

[The Knowledge Bank at The Ohio State University](#)

Feature Title: ЛѢТОПИСЬ Lietopis' Chronicle

Article Title: 25-28 September 1984: Sofia. Session of the Terminology Group of the
CIBAL Commission on Manuscripts

Article Author: Veder, William R.

Journal Title: *Polata Knigopisnaia*

Issue Date: December 1985

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* 13 (December 1985): 82-83.

Appears in:

Community: [Hilandar Research Library](#)

Sub-Community: [Polata Knigopisnaia](#)

Collection: [Polata Knigopisnaia: Volume 13 \(December 1985\)](#)

дания научного фонда всех материалов, связанных со святым.

На заключительном заседании были обсуждены и приняты решения. Участники выразили свою благодарность болгарским организаторам за хорошую организацию конференции и особое удовольствие о том, что она состоялась во входившей обстановке Рильского монастыря. Они также признали конференцию достойным возобновлением первоначальной инициативы Огайского государственного университета по раскрытию славянского рукописного наследия и важным вкладом в международное сотрудничество, которое необходимо расширить. Они, наконец, приняли предложение ФЕДЕРА организовать третью конференцию в Неймегене/Голландии с 1. по 3. сентября 1987 г.

25-28 SEPTEMBER 1984: SOFIA
SESSION OF THE TERMINOLOGY GROUP
OF THE CIBAL COMMISSION ON MANUSCRIPTS
WILLIAM R. VEDER

The Commission on manuscripts, after two sessions (Sofia 1979 and 1982; cf. Полата кзнигописана ѿ:88-89 and ѿ:62-65), decided to make an earnest effort to overcome the most serious difficulty in the realization of its ambitious catalog project – the essential disharmony of descriptive terminology in the various languages and scientific traditions – by constituting a special Terminology Group which now met for the first time. Its task was to examine the basic framework for description within the projected Catalogue of Narrative Monuments on the History and Culture of the Balkan People, the model published in "Description et catalogue des manuscrits médiévaux" Sofia 1984:9-14 (in French), 15-20 (in Russian), to give as exact as possible a definition of problems, and to provide means for their solution. Since the formal decisions taken at the meeting have been published in full in the Informacionen bjuletin CIBAL 8(1984);37-41 (I have not seen its usual French main version) together with a list of all participants, I can restrict myself to a short overview of the main issues.

The model for the description proved to be too tight to the mind of many participants, but the *Commission on Manuscripts* had decided, at its second session, to adopt a short form, so no one was eager to bear responsibility for a larger model that could take much more time to fill in with relevant data. A few adjustments here and there were quickly agreed upon and the global model adopted.

The next step had to be a test of the contents of the individual rubrics of the description model. All rubrics passed the test, albeit with some discussion of CIBAL's requirement that the cataloguing languages in the final version should be French and Russian (is that really necessary for such pedestrian data as country and place names?), except four:

- (1) Dating: it appeared that codicologists and palaeographers reckon time in principle in centuries; years are a strictly secondary refinement. Thus, any attempt at expressing dates as the distance between years

- appeared to be pointless. Instead of using a single dating system to express both exact dates (1296) and stricter or laxer approximations (1275-1300 or 1250-1350), the catalogue will show in principle centuries (XIII or XIII-XIV), where given complemented by the indication of an exact date (1296).
- (2) Origin: Here, too, it appeared that codicologists and palaeographers think in different, usually wider, terms than modern geographers and politicians. Only, here it is much more difficult to find a terminology, equivalent to centuries in chronology, that would be widely acceptable. The issue which is particularly acute in manuscripts that can be localized on either side of a modern border (e.g. between Bulgaria and Greece or Yugoslavia, or between Romania and Moldavia and/or the Ukraine), was for the time being deferred. It is sure to emerge again.
- (3) Watermark nomenclature: verbalization of the figurative elements in watermarks appeared to vary considerably; the correspondence lists in the reedition of Briquet solve only a small part of the difficulties. Colleague AMOSOV (Leningrad) was appointed to lead a team to draw up a comprehensive list in French and Russian.
- (4) Contents: This rubric was the main stumbling block. VEDER's suggestion to supplant verbalization by a complete listing of titles and initials was not in keeping with the idea of a short catalogue. THOMSON's written suggestion to orient the description of the contents on the Latin standard of the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* stranded on the general lack of Latin. A thesaurus principle was envisaged, and the work to develop it was entrusted to a number of teams: colleague A.E. NAUMOV (Kraków) was to lead the work on the descriptive terminology of manuscripts with mainly Biblical texts (cf. the resulting proposal in *Полата књигописнаџа дї·ѣї:4-7*), S. KOŽUHAROV (Sofia) that of manuscripts with mainly liturgical texts, K. IVANOVA (Sofia) that of manuscripts with mainly hagiographico-homiletical, patristic and edificational texts, O.A. Knjzjevskaja (Moskva) that of manuscripts with mainly juridical and historical texts, and H. MIKLAS (Freiburg) that of other manuscripts.

This session was followed by two more sessions (Leningrad 25-30 March 1985, Sofia 20-23 August 1985; cf. *Полата књигописнаџа дї*), which only complicated the problems (4) by discussions of details. Let us hope that we can reach some form of agreement in the near future.