

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

Feature Title: ЛѢТОПИСЬ Lietopis' Chronicle

Article Title: 30 August – 3 September 1982: Sofia.

Second Session of the CIBAL Commission on Manuscripts

Article Author: William R. Veder

Announcement Title: 10 November 1982, Cambridge: Meeting of the
Slavonic and East European Medieval Study Group

Announcement Title: 19 March 1983, London: Meeting of the
Slavonic and East European Medieval Study Group

Journal Title: *Polata Knigopisnaia*

Issue Date: June 1983

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* 8 (June 1983): 62-65.

Appears in:

Community: [Hilandar Research Library](#)

Sub-Community: [Polata Knigopisnaia](#)

Collection: [Polata Knigopisnaia: Volume 8 \(June 1983\)](#)

Lors d'une excursion au monastère de Bačkovo, KUEV a exploré la question du séjour d'Euthyme et de Constantin de Kosteneč à ce monastère. Il a cité l'évidence d'un ms perdu où ce séjour après la chute de Tărnovo était mentionné. Il est difficile de passer un jugement sur l'authenticité de ce jugement puisque le seul témoin de ce séjour est perdu aujourd'hui. Enfin il faut signaler une contribution qui a traité de l'histoire de notre science: VRACIU a donné un compte-rendu des travaux des slavisants de Jaši (avant tout d'I.BARBULESCU) sur le vieux-bulgare et le slavon.

30 AUGUST - 3 SEPTEMBER 1982: SOFIA
SECOND SESSION OF THE CIBAL COMMISSION ON MANUSCRIPTS
WILLIAM R. VEDER

The decisions taken at this meeting have been published in full in the *Bul Letin d'information CIBAL* 6(1982):47-61, together with a list of all the participants. However, I feel that the discussions were much more important than the decisions: they touched all the practical problems of manuscript description and study that *Полата књигописана* has been wanting for a long time to treat in a special thematic issue. I shall therefore present at least a short survey of the questions raised.

The commission was faced with an apparently simple task: to decide up on a model of manuscript description for the *Summary Catalogue of 'Narrative Monuments' Concerning the History and Culture of the Balkan Peoples* (cf. *Полата књигописана* ·Б· 88-89), the 'Narrative Monuments' being restricted at the outset to manuscripts either (1a) written on the territory of the Balkan peninsula or (1b) preserved (or formerly preserved) there, or (2) containing data pertaining to the Balkan peninsula; the year 1500 was retained as the upper chronological limit. Reaching a decision, however, proved to be difficult, for no more than three of the participants had first-hand practical experience in the compilation of summary catalogues, while of the remainder no more than half had experience in the description of manuscripts at all. The discussion, therefore, was in the first place a discussion between compilers and users of manuscript descriptions, and only in the second place between proponents of various forms of manuscript descriptions.

Users want the data in descriptions to be maximally detailed, reliable, comparable, and easily retrievable. Most of the discussion related to the degree of detail desirable in description: a detailed orthographic

profile was advocated by IVANOVA and TOTH, its complement, a detailed morphological and lexical profile, by RUSEK (all three would, no doubt, find a near-to-ideal model for this element of description in the standard *Linguistic profile* created for Old English manuscripts by A. MACINTOSH and M. BENSKIN at the University of Edinburgh), while TOTH proposed to include in the linguistic description all data documenting the diachronic and diatopic strata in the text; THOMSON advocated to give both incipits and explicits of all works, including their identification according to BHG, CPG and other repertories, which led NAUMOW to propose to depart not from the preconceived idea of a 'work'. but to reflect the segmentation of the text as given by the scribe, including all titles, subtitles and liturgical indications, and to represent the text in a form as close as possible to the original, the latter proposal being seconded by VODOFF with a call for a strictly limited set of rules for transcription into available typefaces; the full representation of all colophons and marginalia was advocated by RUSEK, to which VRANOUSI added a plea for completeness in representation of other available data on migration and accession of the manuscript as a major source for the identification of its origin; DŽUROVA and KOŽUHAROV dwelt extensively upon the technicalities of describing decoration and musical notation and the undesirability of simply indicating their presence.

Reliability of descriptive data was aimed at by RAJKOV and VELČEVA, who proposed checking data on all levels of a given manuscript against larger corpora of data, e.g. mss from the same scriptorium or collection or from the same area, by GUŽU and MILTENOVA, who advocated collating its macrostructure with parallel mss in order to bring out its individuality, and by KOČEVA, who suggested checking its macrostructure against the indications of codifications like the *typikon* in order to determine its adherence to a given tradition. Comparability of descriptive data was the intention of THOMSON in proposing to introduce a standard Latin nomenclature for all texts, and of DŽUROVA and KOŽUHAROV in proposing a unified conceptual apparatus for the description of decoration and musical notation (Полата књигописана hopes to be able to print their proposals in extenso in one of its nexts issues). Retrievalability of data, finally, was aimed at by all those participants who called for various forms of alba or indices: incipitaria of texts (TONČEVA), alba of dated and/or localized bookhands (KNJAZEVSKAJA), of dated and/or localized watermarks (MATEJIĆ), and of all watermarks not yet found in published collections (BOGDANOVIĆ).

If all these desiderata are put next to the desire of many participants to have the entries in the *Summary Catalogue* compiled not from previous descriptions, but from a de visu examination of each manuscript, one cannot but wonder why the 'summary' form should not be replaced by a full scientific description; the more so, when one considers KNJAZEVAŠKAJA's paradox — a summary catalogue signals materials to researchers, but its signification can be significant only if it is the result of in-depth research.

The answer was given, of course, by experience: ŠMIDT related of the twenty years of work on the *Svodnyj katalog* (the first volume of which will be ready for the Ninth Congress of Slavists), with an ever-changing team of collaborators (all Russians, and not, as in our case, of widely varying nationalities), with long distances both in space and in time to the keepers of the manuscripts (all in the same country, and not, as in our case, in a wide variety of countries), and with constantly increasing demands on the text of the descriptions and the indices to it. PETROŠJAN (Oriental mss in the USSR) and PRAŽAK (mss in the ČSSR) concurred with him in stressing not only the practical feasibility, but also the scientific usefulness of a *Predvaritel'nyj spisok*, a fact well known to every researcher of early Slavic manuscripts and, without doubt, generally accepted and even acclaimed by them when they see BOGDANOVIĆ's brand new *Inventar* (cf. below p.). TIETZE added to this a report on the necessity of completely renewing the description of the Oriental manuscripts at the ÖNB and the State Archives in Vienna a mere 100 years after the publication of their full scientific description: so radically had insights changed. So the decision was, inevitably, to go ahead with the plan to compile a *Summary Catalogue* according to a model of description proposed by VEDER ('Bulletin d'information CIBAL' 5(1981):12-18), to be republished in an amended version, accompanied by a methodical instruction by STANČEV, in one of the next issues of the 'Bulletin d'information CIBAL'

It seems a pity, however, that the more far-reaching desires of researchers cannot now be fulfilled and it might be worthwhile to give serious consideration to an idea voiced by DOBREV: to finally make the achievements of the computer age available to early Slavic studies on a scale which would allow individual researchers to pool their resources of manuscript descriptions and to profit of the ever increasing possibilities of automatic data retrieval. I think that the facilities of personal computers are within close enough reach now to offer excellent possibilities of

data exchange and the creation of decentralized data bases. If researchers could agree to adhere to a common program for the registration of manuscript data, the conversion of data to suit the various operating systems should not be an impediment to data exchange. Such a common program, designed to accommodate data from all sorts of written and printed documents, including its related data retrieval programs, has recently been presented in print in a preliminary form by A.GRUYS and P.HOLAGER in 'Quaerendo' 11 (1981) and is now fully operational on Apple II E, Osborne M 1 and Philips P 2000 in an expanded version (with enhanced facilities for text description). Perhaps a following session of the CIBAL Commission on Manuscripts or a second Hilandar Conference (cf. *Полата књигописњана* бр. 43-90, especially 84-88) could explore the concrete possibilities of such cooperation.

10 NOVEMBER 1982, CAMBRIDGE:

MEETING OF THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN MEDIEVAL STUDY GROUP

The following papers were read at this meeting of the Study Group:

- A. HIPPISEY. *Sources of the Russian Emblem Book "Symbols and Emblemata".*
- J. HOWLETT. *Russia's Classical Heritage.*
- A. NADSON. *Byelorussian Confraternities in the 15th and 16th Centuries.*
- C. ROBERTS. *The Calvinist Bukvar' in Trinity College Dublin.*
- W. RYAN. *Divination in Rus'.*

We hope to print the abstracts in one of the following issues of this bulletin.

19 MARCH 1983, LONDON:

MEETING OF THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN MEDIEVAL STUDY GROUP

The following papers were read at this meeting of the Study Group:

- R. CLEMINSON. *The Pennington Catalogue.*
- S. FRANKLIN. *Literacy and Documentation in Early Medieval Russia.*
- L. HUGHES. *The Rise of Sofia Alekseevna and the Strel'cy Rebellion of 1682.*
- H. SUNDBERG. *Life in Novgorod during the Swedish Occupation 1611-1617.*

We hope to print the abstracts in one of the following issues of this bulletin.