

Again about the “Babel-ology” in Archival Science: a South-East European approach

POPOVICI, Bogdan-Florin, Again about the “Babel-ology” in Archival Science: a South-East European approach. Atlanti, Vol. 18, Trieste 2008, pp. 379-388.

Original in English, abstract in English, Italian and Slovenian, summary in English

Concerns about the archival terminology have been present at the national and international scale for more than half a century. Often, the attempts of mutual misunderstanding shows that this field of knowledge is rather a new Tower of Babel and therefore any temptation of translation has to face many difficulties. This article presents some of this difficulties and the way they were overcome during the work for IIAS dictionary, mainly from a Romanian archivists' point of view.

POPOVICI, Bogdan-Florin, Ancora a proposito di “Babeleologia” nella scienza archivistica: un approccio dal sud-est europeo. Atlanti, Vol. 18, Trieste 2008, pp. 379-388.

Le problematiche riguardanti la terminologia archivistica sono state presenti a livello nazionale ed internazionale per più di mezzo secolo. I mutui fraintendimenti mostrano che

Ever since the first archivists from different countries have started to talk to each other, they have asked the magic question: “What do you mean by...?” That question showed that the same profession might approach things differently, or the same approaches might have different meanings, or ways of communicating them. Everything was all right up to the moment when globalisation and international collaboration have begun to conquer the archival field. Afterwards, the need for mutual understanding called for an answer to this archival “Tower of Babel”.

The difficulties in satisfying the need of international comprehension have been underlined by reputed professionals. Eric Ketelaar noted that:

Any discourse presupposes understanding and comprehension. Can one really comprehend a foreigner, be it a speaker from another discipline, or a speaker from another country, even if that speaker's language is some form of standard English? A language is not only the expression of a culture. Language is conditioned by culture. When translating a word, an expression, a term into a foreign language, we try to convey the deeper cultural meaning, but the equivalent can only be an exact rendering of the original if the two cultures are congruent. But are there any congruent cultures?¹

Talking about the ICA's Dictionary on Archival Terminology (DAT I)², the famous French theoretician Michel Duchein noted at his turn:

La terminologie est en quelque sorte le reflet de la pratique professionnelle. Si celle de l'archivistique est peu précise, c'est bien la preuve que l'archivistique elle-même est loin d'être une science exacte³.

Facing this challenges, international specialists wondered what would be the aim of an international vocabulary. Should it be prescriptive or descriptive? Should it impose definitions and uses or should it present/explain them? Both strategies have been tried and show pros and cons.

As a prescriptive action one may note elaboration of a **standardised vocabulary**. This would force every professional to use the

1. Eric Ketelaar, *The Difference Best Postponed? Cultures and Comparative Archival Science* in “Archivaria” 44 (Fall 1997), p. 144.

2. Peter Walne et. al., *Dictionary of Archival Terminology*, 1st edition, ICA, 1984.

3. Michel Duchein, *Les Archives dans la tour de Babel: problèmes de terminologie archivistique internationale* in “Etudes d'archivistique (1957-1992)”, Paris, 1992, p. 47.

same words within the same context. As an extreme approach, Herman Hardenberg, *rapporteur* to the second International Congress on Archives (1953) had even the fantasy of achieving “terminological uniformity”. Of course, he was restrained by his colleagues, as Sir Hilary Jenkinson and Robert-Henri Bautier⁴. This was an unrealistic solution, but it has been tried other approaches, in a more limited environment. For instance, Eric Ketelaar cited the way he and Frank Evans used some terms and argued that one concept can be standardized in certain well-defined contexts. Also for international standard developed by ICA, it

...uses terms and definitions formulated specifically for the purposes of ISAD (G), leaving it to the users to find equivalents in their own institutional or national idiom⁵.

As descriptive approach the classical **archival dictionaries** or **lexicons** are good examples. One may take a list of words, sort it alphabetically, seek the equivalents in other languages and the dictionary is ready. Is it?

To quote M. Duchein,

Le plus difficile, dans un dictionnaire de ce genre, est sans doute le choix des termes li y faire figurer, car il pose le problème des frontières mêmes de la science qu'il entend servir⁶.

A second important point is the fact that, inevitably, a list of terms came from one language and there is no guarantee that the same list of words exists or that the words have the same weight in other language. One might take, for instance, the glossary written by Pearce-Moses⁷ and try to translate it in her/his own language. The result would be rather a translation of (using the same example) American archival terminology than a real international archival dictionary.

But the most important issue is the potentiality of a real translation of such terms. Robert-Henri Bautier remarked that

A simple translation would not suffice; terms must first be defined accurately and explained in the technical language of a country⁸.

The famous American theoretician T.R. Schellenberg also observed that

...the principles and practices that have been evolved by archivists in various countries all relate specifically to the conditions in which they receive public records. Since these conditions vary from one country to another, the principles and practices of archival profession also vary; and the literature of a particular country describing such principles and practices is frequently unintelligible to archivists of other countries unless the conditions under which the public records have been currently maintained are fully understood⁹.

Based on such assumptions, Sir Hilary Jenkinson

spesso questa branca del sapere è piuttosto una nuova torre di Babele, e così ogni tentativo di traduzione deve fronteggiare molte difficoltà. Questo articolo evidenzia alcune di queste difficoltà ed il modo con cui sono state superate durante il lavoro per il Dizionario dell'IAS, il tutto considerato principalmente da un punto di vista di un archivista rumeno.

POPOVICI, Bogdan-Florin, Ponovno o babilonskih problemih prevajanja v arhivski znanosti: predlogi iz jugovzhodne Evrope. Atlanti, Zv. 18, Trst 2008, str. 379-388.

Razprave o arhivski terminologiji so bile predstavljene na narodnem in mednarodnem področju že pred več kot pol leta. Pri tem se je pokazalo, kaj vse je narobe razumljeno in da je to skoraj kot babilonski stolp, saj je v prevajanje izrazov mnogo težav. V tem članku prikazujem nekatere izmed njih in so prikazane rešitve, ki bi jih lahko uporabil tudi MIAZ.

SUMMARY

In times, it showed that the same profession might approach things differently, or the same approaches might have different meanings, or ways of communicating them. The nowadays digital software and international need for collaboration called for an answer to this ar-

4. Eric Ketelaar, *Difference...*, p. 143.

5. *Ibidem*, p. 42-143 and idem, *L'ethnologie archivistique* at "<http://cf.hum.uva.nl/bai/home/eketelaar/ethnologiearchivistique.pdf>", p.7 (accessed 1.07.2008).

6. Michel Duchein, *Les Archives...*, p. 48.

7. Richard Pearce-Moses, *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*, ed. Society of American Archivists, 2005.

8. Eric Ketelaar, *Difference...*, p. 143.

9. T.R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, Chicago, 1956, p. 27.

chival "Tower of Babel". The difficulties in satisfying the need of international comprehension have been underlined by reputed professionals that showed the general linguistic issues and specific archival practices vocabularies may create obstacles. The international archival community approaches were the development of standardized vocabularies, the archival dictionaries or lexicons or the development of archival encyclopaedias, in order to put the terms into a broader context. The IAS tries to overcome the difficulties by gathering archivists from various countries and put them into a collaborative framework, in order to find the best equivalent for archival terms for their national specific archival theory and practice. A Romanian perspective over this approach is presented in this article.

...préférerait une encyclopédie et ne voulait pas d'un dictionnaire international de terminologie archivistique. Aujourd'hui encore on a toujours besoin de cette encyclopédie archivistique internationale, comme l'a constaté la Commission de l'administration du programme du Conseil International des Archives. Une encyclopédie composée d'anthologies nationales, ordonnées selon un schéma fixe offrirait aux archivistes et aux chercheurs et aux enseignants des connaissances élémentaires de différents systèmes nationaux, et mettrait chaque système dans son contexte historique et son fonctionnement actuel. En outre elle devrait faire comprendre les différences et les caractéristiques communes des systèmes d'archivage, des traditions et des terminologies. Faire une telle encyclopédie internationale est une vaste entreprise et il n'est pas du tout sûr qu'elle puisse être réalisée¹⁰.

In the same respect, we can cite the words of Charles Kecskeméti, former Secretary General of ICA:

La finalité d'une encyclopédie est de rassembler des informations éparses en ayant recours à des spécialistes pour chacun des thèmes retenus et son grand avantage consiste à pouvoir présenter ceux-ci dans leurs dimensions historiques et théoriques en faisant appel à l'expérience de tous les pays¹¹.

In spite of all these difficulties, but inspired by the ideas of the reputed specialists cited above, International Institute for Archival Science from Maribor-Trieste started to work to a multilingual dictionary for the South Eastern Europe¹². Of course, everybody was aware of the risks and difficulties, but the solution chosen to overcome the classical obstacles was the common work of archivists from each country represented in the dictionary by its language. As an assumption, at least, the presence of archivists from Romania, for instance, offer the possibility to find **one** translation for a certain term. The discussions around that specific term, the translations and definitions given in the other languages involved, allowed re-fining the translation, to "cross-reference" the significance in order to fully and accurate "re-interpret" the concept from English into Romanian. And I truly believe this is the case for every language involved.

Here come several examples and the solution we have tried to find out in order to offer to our colleagues from the countries in Central and South-Eastern Europe a tool for exchange comprehensible experiences. It reflects mostly the Romanian approaches, but I intend it to be a platform for future debates around IAS dictionary.

accession* and *accrual

These two terms reflect the English practice. Looking into Pearce-Moses's *Glossary*, one can see that *accession* are materials physically and legally transferred to a repository as a unit at a single time whilst *accrual* are materials added to an existing collection. It must be also added the word *acquisition*, defined as materials received by a repository as a unit. The author has yet remarked "as nouns, *acquisition* and *accession* are *synonymous*. However, the verb *accession* goes far beyond the sense of *acquire*, connoting the initial steps of proces-

10. Eric Ketelaar, *L'ethnologie...*, p. 7.

11. Charles Kecskeméti, *Sovereignty, Disputed Claims, Professional Culture. Essays on Archival Policies*, Brussels, 2000, p. 186. For an excellent argument in favour of an international archival encyclopaedia, see pp. 185–191.

12. Antonio Monteduro, *The IAS Dictionary of Archival Terminology. Online Edition and Short Edition* in "Atlanti", Trieste, 2007, vol. 17, nr. 1–2, p. 103–108.

sing by establishing rudimentary physical and intellectual control over the materials by entering brief information about those materials in a register, database, or other log of the repository's holdings". In Romanian, *acquisition* is a false friend, the similar word (*achiziție*) meaning: "getting something (generally, by paying)". A proper equivalent would be then **preluare** for accession (as the legal term for accepting the transfer from a creator to Archives and registering the action) and **completare** for *accrual* (as a supplement of materials to an existing fonds).

closed file

This term may be also a "finished action" file (i.e. a file that do not allowed any addition of documents) or a "non-accessible file" (like in *closed/open archives*). The second meaning is relatively recent in Romanian professional vocabulary, but nevertheless it cannot be expressed otherwise. Therefore, a good translation (= ***dosar închis***) must make the distinction of meaning between the two homonyms.

access point – entry – keyword – metadata

These terms raised a great debate during IIAS School 2007 and international dictionaries are not always clear about the peculiarities of each term. Also, it was really interesting to see how older colleagues, grown up in non-digital environment, agrees with some meanings valid for paper world only, while the younger generation understood the terms almost exclusively from digital media environment. *Access point* defines everything that can be used to reach for the sought information; it might be a descriptor, a name, a reference number. The Romanian equivalent is a translation of this expression (= ***punct de acces***), because the term was not use in professional language. An entry is an element, a position in a list. If it is a list of descriptors in a controlled vocabulary, each term is an entry. The Romanian equivalent came from library science and it is the literally translation of the word (***intrare***). *Keyword* is the element that delivers access from a query. It might be a word or a set of symbols. For instance, if the keyword "*este" is queried in the Internet, the results would be *Trieste, funeste, Ciudad del Este*. Can a *keyword* be also an *access point*? Of course, but an *access point* covers more than *keywords*. In Romanian archival vocabulary, *keyword* (translated into Romanian as ***cuvânt-cheie***) is traditionally (and apparently incorrect) used interchangeable with *descriptor* (rom. ***descriptor***). The difference, as far as I understood from different sources¹³, is that a *descriptor* characterise the content of a document, while the *keyword* helps the retrieval; so, a *descriptor* can be used as a *keyword*, but a *keyword* cannot always be a *descriptor*. A related term is *metadata* (rom. ***metadata***), which most frequently refers to digital environment, but the meaning is broader. Based on Pearce-Moses, *metadata* can be defined as "a characterization or description documenting the identification, management, nature, use, or location of information resources". Therefore, a *metadata* can be a *descriptor*, but is more; can be used a *keyword* and as an *access point*.

13. See for instance, <http://lu.com/odlis/about.cfm>

act

The term **act** (rom.)/*atto* (it.) means, also in Italian and in Romanian, an “official document”, a paper issued by an authority¹⁴. The same term has a complete different meaning in English, where the word means “the formal product of a legislative body”¹⁵. Therefore, if we correctly understand the intention of the dictionary, the English word should be changed with *official document*, *official paper* or even *record*.

archival description

As Luciana Duranti argued, this concept was defined for the first time in ‘1970s’¹⁶. In Romania, the concept and its translation (*descriere arhivistică*) have begun to be used with the ICA’s standards translations, in ‘2000s’. The greatest challenge in Romanian professional terminology is to accommodate archival description with the inventorying process. The Romanian archival praxis uses to make an “archival description” at a file level, process that is called *inventorying*, and the result is an *inventory*. Is there then a need for using the term *archival description* or it may be equivalent with *inventorying*? In fact, *archival description* is more than *inventorying*. *Archival description* might be done at different levels, whilst *inventorying* is only a description at the file level (or, for medieval documents, at item level). *Archival description* deals also with general organizational context of creating documents, purpose that is completely secondary in an inventory.

archives

Si on traduit ce terme français en anglais par archives et en allemand par Archive, un Américain ou un Allemand comprend tout autre chose: ce que l'on appelle en français ‘archives définitives’. Archives courantes et archives intermédiaires ne sont pas des archives pour les Américains et les Allemands, mais records aux Etats-Unis et Schriftgut en allemand’¹⁷.

In Romanian, *arhivă* means (1) a fonds and collection or many (the documentary side), (2) a special area inside a building (storage area) where an organisation keeps its archives (1) and (3) the institution that preserves historical archives (1).

archival administration or archives management

In Romania, as influenced by the famous Italian archivist Casanova, the archival science is traditionally divided between *arhivotehnie* (that deals with theoretical, methodological and practical issues of creating, appraising, processing and disseminating archives (1)) and *arhiveconomie* (related to the optimal conditions for keeping and preserving archival holdings). *Archival administration* or *archives management* has been for several years misunderstood as referring to the act of managing an Archive (3). In fact, *archives management* (also *archives administration*) [means]

the general oversight of a program to appraise, acquire, arrange and describe, preserve, authenticate, and provide access to permanently valuable records. Notes: Archives administration includes establishing the program’s mission and goals, securing necessary resources to support those activities,

14. Peter Walne et. al, *Dictionary of Archival Terminology*, 2nd edition, ICA, 1988, definition 12 (hereafter cited as: DAT II).

15. www.merriam-webster.com

16. Luciana Duranti, *Origin and Development of the Concept of Archival Description* in “Archivaria” 35(Spring 1993), p. 47.

17. Eric Ketelaar, *L’ethnologie...*, p. 6.

and evaluating the program's performance. Archives management is distinguished from library, museum, and historical manuscripts traditions by the principles of provenance, original order, and collective control to preserve the materials' authenticity, context, and intellectual character¹⁸.

Looking for the term in DAT II¹⁹, the following definition is presented:

(1) *The theoretical and practical study of policies, procedures and problems relating to archival functions.*

(2) *The direction and management of archives* (2)

And yet, based on the same above quoted glossary, one can find that archival science means:

A systematic body of theory that supports the practice of appraising, acquiring, authenticating, preserving, and providing access to recorded materials.

As it can be seen, there is no exact match between *archives management* on one hand and *arhivotehnie* and *arhiveconomie* on the other hand. *Archival science* covers also *arhivotehnie* and *arhiveconomie*. Looking for the individual feature, one can see that *archives administration* in its main meaning, is equivalent with both *arhivotehnie* and *arhiveconomie* or, better said, with their practical side, while the *archival science* or *archivistics*²⁰ is the theoretical area. Therefore, a correct Romanian translation would be ***practică arhivistică***.

chronological file

The basic word is the Italian *velinario* that means a file comprising the sent correspondence of an office, arranged chronologically. But I have got this explanation because of my participation in the IIAS School 2007; otherwise, the English term is the mere linguistic translation and not a professional rendering of the concept. In Romanian praxis, there is no such equivalent as *velinario*, as far as I know; the English term would only mean a file where documents are arranged chronologically, based on their creation date (= ***dosar cronologic***), but it has no methodological significance.

closed record group

The main problem with this entry is that, as being Europeans, we do not use the concept of records group, which is a "NARA patent". Instead, the concept of *closed fonds* might have the two different meanings, as explained before, at ***closed file*** entry.

disposal – disposition

The British term *disposal*, equivalent with the American *disposition*, refers to an action about the fate of records: transfer or destruction, taken after an appraisal. The Anglo-Saxon archival praxis has different terms for different actions involved in controls of retention and destruction of records: *evaluation* (to indicate a preliminary assessment of value based on existing retention schedules); *appraisal* (the process of determining the length of time records should be retained, based on legal requirements and on their current and potential usefulness); *selection* (the process of identifying materials to be preserved because of their enduring value, especially those materials to be physically transferred to an archives); *disposition* (materials' fi-

18. Richard Pearce-Moses, *op cit.*

19. DAT II, definition 32.

20. Eric Ketelaar, *Archivistics Research Saving the Profession* in "The American Archivist", vol. 63 (Fall/Winter 2000), p. 324.

nal destruction or transfer to an archives as determined by their appraisal²¹. In Romanian archival theory, the term *selecționare* (*selection*) means the process of assessing the practical or historical value of documents, in order to retain the important documents and to destroy as useless the others. Despite this legal definition, in praxis *selecționare* started to mean only the identification of the valueless documents in order to destroy them. So, the Romanian archival language has not a perfect equivalent for *disposition*, because of a different approach of the process. If we consider that ISO 15489 (where *disposition* is defined as “a range of processes associated with implementing records retention, destruction or transfer decisions which are documented in disposition authorities or other instruments”) needs a Romanian translation, it is obvious that if an equivalent do not exist, then it must be invented. Therefore, I presume that *dispoziție* would be a good equivalent.

file – folders

In Romanian, there one word *dosar* (in French *dossier*) refers both to the intellectual aspect (“the file of activity”) and to the physical form = *volume* (“the file must not overcome 300 folios”). Frequently, in common language, *dosar* means also a folder that is the covers of a file. For a precise translation, *file* is *dosar* in its intellectual meaning, while *folder* is *dosar* in its physical dimension.

management

The word obviously reflects an activity connected to Anglo-Saxons mindset. This term - that is frequently used in archival science nowadays - has been translated in a Latin language by Canadians of Quebec, as *gestion*²². Based on my research on topic, I understood that in Canadian French, *gestion* is something that comprises *administration*. But in Romanian (and also even in other counties that speak French) *gestion* defines a set of actions, while *administration* means a whole range of processes and activities, having also a highest feature of authority. Besides, *gestion* in Romanian language has an important reference to accountability, financially speaking. Therefore, in opinion at least, *management* (of records, of information etc.) is better translated by *administrare* and not by *gestiune*.

preservation

This term raised serious debates between Anglo-Saxons and Latin language speakers. As a general framework, there are three terms: *preservation*, *conservation* and *restoration*. The French archivists use the term *conservation préventive*, *conservation curative* and *restauration*. The origins of the words are Latin: *pre-servo* (= serving in advance), *con-servo* (= serving in the same time). Therefore, there are indeed three phases of action, described also by English and French language. In Romanian, the word *preservation* would be rigorously translated (as meaning) by *păstrare*. But *păstrare* means also “conditions for a good preservation of documents” and *retention*, so it is not very precise. In this regard, I my option, a good translation should be *prezervare* which is indeed an imported word, but necessary because of its precision.

21. Definitions after Pearce-Moses, *op. cit.*.

22. One must note the fact that, in 1985, M. Duchein wrote: “Le fameux terme gestion des documents... est dépourvu de sens en français de France”! (Michel Duchein, *op. cit.*, p. 50).

principle...

Archival principles were defined by many theoreticians, but their main obstacle in being indeed **general** principles is that they bear the strong feature of the archival tradition that generates them. A *registry system*, for instance, is characteristic for some area in Europe, but it can be found under a different name in France²³; therefore, there is no one registry principle, but many. So, a series of principles are in broad lines alike, but they are appealed with different names. On the other hand, some apparent similar principles have different backgrounds and have some specific features.

- of pertinence

It seems to be of German origin (*Pertinenzprinzip*). According to J. Papritz, “c’est le principe selon lequel la documentation secrétée par les administrations est mêlée, dans les archives qui leur appartiennent en commun, sans tenir compte de la provenance ou de la destination mais d’après la pertinence et suivant un plan général de classement archivistique”²⁴. Romanian translation is a linguistic one (*principiul pertinentei*), but the principle is not explicitly assumed in praxis.

On the other hand, in the international vocabulary there is also the **principle of (territorial) pertinence** that means, as defined by DAT II²⁵

The concept, deriving from the principle of provenance that records (1)/archives (1) should be preserved in or restored to the archives (2) having archival jurisdiction within the territory in which they were accumulated, excluding documents arising from diplomatic representation and military operations.

The Romanian equivalent would be **principiul teritorialității**, but it is presented only as a theoretical approach.

- of provenance

It is the Anglo-Saxon equivalent of the principle *respect des fonds*. One can notice that J. Papritz do not associate the principle of provenance (principle IB1) with the *principle of internal order*. The French archivist Christine Nougaret notes that respect des fonds/principle of provenance presents a minimalist approach (documents from one creator must be aggregated into fonds, but noting more) and a maximalist one (documents from one creator must be aggregated into fonds and each documents must preserve its place inside the fonds)²⁶. The Romanian equivalent would be **principiul provenienței sau al respectului față de fond**, but it is not explicitly assumed in methodologies.

registry ~

Principle developed in Prussia and applied in countries with *Registratur* system. The English equivalent is *respect of original order*, the French one: *respect de l’ordre primitif*. It refers to maintaining the order of documents inside a fonds as it was done by the (last) creator. Papritz (principle IE1a) considered *Registraturprinzip* as one of the “principes de la conservation où plutôt de la reconstitution du classement pré-archivistique”; therefore, the *registry principle* should be considered as a particular case to follow when applying *principle of*

23. DAT II, definition 387.

24. Johannes Papritz, *Méthodes modernes de classement d’archives. Documentation écrite d’avant 1800*, Bruxelles, 1964, principe IB2.

25. Definition 424.

26. Christine Nougaret, *Les sources archivistiques: production organique où invention de l’archiviste?* in “Hypothèses 2003”. Travaux de l’École doctorale d’histoire de l’Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne, 2004, p. 334.

restoring the original order. The Romanian equivalent would be **principiul registraturii** or broadly, **respectul față de ordinea inițială**, but it is not explicitly assumed in praxis.

record

This concept is one of the main points of divergence between the Latin and Anglo-Saxon archival praxis. Generally, the Latin countries use the concept of *archives*, as defining the whole of documents since their creation. The Anglo-Saxons mindset identifies among *documents* (broadly speaking) a category called *records*. After Pearce–Moses, a *record* is “data or information in a fixed form that is created or received in the course of individual or institutional activity and set aside (preserved) as evidence of that activity for future reference”²⁷. Therefore, this concept covers 4 main aspects: fixity (cannot be modified anymore), organic provenance from an activity of a creator, the propriety of that document and the idea of evidence. By contrast, no Latin language (as far as I know) regards the things from this respect. With the advanced of digital documents, the need for fixity, for context, organicity and legal evidence makes this concept more suitable than the holistic concept of *archives*. In Romanian translators use the word *înregistrare* (= *recording*) - which is definitely a mistake and a confusion - or *document de arhivă* (= *archival documents*) - which is true, but difficult to handle in praxis. As the French archivists also experimented, the only correct solution seems to be the adoption of the word instead of its wrong translation. Therefore, I consider that Romanian equivalent should be **record** or at least **document/record**.

non-current records

In the frame of the archives lifecycle theory, records are currents, semi-currents and permanents (archives (1)). *Non-current records* are the documents in the second age (*semi-active*). Based on Casanova’s classification, the Romanian equivalent would be **arhiva de depozit** or, under recent French influence, **arhiva intermediară**.

Working for this dictionary, I could not agree more with Michel Duchein who, analyzing *DAT 1*, has excellently succeeded to summarize the difficulties:

*Ces difficultés proviennent de trois sources: d’abord, l’imprécision trop fréquente des définitions et des usages nationaux; ensuite, les divergences croissantes de vocabulaire, à l’intérieur d’une même langue, entre pays homophones; enfin, le fait que l’archivistique est étroitement liée aux systèmes juridiques gouvernementaux et administratifs de chaque pays, et que, par conséquent, son vocabulaire reflète tout un ensemble de concepts qui, par définition, sont difficilement transportables d’un pays à l’autre*²⁸.

All these factors have been experienced and, unfortunately confirmed, by working to the IIAS dictionary. The strategy we have adopted, of an archival “brain-storming”, seems to allow overcoming the obstacles. I can only hope that the work we have done to be wel-

27. Richard Pearce–Moses, sub voce
28. Michael Duchein, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

come by our colleagues and more, to be indeed useful for its scope.