]бург. 1795, стр. 287, 274, 277, о Зуте посаднице.

Zuta, [wife of] *posadnik*, lived in the year 6875, [that is,] the year 1367, and [she] erected the stone church of Apostles Peter and Paul in Novgorod in that year. The Sophian Chronicle. Saint-Petersburg, 1795, pages 287, 274, 277, on Zuta, [wife of] *posadnik*.

Сии Павел бысть в 6624 лето, а в 1116 лето по Р. Х. Коли он заложил Ладогу по летописцу Сотко Сыткнича Новгородского. По Нестору. Кенигсберг. Петр заложил 6622/1114, по Софийской, С.-[Петер]бург. 1795, С. 152–6624/1116. Новгородск[ая]. Иоаннов. 1781. Москва, стр. 11–6624/1116.

This Pavel lived in the year 6624, [that is,] in the year 1116 A. D., when he founded Ladoga according to the chronicle of Sotko Sytkinich of Novgorod. According to Königsberg Nestor, Petr founded [it in] 6622/1114. According to the Sophian Chronicle. Saint-Petersburg, 1795, page 152–6624/1116. Novgorodian [chronicle of] Ioann, 1781, Moscow, page 11–6624/1116.

О печач банных. Нестор. С.-[Петер]бург. стр. 130, 177.  
On bath ovens. Nestor. Saint-Petersburg, pages 130, 177.

Thus, Sulakadzev tried not only to draw attention to a book he himself “made” more aged, but also to confirm the authenticity of forged inscriptions by bibliographical references. It is interesting that Sulakadzev used the same script, imitating medieval one, to write both, the inscriptions pretending to be medieval and comments to them. This implies that in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Sulakadzev fabricated those inscriptions, content was more important than form. What was written was trusted – in spite of the incompetency of the imitator. Palaeographical criticism had not emerged yet.

Of course, one must take into account the commercial aspect of this. Forged inscriptions raised the price of books. Up to, generally, the early 1830s there was not yet enough palaeographical knowledge to tell genuine pieces of Old Rus writing from forgeries. As Pavel Stroeve put it, “тогда не трудно было морочить” (“it was not difficult to fool [people] then”). – Барсуков 1878. С. 239). Even such connoisseurs of antiquities as the great historian Nikolai Karamzin and the great poet Gavriil Derzhavin trusted Sulakadzev’s forgeries and appreciated his collection of antiquities. People visited this “замечательный археолог” (“outstanding archaeologist”) to see “the crockery of Tatar khans”, the fragment of stone on which Prince Dmitrii Donskoi allegedly sat, or “роковой костыль” (“the fatal crutch”) of Ivan the Terrible. Sulakadzev himself had a reputation of a strange person but nevertheless a true connoisseur of antiquities.

In 1807, he impressed the public when he demonstrated “Novgorodian Runes”, which contained, among other things, “Boian’s hymn”. Derzhavin

accepted those “Runes” as genuine and took notes on them (РНБ. Архив Г. Р. Державина. № 39. F. 172–174). Later he inserted quotations from those “Runes” into his “Рассуждение о славянской поэзии” (“Tract on Slavonic Poetry”. – Жихарев 1955. С. 436–438). In 1812, he printed them as a genuine text in the sixth book of “Чтения в Беседе любителей русского слова” (“Readings at the Colloquy of Lovers of the Russian Word”. – Лотман 1962. С. 330–405).

Sulakadzev’s “Novgorodian Runes” were written in a special language, full of pseudo-archaisms, generated on the base of Slavonic words and roots. Iurii Lotman regarded unintelligibility as a stylistic feature of those “Runes” (Там же. С. 403–404). Sulakadzev described the “original” manuscript of the “Runes” as follows:

Рукопись свитком на пергамене, писана вся красными чернилами, буквы рунические и самые древние греческие (Там же. С. 398).

The manuscript is a parchment roll, all written in red ink, with runic and the most ancient Greek letters.

The “Runes” were written in a quasi-runic alphabet. The latter probably was created by Sulakadzev himself as a strange mixture of Scandinavian runes and Cyrillic letters. It is interesting that Sulakadzev tried to introduce into circulation his “translation” of the “newly discovered monument” rather than the “original”. The “translation” was accompanied by a comment:

Перевод может быть и неверен, ибо древних лексиконов нет (Там же. С. 398).

The translation may be incorrect, as there are no ancient dictionaries.

In 1830, the Emperor’s Public Library purchased, among other manuscripts of the collection of Count Fedor Tolstoy, a 13<sup>th</sup>-century Gospel-book (РНБ. F.n.1.6) with a colophon in f. 143c:

По благословию преосвященного митрополита Георгия Киевскаго и всеа Роусиа написася святое Еоуангелие тетрой при игоумине Феодосии Печерском въ лето 6580... (Столярова 2000. С. 18–19, № 7).

By blessing of Most Reverend Metropolitan Georgii of Kiev and all Russia, this book of Four Gospels was written under abbot Feodosii of the Cave Monastery in the year 6580.

Thus, the colophon dated to 1072 pretended to be earlier than the book itself.

Already Konstantin Kalaidovich and Pavel Stroev did not hesitate to treat this colophon as a fake. In Russia’s first catalogue of a collection of

manuscripts, they published and commented on this colophon (Калайдович, Строев 1825. С. V) noting that palaeographically the book could not be dated earlier than to the 13<sup>th</sup> century and, therefore, the colophon with the date 1072 was spurious (Там же. С. 1–2).

Tolstoy’s collection of manuscripts was one of the biggest in Russia (Козлов 1988. С. 130). By 1818, this rich official and philanthropist had collected as many as 1093 manuscripts. The colophon mentioning Feodosii of the Cave Monastery had to increase not only historical but also financial value of the Gospel-book: Tolstoy as collector appreciated both. The book was purchased by Tolstoy not later than December, 1820 (Калайдович, Строев 1825. С. V), so, the colophon was written prior to that date.

The 13<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript itself was written by two scribes: I – f. 1c–35b, 50a–93a, 114a–165b, II – f. 36a–49d, 93b–113d. The fake inscription, written with brown ink and placed under the main text, imitates the hand of the first scribe. It is placed in a blank space, but not in a place where a genuine colophon probably would have been written. If the first scribe had written a colophon, he would have placed it at the end of one of the portions of the text he wrote: either in f. 93 or in f. 165b. In f. 165b he probably would have composed it on behalf of both scribes.

There is no reason to treat the colophon in f. 143 as a copy of a lost original. The formulaic of the inscription is not characteristic of the 11<sup>th</sup> century: there is no *invocatio*, no scribe’s name, no *apprecatio*; the date is at the end of the text instead of the beginning (on the formulaic of genuine 11<sup>th</sup>-century scribal inscriptions see: Столярова 2024. С. 58–94). The title of the metropolitan (“of Kiev and all Russia”) is anachronistic, as well as the orthography: *i* is used instead of *u*). Pseudo-archaic style of the colophon is well-known from Sulakadzev’s forgeries, however it is much less radical in this case. The forger obviously was familiar with genuine inscriptions of Old Rus books. He imitated medieval letter shapes, used Old Rus abbreviations, a red initial letter encircled with text ink, and dots at the end of the inscription. Wordings characteristic to genuine inscriptions (however, those of the 14<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> centuries) are used, such as “по благословению... написася” (“by blessing... was written”), “...при игоумине” (“under abbot”), “въ лето...” (“in the year...”). Thus, the composer of the “1072 inscription” demonstrated a certain level of historical and palaeographic knowledge. However, this knowledge was not yet sufficient to distinguish features of 11<sup>th</sup>-century inscriptions from those of 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup>-, or even 15<sup>th</sup>- century ones.

As knowledge about Old Rus writing was gradually being accumulated, forged inscriptions in genuine manuscripts became more sophisticated. The fake inscription in f. 64 of a parchment Gospel-book of the 1390s from

Mikhail Pogodin's collection (РНБ. Погод. № 21) is an unfinished line written in decorative script known as *vyaz* (*вязь*):

При великом княз[e] Василие Дмитри[евиче]... (Столярова 2000.  
С. 366, № 367).

Under Prince Vasiliï Dmitrievich...

Great prince Vasiliï of Moscow, son of Dmitriï Donskoi, reigned in 1389–1425. The earliest examples of Old Rus *vyaz* are known in the Lavra Sticherar of 1380 (Щепкин 1967. С. 44). So, we deal with an attempt to imitate the early *vyaz*. The colophon is written in a watery red ink, probably with a brush: the thickness of the masts is uneven, and a more intensive color in some three or four places shows how many times the brush was dipped into paint. The history of the book prior to its purchase by Pogodin is unknown, as it is unknown whether the fabrication of the colophon was related in any way to this purchase. It is possible that the fake inscription was written simultaneously with the present binding of the book (early 19<sup>th</sup>-century wooden boards in embossed leather<sup>1</sup>).

It can be palaeographically shown that the inscription is spurious. The *vyaz* line is made with the use of two-letter ligatures П–Р, И–В, К–Н, С–И, И–М as well as a three-letter ligature Л–И–К. Most of the ligatures are made in one way: a mast + a semi-mast. An exception is the ligature С–И: И is attached to the middle of the inner side of С with a short horizontal line in the upper part of the left mast of И. The technique of subordination is used in letters В, Л. Twice letters are written above the line. In the word “Василие”, letters Л and И are placed one under the other. In general, the *vyaz* is very unskilled, and the ligatures do not match those of genuine examples of late 14<sup>th</sup>-century *vyaz* (М–К, К–Н, С–И, Т–Р).

Why did the forger opt to use *vyaz*? Probably, there were two reasons. Firstly, the manuscript itself is of a small format: 9,0 x 13,0 cm, letters do not exceed 0,1 cm, and intervals between lines do not exceed 0,3 cm. It would have been difficult for the forger to follow those proportions using an ordinary script. *Vyaz* allowed the forger to increase the size of letters to 0,6 cm. Anyway, the small format of the book and the lack of writing space made the forger to use one of the techniques of compressing text. *Vyaz* was here a suitable method. Secondly, the usage of this pseudo-archaic style of writing created an illusion of antiquity and authenticity. There is no *vyaz* in the main, genuine text of the Gospel-book. As if in harmony with the style of the book itself, the forger used a paint imitating cinnabar.

<sup>1</sup>In Gerold Vzdornov's description the binding is dated to the 18<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> centuries (Вздорнов 1980. № [46]).

Probably, the inscription appeared in the book not earlier than the second quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century: only then such features of medieval books as script, colors, etc. became significant, or, at least, could not escape being considered when evaluating a book as a historical monument. However, the inscription certainly was composed prior to 1852 when the manuscript, as a part of Pogodin's collection, was purchased for the Public Library.

*(to be continued)*

*Translated by Timofey V. Guimon*

### СОКРАЩЕНИЯ / ABBREVIATIONS

- БАН (BAN) – Библиотека Академии наук (Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint-Petersburg)  
 РГАДА (RGADA) – Российский государственный архив древних актов (Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts, Moscow)  
 РНБ (RNB) – Российская национальная библиотека (Russian National Library, Saint-Petersburg)

### БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ / REFERENCES

- Бакланова Н. А.* Значение владельческих записей на древнерусских книгах как источника для истории русской культуры // Археографический ежегодник за 1962 год. М., 1963. С. 197–204. [*Baklanova N. A.* Znachenie vladel'cheskikh zapisey na drevnerusskikh knigakh kak istochnika dlya istorii russkoy kul'tury (The Significance of Inscriptions in Old Rus Books as a Source for the History of Russian Culture) // Arkheograficheskiy yezhegodnik za 1962 god. Moscow, 1963. S. 197–204.]
- Барсуков Н.* Жизнь и труды П. М. Строева. СПб., 1878. [*Barsukov N.* Zhizn' i trudy P. M. Stroyeva (Life and Works of Pavel Stroeov). St-Petersburg, 1878.]
- Вздорнов Г. И.* Искусство книги в Древней Руси. Рукописная книга в Северо-Восточной Руси XII – начала XV в. М., 1980. [*Vzdornov G. I.* Iskusstvo knigi v Drevney Rusi. Rukopisnaya kniga v Severo-Vostochnoy Rusi XII – nachala XV v. (Book Art in Old Rus: Manuscript Book of Northeastern Rus of the 12<sup>th</sup> – the Early 15<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Moscow, 1980.]
- Волков Н. В.* Статистические сведения о сохранившихся древнерусских книгах XI–XIV вв. и их указатель. [СПб.,] 1897. [*Volkov N. V.* Statisticheskiye svedeniya o sokhranivshikhsya drevnerusskikh knigakh XI–XIV vv. i ikh ukazatel' (Statistics of Surviving Old Rus Books of 11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> Centuries). [St-Petersburg,] 1897.]
- Воробьев Б. Н.* Рукопись Сулакадзева «О воздушном летании» // Труды по истории техники. М., 1952. Вып. 1. С. 122–127. [*Vorob'yev B. N.* Rukopis'

- Sulakadzeva “O vozdushnom letanii” (Sulakadzev’s Manuscript “On Air Flying”) // Trudy po istorii tekhniki. Moscow, 1952. Vyp. 1. S. 122–127.]
- [*Востоков А. Х.*] Филологические наблюдения А. Х. Востокова. СПб., 1865. [*Vostokov A. Kh.*] Filologicheskiye nablyudeniya A. Kh. Vostokova (Philological Observations of Aleksandr Vostokov). St-Petersburg, 1865.]
- Востоков А. Х.* Переписка А. Х. Востокова в повременном порядке, с объяснительными примечаниями И. И. Срезневского. СПб., 1873. [*Vostokov A. Kh.* Perepiska A. Kh. Vostokova v povremennom poriyadke, s ob'yasnitel'nymi primechaniyami I. I. Sreznevskogo (Aleksandr Vostokov’s Correspondence in Chronological Order, with Comments by Izmail Sreznevskii). St-Petersburg, 1873.]
- Данилевский И. Н.* Древняя Русь глазами современников и потомков (IX–XII вв.). М., 1999. [*Danilevskiy I. N.* Drevnyaya Rus' glazami sovremennikov i potomkov (IX–XII vv.) (Old Rus through the Eyes of Contemporaries and Descendants). Moscow, 1999.]
- Жихарев С. П.* Записки современника. М.; Л., 1955. [*Zhikharev S. P.* Zapiski sovremennika (Memoirs of a Contemporary). Moscow; Leningrad, 1955.]
- Жуковская Л. П.* Поддельная докириллическая рукопись (К вопросу о методе определения подделок) // Вопросы языкознания. 1960. № 2. С. 142–144. [*Zhukovskaya L. P.* Poddel'naya dokirillicheskaya rukopis' (K voprosu o metode opredeleniya poddelok) (A Forged pre-Cyrillic Manuscript: on the Method of Identification of Forgeries) // Voprosy yazykoznaniiya. 1960. № 2. S. 142–144.]
- Жуковская Л. П.* К истории буквенной цифири и алфавитов у славян // Источниковедение и история русского языка. М., 1964. С. 38–39. [*Zhukovskaya L. P.* K istorii bukvennoy tsifiri i alfavitov u slavyan (To the History of Slavonic Letter Numerals and Alphabets) // Istochnikovedeniye i istoriya russkogo yazyka. Moscow, 1964. S. 38–39.]
- Жуковская Л. П.* Типология рукописей древнерусского полного апракоса XI–XIV вв. в связи с лингвистическим изучением их // Памятники древнерусской письменности. Язык и текстология. М., 1968. С. 199–332. [*Zhukovskaya L. P.* Tipologiya rukopisey drevnerusskogo polnogo aprakosa XI–XIV vv. v svyazi s lingvisticheskim izucheniym ikh (Typology of Manuscripts of 11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup>-Century Old Rus Full Apracos Gospels in Connection with Their Linguistic Study) // Pamyatniki drevnerusskoy pis'mennosti. Yazyk i tekstologiya. Moscow, 1968. S. 199–332.]
- Зализняк А. А.* О «Велесовой книге» // Фальсификация исторических источников и конструирование этнократических мифов. М., 2011. С. 101–113. [*Zaliznyak A. A.* O “Velesovoy knige” (On the *Veles Book*) // Fal'sifikatsiya istoricheskikh istochnikov i konstruirovaniye etnokraticeskikh mifov. Moscow, 2011. S. 101–113.]
- Зимин А. А.* Слово о полку Игореве. СПб., 2006. [*Zimin A. A.* Slovo o polku Iгореve (The *Tale of Igor's Campaign*). St-Petersburg, 2006.]
- Изыумский А.* Мистификация продолжается (заметки историка) // Вопросы литературы. 1984. № 6. С. 212–223. [*Izyumskiy A.* Mistifikatsiya prodolzhayetsya (zametki istorika) (Mystification Continues: Historian’s Notes) // Voprosy literatury. 1984. № 6. S. 212–223.]

- Калайдович К. [Ф.], Строев П. [М].* Обстоятельное описание славяно-русских рукописей, хранящихся в Москве в библиотеке... графа Ф. А. Толстого. М., 1825. [*Kalaydovich K. [F.], Stroyev P. [M].* Obstoyatel'noye opisaniye slavyano-rossiyskikh rukopisey, khranyashchikhsya v Moskve v biblioteke... grafa F. A. Tolstogo (A Detailed Description of Slavonic and Russian Manuscripts Kept in Moscow in the Library... of Count Fedor Tolstoy). Moscow, 1825.]
- Калугин В. В.* Ошибался ли дьяк Козьма Попович (числа 800 и 900 в русской письменности XIV в.) // Русская речь. 1990. № 2. С. 109–113. [*Kalugin V. V. Oshibalsya li d'yak Koz'ma Popovich (chisla 800 i 900 v russkoy pis'mennosti XIV v.) (Did Dyak Kozma Popovich Make Mistakes? Numerals 800 and 900 in 14<sup>th</sup>-Century Rus Writing) // Russkaya rech'. 1990. № 2. S. 109–113.]*
- Калугин В. В.* Андрей Микулинский и Козьма Попович – псковские писцы XIV в. // Книжные центры Древней Руси XIV в. СПб., 1991. С. 46–61. [*Kalugin V. V. Andrey Mikulinskiy i Koz'ma Popovich – pskovskiye pistsy XIV v. (Andrei of Mikulin and Kozma Popovich as Pskov 14<sup>th</sup>-Century Scribes) // Knizhnyye tsentry Drevney Rusi XIV v. St-Petersburg, 1991. S. 46–61.]*
- Карский Е. Ф.* Славянская кирилловская палеография. М., 1979. [*Karskiy Ye. F. Slavyanskaya kirillovskaya paleografiya (Slavonic Cyrillic Palaeography). Moscow, 1979.]*
- Каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг XI–XIV вв., хранящихся в ЦГАДА СССР. М., 1988. Ч. 1. [*Katalog slavyano-russkikh rukopisnykh knig XI–XIV vv., khranyashchikhsya v TsGADA SSSR (A Catalogue of Slavonic and Rus 11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup>-Century Manuscripts Kept in the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts of the USSR). Moscow, 1988. Ch. 1.]*
- Каштанов С. М.* Русская дипломатика. М., 1988. [*Kashtanov S. M. Russkaya diplomatika (Russian Diplomats). Moscow, 1988.]*
- Каштанов С. М.* Исследования по истории княжеских канцелярий средневековой Руси. М., 2014. [*Kashtanov S. M. Issledovaniya po istorii knyazheskikh kantselyariy srednevekovoy Rusi (Studies in the History of Princely Chanceries of Old Rus). Moscow, 2014.]*
- Козлов В. П.* Кружок А. И. Мусина-Пушкина и «Слово о полку Игореве». М., 1988. [*Kozlov V. P. Kruzhok A. I. Musina-Pushkina i “Slovo o polku Igoreve” (Musin-Pushkin’s Circle and the Tale of Igor’s Campaign). Moscow, 1988.]*
- Козлов В. П.* Тайны фальсификации. Анализ подделок исторических источников XVIII–XIX веков. М., 1996. [*Kozlov V. P. Tayny fal'sifikatsii. Analiz poddelok istoricheskikh istochnikov XVIII–XIX vekov (Mysteries of Falsification: An Analysis of Forgeries of Historical Sources in the 18–19<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Moscow, 1996.]*
- Козлов В. П.* Обманутая, но торжествующая Клио: Подлоги письменных источников по российской истории в XX веке. М., 2001. [*Kozlov V. P. Obmanutaya, no torzhestvuyushchaya Klio: Podlogi pis'mennykh istochnikov po Rossiyskoy istorii v XX veke (Clio Deceived but Triumphant: Forging of Written Sources for Russian History in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century). Moscow, 2001.]*
- Лихачёв Н. П.* Владимирская эпиграфическая запись XIV в. // Известия по Отделению русского языка и словесности Имп. Академии наук. СПб., 1901. Т. 6. Кн. 3. С. 290–296. [*Likhachev N. P. Vladimirskaya epigraficheskaya zapis' XIV v. (A 14<sup>th</sup>-Century Epigraphic Inscription in Vladimir) // Izvestiya po*

- Otdeleniyu russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk. St-Petersburg, 1901. T. 6. Kn. 3. S. 290–296.]
- Лотман Ю. М.* «Слово о полку Игореве» и литературная традиция XVIII – начала XIX в. // Слово о полку Игореве – памятник XII века. М.; Л., 1962. С. 330–405. [*Lotman Yu. M.* “Slovo o polku Igoreve” i literaturnaya traditsiya XVIII – nachala XIX v. (The *Tale of Igor’s Campaign* and the Literature Tradition of the 18<sup>th</sup> and the Early 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries) // Slovo o polku Igoreve – pamyatnik XII veka. Moscow; Leningrad, 1962. S. 330–405.]
- Пергаменные рукописи Библиотеки Академии наук. Описание русских и славянских рукописей XI–XVI веков / Сост. Н. Ю. Бубнов, О. П. Лихачева, В. Ф. Покровская. Л., 1976. [Pergamennyye rukopisi Biblioteki Akademii nauk. Opisanie russkikh i slavyanskikh rukopisey XI–XVI vekov (Parchment Manuscripts of the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences: A Description of 11<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup>-Century Rus and Slavonic Books) / Sost. N. Yu. Bubnov, O. P. Likhacheva, V. F. Pokrovskaya. Leningrad, 1976.]
- Покровская В. Ф.* Еще об одной рукописи А. И. Сулакадзева // Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы. М.; Л., 1958. Вып. 14. С. 634–636. [*Pokrovskaya V. F.* Yeshche ob odnoy rukopisi A. I. Sulakadzeva (On One More Sulakadzev’s Manuscript) // Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury. Moscow; Leningrad, 1958. Vyp. 14. S. 634–636.]
- Протасьева Т. Н.* Описание рукописей Чудовского собрания. Новосибирск, 1980. [*Protas’yeva T. N.* Opisanie rukopisey Chudovskogo sobraniya (Description of Manuscripts of the Former Library of Chudov Monastery). Novosibirsk, 1980.]
- Пытин А. Н.* Подделки рукописей и народных песен // Памятники древней письменности. СПб., 1898. Т. 27. [*Pytin A. N.* Poddelki rukopisey i narodnykh pesen (Forging of Manuscripts and Folk Songs) // Pamyatniki drevney pis’mennosti. St-Petersburg, 1898. T. 27.]
- Резников Л.* Поклонники Герострата. Pamфлет // Нева. 1986. № 4. С. 135–150. [*Reznikov L.* Poklonniki Gerostrata. Pamflet (Followers of Herostratus. A Pamphlet) // Neva. 1986. № 4. S. 135–150.]
- Симонов Р. А.* О некоторых особенностях нумерации, употреблявшейся в кириллице // Источниковедение и история русского языка. М., 1964. С. 14–36. [*Simonov P. A.* O nekotorykh osobennostyakh numeratsii, upotrebl’yavsheysya v kirillitse (On Some Features of Numerals Used in Cyrillic) // Istochnikovedeniye i istoriya russkogo yazyka. Moscow, 1964. S. 14–36.]
- Смирнов И. П.* О подделке А. И. Сулакадзевым древнерусских памятников. Место мистификации в истории русской культуры // Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы. Л., 1979. Вып. 34. С. 200–219. [*Smirnov I. P.* O poddelke A. I. Sulakadzevym drevnerusskikh pamyatnikov. Mesto mistifikatsii v istorii russkoy kul’tury (On Sulakadzev’s Forging of Old Rus Monuments: the Place of Mystification in the History of Russian Culture) // Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury. Leningrad, 1979. Vyp. 34. S. 200–219.]
- Соболев Н. А.* Деструктивность фальсификатов древнерусской книжности // Древняя Русь: Вопросы медиевистики. 2002. № 2 (8). С. 87–90.

- [*Sobolev N. A.* Destruktivnost' fal'sifikatov drevnerusskoy knizhnosti (The Destructivity of Falsifications of Old Rus Books) // *Drevnyaya Rus': Voprosy medievistiki.* 2002. № 2 (8). S. 87–90.]
- Соболевский А. И.* Лекции по истории русского языка. СПб., 1891. [*Sobolevskiy A. I.* Leksii po istorii russkogo yazyka (Lectures on the History of the Russian Language). St-Petersburg, 1891.]
- Сперанский М. Н.* К истории русских рукописных подделок // Доклады Академии наук СССР. М., 1928. С. 181–184. [*Speranskiy M. N.* K istorii russkikh rukopisnykh poddelok (To the History of Russian Manuscript Forgeries) // *Doklady Akademii nauk SSSR.* Moscow, 1928. S. 181–184.]
- Сперанский М. Н.* Русские подделки рукописей в начале XIX в. // Проблемы источниковедения. М., 1956. Вып. 5. С. 44–101. [*Speranskiy M. N.* Russkiye poddelki rukopisey v nachale XIX v. (Russian Early 19<sup>th</sup>-Century Forgeries of Manuscripts) // *Problemy istochnikovedeniya.* Moscow, 1956. Vyp. 5. S. 44–101.]
- Срезневский И. И.* Древние памятники русского письма и языка (X–XIV вв.). 2-е изд. СПб., 1882. [*Sreznevskiy I. I.* Drevniye pamyatniki russkogo pis'ma i yazyka (X–XIV vv.) (Early Monuments of Russian Writing and Language, the 10<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> Centuries). 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. St-Petersburg, 1882.]
- Столярова Л. В.* Свод записей писцов, художников и переплетчиков древнерусских пергаменных кодексов XI–XIV веков. М., 2000. [*Stolyarova L. V.* Svod zapisey pistsov, khudozhnikov i perepletchikov drevnerusskikh pergamenykh kodeksov XI–XIV vekov (Corpus of Inscriptions by Scribes, Painters, and Bookbinders in Old Rus Parchment 11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup>-Century Manuscripts). Moscow, 2000.]
- Столярова Л. В.* Выходные записи древнерусских пергаменных кодексов XI–XIII вв. М., 2024. Ч. 1: Опыт формулярного анализа. [*Stolyarova L. V.* Vykhodnyye zapisi drevnerusskikh pergamenykh kodeksov XI–XIII vv. (Output Inscriptions of Old Rus Parchment Books of the 11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Moscow, 2024. Part 1: Opyt formulyarnogo analiza.]
- Творогов О. В.* Влесова книга // Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы. Л., 1990. Вып. 43. С. 170–254. [*Tvorogov O. V.* Vlesova kniga (The *Veles Book*) // *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury.* Leningrad, 1990. Vyp. 43. S. 170–254.]
- Шумилов В. Н.* Обзор документальных материалов Центрального государственного архива Древних актов по истории СССР периода феодализма XI–XVI вв. М., 1954. [*Shumilov V. N.* Obzor dokumental'nykh materialov Tsentral'nogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva Drevnikh aktov po istorii SSSR perioda feodalizma XI–XVI vv. (An Overview of Documents of the Central State Archive of Ancient Acts Concerning the Period of Feudalism, the 11<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Moscow, 1954.]
- Щепкин В. Н.* Русская палеография. М., 1967. [*Shepkin V. N.* Russkaya paleografiya (Russian Palaeography). Moscow, 1967.]
- Gardthausen V. E.* Griechische Palaeographie. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, 1913. Bd. 2.

**Информация об авторе**

ЛЮБОВЬ ВИКТОРОВНА СТОЛЯРОВА  
доктор исторических наук,  
главный научный сотрудник  
Института всеобщей истории РАН  
Российская Федерация, 119334,  
Москва, Ленинский проспект, 32А  
e-mail: lvsto@mail.ru  
ORCID: 0009-0000-3795-2871

**Information about the author**

LYUBOV V. STOLYAROVA  
Dr.Sc. (Hist.), Chief Researcher at the  
Institute of World History of the  
Russian Academy of Sciences  
Russian Federation, 119334, Moscow,  
Leninsky prospekt 32A  
e-mail: lvsto@mail.ru  
ORCID: 0009-0000-3795-2871

Поступила в редакцию / Received: 26.09.2025

Поступила после рецензирования / Revised: 10.10.2025

Принята к публикации / Accepted: 20.10.2025