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In the 1950's, after a lull of thirty years, specialists in the Soviet Union resumed publishing descriptions of early Slavic manuscripts. The French scholar Wladimir Vodoff surveyed the initial phase of these publications to 1968.¹ The present article surveys those descriptions—not only in catalogs, but also in books and articles—that have appeared since then.

Problems of resources, limited time, historical circumstances and shortage of qualified personnel have acted to restrict the number of manuscripts described thus far in the Soviet Union, as well as the degree to which any particular manuscript has been described. When manuscripts are not described, or described inadequately, they are in effect lost both to scholarship and as treasures of historical heritage. Without such information that a thorough description provides it is extremely difficult and time consuming for a researcher to locate copies of any particular source. If the researcher overlooks significant copies, the risk increases that analysis of the source may be faulty. The editor who publishes a text without taking into consideration evidence from all the significant copies, not only is more likely to produce a faulty edition but also is more likely to lead others astray unintentionally. Finally, without adequate descriptions those scholars who study the history of the codex, or


(*) I would like to express deep gratitude to Patricia K. Grimsted, Lubomyr Hajda, Edward L. Keenan, Hugh Olmsted, S. V. Utechin, William R. Veder, and especially Daniel C. Waugh for reading drafts of this article, making many valuable stylistic and substantive suggestions and bringing to my attention items that I would have overlooked otherwise. By the phrase "early Slavic manuscripts" I mean those copied before the eighteenth century.
manuscript book, are often deprived, through no fault of their own, of some very valuable information. Any serious research on early Slavic culture, history, or literature begins with adequate manuscript descriptions.

When I began examining early Slavic manuscripts, I established for myself as a researcher ten distinguishing characteristics that I felt were indispensable for me to know about each manuscript. It might not be completely inappropriate, therefore, for me to apply these distinguishing characteristics as criteria in order to evaluate descriptions that have come from the Soviet Union.

1. The most important component of a manuscript description is identification (as thorough as possible) of the contents of a manuscript. It is useful when the description provides the folio numbers of the beginning and end of each item, the title of each written work more or less exactly as it is given in the manuscript, and the beginning (incipit) and ending (explicit) words of the text. Many nineteenth-century Russian descriptions gave no foliation or only the beginning foliation (sometimes only the recto number even when an item began on the verso of the folio).

Such practice made for imprecision in determining how much of a work was...
included, especially since incipits and explicits were almost never given. Sometimes an arbitrary modern designation for a work is given instead of the title in the manuscript. But inconsistency in designation creates difficulties in determining which redaction, or even which work, is located there. Of course, one would like to see identification of the redaction according to a published version of the text. But, given the state of published editions (although this has been improving), the describer of a manuscript cannot always identify redactions accurately. Therefore, an incipit with exact title could help a future researcher, who is investigating a particular source, to determine at a glance to which group the copy belongs. While omissions of folio numbers, exact titles, incipits, and explicits are merely inconvenient for researchers who are able to examine the manuscripts de visu, for scholars who do not have ready access to the manuscripts these omissions can be extremely frustrating.

It is also useful when the description identifies a work as a translation, especially if that work is published elsewhere in the original language. Since estimates of the amount of translated literature in Early Rus' run as high as 95% of the total literary production, it is important to devise a system of identifying translations. For example, texts could be compared with the repertories for Greek and Latin texts compiled by the Society of Bollandists in Belgium.

For example, in a recent catalog of the Synodal Collection at the Historical Museum in Moscow, the compiler cites a fifteenth-century copy of the Life of Leontij of Rostov (Т. Н. Протасева, Описание рукописей Синодального собрания, vol. 2, 1974, p. 59). Besides the fact that the foliation is not clearly given, she does not provide the incipit. V. O. Ključevskij identified six redactions of the Life of Leontij, only one of which he assigned to the pre-sixteenth-century period (В. О. Ключевский, Древнерусская жития святых как исторический источник, Moscow, 1871, p. 4). Is the Synodal copy representative of that redaction, or of one of the other five? Without incipits we have no way of telling besides looking at the manuscript (my thanks to Richard Bosley of Yale University for pointing out this example to me). While working on the Decisions for the Council of 1503, I was able tentatively to place the Uspenskij copy of the Great Menology closer to the Carskij copy than to the St. Sophia copy on the basis of the incipit provided in Archimandrite Iosif's Подробное оглавление Великих четырнадцати всероссийского митрополита Макария, Moscow, 1892, col. 476.

(6) Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca, updated and enlarged by F. Halkin, 3 vols., Brussels, 1957 (Subsidia hagiographica, 8a); Auctarium,
2. Formal identification of the manuscript including present and former code numbers, approximate date of compilation, format, and total number of folios.

3. References to previous descriptions and catalog listings.

4. Information concerning the type and approximate date of binding, evidence of previous bindings, and so forth.  


(7) Besides articles by S. А. Klepikov ("Из истории русского художественного переплета," Книга. Исследования и материалы, vol. 1, 1959, pp. 98-166; "Орнаментальные украшения переплетов конца XV первой половины XVII веков в рукописях библиотеки Троице-Сергиева монастыря," Записки Отдела рукописей ПИ, vol. 22, 1960, pp. 57-73; and fn. 47 below) very little has been published on Slavic bindings since the outstanding work of Simoni: П. К. Симони, Отчет обрывки сведений по истории и технике книгопереплетного искусства на Руси, преимущественно в до-и по-Петровское время, c XI по XVII столетие включительно. Тексты - материалы (Материалы памятники древней письменности и искусства, vol. 122), St. Petersburg, 1903. One hopes that the posthumously published work of E. Laucevičius (XX-VII a. knygu iristimai Lietuvos
5. General information concerning the numbering of folios (for example: how many foliations; which one is being followed; blank pages; pages omitted in numbering; numbers used twice or more; and so forth).

6. Watermarks (with folio locations) for manuscripts on paper. Catalogs have been notoriously chary on watermark information. Nineteenth-century East Slavic descriptions rarely gave any indication of watermarks. The date of a manuscript seems to have been calculated almost solely on the basis of handwriting. Then, it was fortunate whenever the manuscript was dated to the right century. Recent descriptions from the Soviet Union have provided some information, but rarely with indication of folio locations, or typicality of the mark in the codex (is it a remnant of paper or a run?), or with any accuracy. 8

7. Types of hand (with folio locations). Such information has been subsumed for the entire codex under one or another general designation, such as "semi-uncial" (полустав), or "cursive" (скоропись) or some combination of the two. Indication of changes in hand is rarely given. 9

bibliotekose, Vilnius, 1976) will act as a stimulus to study of Slavic manuscript bindings.


(9) See Н. Н. Розов, Скорописание или скоропись? Об уточнении
8. Arrangement of quires (or at least an indication of signature markings). Information about quires is rarely given; yet it is the basic unit of analysis because codices were compiled and copied according to the quire.

9. Inscriptions. While it is undesirable to report every stroke of a pen or pencil, descriptions have tended to provide only those that have...
a direct connection with dating or attribution. An equitable balance in selection of what inscriptions or markings to report would provide more information concerning place of copying and history of the manuscript.

10. Remarks by the compiler of the description concerning any oddities or special characteristics of the codex, for example, illuminations, decorations, or more prosaic considerations of grease or dampness stains, rulings, prickings, and so forth. Even a very preliminary analysis can assist other researchers and stimulate ideas.

All too infrequently are we able to obtain the information we would like to have about a manuscript from a published description. However, it may be possible to compile substantial data from various references to a manuscript. Places where information about manuscripts is published can be broken down into four categories: (1) reports of archeographic expeditions; (2) archeographic essays; (3) descriptions of individual manuscripts; and (4) catalogs of manuscript descriptions.

What is the status of descriptions by codicologists in the Soviet Union in each of these categories?

REPORTS OF ARCHEOGRAPHIC EXPEDITIONS

These reports often appear in journals such as Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы (ТОДРИ) or Археографический ежегодник (АЕ). They usually contain short, telegraphic descriptions providing minimal information. Their purpose is to report the discovery of manuscripts and to serve as a description until (or in lieu of) the making of a full description. Anywhere from two to several hundred manuscripts can be "described" in such a report.

In the past dozen years, as for the past three decades, the late V. I. Malyšev was an active leader of archeographic expeditions, especially into Old Believer areas, most notably Ust'-Cil'ma, in search of manuscripts. His energetic work in this field is memorialized by the fact that Pushkin House's Manuscript Division, which he founded over twenty-five years ago, now houses more than 7000 manuscripts, most of which were gathered on such expeditions. One can only encourage the following of

(10) See Malyšev's reports on new acquisitions: В. И. Малышев, "Новые поступления в собрание древнерусских рукописей Пушкинского дома,"
Malyšev's example in the searching out of early manuscripts.  

ARCHEOGRAPHIC ESSAYS

These essays often appear in introductions to publications of texts. The information here is fuller than in archeographic reports, but less than a full description, because the compiler may only be concerned about the copy of the text that is being published. Usually, an archeographic essay describes fewer manuscripts than a catalog does.


(12) See, for example, the archeographic essays: О. А. Державина, Сказание Авраамия Палица, Moscow-Leningrad, 1955, pp. 64-92; А. А. Зимин and Я. С. Лурье, Послания Носифа Вологдского, Moscow-Leningrad, 1959, pp. 98-136 and 289-295; and А. А. Зимин, Сочинения И. Пересветова, Moscow-Leningrad, 1956, pp. 78-120.
V. A. Kuckin's essay on sixty-six copies of the Tale Concerning Mixail of Tver' is an outstanding example of an archeographic essay. In addition to the present code numbers, he usually provides for each manuscript a brief designation (for example, "Codex of Lives of Russian and Byzantine Saints"), previous descriptions, some watermark information (but no folio locations or indications of typicality of the mark for that codex), a conjecture on date of the manuscript, location of the Tale Concerning Mixail, and some peculiarities of that copy. Sometimes he provides total number of folios, type or types of hand (for example, "The manuscript was written with various hands, semi-uncial and cursive" or "various hands" (пoчерки разные), and an inscription or two. Infrequently, he will name some or all of the other works in the codex, but only if they have some direct relationship to Mixail of Tver'. or when they are not noted in a previous description. Also Kuckin provides only the modern titles for works, not the heading in the codex, nor incipits or explicits.

But, given the format of an archeographic essay and what Kuckin set out to do, one should not fault him for the information that he does not include. Many descriptions in catalogs where one expects fuller information are often not as thorough as Kuckin's is.

N. S. Demkova's archeographic essay on copies of three redactions of the Life of Avvakum is sparse in comparison. She gives code numbers, former numbers [], format, location of the Life in the codex, approximate date of the codex, and remarks. These remarks could have been the basis for providing information of some value. Instead, Demkova often is content to state that the manuscript has been described elsewhere. Frequently, this other "description" provides only the same information that she has just given. Very little is gained by having the other reference,

(13) В. А. Кучкин, Повести о Михаиле Тверском, Moscow, 1974, pp. 33-74.
(15) For example, she refers often to the article: В. И. Малышев, "Заметка о рукописных списках Жития протопопа Аввакума (Материалы для
because only the minimum amount of information (essentially present location of the manuscript, folio number of the Life within it, and some idea of date) is given in both. 16

Two of the articles in a recent collection devoted to the Izbornik of 1073 contain archеographic information about manuscript copies of that compilation. 17 K. M. Kuev's article barely meets the promise in the title of being merely "observations" (наблюдења). For nineteen codices he gives the current code number, format, number of folios, approximate date of copy (without indication how the date was arrived at), type of script, redaction, reference to fullest description, and comments concerning what is known about where the codex was and when. The other article, written by L. P. Grjazina and N. A. Ščerbačeva, contributes much fuller information about one of the manuscripts that Kuev covers and about eleven other manuscripts that Kuev does not cover. A comparison of the descriptions of the manuscript (ГБЛ, Волок. 496) that the two articles have in common shows that in addition to the information Kuev provides, Grjazina and Ščerbačeva give the designation as it appears in the codex, incipit of the codex, watermark information (although without foliation or indication of typicality), the fact that fols. 1 and 196 are blank (these were not counted in Kuev's foliation), size of pages, binding, inscriptions, the fact that the codex has thick cinnabar sigla and vjaz' (а type of decorative lettering) in the titles, and citation

(16) Demkova does make one regrettable excursion into the realm of watermarks. The ms. БАН, Дружинин № 746, allegedly contains the autograph of Avvakum from 1673 on fols. 189-285v. According to Dianova, some of the paper of these folios contain a watermark dated by Geraklitov to 1681. Could Avvakum have used paper that first made its appearance eight years after he was supposed to have written on it? Demkova could have challenged Geraklitov's dating or Dianova's identification. Instead, she chose to sidestep the issue by observing that such "facts... do not help the dating" (данные не помогают датировке) (p. 21 fn. 19).

(17) К. М. Куев, Археографические наблюдения над Сборником Симеона в старославянских литературах," in Izборник 1073 г. Сборник статей, Moscow, 1977, pp. 50-56; and Л. П. Грязина и Н. А. Щербачева, "К текстологии Изборника 1073 г. (По рукописям Государственной библиотеки СССР им. В. И. Ленина)," ibid., esp. pp. 82-89.
of the Inventory of 1573 concerning the codex. It is clear that the second description shows much more thorough analysis, and is thereby more valuable for researchers.

At this point I might mention other recent examples of archeographic essays. N. N. Pokrovskij provided extensive descriptions of three manuscripts that contain copies of the trials of Maksim Grek and Isaac Sobak. L. A. Dmitriev provided very brief descriptions (code numbers, designation, date by century, folio numbers of the studied text) of more than 475 codices containing saints' lives. V. I. Buganov provided brief information (designation, code number, item, type of hand, date, format, total folios, and sometimes watermark information or brief comment) of sixty-eight copies of Service Books. V. M. Zagrebin described forty Serbian manuscripts in the Pogodin Collection of the Public Library in Leningrad. T. S. Ivanova discussed the Tver' Collection in TsGADA. G. V. Markelov and S. V. Frolov provided information about three manuscripts from the sixteenth century in Pushkin House. Ja. N. Szapov provided descriptions, which are mainly valuable for their watermark information, of codices containing early copies of the Rule of Vladimir. N. B. Sinitsyna described thoroughly over ninety codices containing works attributed to Maksim Grek. Archeographic essays appear in result publications of chronicles. R. P. Dmitrieva provided brief descriptions of

(25) Н. Б. Синицына, Максим Грек в России, Москва, 1977, pp. 223-279
(26) Полное собрание русских летописей (ПСРЛ), vol. 33, 1977, pp. 3-9; ПСРЛ, vol. 34, 1978, pp. 3-7
approximately 350 codices that contain the Tale About Peter and Fevronia.27 Ja. S. Lur'e and Ju. D. Rykov provided various amounts of information about more than 100 codices that contain parts of the Correspondence attributed to Ivan IV and Andrej Kurbskij.28

DESCRIPTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL MANUSCRIPTS

A description of a single manuscript may appear as an article in a journal or sometimes as an introduction to a published text based on a single manuscript. The information here is often the best available and most extensive description of a particular manuscript.29

In this category, scholarship in the Soviet Union has produced an outstanding example in the past few years—the description of the Uspenskij Codex.30 This is an extremely thorough description as is clear from the sub-headings: "Concerning the manuscript and its publications" (pp. 4-7); "Composition of the manuscript" (pp. 8-10); "Paleographic description and binding" (pp. 10-24), which includes subsections on: "Binding" (pp. 10-11), "The Parchment" (pp. 12-13), "Rulings for the text" (pp. 13-14), "Quires, their composition and numeration" (pp. 14-16), "The ink" (p. 16), "Cinnabar" (pp. 16-17), "Ornament" (pp. 17-19), "Analysis of the handwriting" (pp. 20-24); also "Time and place of copying of the manuscript" (pp. 24-25); and "Reproduction of the text" (pp. 26-28). The table of contents of the book acts as a table of contents for the codex. In addition, all the words and their forms that appear in the codex are given in an index (pp. 500-752).

Although I am not in a position to evaluate the accuracy of the description without access to the codex, I can certainly applaud an attempt at such thorough work. First, it gives to researchers who do not have

(27) Р. П. Дмитриева, Повесть о Петре и Февронии, Leningrad, 1979, pp. 147-208.
(28) Я. С. Лурье и Ю. Д. Рыков, "Археографический обзор," in Переписка Ивана Грозного с Андреем Курбским, Leningrad, 1979, pp. 250-351.
(30) Успенский сборник XII-XIII в., publication prepared by О. А. Князевская, В. Г. Демьянов, and M. V. Ляхон under the editorship of С. И. Котков, Moscow, 1971, esp. pp. 4-28.
access to the codex an abundance of material to work with. Second, those
researchers who do not have access will have an easier task since they do
not have to break new ground in figuring out the make-up of the codex,
but can make adjustments as needed.\textsuperscript{31} In addition, the codicological
analysis of individual manuscripts contributes to our understanding of
their composition and of the times in which they were compiled.

A number of articles have appeared that analyze individual manuscripts.
A. A. Amosov analyzed the watermarks, handwriting, quires, and chrono­
logical layers in the ms. ЦГАДА, ф. 1196, оп. 3, д. 4а, a collection of
documents.\textsuperscript{32} G. M. Proxorov provided a detailed discussion of the ms.
ГПБ, Ф. IV. 2, which contains the Laurentian Chronicle.\textsuperscript{33} O. A. Knjazev­
skaja of a manuscript a Moscow University--2Ag80.\textsuperscript{34} She also gave a
brief report on her thesis work involving the Apostolos ГИМ, Синод. № 7.\textsuperscript{35}
G. V. Popov provided an analysis of another Moscow University manuscript
№ 2Ag78.\textsuperscript{36} V. Raudjaljunas devoted separate articles to describing
Ukrainian copies\textsuperscript{37} and the Чудов copy (ГИМ, Чудов. № 364)\textsuperscript{38} of the

\textsuperscript{31} Although criticisms have been made of the description of the
Успенскiй Codex, it should be understood that these criticisms are
mainly concerning degree of sophistication. See, e.g., Angiolo
Danti, "The Vision of Isaiah According to the Uspenskii Sbornik. A
Critical Analysis of the Text," Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian
Studies Held at Harvard University, № 9, 1978-1979 (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{32} A. A. Амосов, "Копийная книга Антониево-Сийского монастыря," АЕ за
1971 год, Moscow, 1972, pp. 276-282.

\textsuperscript{33} Г. М. Прохоров, "Кодикологический анализ Лаврентьевской летописи,"
Вопомогательные исторические дисциплины, vol. 4, 1972, pp. 77-104.

\textsuperscript{34} O. A. Князевская, "Рукопись Евангелия XIII в. из собрания Москов­
ского университета," Рукописная и печатная книга в фондах Научной

\textsuperscript{35} O. A. Князевская, "Об одной рукописи XIII в. из Ростовской книго­
pисной мастерской (графико-палеографическое описание)," История
славянских языков и письменности (Тезисы докладов), Moscow, 1973,
pp. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{36} Г. В. Попов, "Лицевое евангелие с 'заметью 1514 г.' и его место в
Московском искусстве последней трети XV в.," Рукописная и печатная
книга в фондах Научной библиотеки Московского университета, vol. 1,

\textsuperscript{37} V. Рaudjaljunas (Raudeliūnas), "Украинские списки Второго Литовского

\textsuperscript{38} V. Рaudjaljunas (Raudeliūnas), "Чудовский список Второго Литовского
Second Lithuanian Statute. V. F. Pokrovskaja provided a description of the ms. ЛОИИ, Н. П. Лихачев No 365 from the late fifteenth/early sixteenth century. Amosov did a codicological analysis of a part from one manuscript that contains the handwriting of Mixail Medovarcev. V. S. Golyšenko provided a detailed discussion of a Service Book (No 1), which had been restored at the end of the eighteenth century, and a Gospel (No 19) both from the early sixteenth century now located in the Institute of Russian Language. Ja. A. Kim did a detailed codicological and linguistic analysis that led him to date a parchment gospel in the Lenin Library to the fourteenth or fifteenth century. T. N. Kopreeva discussed the ms. ГПБ, Погодин No 1032. Proxorov analyzed the ms. ХГНБ, No 816281 from Kharkiv Library. And E. Ja Blagova provided information about the ms. ГИМ, Хлудов No 55.

Recent'y, descriptions almost as thorough as the one for the Uspenskij codex were provided for three other codices: a sixteenth-century codex that contains a translation into East Slavic of Liber ruralium commonorum written by Petrus de Crescentiis (Pietro dei Crescenzi) in Latin in 1488.
the early fourteenth century; a seventeenth-century codex that contains
the Life of Archpriest Avvakum supposedly in his own hand; and a late
twelfth- or thirteenth-century codex that contains East Slavic transla-
tions of the Greek saints' lives of Nifont, bishop of Constantia and
Theodore of Studite. One should also note that two facsimile editions
with color plates of every folio in the manuscripts have recently come
out. The first facsimile is that of the Kievan Psalter of 1397. The
second facsimile is of a seventeenth-century illuminated codex contain-
ing the Tale About Mamaj's Defeat.

The codicological analysis of individual manuscripts contributes to our
understanding of their composition and of the times in which they were
compiled. One would like to see thorough descriptions, and perhaps fac-
simile reproductions, of all the significant Slavic codices.

CATALOGS OF MANUSCRIPT DESCRIPTIONS

Catalogs are usually devoted to describing the manuscripts in a specific
collection, but other selections of manuscripts to describe are possible.
For example, M. N. Tixomirov described chronicle materials in Moscow
repositories.

(46) Назиратель, publication prepared by В. С. Гольшемко, Р. В. Бахтурина
and И. С. Филиппова, under the editorship of С. И. Котков, Moscow,

(47) Пустозерский сборник. Автографы сочинений Аввакума и Епифания, pre-
pared by Н. С. Демкова, Н. Ф. Дробленкова, and Л. И. Сазонова, esp.
pp. 139-162.

(48) Выгольский сборник, prepared by В. Ф. Дубровина, Р. В. Бахтурина
and В. С. Гольшемко, under the editorship of С. И. Котков, Moscow,

(49) Киевская Псалтия 1397 года из Государственной Публичной библиотеки
имени М. Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина в Ленинграде (ОЛПФ 66), Moscow, 1978,
with accompanying volume, Г. И. Взорнов, Исследование о Киевской
Псалтири, Moscow, 1978, 171 p., 25,000 copies.

(50) Сказание о Мамаевом побоище. Лицевая рукопись XVII века из собрания
Государственного Исторического музея, Moscow, 1980, 272 p., 50,000
copies.

(51) М. Н. Тихомиров, Краткие заметки о летописных произведениях в руко-
писных собраниях Москвы, Moscow, 1962. See also his earlier article
"Летописные памятники Синодального (быв. Патриаршего) собрания,"
Исторические записки, vol. 13, 1942, pp. 256-283. The latter item,
because of its relative brevity and stricter limits, I would be more
inclined to classify as an archeographic essay.
D. N. Al'šic has challenged the prevailing methods of describing manuscripts in collections. He has charged that the present arrangements of descriptions within catalogs (either by shelf list or by type of manuscript) make for difficulty in locating individual works. Instead, he proposes to arrange catalogs topically according to the themes of compositions found within the codices. But it seems to me that whatever difficulties Al'šic is talking about can be remedied by better indexing; and it does not really matter how the manuscript descriptions are arranged in the catalog.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's a number of catalogs of early Slavic manuscripts in collections outside Moscow and Leningrad came out. The year 1968 saw the appearance of the catalog for the M. N. Tixomirov Collection in Novosibirsk. The collection contains 648 Slavic manuscripts that had been gathered by Tixomirov and donated to the Siberian Section of the Academy of Sciences in order to promote the study of manuscripts in Siberia. The catalog, compiled by Tixomirov and published posthumously, describes 500 of these manuscripts. For each manuscript, at the very least, Tixomirov provides code numbers, designation, format, number of folios, a watermark, type of script, and binding. The catalog also includes an alphabetical index of the manuscripts and the publication of


ten rare texts. In two respects the descriptions are disappointing. First, the perennial problem of incomplete watermark information. Second, the absence of a full (or in many cases the absence of any) contents listing for the manuscripts. This absence could have been remedied before publication through revision by one or more of Tixomirov's students, or by means of a supplement.

Three catalogs covering early Slavic manuscripts in the Ukraine came out during this period. The first, compiled by the late M. V. Heppener and his assistants, contains rather extensive descriptions of twenty-eight manuscripts from the eleventh to the fourteenth century in the Central Scientific Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev. The catalog consists of a nine-and-a-half page foreword; seventy-seven pages of manuscript descriptions; a list of abbreviations; a name index; a subject and geographical index; seven pages of bibliography (rare for works published in the Soviet Union); résumés in Russian, German, French, and English; plus thirty pages of reproductions, which run from good to excellent in quality. This is a book of sharp contrasts: the modest offset format versus the number and excellence of the reproductions; the generous extent of each manuscript description versus the sparse indexes. The descriptions themselves are much more in the form of short essays (replete with extensive footnotes on each manuscript) than in the telegraphic form of most descriptions. In the foreword the component parts of each description are listed (p. 5). One must agree with the sentiments expressed clearly in the summaries (pp. 109-112, 115, and 118) and less clearly in the Ukrainian original text (p. 11) that completion of the work that this catalog has begun will involve describing other Slavic manuscripts from the eleventh through fourteenth century in other cities of the Ukraine as well as Ukrainian manuscripts from the fifteenth century.

Two catalogs that appeared shortly thereafter helped to further the reali
zation of this sentiment. The first catalog presents brief information concerning 631 documents in the collection of the Kievan Archeographic Commission. The second catalog contains information about 1133 documents on parchment in the Central Historical Archive in L'viv. Most of the L'viv documents are in Latin, but a sizable number are in Polish and Ukrainian. In addition, documents written in Russian, Arabic, Greek, Italian, German, French, and Czech are also described. Summaries of the foreword in Russian, English, and French appear along with the following indexes: documents cited, place of composition, the languages of the documents, personal names, geographical names, and rare words. Extensive and thorough indexes are extremely helpful when one uses such catalogs.

Two catalogs, both compiled by V. N. Šumilov, with descriptions of Muscovite documents have appeared in the last ten years. The first of these covers fond 135 of the Central State Archive of Early Acts (ЦГАДА), an archive that has not been as extensively described as its importance warrants. The catalog is sparsely indexed (with only a personal name index and geographical index), but merely the appearance of this catalog represents a giant step forward both practically and symbolically. The other catalog describes documents in the Moscow Chancery Collection in CGADA. It is better indexed with an extensive name index and a geographical, topographical, and ethnographical index. In both catalogs the descriptions themselves are not as extensive as in the Ukrainian cata-

(55) Каталог колекції документів Київської археографічної комісії 1869-1899, compiled by Я. П. Дашкевич, Л. А. Проценко, and З. С. Хомутецька, Kiev, 1971, 184 p., 2600 copies. Since this catalog was given an extensive review by Omeljan Pritsak in Recenzija, vol. 3, 1972, pp. 34-52, I will not comment further on it, except to remark on the relatively large edition (2600 copies) -- larger than any of the other catalogs discussed here -- and on the relatively poor quality paper.

(56) Каталог пергаментних документів Центрального державного історичного архіву УРСР у Львові 1233-1799, compiled by О. А. Купчинський and Е. Й. Ружицький, Kiev, 1972, 675 p., 1400 copies.

(57) Господарственное древлехранение хартий и рукописей. Описъ документовъ материаловъ фонда № 135, compiled by В. Н. Шумилов, Moscow, 1971, 204 p., number of copies not given. The book describes 404 documents and is printed on excellent quality paper with several well-produced illustrations. It is bound in a paper format.

(58) Книги московских приказов в фондах ЦГАДА, Опись 1495-1718 гг., compiled by В. Н. Шумилов, Moscow, 1972, 327 p., 1000 copies. It lists 3046 documents, is printed on poor quality paper, has no illustrations and is bound in hard cover.
logs, but may be adequate for most purposes. One cannot help but wonder, however, why no indication of watermarks is ever given for the documents on paper. Even poorly identified, randomly cited, and approximately dated watermark information, as in a recent publication of 302 Muscovite documents from the early sixteenth century, is better than no information at all.

Also in the early 1970's the catalog for manuscripts in the Synodal Collection of the Historical Museum in Moscow was completed. The description of these manuscripts had been begun by A. V. Gorski and K. I. Nevostruev in one of the outstanding catalogs of the nineteenth century. T. N. Protas'eva completed the description of manuscripts that Gorski and Nevostruev did not cover. Protas'eva had at her disposal unpublished material of Gorski and Nevostruev, notes by V. O. Ključevskij, and a typescript catalog compiled by A. D. Sedelnikov in the 1920's, yet her catalog leaves much to be desired.

Protas'eva has recently published a catalog of another collection for the Historical Museum. The Čudov catalog shares many of the insufficien-

(59) Акты русского государства 1505-1526 гг., compiled by С. Б. Веселовский et al., Moscow, 1975, 435 p., 3700 copies. The extensive commentary, name index (31 pages), geographical index (24 pages), and subject and terminological index (15+ pages) facilitate use of this valuable addition to the published sources. See the review of Daniel Kaiser in American Historical Review, vol. 82, 1977, p. 1024.

(60) Описание рукописей Синодального собрания (не вошедших в описание А. В. Горского и К. И. Невоструева), compiled by Т. Н. Протасьева, 2 vols., Moscow, 1970-1974, 211, 164 p., 1000 copies for first volume; number of copies for second volume not given. See my review in Kritika, vol. 12, 1976, pp. 1-15. I might add one typical and significant example of difficulty in watermark identification. In Makarii's Great Menology for August (ГИМ, Синод. № 183), one of the marks cited is "Sphere, Briquet № 39994, 1550." No indication of typicality or how closely the mark in the ms corresponds to the mark in the album is made. Since Briquet has only a little over 16,000 watermarks, he cannot possibly have one numbered 39,994. But what mark is it? The designation "sphere" does not help because spheres were extensively used during this period. The mark that Protas'eva wanted to designate was "Sphere held by a hand" of the type Briquet № 13994 = 1550. But a closer identification can be made with Lixačev № 1667 = 1553 (which was taken from the Great Menology for November).

(61) Т. Н. Протасьева, Описание рукописей Чудовского собрания, Novosibirsk, 1980, 1700 copies.
cies of her earlier catalog: insufficient information about contents of each manuscript; beginning folio, but not always ending folio for an item; no incipits or explicits; scant watermark data (but more than in her Synodal catalog); mere mention of type of handwriting; no information about signatures; and inadequate indexing. For example, under "Иван (Иоанн) Грозный, царь"--eight entries, only six of which actually refer to Ivan IV, the other two refer to Ivan III (Н 71 and Н 167); under "Иосиф, игумен Волоцкий"--one entry (Н 294), but his Life also appears in Н 308 and his letter to Vasilij III in Н 236). On the positive side, the indexes are divided into name, subject, names that appear in the inscriptions, and geographical indexes. And, at last, we have some indication of what is in the Čudov Collection.

Another catalog about manuscripts in a Moscow collection appeared recently. This catalog, compiled by N. A. Kobjak and I. V. Pozdeeva, presents detailed descriptions of fifty-four manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth century recently acquired as the result of archeographic expeditions by representatives of Moscow State University.62 For each manuscript they provide its code number, designation, approximate date, format, size, type of hand (but not location), number of folios, watermarks (but not location), decorative aspects, contents, inscriptions, binding, and present condition. Incipits are plentiful and are given in a font that has old script characters. For some of the manuscripts the compilers provide brief remarks about peculiarities. In addition, V. G. Motovilov discusses in further detail the sixteenth-century bindings of two of the manuscripts (pp. 179-180). The book has three indexes--names of the compositions, personal names, and geographical names--as well as forty-three plates with illustrations from the manuscripts. This catalog does not provide information about foliation, quires, end folios for each work, explicits, breakdown of the watermarks and handwriting, or bibliographic references about the compositions. Nonetheless, this catalog is clearly above average in amount of information provided.

(62) Славяно-Русские рукописи XV-XVI веков Научной библиотеки Московского университета (поступления 1964-1978 годов), compiled by Н. А. Кобяк and И. В. Pozdeeva, under the editorship of И. Д. Ковальченко and В. А. Черных, Moscow, 1981. 2090 copies.
G. I. Vzdornov has compiled an art book\(^{(63)}\) that contains descriptions of 112 Slavic manuscripts mostly on parchment from the twelfth through the early fifteenth centuries from Vladimir, Rostov, Ustiug, Riazan'. Moscow, Tver', Kirillo-Belozersk Monastery, Trinity- St. Sergius Monastery, Kostroma, Nizhnii Novgorod, Kolomna, Perjaslavl' Zalesskij, and so forth. The descriptions are arranged topographically according to place of origin, then chronologically. The volume is lavishly illustrated with many color plates, in most cases representing the actual size of the folio. There is also an index to the manuscripts and a name index. Vzdornov also supplies extensive bibliographic references for each of the codices.

The catalog recently compiled by Ja. N. Ščapov on Slavic manuscripts in Polish repositories slightly misrepresents itself in the title.\(^{(64)}\) As Ščapov pointed out in the introduction, it does not attempt to describe East and South Slavic manuscripts from Peremyšl that were transferred to the major Polish repository--the National Library in Warsaw. Nevertheless, it is still a valuable work, although it gives an appearance of having been "slapped together" rather quickly (see especially the writing in by hand of certain Old Slavic letters).

In contrast to the haphazard appearance and inexpensive offset format of Ščapov's catalog, the catalog of parchment manuscripts in the Library of the Academy of Sciences (БАН) is luxurious both in appearance and in amount of information given.\(^{(65)}\) The compilers have provided us with exactness in detail, excellent reproductions, generous citing of incipits and

---

\(^{(63)}\) Г. И. Вадорнов, Искусство книги в древней Руси. Рукописная книга Северо-Восточной Руси XII-начала XV веков, Moscow, 1980, 551 p. 25,000 copies.


My thanks to Professor Frank Sysyn of Harvard University for information concerning this catalog. One should also look at Ščapov's article: "Biblioteka Polockogo Sofijskogo sobora i biblioteka akademij Zamojskoj," Kul'turnye svjazi narodov Vostočnoj Evropy v XVI v., Moscow, 1976, pp. 262-282, where he describes eleven codices from the Zamoyski Collection now in the National Library.

\(^{(65)}\) Пергаменные рукописи Библиотеки Академии наук СССР. Описание русских
explicits, numerous references, Old Slavic type used to set off citations from the 195 manuscripts, as well as a name index, a geographical index, and an index of the works found in the manuscripts. This catalog represents one of the crowning achievements thus far of work in the field of manuscript descriptions.

Another admirable achievement is the publication of descriptions of six codices belonging to the fifteenth-century book master, Efrosin, a monk in the Kirillo-Belozersk Monastery. A special archeographic team under the aegis of the Academy of Sciences and the guidance of D. S. Lixačev described these manuscripts according to the rules proposed by an international committee of Slavists and by Lixačev (see fn. 3 above). An indication of the thoroughness of these descriptions can be conveyed by pointing out that the description of one of the codices (ГБЛ, Кирилло-Белозерское собрание, № 22/1099) is 98½ pages long! For each codex the compilers provide format, size of folios, dimensions of text, total foliation (including designation of blank folios), paginations, quire marks, a discussion of date, a clear attempt to identify all the watermarks and which folios they appear on, all the hands and which folios they appear on, binding, condition of maintenance, extensive information about inscriptions, previous descriptions and investigations of the codex, and detailed description of contents (including titles as they appear in the codex, incipits, explicits, and publications of the item). In addition, ample indexes are provided of the following: proper names, titles, incipits (!), geographical designations, and subjects in the compositions.


What more can the researcher ask for than that such excellent work be continued and, perhaps, that it be used as a model for the proposed union catalog of early Slavic manuscripts currently being worked on by specialists under the direction of S. O. Šmíd and the auspices of the Archeographic Commission.

The project of a union catalog was proposed by M. N. Tixomirov at sessions of the Archeographic Commission in October 1960 and April 1961. Tixomirov's proposal had been anticipated several years earlier by E. E. Granstrem. Tixomirov and Granstrem agreed for the most part on what the description of each manuscript should contain: date, designation, format and number of folios, material (paper or parchment), types of handwriting, decorations, binding, bibliography of the manuscript and shelf mark. They differed slightly about which inscriptions to include (Tixomirov wanted only those that concern the time and circumstances of the writing of the manuscript; Granstrem wanted also later notes, their content and date). Granstrem thought the manuscripts should be listed according to language, then chronologically and alphabetically, while Tixomirov thought a chronological-alphabetical arrangement with the language indicated for each manuscript was better. The subsequent decisions of the project consultants have followed Tixomirov's suggestion on arrangement of the descriptions, while their wider inclusion of inscriptions is more in accord with Granstrem's proposal.


(68) For a summary of Tixomirov's talk at the April session and the response to it, see Ю. О. Бем, Общее собрание Археографической комиссии, Вопросы истории, 1961, № 12, pp. 121-123, and Н. В. Шеламанова, "Деятельность Археографической комиссии при Отделении исторических наук АН СССР за 1961 год," АЕ за 1961 год, Moscow, 1962, p. 469.

(69) Е. З. Гранстрем, "О подготовке сводного печатного каталога славянских рукописей," Славянская филология. Сборник статей, vol. 2, Moscow, 1958, pp. 397-418. Granstrem even provided a list of Slavic mss from the eleventh to early twelfth century (pp. 412-418).
N. B. Šelamanova compiled a preliminary list of Slavic manuscripts through the fourteenth century for the catalog, and L. P. Žukovskaja compiled an index to accompany it. Sessions of the Archeographic Commission with the participation of leading archeographers in the Soviet Union were held in 1971 and 1973 to work out the details of the catalog. Decisions made at these sessions were later given in the form of instructions for describing manuscripts.

More recently, M. N. Vorob'ev and A. I. Rogov have reported about progress on the preliminary list of fifteenth-century Slavic manuscripts, which is to be part of the union catalog project. In their article


(73) L. P. Жуковская и N. B. Šelamanova, "Инструкция по описанию славяно-русских рукописей XI-XIV вв. для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР," АЕ за 1975 год, Москва, 1976, с. 28-40, and in a mimeograph publication of 250 copies (Москва, 1974), which includes forms for describing manuscripts (pp. 26-37) and a list of abbreviations (pp. 38-43).

(74) M. Н. Воробьев и A. I. Rogov, "К выводу 'Предварительного списка славяно-русских рукописей XV в., хранящихся в СССР' (для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР)," АЕ за 1978 год, Москва, 1978, с. 49-55. The decision to inventory fifteenth-century Slavic manuscripts in the Soviet Union with a view to including them in the compilative catalog was made in 1966 and the inventory was begun shortly afterward. See Šelamanova, "Составление 'Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР,'" АЕ за 1968 год, Москва, 1970, с. 447. Early reports of work on this project were given in "О работе над
Vorob'ev and Rogov make this statement about their procedure: "Similar attempts at exactness [in dating] create, unfortunately, too great a possibility for the appearance of a mistake" (p. 52). What is unfortunate is that their fear of making mistakes leads them to justify inexactness. One might also question their means of establishing the exact date of manuscripts "only on the basis of a scribe's inscription" (p. 53). Such inscriptions should be checked against other, indirect indications, such as watermarks, paleography, contents of manuscript, and so forth, because scribes often copied without change any inscription in their exemplar.

Already the union catalog project has contributed much to the study of early manuscripts. The two-volume handbook that came out as a result of this project, while extremely uneven in the quality of its articles, is a long overdue methods manual. The articles in the first volume give the impression that they were composed rather hurriedly and, as it were, off the top of the head. Ironically, this superficiality may be more appropriate for fulfilling the goal of the handbook, that is, allowing archivists to become aware of what characteristics of a manuscript are considered most valuable and how to describe them. Other articles (especially in volume two) are rather detailed and could profitably be read even by those who are already familiar with the respective topics.

(75) Методическое пособие, по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР, vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, Методические рекомендации .., vol. 2 (two parts), Moscow, 1976.

(76) The handbook has already had an effect upon descriptions. The recent catalog from L'viv about music manuscripts (Нотолінійні рукописи XVI-XVIII ст. Каталог, compiled by І. П. Ясинський and О. О. Дзюбана, under the editorship of Я. Н. Щапова, L'viv, 1979, 101 p. + 11 illustrations) used M. V. Bražnikov's schema for describing song books, which had appeared in volume one. However, none of the 142 Ukrainian mss would be noted in the union catalog as presently constituted. The L'viv catalog is in an offset format with poor quality illustrations. The descriptions are brief providing designation, date external form and condition, number of folios, size, type of writing, character of the artistic form, glosses, and library number. There are four indexes: name, geographical, subject, and list of writers and artists.

(77) In particular, I have in mind these articles: С. А. Клепиков,
This consideration alone suggests that the issuing of a revised, improved published edition might be proposed.

When completed, the union catalog of early Slavic manuscripts should be a major contribution to archeographical and codicological studies. There have already been proposals for similar catalogs covering Latin, Greek, Armenian, and other kinds of manuscripts in the Soviet Union.

CONCLUSION

While Soviet codicologists have made great progress in describing manuscripts, there remains much to be done: (1) describing collections and manuscripts that have not been described before or described unsatisfac-

"Описание древних русских обиходных переплетов" (pp. 51-64); Б. М. Клосс and Я. С. Лурье, "Русские летописи XI-XV вв. Материалы для описания" (pp. 78-139), and О. В. Творогов and В. А. Рыбин, "Материалы к классификации Русского хронографа" (pp. 140-164). In addition, the articles on parts of the Bible (Apocrypha and Apostolos), and on church service books may be the first serious work published on these topics since prerevolutionary times.

(78) Šelamanova gave a report on this catalog at a conference held in Erevan, October 25-27, 1977: Н. Б. Шеламанова, "О Сводном каталоге рукописей, хранящихся в СССР," Конференция по истории средневековой письменности и книги. Тезисы докладов, Ереван, 1977, р. 14) and at a conference held in Leningrad, February 14-16, 1979 (Н. Б. Шеламанова, "О подготовке Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР," Проблемы научного каталога рукописей и факсимильного издания памятников письменности. Всесоюзная научная конференция, Ленинград, 14-16 февраля 1979 г. Тезисы докладов, Ленинград, 1979, pp. 49-50). Among the other reports at this conference that touch on the same themes I have been discussing are: Amosov on identifying watermarks Al'sic on the fontological aspects of descriptions; Vorob'ev on fifteenth-century paleography; N. A. Dvoretskaja on describing the Pogodin Collection at the Public Library in Leningrad; L. I. Kiseleva on codicological methods in descriptions; O. A. Knjazevs-kaja on general questions of paleography in descriptions; Kostjuzina and Djanova on describing the part of the Volokolamsk Collection that is at the Historical Museum in Moscow; Kukuškina on BAN descriptions; I. V. Levočkin on collections that have not been described at the Historical Museum in Moscow; B. N. Morozov on the completion of the describing of fond 188 at the Central State Archive for Early Acts (ЦГАДА); Serbina on descriptions of mss at the Leningrad Section of the Institute of History (ЛОИ); and T. V. Špektorova on the problems of describing one ms from the fourteenth century at Moscow State University.
torily; (2) supplementing earlier descriptions with recent findings; (3) improvement of accuracy in identifying watermarks and more information concerning their placement in the codices; (4) more accurate paleographic information, especially concerning changes in hand within each codex; (5) attention to the way the codices were put together, that is, more information concerning signatures, quires, and layers; (6) more attention to the history of each codex; (7) more analysis and general observations from specialists concerning the codices; and (8) publication of these basic reference works on better quality paper with stronger bindings.

For most of East Slavic history manuscripts are our basic sources, not only because of the texts they convey, but also as archeological objects.


(80) A suggestion for future development of manuscript descriptions and for facilitating information retrieval was made by Daniel C. Waugh in a talk presented at the Institute of Russian Literature in September 1975. Waugh proposed that all present descriptions be fed into a computer. Then changes, corrections, and additions could be made more easily. Also this would make available to researchers outside the Soviet Union such typescript catalogs as those that are in the Manuscript Division at the Lenin Library (ГБЛ). (A list of those collections for which typescript catalogs exist can be found in Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR. Moscow and Leningrad, Supplement I: Bibliographical Addenda, Zug, Switzerland, 1976, p. 89; see also Л. В. Тиганова, "Подготовка каталога-справочника русско-славянских рукописей (Рукописные собрания Государственной библиотеки СССР им. В. И. Ленина)," Пути изучения древнерусской литературы и письменности, Leningrad, 1970, pp. 146-160.) Waugh's proposal is clearly the only long-term plan that makes any sense.
The thoroughness of descriptions of these manuscripts can be seen as an adequate gauge of the seriousness of literary and historical work being done. Time and again it has been shown that not having examined the manuscripts closely or not having adequate descriptions at hand has led researchers to faulty conclusions. The descriptions of the Uspenskij Codex, the parchment manuscripts in BAN, and the Efrosin codices have set high standards for any work on Slavic manuscripts presently being done or planned not only within but also outside the Soviet Union.