Feature Title: Дѣло кънижьноє Dielo k”nizh’noie

Article Title: Recent Descriptions from the Soviet Union of Early Slavic Manuscripts

Article Author: Donald Ostrowski

Journal Title: Polata Knigopisnaia

Issue Date: December 1982

Publisher: William R. Veder, Vakgroep Slavistiek, Katholieke Universiteit, Postbus 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen (Holland)

Citation: *Polata Knigopisnaia: an Information Bulletin Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literatures* 6 (December 1982): 2-29.

ДѢЛО КЪНИЖЬНОЄ

RECENT DESCRIPTIONS FROM THE SOVIET UNION OF EARLY SLAVIC MANUSCRIPTS

DONALD OSTROWSKI

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.

(1) "La publication des catalogues de manuscrits slaves et des inventaires d'archives en U.R.S.S.," *Journal des savants*, January-March, 1970, pp. 29-52.

manuscript book, are often deprived, through no fault of their own, of some very valuable information.[2] 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.[3]

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).[4] Such practice made for imprecision in determining how much of a work was

---

(2) About the importance and problems of manuscript work, see, e.g., the insightful essay of Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Tasks and Problems of Manuscript Research," *Codicologica*, vol. 1, 1976, pp. 84-90; for the study of manuscripts as archeological objects, see L. M. J. Delaissé, "Towards a History of the Medieval Book," *Codicologica*, vol. 1, 1976, pp. 75-83; for the fontological aspects of descriptions, see Д. Н. Альшиц, "Источниковедческие аспекты научного описания рукописей," *Проблемы научного описания рукописей и факсимильного издания памятников письменности. Всесоюзная научная конференция. Ленинград, 14-16 февраля 1979 г. Тезисы докладов*, Leningrad, 1979, pp. 6-7.

(3) For slightly different views concerning what is important in a manuscript description, see "Инструкция для составления каталогов древних славянских рукописей," *Slavia*, vol. 32, 1963, pp. 240-250; and Д. С. Лихачев, *Текстология на материале русской литературы X-XVII вв.*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1962, pp. 109-112. See also Д. С. Лихачев, "Задачи составления методик описания славянорусских рукописей," *Археографический ежегодник за 1972 год*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 234-242 and С. М. Каштанов, *Очерки русской дипломатики*, Moscow, 1970, pp. 218-243 on codicological aspects.

(4) See, e.g., А. Е. Викторов, *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах северной России*, St. Petersburg, 1890; and К. Калайдович and П. Строев, *Обстоятельное описание славяно-российских рукописей, хранящихся в Москве в библиотеке . . Толстого*, Moscow, 1825.

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.[5] 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.[6]

---

(5) 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. Протасьева, *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, *Древнерусския 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 четьих-миней 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]

Brussels, 1969 (*Subsidia hagiographica*, 47); *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antique et mediae aetatis*, 2 vols., Brussels, 1898-1901 (*Subsidia hagiographica*, 6); *Supplement*, Brussels, 1911 (*Subsidia hagiographica*, 12). Migne's compilations might also be helpful: Jacques Paul Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844-1864; A. Hamman, *Supplementum*, 5 vols., Paris, 1958-1974; and Jacques Paul Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca*, 161 vols., Paris, 1857-1866. Francis Thompson is currently compiling a guide to early Slavic translations from Greek. See Francis J. Thompson, "A Guide to Slavonic Translations from Greek Down to the End of the Fourteenth Century," in *Славянска палеография и дипломатика, Доклади и съобщения от семинара по славянска палеография и дипломатика*, eds. *Боряна Велчева*, et al., Sofia, 1980, pp. 27-37. A recent introductory survey of the Byzantine manuscript heritage is E. Э. Гранстрем, "Византийское рукописное наследие и древняя славяно-русская литература," *Пути изучения древнерусской литературы и письменности*, Leningrad, 1970, pp. 141-148. See also her valuable work in pinning down translations of John Chrysostom's compositions into Slavonic and their locations: E. Э. Гранстрем, "Иоанн Златоуст в древней русской и южнославянской письменности (XI-XIV вв.)," *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы* (*ТОДРЛ*), vol. 29, 1974, pp. 186-193; and E. Э. Гранстрем, "Иоанн Златоуст в древней русской и южнославянской письменности (XI-XV вв.)," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 35, 1980, pp. 345-375. For a provocative essay on the question of what was being translated and why, see Francis Thompson, "The Nature of the Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implications for Russian Culture," *Slavica Gandensia*, vol. 5, 1978, pp. 107-139. For a detailed analysis of the scientific literature, see Ihor Ševčenko, "Remarks on the Diffusion of Byzantine Scientific Literature Among the Orthodox Slavs," *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 59, 1981, pp. 321-345.

(7) Besides articles by S. A. 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 рукопсях библиотеки Троице-Сергиева монастыря," *Записки Отдела рукописей ГБЛ*, 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, *Опыт сборника сведений по истории и технике книгопереплетного художества на Руси, преимущественно в допетровское время, с XI по XVIII столетие включительно. Тексты - материалы снимки* (= Памятники древней письменности и искусства, vol. 122), St. Petersburg, 1903. One hopes that the posthumously published work of E. Laucevičius (*XV-XVII a. knygu irisimai 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" (*полуустав*), 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.

(8) See Waugh's comments on the problems of accuracy in Soviet watermark identification: Daniel C. Waugh, "Soviet Watermark Studies--Achievements and Prospects," *Kritika*, vol. 6, 1970, pp. 78-111. See also the remarks of T. V. Dianova in "Метод датировки документов с помощью водяных знаков и принципы публикации филиграней," *Археографический ежегодник за 1974 год*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 58-59, where she takes issue with some of the parameters Waugh proposed for identifying watermarks. Recent exceptions to the general Soviet insouciance in the filed of watermark studies can be seen in the works of Amosov, Dianova, Kaštanov, and Kloss: А. А. Амосов, "К вопросу о времени происхождения лицевого свода Ивана Грозного," *Материалы и сообщения по фондам Отдела рукописной и редкой книги*, Leningrad, 1978, pp. 6-36; Т. В. Дианова, "К вопросу о времени создания рукописи Пискаревского летописца," *Летописи и хроники. 1976 г. М. Н. Тихомиров и летописеведение*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 142-147; С. М. Каштанов, "По следам троицких копийных книг XVI в.," *Записки Отдела рукописей ГБЛ*, vol. 38, 1977, pp. 30-63 and vol. 40, 1979, pp. 4-58; Б. М. Клосс, "Деятельность митрополичьей книгописной мастерской в 20-х--30-х годах XVI века и происхождение Никоновской летописи," *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1972, pp. 333-335, where he corrects the watermark dating of the Ioasaf Chronicle made by A. A. Zimin; idem, "Нил Сорский и Нил Полев--'списатели книг,'" *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга*, vol. 2, Moscow, 1974, pp. 155-156; and idem, *Никоновский свод и русские летописи XVI-XVII веков*, Moscow, 1980.

(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

---

термина)," *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины*, vol. 2, 1969, pp. 134-143 about the insufficiency of terminology i- describing types of handwriting. The problem of differentiating between uncial and semi-unical was discussed in a report at the March 1973 session of the Archeographic Commission: М. В. Кукушкина, "Об определении устава и полуустава при описании рукописей," which was summarized by Vorob'ev: М. Н. Воробьев, "Совещание по вопросам описания древнеславянских рукописей," *АЕ за 1973 год*, Moscow, 1974, p. 323. General problems of the identification of hands were discussed at a conference held in April 1971: М. А. Орлова, "Конференция, посвященная методике идентификации почерков в древнерусской рукописной книге," *АЕ за 1971 год*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 393-398. See also the first five articles in the second volume of *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга*, Moscow, 1974, about the identification of handwriting in early Slavic manuscripts: М. В. Щепкина, "Возможность отождествления почерков в древнерусских рукописях" (pp. 7-13); Н. Н. Розов, "Об идентификации почерков старейших русских книг (XI-XII века)" (pp. 14-17); Л. М. Костюхина, "О некоторых принципах отождествления и типизации почерков в русских рукописях рубежа XVI-XVII веков" (pp. 18-27); Л. П. Жуковская, "Экслиттеральные способы определения разных почерков" (pp. 28-37); and И. С. Филиппова, "Идентификация писцов на основании анализа письма скорописных рукописей" (pp. 38-57). A recent paleography album from the Historical Museum in Moscow--Л. М. Костюхина, *Книжное письмо в России XVII в.*, Moscow, 1974--contains 155 photocopy samples of seventeenth-century handwriting (pp. 74-228), an analysis of seventeenth-century semi-uncial (pp. 6-64), and a list of seventeenth-century scribes (pp. 66-72). For an attempt at finding common principles in the identification of hands in Latin and Cyrillic alphabets, see В. И. Мажуга, "Отождествление руки писца в палеографии и кодикологии," *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины*, vol. 7, 1976, pp. 272-289. For the praxis of identification see the works of Kloss and Sinitcyna: Б. М. Клосс, "О составе Копийной книги московского митрополичьего дома," *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины*, vol. 5, 1973, esp. p. 109, where gives a detailed breakdown including folio locations of all the hands in a codex; idem, "Деятельность," pp. 329-333; Н. Б. Синицына, Книжный мастер Михаил Медоварцев, *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1972, pp. 286-317; idem, "Отождествление почерков русских рукописных книг конца XV-первой половины XVI в. и его трудности," *Проблемы палеографии и кодикологии в СССР*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 89-113; and idem, *Максим Грек в России*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 12-43 (I questioned the identification of the Russian autograph of Maksim/Michael Trivolis in *Kritika*, vol. 15, 1979, pp. 17-30).

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 to 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 (ТОДРЛ)* 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.[10] 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.[11]

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]

Русская литература, 1966, no. 2, pp. 217-219; 1967, no. 1, pp. 195-197; 1968, no. 2, pp. 201-204; 1969, no. 2, pp. 119-125; 1970, no. 1, pp. 191-196; 1971, no. 1, pp. 137-142; 1972, no. 2, pp. 177-184; 1973, no. 2, pp. 196-201; 1974, no. 1, pp. 231-237; and В. П. Бударагин, "Новые поступления в собрание древнерусских рукописей Пушкинского дома," *Русская литература*, 1976, no. 4, pp. 184-188.

(11) For a brief survey of Malyšev's work in collecting manuscripts, ✓ В. Кукушкина, "Рукописи Библиотеки Академии наук СССР, собранные при участии В. И. Малышева," in *Рукописное наследие древней Руси по материалам Пушкинского дома*, Leningrad, 1972, pp. 401-405. For a list of archeographic expeditions of Pushkin House, Leningrad State University, the Russian Museum, and Archive of the Academy of Sciences from 1965 to 1974, see *Древлехранилище Пушкинского дома литература 1965-1974 гг,)*, compiled by В. И. Малышев, Leningrad, 1978, pp. 106-110; for a list of the archeographic expeditions of the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN), see А. А. Амосов and Н. П. Бубнов, "Новые поступления в Отдел рукописей Библиотеки АН СССР в 1955-1976 гг." Supplement 1: "Отчеты об археографических экспедициях и обзоры новых поступлений рукописей в ОРРК БАН СССР, опубликованные в 1961-1977 гг.," *Материалы и сообщения по фондам Отдела рукописей и редкой книги*, edited by М. В. Кукушкина, Leningrad, 1978 pp. 331-333. Various theoretical considerations based on eleven archeographic expeditions of Moscow State University from 1971 to 1976 were summed up in an article: И. В. Поздеева, "Комплексные археографические экспедиции. Цели, методика, принципы организации," *История СССР*, 1978, № 2, pp. 103-115. Sixty-four manuscripts from one of these expeditions were briefly described: Т. А. Круглова, "Краткое описание рукописей, найденных в 1973 г. на территории Молдавской ССР и Одесской области УССР," *Из истории фондов Научной библиотеки Московского университета*, edited by У. С. Карпова, Moscow, 1978, pp. 152-158. For the "First All-Union Conference on Field Archeography," see the reports: А. А. Курносов and В. А. Черных in *Вопросы истории*, 1977, № 4, pp. 141-145; М. П. Мироненко in *АЕ за 1977 год*, Moscow, 1978, pp. 370-373; and М. П. Мироненко and В. В. Морозов in *Советские архивы*, 1977, № 2, pp. 119-121.

(12) See, for example, the archeographic essays: О. А. Державина, *Сказание Авраамия Палицына*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1955, pp. 64-92; А. А. Зимин and Я. С. Лурье, *Послания Иосифа Волоцкого*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1959, pp. 98-136 and 289-295; and А. А. Зимин, *Сочинения И. Пересветова*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1956, pp. 78-120.

V. A. Kučkin's essay on sixty-six copies of the *Tale Concerning Mixail of Tver'* is an outstanding example of an archeographic essay.[13] 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" (*почерки 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 Kučkin 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 Kučkin 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 Kučkin's is.

N. S. Demkova's archeographic essay on copies of three redactions of the *Life of Avvakum* is sparse in comparison.[14] 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.[15] Very little is gained by having the other reference,

---

(13) В. А. Кучкин, *Повести о Михаиле Тверском*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 33-74.

(14) Н. С. Демкова, *Житие протопопа Аввакума*, Leningrad, 1974, pp. 12-66. Not all of this chapter is concerned with the manuscript copies. After each section that describes manuscripts she has a longer section discussing the relationship of the redactions. Only about fourteen of the fifty-four pages deal solely with the fifty-six manuscript copies. Although she has more information (contents, handwriting) about some copies in the sections devoted to redactions, it is not much.

(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 archeographic information about manuscript copies of that compilation.[17] K. M. Kuev's article barely meets the promise in the title of being merely "observations" (*наблюдения*). 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'* (a type of decorative lettering) in the titles, and citation

---

библиографии)," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 8, 1951, pp. 379-397, but only repeats the information given there (p. 14, № 5; p. 15, №№ 11, 12, 14; p. 16, №№ 17, 20; pp. 42-43, № 2; p. 43, №№ 4, 7; p. 44, №№ 10, 11). When there is so much original research waiting to be published, one expects more than mere repetition from that which is published.

(16) Demkova does make one regrettable excursion into the realm of watermerks. 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 *Изборник 1073 г. Сборник статей*, Moscow, 1977, pp. 50-56; and Л. П. Грязина and 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.[18] 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.[19] 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.[20] V. M. Zagrebin described forty Serbian manuscripts in the Pogodin Collection of the Public Library in Leningrad.[21] T. S. Ivanova discussed the Tver' Collection in TsGADA.[22] G. V. Markelov and S. V. Frolov provided information about three manuscripts from the sixteenth century in Pushkin House.[23] Ja. N. Ščapov provided descriptions, which are mainly valuable for their watermark information, of codices containing early copies of the *Rule of Vladimir*.[24] N.B. Sinitsyna described thoroughly over ninety codices containing works attributed to Maksim Grek.[25] Archeographic essays appear in result publications of chronicles.[26] R. P Dmitrieva provided brief descriptions of

(18) Н. Н. Покровский, *Судные списки Максима Грека и Исака Собаки*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 10-19.

(19) Л. А. Дмитриев, *Житийные повести русского севера как памятники литературы XIII-XVII вв.*, Leningrad, 1973, pp. 271-292.

(20) В. И. Буганов, "Описание списков разрядных книг XVII вв." *АЕ за 1972 год*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 276-282.

(21) В. М. Загребин, "Сербские рукописи из собрания М. П. Погодина," *АЕ за 1973 год*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 188-199.

(22) Т. С. Иванова, "Коллекция государственных и частных актов поместно-вотчинных архивов XVI-XIX вв.," *АЕ за 1973 год*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 210-218.

(23) Г В. Маркелов and С. В. Фролов, "Строгановские рукописи в Пушкинском доме," *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. Письменность. Искусство. Археология. Ежегодник 1975*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 70-72.

(24) Я. Н. Щапов, *Древнерусские княжеские уставы XI-XV вв.*, Moscow, 1976.

(25) Н. Б. Синицына, *Максим Грек в России*, Moscow, 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 Fevroniia*.[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. n addition, all the words and their forms that appear in the codex are given in an indes (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 and Ю. Д. Рыков, "Археографический обзор," in *Переписка Ивана Грозного с Андреем Курбским*, Leningrad, 1979, pp. 250-351.

(29) Examples of this type are: Л. Н. Пушкарев, "К вопросу об издании списки Царского Софийской I летописи," *Проблемы источниковедения*, vol. 8, 1959, pp. 432-444; К. Н. Сербина, "О происхождении сборника № 645 Синодального собрания Государственного исторического музея," *Вопросы социально-экономический истории и источниковедения периода феодализма в России*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 237-241.

(30) *Успенский сборник XII-XIII вв.*, publication prepared by О. А. Князевская, В. Г. Демьянов, and М. В. Ляпон 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.[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 chronological layers in the ms. ЦГАДА, ф. 1196, оп. 3, д. 4а, a collection of documents.[32] G. M. Proxorov provided a detailed discussion of the ms. ГПБ, F.IV.2, which contains the Laurentian Chronicle.[33] O. A. Knjazevskaja of a manuscript a Moscow University--2Ag80.[34] She also gave a brief report on her thesis work involving the Apostolos ГИМ, Синод. № 7.[35] G. V. Popov provided an analysis of another Moscow University manuscript № 2Ag78.[36] V. Raudjaljunas devoted separate articles to describing Ukrainian copies[37] and the Čudov copy (ГИМ, Чудов. № 364)[38] of the

---

(31) Although criticisms have been made of the description of the Uspenskij 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).

(32) А. А. Амосов, "Копийная книга Антониева-Сийского монастыря," *АЕ за 1971 год*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 276-282.

(33) Г. М. Прохоров, "Кодикологический анализ Лаврентьевской летописи," *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины*, vol. 4, 1972, pp. 77-104.

(34) О. А. Князевская, "Рукопись Евангелия XIII в. из собрания Московского университета," *Рукописная и печатная книга в фондах Научной библиотеки Московского университета*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, pp. 5-18.

(35) О. А. Князевская, "Об одной рукописи XIII в. из Ростовской книгописной мастерской (графико-палеографическое описание)," *История славянских языков и письменности (Тезисы докладов)*, Moscow, 1973, pp. 16-17.

(36) Г В. Попов, "Лицевое евангелие с 'записью 1514 г.' и его место в Московском искусстве последней трети XV в.," *Рукописная и печатная книга в фондах Научной библиотеки Московского университета*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1973, pp. 19-40.

(37) В. Рауделюнас (Raudelionas), "Украинские списки Второго Литовского Статута," *Архивы Украины*, 1973, № 4, pp. 69-76.

(38) В. Раудялюнас (Raudelionas), "Чудовский список Второго Литовского

Second Lithuanian Statute. V. F. Pokrovskaja provided a description of the ms. ЛОИИ, Н. П. Лихачев № 365 from the late fifteenth/early sixteenth century.[39] Amosov did a codicological analysis of a part from one manuscript that contains the handwriting of Mixail Medovarcev.[40] V. S. Golyšenko provided a detailed discussion of a Service Book (№ 1), which had been restored at the end of the eighteenth century, and a Gospel (№ 19) both from the early sixteenth century now located in the Institute of Russian Language.[41] 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.[42] T. N. Kopreeva discussed the ms. ГПБ, Погодин № 1032.[43] Proxorov analyzed the ms. ХГНБ, № 816281 from Xarkiv Library.[44] And E. Ja Blagova provided information about the ms. ГИМ, Хлудов № 55.[45]

Recently, 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 commodorum* written by Petrus de Crescentiis (Pietro dei Crescenzi) in Latin in

---

Статута," *Труды Академии наук ЛитССР*, Серия А, Общественные науки, vol. 4, 1973, pp. 67-76.

(39) В. Ф. Покровская, Летописный свод 1488 г. из собрания Н. П. Лихачева, *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. Письменность. Искусство. Археология. Ежегодник 1974*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 28-32.

(40) А. А. Амосов, "Из истории кодекса сборника Д. 193 Архангельского собрания РО БАН СССР," *Рукописные и редкие печатные книги в фондах Библиотеки АН СССР. Сборник научных трудов*, Leningrad, 1976, pp. 34-42.

(41) В. С. Голышенко, "Две рукописи XVI в. из собрания Института русского языка АН СССР," *Источники по истории русского языка*, edited by С. И. Котков and В. Я. Дерягин, Moscow, 1976, pp. 225-232.

(42) Я. А. Ким, К датировке Вологодского евангелия Рукопись ГБЛ, ф. 354, № 1)," *Источники по истории русского языка*, edited by С. И. Котков and В. Я. Дерягин, Moscow, 1976, pp. 232-248.

(43) Т. Н. Копреева, "Рукописные сборники энциклопедического состава XVI веков и славяно-русское Возрождение (Некоторые наблюдения над типологией жанра по сборнику 1032 из Погодинского собрания)," *Книга. Исследования и материалы*, vol. 32, 1976, pp. 78-92.

(44) Г. М. Прохоров, "Древнейшая рукопись с произведениями Митрополита Киприана," *Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. Письменность. Искусство. Археология. Ежегодник 1978*, Leningrad, 1979, ppp 17-30.

(45) Э. Я. Благова, "Значение Хлудовского сборника № 55 для изучения состава древнейших славянских гомилетический сборников," *АЕ за 1978 год*, Moscow, 1979, pp. 163-170.

the early fourteenth century;[46] a seventeenth-century codex that contains the *Life of Archpriest Avvakum* supposedly in his own hand;[47] and a late twelfth- or thirteenth-century codex that contains East Slavic translations of the Greek saints' lives of Nifont, bishop of Constantia and Theodore of Studite.[48] 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.[49] The second facsimile is of a seventeenth-century illuminated codex containing the *Tale About Mamaj's Defeat*.[50]

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 facsimile 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.[51]

---

(46) *Назиратель*, publication prepared by В. С. Голышенко, Р. В. Бахтурина and И. С. Филиппова, under the editorship of С. И. Котков, Moscow, 1973, esp. pp. 82-102.

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

(48) *Выголексинский сборник*, prepared by В. Ф. Дубровина, Р В. Бахтурина and В. С. Голышенко, under the editorship of С. И. Котков, Moscow, 1977, esp. pp. 7-59.

(49) *Киевская Псалтирь 1397 года из Государственной Публичной библиотеки имени М. Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина в Ленинграде (ОПИ F6)*, 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 рукописных 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 it relative brevity and stricter limits, I would be more inclined to classify as a archeographic essay.

D. N. Al'šic has challenged the prevailing methods of describing manuscripts in collections.[52] 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.[53] 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

---

(52) Д. Н. Альшиц, "Вопросы теории и практики научного описания исторический источников," *АЕ за 1969 год*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 36-53; idem, *Историческая коллекция Эрмитажного собрания рукописей. Памятники XI-XVII вв. Описание*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 32-36. See the criticism of Al'šic's catalog by Joan Afferica in "Considerations on the Formation of the Hermitage Collection of Russian Manuscripts," *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte*, vol. 24, 1976, pp. 237-282 (republished with changes as "К вопросу об определении русских рукописей М. М. Щербатова в Эрмитажном собрании Публичной библиотеки им. М. Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 35, 1980, pp. 376-393) and in the review of Ю. К. Бегунов in *Советские архивы*, 1970, № 4, pp. 112-114.

(53) М. Н. Тихомиров, *Описание Тихомировского собрания рукописей*, Moscow, 1968, 194 p., 2100 copies. For further critical comments, see the review by Ю. К. Бегунов in *Советские архивы*, 1969, № 6, pp. 122-124. Concerning the circumstances of the gathering of some of the manuscripts and their transfer to Novosibirsk, see В. И. Малышев, "Об одном важном источнике Тихомировского собрания," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 32, 1977, pp. 395-401, and А. И. Рогов and Н. Н. Покровский, "Собрание рукописей академика М. Н. Тихомирова, переданное Сибирскому отделению АН СССР (г. Новосибирск)," *АЕ за 1965 год*, Moscow, 1966, pp. 162-172.

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.[54] 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

(54) *Слов'янські рукописи XI-XIV ст. у фондах відділу рукописів Центральної наукової бібліотеки Академії наук Української РСР огляд, опис, публікації*, compiled by М. В. Гепненер with the participation of М. П. Візир and Й. В. Шубинський, Kiev, 1969, 152 p., 1000 copies. The fact that most of the manuscripts described here are on parchment makes this the first of three outstanding catalogs published in the last few years devoted almost exclusively to parchment manuscripts.

zation of this sentiment. The first catalog presents brief information concerning 631 documents in the collection of the Kievan Archeographic Commission.[55] The second catalog contains information about 1133 documents on parchment in the Central Historical Archive in L'viv.[56] 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.[57] 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 symbollically. The other catalog describes documents in the Moscow Chancery Collection in CGADA.[58] It is better indexed with an extensive name index and a geographical, topographical, and ethnographic index. In both catalogs the descriptions themselves are not as extensive as in the Ukrainian cata-

---

(55) *Каталог колекції документів Київської археографічної комісії 1369-1899*, 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) *Государственное древлехранилище хартий и рукописей. Опись документальных материалов фонда № 135*, compiled by В. И. 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,[59] 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.[60] The description of these manuscripts had been begun by A. V. Gorskij and K. I. Nevostruev in one of the outstanding catalogs of the nineteenth century. T. N. Protas'eva completed the description of manuscripts that Gorskij and Nevostruev did not cover. Protas'eva had at her disposal unpublished material of Gorskij 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.[61] 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 T. H. 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) T. H. 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 (№ 71 and № 167); under "Иосиф, игумен Волоцкий"--one entry (№ 294), but his *Life* also appears in № 308 and his letter to Vasilij III in № 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. Поздеева, 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 Peremyśl 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. Вздорнов, *Искусство книги в древней Руси. Рукописная книга Северо-Восточной Руси XII-начала XV веков*, Moscow, 1980, 551 p. 25,000 copies.

(64) Я. Н. Щапов, *Восточнославянские и южнославянские рукописные книги в собраниях Польской Народной Республики*, 2 vols., Moscow, 1976, 163, 202 p., 350 copies. For an inventory of 706 mss in the Peremyśl Collection, see the anonymous "Рукописи гр.-католицької Перемиської Капітули," in *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni/Записки чина св. Василія Великого*, Section 2, vol. 9, pp. 235-264, Rome, 1974 (also published in *Богословія*, vol. 37, 1973, pp. 194-213). 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 Zamojskoi," *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.[66] 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.

и славянских рукописей XI-XVI веков, compiled by Н. Ю. Бубнов, О. П. Лихачева, and В. Ф. Покровская, Leningrad, 1976, 235 p., 2400 copies. See the reviews of Н. Б. Шеламанова in *История СССР*, 1978, № 1, pp. 199-201, and О. А. Князевская in *АЕ за 1977 год*, Moscow, 1978, pp. 340-342. The debt of this catalog to the outstanding work of the archivist N. B. Tixomirov is obvious; cf. Н. Б. Тихомиров, "Каталог русских и славянских пергаменных рукописей XI-XII веков, хранящихся в Отделе рукописей Государственной библиотеки СССР имени В. И. Ленина," *Записки Отдела рукописей*, vol. 25, 1962, pp. 153-183; vol. 27, 1965, pp. 93-148; vol. 30, 1968, pp. 87-156; vol. 33, 1972, pp. 213-220. In Vodoff's article (see fn. 1 above) this series was mistakenly attributed to M. N. Tixomirov.

(66) М. Д. Каган, Н. Б. Понырко, and М. В. Рождественская, "Описание сборников XV в. книгописца Ефросина," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 35, 1980, pp. 3-300. See the preliminary report about this project: М. Д. Каган, Н. Б. Понырко, and М. В. Рождественская, "Описание сборников Ефросина XV в.," *АЕ за 1976 год*, Moscow, 1977, pp. 318-319.

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. Šmidt 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[67] and April 1961.[68] Tixomirov's proposal had been anticipated several years earlier by E. E. Granstrem.[69] 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 hand writing, 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.

---

(67) Tixomirov's talk and the response to it were first reported by Н. Б. Шеламанова, "Деятельность Археографической комиссии при Отделении исторических наук АН СССР за 1960 г.," *АЕ за 1960 год*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 368-369, and more fully by Н. Б. Шеламанова, "О составлении сводного каталога древних рукописей," *Исторический архив*, 1961, № 1, pp. 179-181. The talk itself was eventually published in full: "Доклад М. Н. Тихомирова 1960 г. о составлении сводного каталога древних рукописей," *АЕ за 1971 год*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 368-372.

(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. Б. Шеламанова, "Деятельность Археографической комиссии при Отделении исторических наук АН СССР за 1961 год," *АЕ за 1961 год*, Moscow, 1962, p. 469.

(69) Е. Э. Граншрем, "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,[70] and L. P Žukovskaja compiled an index to accompany it.[71] 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.[72] Decisions made at these sessions were later given in the form of instructions for describing manuscripts.[73]

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.[74] In their article

---

(70) Н. Б. Шеламанова, "Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописей, хранящихся в СССР," *АЕ за 1965 год*, Moscow, 1966, pp. 177-272.

(71) Л. П. Жуковская, "Памятники русской и славянской письменности XI-XIV вв. в книгохранилищах СССР," *Советское славяноведение*, 1969, № 1, pp. 57-71. See also Л. П. Жуковская, "Замечания о 'Предварительном списке' и 'Сводном каталоге' славянских древних рукописей," *Вопросы языкознания*, 1969, № 1, pp. 98-107.

(72) For the sessions of February 1-4, 1971, see Н. Б. Шеламанова, "Совещание по составлению Сводного каталога славяно-русских рукописей XI-XIV вв.," *АЕ за 1971 год*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 384-391 and О. П. Лихачева, "Подготовка Сводного каталога славяно-русских рукописей XI-XIV вв.," *Известия Академии наук СССР, Серия литературы и языка*, vol. 31, 1972, pp. 97-101. For the sessions of March 19-23, 1973, see М. Н. Воробьев, "Совещание по вопросам описания древнеславянских рукописей," *АЕ за 1973 год*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 321-328 and В. А. Черных, "Вопросы описания древних рукописей. Совещание в Ленинграде," *История СССР*, 1973 № 5, pp. 223-225. For a brief account of the preparation through 1972, see Л. П. Жуковская, "Работа над Сводным каталогом славяно-русских рукописей и некоторые вопросы методики их описания," *АЕ за 1972 год*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 243-247.

(73) Л. П. Жуковская and Н. Б. Шеламанова, "Инструкция по описанию славяно-русских рукописей XI-XIV вв. для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР," *АЕ за 1975 год*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 28-40, and in a mimeograph publication of 250 copies (Moscow, 1974), which includes forms for describing manuscripts (pp. 26-37) and a list of abbreviations (pp. 38-43).

(74) М. Н. Воробьев and А. И. Рогов, "К выходу 'Предварительного списка славяно-русских рукописей XV в., хранящихся в СССР' (для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР)," *АЕ за 1977 год*, Moscow, 1978, pp. 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 Шеламанова, "Составление 'Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР,'" *АЕ за 1968 год*, Moscow, 1970, p. 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.[75] The articles in the first volume give the impression that they were composed rather hurridly 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.[76] 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.[77]

предварительным списком славяно-русских рукописей XV в., хранящихся в СССР," *АЕ за 1971 год*, Moscow, 1972, p. 392, and by М. Б. Булгаков, "К датировке отдельных рукописей ЦГАДА," *Советские архивы*, 1972, № 4. pp. 59-64.

(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 Ч. П. Ясиновський and О. О. Дзьобана, under the editorship of Я. Н. Щапов, 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.[78] 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*, Erevan, 1977, p. 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 описания рукописей и факсимильного издания памятников письменности. Всесоюзная научная конференция, Ленинград, 14-16 февраля 1979 г. Тезисы докладов*, Leningrad, 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'šic on the fontological aspects of descriptions; Vorob'ev on fifteenth-century paleography; N. A. Dvoretckaja on describing the Pogodin Collection at the Public Library in Leningrad; L. I. Kiseleva on codicological methods in descriptions; O. A. Knjazevskaja 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 (ЛОИИ); and T. V. Špektorova on the problems of describing one ms from the fourteenth century at Moscow State University.

torily;[79] (2) supplementing earlier descriptions with recent findings;[80] (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;[81] (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.

---

(79) For examples of work being done in the neglected outlying areas, see: Е. И. Дергачева-Скоп and Н. Н. Покровский, "Задачи археографического изучения Сибири," *Пути изучения древнерусской литературы и письменности*, Leningrad, 1970, pp. 171-177; Д. Г Дубинская, "Материалы Устюжской четверти 1675-1700 гг. по истории северных уездов," *Северный археографический сборник*, vol. 1, Vologda, 1970, pp. 497-505; *Северные писцовые книги сотницы и платежницы XVI в.* (= *Северный археографический сборник*, vol. 2), Vologda, 1972 (the entire issue--14 articles--devoted to publication of documentary sources with brief descriptions of mss); С. А. Попов, "Рукописные и старопечатные книги из фондов Обенбуркского областного краеведческого музея," *Южноуральский археографический сборник*, Ufa, 1973, pp. 388-389 (briefly describes one seventeenth-century chronograph); and В. А. Оборин, "Документы XVII--начала XVIII века в рукописных фондах музеев Пермской области (краткий обзор)," *Уральский археографический ежегодник за 1972 год*, Perm', 1974, pp. 111-120.

(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 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. 148-160.) 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 guage 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.

---

(81) Extremely helpful for determining the past locations of extant manuscripts are the attempts at figuring out the compositions of monastic libraries. See, for example: Р. П. Дмитриева, "Светская литература в составе монастырских библиотек XV-XVI вв. (Кирилло-Белозерского, Волоколамского монастырей и Троице-Сергиевой лавры)," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 23, 1968, pp. 143-170; В. Н. Флоря, "О реконструкции состава древнерусских библиотек," *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1972, pp. 52-59; Р. П. Дмитриева, "Волоколамские четьи сборники XVI в.," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 28, 1974, pp. 202-230; А. А. Зимин, "Из истории собрания рукописных книг Иосифо-Волоколамского монастыря," *Записки Отдела рукописей ГБЛ*, vol. 38, 1977, pp. 15-19. Л. Б. Белова and М. В. Кукушкина, "К истории изучения и реконструкции рукописного собрания Антониево-Сийской библиотеки," *Материалы и сообщения по фондам Отдела рукописной и редкой книги*, edited by М. В. Кукушкина, Leningrad, 1978, pp. 154-187. See also the work of Rozov on bibliogeography, that is, codex migrations: Н. Н. Розов, "Об исследовании географического распространения рукописной книги (По материалам Софийской библиотеки)," *Пути изучения древнерусской литературы и письменности*, Leningrad, 1979, pp. 160-170; idem, "Искусство книги древней Руси и библиогеография (по Новгородско-Псковским материалам)," *Древнерусское искусство. Рукописная книга*, vol. 1, 1972, pp. 24-51. Also helpful in pinpointing places of codex copying is work on illuminations and decorative headings and letterings; see, e.g., И. В. Ильина, *Декоративное оформление древнерусских книг. Новгород и Псков. XII-XV вв.*, Leningrad, 1978. Recently a non-Soviet scholar has done extremely valuable work on nineteenth-century collections of manuscripts that subsequently were dispersed: Д. К. Уо (Daniel C. Waugh), "К изучения истории рукописного собрания П. М. Строева," *ТОДРЛ*, vol. 30, 1976, pp. 184-203, and vol. 32, 1977, pp. 133-164; Daniel C. Waugh, *The F. A. Tolstoi Collection: The Slavic Manuscripts in the Collection of Count F. A. Tolstoi: Materials on the History of the Collection and Indexes of Former and Current Code Numbers*, Zug, Switzerland, 1976; also published as *Славянские рукописи собрания Ф. А. Толстого. Материалы к истории собрания и указатели старых и новых шифров*, Leningrad, 1980. And, finally, see also Б. А. Градова, Б. М. Клосс, and В. И. Корецкий, "К истории Архангельской библиотеки Д. М. Голицына," *АЕ за 1978 год*, Moscow, 1979, pp. 238-253.