





HumaReC – SNF project 169869, 2016-2018 Report #2 for the editorial and scientific board

(Link to Report #1: <u>https://humarec.org/images/blog/Report1_final.pdf</u>)

Revision History

Revision	Date	Author	Organisation	Description
0.1	26.03.2018	SS	SIB	Outline
0.2	26.03.2018	MS, AC, CC	SIB	Revision
0.3	Until 07.05.18	Editorial board	International	Validation
0.4	28.05.2018	SS	SIB	Update
1.0	29.05.2018	SS and team	SIB	Final version

AC: Anastasia Chasapi, CC: Claire Clivaz, MS: Martial Sankar, SS: Sara Schulthess

Table of Contents

Revision History	1	
Table of Contents		
I. Transcription and encoding	1	
II. Study of the text		
III. Communication	2	
III.1 Talks/papers		
III.2 Blog and web book		
IV. Analytics	2	
V. Transkribus		
VI. Future tasks		
VI.1 Improvements on the platform	3	
VI.2 Adaptation of the XML files		

I. Transcription and encoding

SS has transcribed the three columns of 100 folios (1 Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, 1 Corinthians 1); 59 of them were encoded and are now available online.

SS will focus during the next months on 1 Corinthians.

II. Study of the text

Important observations about the text have been made since the beginning of the project (see Report #1, II.2). We were able to refine our discoveries.

The Arabic text, which belongs to the translation family of Latin origin as Vat. Lat. 12900 and Madrid BN 4971, shows peculiarities that can indicate that at some point a revision was made. We also have pointed out the differences in the proper names, which let us think that the text shows influences from the Eastern tradition.¹ Finally, the analysis of 68 particular readings shows the Latin Vorlage of the translation was close to the Spanish Vulgate such as conserved in the codex Cavensis or to a lesser extent in the codex Toletanus.

The analysis of 126 readings in the Latin text shows the codex Sarisburiensis as one of the closest texts; codex Sarisburiensis belongs to the group of the "Atlantic Bibles". This observation will be strengthened by further study before publication.

The cases of harmonization that we have observed have led us to the interesting realization that the same scribe copied the three columns, a fact that well illustrates the multilingual setting of the manuscript.²

Parts of these results have been published in the blog; they will also be the subject of additional blog posts and will be ultimately gathered in the web book.

III. Communication

III.1 Talks/papers

The team was able to communicate about the HumaReC project at 7 separate occasions (meetings) since Report #1. All of our presentations provided important inputs and punctually increased the web traffic of the platform⁴. A complete record of the events where HumaReC was presented is listed in the output section of the platform.³

III.2 Blog and web book

We have continued to keep a good publishing rhythm in the blog with one blog post each month. Some of the blog posts have been implemented into the web book as well.

AC has implemented the numbering of the paragraphs in the link margin and in the URL in order to improve the object citability.

IV. Analytics

MS performed and presented a second Analytics & Acquisition Report for 22th May-22th

² See blog posts "Where did Cilicia go? About Gal 1:21" (<u>https://humarec.org/index.php/continuous-publications-blog/28-where-did-cilicia-go-about-gal-1-21</u>) and "Rm 4:25: Who was delivered... for our justification" (<u>https://humarec.org/index.php/continuous-publications-blog/49-rm-4-25-who-was-delivered-for-our-justification</u>).

¹ See "The Arabic Translation of the Letters of Paul of Latin Origin: New Elements" (https://humarec.org/index.php/continuous-publications-blog/11-articles/47-the-arabic-translation-of-theletters-of-paul-of-latin-origin-new-elements).

³ <u>https://humarec.org/index.php/outputs/16-events.</u>

December 2017.⁴ We have observed session trend stabilization over the last month for the platform, while the manuscript viewer trends showed a traffic increase. This may mean that the users start to consider the manuscript viewer as a study tool.

We are globally satisfied with the results, particularly with the session duration/users of ca. 6 min.

V. Transkribus

We had performed a first test for Greek and Arabic with 5,000 words for each language. As the dataset was small, the results were low, with more that 30% of Character Error Rate (CER).

A second test was made with 10'000 words: the results are still not usable with over 20% CER. For now, we will do some more tests with adjustments (e.g. run with the two languages in separate files). We will also have a third test at the end of the project.

VI. Futures tasks

VI.1 Improvements on the platform

We mentioned in Report #1 that we wish to adapt the layout of the manuscript viewer and release a new annotation feature (based on the Annotatorjs library). However, we faced several technical issues related to the EVT technology. Thanks to the user support of the EVT team, we are confident that we will be able to update the manuscript viewer soon.

VI.2 Adaptation of the XML files

Since the beginning of the project, we have been using our own guidelines for the encoding of the transcription. This was related to the choice of EVT for our visualization. It appears to us that it would be a major improvement if we could provide XML files that fit the standards in other New Testament projects.⁵ Our transcription could then, for example, be displayed in the *New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room*.⁶

We will provide this new type of XML files at the end of the project. We are currently evaluating whether we will do the adaptations manually or whether we will opt for building a parser for this task.

⁴ See "Analytics & Acquisition Report #2") <u>https://humarec.org/index.php/continuous-publications-blog/48-arr2</u>).

⁵See IGNTP/INTF Guidelines, <u>http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/1727/5/IGNTP_XML_guidelines_1%2D4.pdf</u>.

⁶ <u>http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/</u>.