

“Kopitar’s Collection of Slavic Codices”: Its Creation and Disposition¹

Mary Allen Johnson

*Dedicated to Allen McTavish Johnson, PhD
Slavicist & Europeanist (1923–2014)*

Jernej Kopitar (1780–1844), a bookman *par excellence*, was a philologist, linguist, man of letters, and “custos” or curator at the Imperial Library in Vienna, where he was also the censor of Slavic, Modern Greek, Albanian, and Romanian publications. He was mentor to Vuk Stefanović Karadžić—the father of the modern Serbian language; and Franc Miklošič, the author of *Lexicon palaeoslovenicum graeco-latinum* (Vienna, 1862–65), was his student. From 1803–1808, Kopitar served as secretary and librarian to his patron, Baron Žiga Zois (1747–1819). Even after moving to Vienna, Kopitar continued to take part in Zois’s intellectual circle, which led the Slovene National Revival (Vidmar 2016: 27–30). Much of Kopitar’s voluminous correspondence with Zois, and with noted linguists and Slavacists of his day, such as Jacob Grimm, Josef Dobrovský, Karadžić, and others, is preserved.

Kopitar amassed a personal library that contained not only contemporary publications, mostly on the topic of linguistics, particularly Slavic, but also incunables and original Slavic manuscripts. This article focuses both on the collection development strategy of Kopitar’s original handwritten codices and manuscripts, and on the dispensation of this collection after Kopitar’s death, where an examination of internal evidence in the individual items informs how these materials were subsequently inventoried and arranged.

Currently housed in the National and University Library in Ljubljana (hereafter, “NUK”), “Kopitar’s Collection of Slavic Codices”² is

¹ An earlier version of this article was presented at the Society for Slovene Studies-sponsored panel “Mining Slovene Archives for New Insights into the Thoughts and Lives of Kopitar and Bartol,” Saturday, 21 November 2015, at the 47th Annual Convention of the Association for Slavic, East European, & Eurasian Studies in Philadelphia.

² The originals are housed in the Zbirka rokopisov, redkih in starih tiskov (Manuscript and Rare Book Department) of the Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica (NUK) in Ljubljana. I would like to thank the head of the department, Marijan Rupert, and his staff, Matjaž Lulik and Samo Kristan, for their hospitality and assistance during my visits in September 2015 and September

cataloged in print most recently in Vladimir Mošin's 1971 description.³ Mošin lists thirty-three items in Kopitar's collection, but adds as well Ms 368, a Cyrillic parchment fragment (from the end of the thirteenth to the beginning of the fourteenth century) that belonged to Zois.⁴ Mošin states that he included the latter description simply because he had the opportunity to examine it (Mošin 1971: 11). It is likely, then that he was unaware of the fifteenth-century Cyrillic *Nomokanon*, which was donated to NUK in 1935.⁵ The Croatian-Glagolitic liturgical codices, including those that belonged to Baron Zois, are briefly summarized in Vatroslav Jagić's 1899 publication. After a heartbreaking description of the building where the Lyceum Library of Ljubljana was then housed, a structure which had not fully recovered from an earthquake several years prior to his visit, Jagić indicates the scholars who have used the "Kopitariana" and the Croatian Glagolitic materials in their research and publications to date, provides a linguistic analysis of the Office to St. Cyril in the "Ljubljana redaction" (Ms 164), and lists Kopitar's codices (omitting numbers 13, 25, 27, and 31–33) and the

2016. Milan Štupar, head of NUK's Služba za reproduciranje knjižničnega gradiva (Library Reproduction Services), was hospitable and helpful in photographing, with the assistance of Zoran Kuder, both watermarks and portions of the codices that were not included in the online digital repository. See "Kopitarjeva zbirka slovanskih kodeksov," Narodne in univerzitetne knjižnice v Ljubljani (Slovenija), <http://old.nuk.uni-lj.si/kopitarjevazbirka/> (accessed 17 October 2016).

³ Alen Novalja and Ines Jerele's "The 118 Leaves of Cyrillic Mysteries: The Slovenian Part of *Codex Suprasliensis*" (2012) provides only a brief summary of Kopitar's manuscript collection, focusing more on NUK's digitization projects, and, of course, on *Codex Suprasliensis*.

⁴ Mošin labels the fragment "Ms 368"; however, according to the online finding aid located on NUK's website, "Ms 368" is a Slavic collection of Žiga Zois, described as "Various studies, Glagolitic letters, translations of the Glagolitic, Slavic roots, botanical names, etc. (boxes 1–7) [Including:] the Cyrillic parchment fragment from a Gospel, Raška redaction, from the end of the thirteenth to the beginning of the fourteenth century." See Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, "Katalog Rokopisov," http://www.nuk.uni-lj.si/sites/default/files/dokumenti/2015/katalog_rokopisov.pdf (accessed 17 October 2016).

⁵ Ms 880, the fifteenth-century Cyrillic *Nomokanon*, was donated to NUK by Ivan Vrhovnik of Ljubljana in 1935, accession number Dar 23. 4. 1935. Additionally, since the publication of Mošin's catalog, NUK accessioned a collection between 1965 and 1976 that belonged to Gabrijel Justin. One series of Gabrijel (Elko) Justin's papers, "MS 1876, VIII. 32 Zbirka rokopisov (26)," includes manuscripts codices and fragments: "VIII. 32. 1. Binding fragments (17)"—the language and alphabet of the fragments are not indicated in this description, but "VIII. 32. 4. Starosrbski cirilski rokopis (2)" specifies 'Old Serbian Cyrillic.' See "Katalog Rokopisov."

Croatian Glagolitic monuments held in the library (Nr. 368 and Nrs. 161–64, 166 and 175) (Jagić 1899).⁶

In discussing Kopitar's collection, I will henceforth use the term "codex" (pl. codices) for the medieval or pre-modern texts and "manuscripts" in the sense of handwritten copies or drafts of works that were produced by Kopitar or his contemporaries.

Kopitar's collection, although small, is remarkable in a number of ways, including the spectrum of alphabets and linguistic recensions that it represents. This was undoubtedly part of Kopitar's collecting strategy to support his various interests. Miklošič used several of the codices as sources for his *Lexicon*, and the collection—or individual codices—have been described by a slew of distinguished scholars of manuscript studies, such as Grigorii Aleksandrovich Voskresenskii (1883), Grigorii Andreevich Il'inskii (1903), Aleksandr Ivanovich Iatsimirskii (1921), and Jagić (1899). Mošin effectively integrates into his descriptions comments from these previously published sources, indicating, for example, where Iatsimirskii may have noted a different measurement for a text block, or where the scholars differ in dating the codices,⁷ and, in the process of comparing the various

⁶ Jagić bases his descriptions of the Croatian Glagolitic materials largely on the work of Ivan Berčić (1870: 13, 14, 21–24), who compares the text of two Roman rite offices to Sts. Cyril and Methodius. See the "Katalog Rokopisov" for brief descriptions of Zois's Mss 161, 163, 172, and Ms 166 (Glagolitic correspondence); and Mss 162, 164 and 175, which are of "undetermined provenance." Note that of the latter three, only Mss 162 and 164 are listed as being Croatian Glagolitic. Jagić thus describes the library:

Der Eingang in das alte, baufällige Gebäude, wo derzeit noch (auf wie lange?) diese Bibliothek untergebracht ist, macht einen traurigen Eindruck. Die Spuren des furchtbaren Erdbebens, das vor einigen Jahren Laibach heimsuchte, sind hier noch immer unverwischt, ja unangetastet erhalten. Man geht durch den langen Corridor des zweiten Stockwerkes und sieht überall dieselben Sprünge und Risse am Mauerwerk wie am ersten Tage nach dem Erdbeben.

(The entrance to the old, dilapidated building where this library is still [for how long?] housed, makes a wretched impression. The traces of the terrible earthquake that struck Ljubljana some years ago are still here uneffaced, yes, preserved untouched. One goes through the long corridor on the second floor and sees everywhere the same cracks and fissures in the masonry as on the first days after the earthquake). (1899: 122–23)

⁷ Mošin (1971: 16) indicates, for example, the size of the parchment leaves of Cod. Kop. 12 as 21 x 13 cm, adding, "tako je na f. 1; pri Jacimirskem 21 x 15, ker je meril v sredini rokopisa—tako je na f. 186" / "so it is on f. 1; according to Iatsimirskii it is 21 x 15, where he measured in the middle of the codex—which

publications, Mošin highlights the subjectivity of these earlier codicological description (1971: 21).⁸

The majority of the codices in the collection are Serbian, but then Kopitar seems to have acquired most of these with the assistance of Karadžić (Mošin 1971: 11). The codices range in date from the eleventh century to the beginning of the nineteenth. One is in Old Church Slavonic (Cod. Kop. 2); also represented are Church Slavonic recensions of Serbian (nineteen: Cod. Kop. 3–8, 10–12, 14–19, 23, 26, 32, 33), Bosnian (*bosančica*, Cod. Kop. 24), Macedonian (Cod. Kop. 9), Bulgarian (four: Cod. Kop. 28, 30, 29, 31), and a Croatian text (Cod. Kop. 22), which is the only one written in the squared, Western Glagolitic alphabet;⁹ the rest are in Cyrillic, although, unbeknownst to Kopitar, Cod. Kop. 21 also contained a firman of Sultan Mehmed IV, dated 1682, written in Ottoman script, which was discovered when the codex was disbound for restoration in 1957 (Mošin 1971: 91).¹⁰ There is the Slovenian manuscript of Adam Skalar (Cod. Kop. 25, dated 1643); the other “manuscripts” include Kopitar’s handwritten copy of the whole of *Codex Suprasliensis* (Cod. Kop. 1, 1838–

is the size of leaf 186.’ Regarding Cod. Kop. 10, Mošin (1971: 21) faithfully records the varying opinions regarding the dating, while indicating his date as the third quarter of the fourteenth century: Il’inskii agrees with Jagić that the codex could not have originated before the second half of the fifteenth century; Iatsimirskii assumes, also unequivocally, that it dates to the beginning of the fifteenth century: “Iljinski bez argumentacije misli kakor Jagić, da rokopis ni nastal pred drugo polovico XV. stol.; Jacimirski prav tako brez argumentacije domneva, da je nastal v začetku XV. stol.”

⁸ “Zanimivo je stališče teh dveh odličnih strokovnjakov do značaja pisave: Iljinskemu je to ‘velik in zelo lep ustav’, Jacimirskemu pa ‘neenakomerna, nelepa, velika pisava z navpičnimi črkami’” (The viewpoint of these two excellent professionals on the characteristics of the writing is interesting: to Il’inskii it is a “large and very nice uncial,” but to Iatsimirskii is an “uneven, ugly large script with vertical letters”).

⁹ As mentioned above, there were a number of additional Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts in Zois’s collection at Kopitar’s disposal, and Kopitar provided the Latin translation of the *Reims Gospel*, which contains text in both Cyrillic and Croatian Glagolitic, in J.P. Silvestre’s partial facsimile that was published in 1843.

¹⁰ See also the identifying description of the firman, written by Professor Sulejman Bajraktarević, 7 September 1959, included with the codex and viewable online, “Kopitarjeva zbirka slovanskih kodeksov,” kodeks 23. Cod. Kop. 21, NUK, old.nuk.uni-lj.si/kopitarjevazbirka/ImageBrowser.asp?Kodeks=23&Slika=1 (accessed 17 October 2016). I would like to thank Dale J. Correa, Middle Eastern Studies Librarian at the University of Texas at Austin, for confirming the date and the script of this Ottoman firman.

40), and a handwritten copy of the Rakovac manuscript¹¹ of Stefan 'Dušan's Code' or the *Dušanov Zakonik* (Cod. Kop. 20, 1827); Valentin Vodnik's notes on Slavic paleography (Cod. Kop. 13, 1797), which is in Latin but has tables of the Glagolitic and Cyrillic letters and Slavic texts in Cyrillic; and a copy of Kopitar's debate on the language of the Styrian Slovenes in relation to codex *Glagolita Clozianus* (Cod. Kop. 27), which, as Mošin notes, is not in Kopitar's handwriting (1971: 110). The writing supports represented in this collection are parchment and paper; there is nothing on bombasine (a cloth material not used in the Western manuscript tradition, but seen, although seldom, in the Eastern—Slavic and Byzantine—traditions) (Dzhurova 1997: 54).

Kopitar's collection of codices and manuscripts appears to be a more ethical attempt at what the Russian Porfirii Uspenskii (1804–85)¹² in the nineteenth century and Ohioan Otto Ege¹³ in the twentieth century tried to do—which was to compile a representative sample or exemplars illustrating various paleographical scripts, recensions and traditions. But what is missing? There are no Russian or East Slavic codices in Kopitar's personal collection, although he had access to them elsewhere, but one aspect of Kopitar's view of Austro-Slavism involved purging the Slavic languages on the territory of the Austrian Empire of Russian influence, out of what E. Winter goes so far as to characterize as Kopitar's "Russophobia" (Winter 1958, especially 111).¹⁴ Codices written in the rounded Eastern

¹¹ The antegraph of Cod. Kop. 20, written in 1700 by Hieromonk Pahomij of the Rakovac Monastery in Fruška Gora, has 78 folia (Solovjev 1928: 28–30).

¹² Uspensky is, alas, notorious for mutilating manuscripts by removing folia.... There was, however, method in his madness: an examination of the folia removed reveals that they were mostly taken from dated manuscripts and wherever possible contained the same passages as other folia removed from manuscripts with the same text. So it was obvious that he was constructing a palaeographic album *sui generis* that would enable him to date undated codices accurately. For this purpose he noted in pencil on the folia the date of the codex from which they had been removed and the place where he had found the manuscript. (Thomson 2003: 320–21)

¹³ One scholar comments:
To some, Otto Frederick Ege (1888–1951) is a scandal. In many cases he cut up more-or-less complete medieval manuscripts to supply middle class American connoisseurs with examples of the Book Beautiful.... To others, however, Ege promoted Book Arts as a professional educator and enthusiast who fostered appreciation for medieval book design, including script, illumination, and mise-en-page. (Gwara 2013: 1)

¹⁴ See also Thomson (1999: 201).

Glagolitic alphabet and texts of the Wallachian and Moldavian recensions are also absent. However, Kopitar had worked with manuscripts in the Eastern Glagolitic tradition, publishing in 1836 the aforementioned *Glagolita Clozianus* (discovered in 1830), which is comprised of fourteen folia of an eleventh-century homiletic miscellany. In 1842, he was also able to view in Rome *Codex Assemanianus* (a Glagolitic *aparakos* or lectionary Gospel from the beginning of the eleventh century) (Kopitar 1836; Lencek 1982: 5–6).

Kopitar acquired a dozen codices from the monastic republic of Mount Athos for the Imperial Library in 1827, an endeavor chronicled by Kopitar (1945), Winter (1958), Stanislaus Hafner (1959), Walter Lukan (1995a), and Francis J. Thomson (1999). Among the codices purchased is Cod. Slav. 7, which is written in the Moldavian recension of Church Slavonic. It is an illuminated Gospel that belonged to Stefan the Great, Voivode of Moldavia, which is dated 1502 and had been housed in Zograf monastery (Birkfellner 1975: 86–88).¹⁵

The most famous in the Kopitar collection, of course, is part 1 of *Codex Suprasliensis* (Cod. Kop. 2), the eleventh-century Old Church Slavonic collection of saints' lives (*chetii-minei*) for the month of March, which was discovered by Mihał Bobrowski in 1823 in the Monastery of the Annunciation in Supraśl.¹⁶ In 1838, Bobrowski lent Kopitar the second part of the manuscript, that is, the last twenty-one quires, which were returned to Bobrowski once Kopitar had copied them. Then the first sixteen gatherings were sent to Kopitar for his examination, which he also copied (Cod. Kop. 1). However, Kopitar did not return the first part of *Codex Suprasliensis* to Bobrowski, so that the first 118 leaves of the codex were found among Kopitar's effects after his death. Bobrowski sold his library in 1847 (dying the next year) (Dennis 1996: 42); however, before the new owner could sell the second half of *Codex Suprasliensis*, sixteen of its leaves were sold in 1856 to Afanasii Feodorovich Bychkov, who headed the manuscripts division of the Public Library in Saint Petersburg, Russia.¹⁷ The Public

¹⁵ Note that Cod. Slav. 7 is numbered II/11 in Birkfellner's catalog. There are several Russian ("South Russian") codices among the dozen Kopitar obtained from Mt. Athos for the Imperial Library in Vienna.

¹⁶ Supraśl is near Białystok, Poland. The codex is written in Old Church Slavonic uncial, 296 leaves, and contains the readings of feast days for the month of March and additional sermons (Dennis 1996; Stempniak-Mincheva 2012, especially 303).

¹⁷ The three parts of the codex have been reunited virtually online as part of the UNESCO International Register, "Codex Suprasliensis," <http://csup.ilit.bas.bg/node/5> (accessed 30 November 2015). The resulting publication from this project includes twenty-three articles regarding various aspects of the history, study, and digitization of *Codex Suprasliensis* (Miltenova 2012).

Library (now the Russian National Library) obtained this third part of the manuscript from Bychkov's widowed daughter-in-law in 1947 (Shmidt 1984: 65–66, no. 23; Krushel'nitskaia 2012: 220–24). Rodney Dennis, former curator of manuscripts in the Harvard College Library, filled in a gap in the provenance of the second half of the codex (146 leaves), which traveled from Warsaw to Cambridge, Massachusetts, and back to Poland in his 1996 article in *Harvard Magazine* (Dennis 1996).

On 18 August 1844, a week after Kopitar's death, Vuk Karadžić writes from Vienna to the Russian publicist and historian Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin (1800–75), “You probably already heard from the newspapers that we lost Kopitar! It is not yet known what will happen with his library and manuscripts. They say that he did not leave any kind of will and testament” (Karadžić 1913: 492).¹⁸ Pogodin, the owner of an extraordinary library that included over 2,000 codices and fragments,¹⁹ responded to Karadžić, expressing his regret at the death of Kopitar, and announcing himself ready to purchase Kopitar's library. Pogodin continues that, if the library is to be sold at auction, he will take all of the manuscripts and early printed books.²⁰

¹⁸ “Vy vierno slykhali iz gazet, chto my poteriali Kopytaria! Eshche nieizviestno, chto sluchitsia s ego bibliotekoii i rukopisiami. Govoriat, chto on ne ostavil po sebe nikakovago zavieshchaniia (testamenta).”

¹⁹ According to Klimentina Ivanova (1981: 10), Pogodin's personal library included 2019 codices. Tvorogov and Zagrebin note that Pogodin's collection, which included coins, engravings, eighteenth-century printed books as well as codices, fragments, and early printed books, was sold to Tsar Nicholas I for 150,000 rubles and became part of the Imperial Public Library in 1852. Currently, the Pogodin Collection is fond 583, still housed in what is now known as the Russian National Library in St. Petersburg. See also Tvorogov and Zagrebin (1988: 10–11) and Shmidt (1984: 16–17).

²⁰ Proshchu vas pokornieishe ne upuskat' ego biblioteki. Ia gotov kupit' ee. Esli ona budet prodavat'sia s auktsiona, to ia beru na sebe vse Slovenskiiia [sic]* rukopisi i staropechatnyiia knigi. Nauchite kak ia dolzhen postupit'. Esli zhe biblioteka budet prodavat'sia spolna, to uviedom'te c pervoiu pochtoi u tsenie. Ia budu, esli nuzhno, prosit' Gospodina nashego poslannika o sodeistvii i polagaius' na vas kak na kamennuiu stenu. Boius' tol'ko poteriat' vremia. Vy khot' zaimite deneg, no ne upuskaite Serbskikh, Bolgarskikh i Slovenskikh rukopisei i knig. (I humbly beg you not to let his library go. I am ready to buy it. If it is to be sold at auction, I will take for myself all of the Slovenian* [Slavic?] manuscripts and early printed books. Instruct me as to how I must proceed. If the library is to be sold as a whole, then let me know the price by the first post. I will, if necessary, appeal to our Minister [the Russian Minister of Culture? cited below by Lukan] for assistance and rely heavily on you. I am afraid only to lose time. Borrow money if

Pogodin returns to the topic in his postscript, musing on his intention to write also to Pavel Šafárik, as perhaps he could help with Kopitar's library. (Šafárik was the censor of Czech material [1837–47] and custos at the Prague University Library in 1841 and was later appointed the director of that library in 1848.)²¹ Acknowledging that Šafárik is too far away to be of much help, Pogodin ends the letter emphasizing to Karadžić, “You, only you, can do me this favor” (Karadžić 1913: 493).²²

Walter Lukan of the East- and Southeast European Institute in Vienna has written extensively on Kopitar's library, including a lengthy article (1995b) and a catalog for the exhibition “Jernej Kopitar and European Science in the Mirror of his Private Library” that was held in Ljubljana, January–March, 2000 (2000). Lukan establishes the time line for the fate of Kopitar's collection: as Karadžić reported to Pogodin, Kopitar died intestate. An inventory was created where the codices and manuscripts appeared at the end of the list, almost as an addendum. This inventory is still housed in the Vienna City and Regional Archives. With some revisions, the inventory, henceforth, the “Vienna Inventory,” was then printed as an auction catalog (Lukan 1995b: 223). Several prestigious libraries and repositories were interested in purchasing the collection of codices, e.g., the Vatican, the Royal Library in Berlin, the British Library, and the Russian minister of Culture also made inquiries; however, the heirs decided that the collection should remain in Ljubljana (Lukan 2000: 15) and accepted 1400 silver guldens (a monetary unit) from the Lyceum Library, although they could have received much more.²³ The collection was accessioned by the Lyceum Library in Ljubljana on 24 November 1845 (Mošin 1971: 9).

necessary, but do not let go of the Serbian, Bulgarian and Slovenian manuscripts and books [18 September 1844]). (Karadžić 1913: 493)

*“Slovenskiiia” may be a typo in this Serbian edition of Karadžić's correspondence. Pogodin is writing in Russian, and the text probably should read “Slavianskiiia,” i.e., the Russian word for “Slavic.” “Slovenski” is the Serbian word for “Slavic” and the Russian word for “Slovenian.”

²¹ A Slovak philologist, historian, Slavicist, and manuscript collector, Pavel Jozef Šafárik (1795–1861) was also a student of Kopitar and corresponded with him for a number of years (Nahtigal 1944: XVI–XVIII). See also Grasheva (2003).

²² “O bibliotekie ia pishu i k Shafariku: ne mozet li i on mnie sodieistvovat'. Vprochem emu edvali no otdalennosti mozhno. Vy, tol'ko vy, mozhete okazat' mnie eto odolzhenia.”

²³ Letter from Vuk Karadžić in Vienna to Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin, 7–12 September 1845: “Biblioteku Kopitaria kupil Litsei Liublianskii za 1400 guld. ser.; mozhno bylo ot drugikh dostat' za onuii bolee 2000 gul'denov, no naslednikam bylo tak ugodno” (The Ljubljana Lyceum bought Kopitar's library for 1400 silver guldens; it would have been possible to receive more than 2000 guldens from others, but this was agreeable to the heirs). (Karadžić 1913: 495)

"After the abolition of the Lyceum in 1850, the library became the main reference library of the province"; eventually, it also became the university library until NUK was officially established as Slovenia's national library in 1945.²⁴

An inventory of Kopitar's personal library was created when the Lyceum Library accessioned the collection. That inventory, henceforth, "Lyceum inventory," is part of the Manuscripts and Rare Books Department's holdings in NUK, but the codices are not listed.²⁵

When I submitted a proposal to the Slovenian Research Initiative, a visiting faculty exchange between The Ohio State University's Center for Slavic and East European Studies and the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences,²⁶ I was hoping to find traces of Kopitar and Karadžić in the codices themselves, in the form of inscriptions, marginalia, or perhaps corrections and emendations in the body of the texts. I did not find any signatures or inscriptions signed with the names of Kopitar or Karadžić in the codices I examined. There were some editorial notes and marginalia (some of which appeared to date to a time when the codices were being used in the liturgy). However, I did find in the thirteenth-century Macedonian *Triodion* (Cod. Kop. 9), lightly penciled in the margin of

²⁴ For an account of both the fate of the Lyceum Library and the establishment of NUK and the various buildings they occupied, please see the "History," Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica / National and University Library, <http://www.nuk.uni-lj.si/eng/node/455> (accessed 17 October 2016).

²⁵ NUK, arhiv, inv. štev. 44/83. Mss 667, the inventory of Baron Zois's library, which is digitized and available on NUK's website, does include the Croatian Glagolitic codices mentioned above (see numbered page 111 of the inventory, which is page 115 of the pdf available on the NUK website). One hand writes pages 1–131, a different hand begins on page 132. Pages 135–36 are blank; and the supplement begins on page 137. "Bibliothecae Sigismundi Liberi Baronis de Zois Catalogus," 1821, Digitalna knjižarnica Slovenije, <http://www.dlib.si/?URN=URN:NBN:SI:DOC-HPBII5XS> (accessed 17 October 2016).

²⁶ I was selected as the visiting faculty in the Slovene Research Initiative (SRI) of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies (CSEES) at The Ohio State University in both 2015 and 2016. The SRI is an exchange program made possible in part by an endowment from the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU). I am grateful to Yana Hashamova and Joe Brandesky, CSEES directors at the time of my selection (in 2015 and 2016, respectively) and Eileen Kunkler, CSEES Assistant Director, as well as to Oto Lothar, Director of ZRC SAZU, and his associate Luka Vidmar for the opportunity to conduct research in Slovenia and for their assistance. I also thank Predrag Matejic and the Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies and the Hilandar Research Library at Ohio State for supporting my research and travel in both Slovenia and Austria in 2015. My thanks to the Ohio State University Libraries for supporting my travel and research in 2016.

several pages in modern Bulgarian, the name of the feast day associated with the readings on those pages. (Typically, in a liturgical text there are rubrics in a heading indicating the feast day, e.g., Matins, on Friday of the second week of Lent, etc.) Unfortunately, NUK does not keep a “passport” or list of who has viewed each individual codex, but with a little research it may be possible to make an educated guess as to the identity of the modern scribe.

I examined the individual codices and noted that each is stamped (usually more than once) in black ink with the seal or stamp of the Lyceum Library in Ljubljana: “K[aiserliche] K[oenigliche] Lyceal Bibliothek zu Laibach” surmounted by the crowned double-headed eagle symbol of the Austrian Empire. There is also a red number on the lower outer corner of the inside of the front binding board of many of the codices—some of the inside front covers have pastedowns and some do not. (See Fig. 1.) Usually, there is also indicated in the upper outer corner written in brown ink the abbreviation “Msc.” (as opposed to the contemporary abbreviation for manuscript “MS” or “Ms.”) and a number that matches the assigned shelf mark designated as “Cod. Kop.” in Mošin’s catalog and on the NUK website. The handwriting and the brown ink are similar to that found on the 3 x 5 pieces of paper with a brief description of the codex in Latin, which is typically included in the codex itself or in the clamshell box where the codex is housed. These shelf mark notations and Latin descriptions were probably done when the Lyceum Library received the collection, as the handwriting is similar to that of the Lyceum inventory, which, according to Lukan, was made by the Lyceum librarian Mihael Kastelic (Lukan 1995b: 225, n14).

Mošin renumbered the codices and manuscripts in his catalog. This is not uncommon. In fact, invariably, when someone produces a description of a collection of codices, there is usually renumbering involved, which then necessitates the inclusion of a chart listing the current shelf marks and previous ones. For example, Gerhard Birkfellner numbers the Cyrillic and Glagolitic codices described in his catalog and provides a legend listing the corresponding shelf marks assigned by the Austrian National Library, which is the holding repository. I do not have access to the first Vienna Inventory or the auction catalog, but fortunately, Lukan, in his article “Kopitars Privatbibliothek,” lists the thirty-three codices and manuscripts with their corresponding numbers both from Mošin and from the Vienna Inventory (see fig. 1). I was thus able to determine that thirteen of the red numbers in the physical items (usually located in the lower outer corner of the inside front cover) match those in the Vienna inventory (Cod. Kop. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12–14, 17–19, 22, and 32).

Eleven of the items are indicated in the Vienna Inventory list published by Lukan as not having assigned numbers, however, one of the

eleven (Cod. Kop. 23) has a red number on its front pastedown, which is visible in the corresponding digital image on NUK's website of the "Kopitar's Collection of Slavic Codices," and another (Cod. Kop. 25) has a red number clearly visible from viewing the original codex (images of its binding are not at this time available online). The remaining nine items are either unbound (Cod. Kop. 2, 27–31), or have recently undergone preservation measures of new bindings and new front pastedowns that cover where the red numbers are typically found (Cod. Kop. 26 and 33). Cod. Kop. 20 is bound in a cardboard binding that appears to be contemporary to the manuscript, but there is no red number indicated on the front pastedown. According to Lukan, the Vienna inventory lists separately 2022 volumes, 1071 notebooks and 144 leaves (Lukan 1995b: 225)—the unbound items may have been listed in either of the latter two categories of the inventory.

Of the remaining items, four of codices (Cod. Kop. 9, 10, 11, 21) have new bindings and pastedowns that date from the second half of the twentieth century. I requested photos of the covers and pastedowns of the items which were not available online.²⁷ There are five items where the numerical correspondences between what is listed in Vienna Inventory and what is written in the codices are inconsistent (Cod. Kop. 5, 7, 15, 16, 24), but these may be clerical errors in the Vienna Inventory or typos in Lukan.

I hope to obtain a copy of the Vienna Inventory in order to verify the descriptions of the codices and manuscripts as well as the numbers, which will aid in the construction of the provenance and evolving descriptive history of this collection.

I will continue to study the codices; a closer examination of the texts is necessary before any other conclusions can be hypothesized about the origins and significance of any of the other corrections or notations in the codices.

²⁷ The photography of the binding or folders and of the pastedowns of Cod. Kop. 4, 5, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 31, and 32 was done by Milan Štupar, head of NUK's Library Reproduction Services, and his assistant Zoran Kuder.

Fig. 1: Correspondences among the various shelf marks assigned to items in “Kopitar’s Collection of Slavic Codices”

NUK Shelf Mark	Number Assigned by Mošin (1971)	Vienna Inventory according to Lukan (1995b: 323–24)	Red number visible	Source of “Red number visible”	Location of number
Cod. Kop. 1	17	146	146	online	front pastedown or bindery leaf Iv
Cod. Kop. 2	16	none	none ²⁸	online	unbound
Cod. Kop. 3	11	912	912	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 4	19	905	905	photo	inside front cover
Cod. Kop. 5	22	901	902	photo	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 6	7	906	906	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 7	6	868	879	online	f. 1r, lower margin
Cod. Kop. 8	12	919	919	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 9	13	882	not visible	not online	new binding & pastedowns; viewed original

²⁸ In *Codex Suprasliensis*, red quire marks appear in the upper right-hand corner of the first leaf of each new quire. However, this notation was added (possibly by Bobrowski) prior to Kopitar’s receipt of even the second half of the codex (which he received first), because the quire marks are numbered sequentially and with consistency throughout the manuscript (see “Codex Suprasliensis,” <http://csup.ilit.bas.bg/node/5>). The red quire marks in Cod. Kop. 2 are in a different type of ink than the red shelf marks that are found typically in the lower outer corner of the inside front cover of the binding of Kopitar’s codices.

NUK Shelf Mark	Number Assigned by Mošin (1971)	Vienna Inventory according to Lukan (1995b: 323–24)	Red number visible	Source of “Red number visible”	Location of number
Cod. Kop. 10	4	916	not visible	not online	new binding & pastedowns; viewed original
Cod. Kop. 11	3	867	not visible	online image has missing	codex restored in Rome, 1958
Cod. Kop. 12	2	869	869	online	f. 1r lower margin
Cod. Kop. 13	29	861	861	online	front bindery leaf 1v
Cod. Kop. 14	21	900	900	online	inside front cover
Cod. Kop. 15	10	899	868	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 16	9	902	901	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 17	14	904	904	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 18	20	903	903	photo	inside front cover
Cod. Kop. 19	18	917	917	photo	inside front cover
Cod. Kop. 20	27	none	none	photo	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 21	23	883	?	photo	new binding; original front
Cod. Kop. 22	25	873	873	photo	inside front cover
Cod. Kop. 23	8	none	899	online	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 24	5	879	867	online	f. 1r lower margin

NUK Shelf Mark	Number Assigned by Mošin (1971)	Vienna Inventory according to Lukan (1995b: 323–24)	Red number visible	Source of “Red number visible”	Location of number
Cod. Kop. 25	28	none	931	photo	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 26	26	none	?	online	new front pastedown and binding
Cod. Kop. 27	34	none	none	no cover online	unbound
Cod. Kop. 28	30	none	none	online	unbound
Cod. Kop. 29	32	none	none	online	unbound
Cod. Kop. 30	31	none	none	online	unbound
Cod. Kop. 31	33	none	none	photo	unbound
Cod. Kop. 32	24	890	890	photo	front pastedown
Cod. Kop. 33	15	none	none	online	new binding partly covers inside front board

My approach to the study of medieval Slavic codicology is to question everything: to ask—what is this notation, why is a numeral in the middle of lower margin followed by the next numeral in sequence in the upper margin? In this way, I attempt to reconstruct scribal and user practices from internal evidence, and then compare the results with those from other codices. As mentioned above, for example, while medieval users of the Macedonian *Triodion* were so familiar with the structure and content of the text that they did not need to include a title, a modern reader of the codex felt compelled to identify several passages. My seemingly inconsequential questions—what are these red numbers, what are these numbers in brown ink—led me to the various catalog descriptions and to the letters of Kopitar, Karadžić, and Pogodin. Analyzing the more recent

layers of notation in the codices reveals the organizational structure underlying the Vienna and Lyceum inventories. After the death of the private collector, the codices and manuscripts were recontextualized as they first became a part of Kopitar's estate as a whole, and then were acquired by the Lyceum Library, etc. Tracking and analyzing the successive descriptions of the collection reveals that the codices and manuscripts—as a whole, individually, and/or in distinctively configured groupings—are also reinterpreted by the catalogers according to varying criteria, which do not always align with the intent and strategy of the collection's creator.

The Kopitar collection of codices and manuscripts is remarkable. While I was working with them in Ljubljana, I contacted a half a dozen scholars—in Russia, Bulgaria, Canada, and the US—to tell them about the codices and materials in NUK that were relevant to their research interests. Aside from *Codex Suprasliensis*, which everyone knows about and for which there is a website that unites its three sections virtually (see footnote 17 above), a few of the scholars knew about the Ljubljana *Damaskin* (Lamanskii 1869; Novaković 1874; Jagić 1877; Agrirov 1895, 1900; Mladenova and Velcheva 2013; and Mladenova 2015) for example, but learning of the accessibility of the entire collection online was welcome news to everyone.

The Manuscript and Rare Book Department in NUK has preserved a wealth of materials—such as the Kopitar and Zois archives—which for me are sources for determining the provenance of these codices, how Kopitar may have used them, and what his collection policy or strategy may have been for his personal library. In 1828 Kopitar writes to Karadžić from Vienna about sought-after manuscripts and medieval Serbian church books—asking where, if not to buy them, then at least to view them, and exclaims, “Where are such things *better* protected from destruction, than in the [Vienna] *Imperial Library*!”²⁹ The debt of gratitude is owed, in fact, to the National and University Library in Slovenia for protecting and preserving Kopitar's personal library and making it accessible to today's researchers and scholars.

Ohio State University

²⁹ “Wien 23^{ten} Febr. 1828.... Suchen Sie doch die von ihm besprochenen MSS. und *србуље* [*srbulje*] wo nicht zu *kaufen*, wenigstens zum *Ansehen* zu bekommen! Wo werden solche Dinge *besser* vor dem Untergange gesichert, als in der *Hofbibliothek*!” (Karadžić 1908: 308).

Works Cited

- Agrirov, S. 1895, 1900. Liublianskiiat bŭlgarski rŭkopis ot XVII vek. *Sbornik za narodni umotvoreniiia* 12 (1895): 463–560; 16–17 (1900): 246–313.
- Berčić, Ivan. 1870. *Dvie Službe rimskoga obreda za svetkovinu Svetih Ćirila i Metuda*. Zagreb.
- Birkfellner, Gerhard. 1975. *Glagolitische und kyrillische Handschriften in Österreich*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Dennis, Rodney. 1996. Mr. Vlasov Meets the Ham King. *Harvard Magazine* (March–April 1996): 40–46.
- Dzhurova, Aksiniia. 1997. *Vŭvedenie v slavianskata kodikologiia: Vizantiiskiiat kodeks i retseptsiiata mu sred slavianite*. Sofia: CIBAL.
- Grasheva, Liliana, ed. 2003. *Kirilo-Methodievska entsiklopediia 4: T–Ia dopŭlnenie*, s.v. Shafarik, Pavel Iozef. Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo Marin Drinov.
- Gwara, Scott. 2013. *Otto Ege's manuscripts: A study of Ege's manuscript collections, portfolios and retail trade, with a comprehensive handlist of manuscripts collected or sold*. Cayce, SC: De Brailles Publishing.
- Hafner, Stanislaus. 1959. B. Kopitar und die slawische Handschriften der Athosklöster (B. Kopitar and the Slavic Manuscripts of Mount Athos). *Südost Forschungen* 18: 89–122.
- Iatsimirskii, A.I. 1921. *Opisanie iuzhno-slavianskikh i russkikh rukopisei zagranichnykh bibliotek* 1. Viena.–Berlin.–Dresden.–Leiptsig.–Miunkhen.–Praga.–Liublana. Series *Sbornik Otdieleniia russkago iazyka i slovesnosti Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk* 98. Petrograd: Akademicheskaia Dvienadtsataia Gosudarstvennaia Tipografiia.
- Il'inskii, G.A. 1903. Rukopisi Kopitara v Liublianskoi litseiskoi biblioteke. *Izvestiia Otdieleniia russkago iazyka i slovesnosti Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk* 9.1: 245–72.
- Ivanova, Klimentina. 1981. *Bŭlgarski, srŭbski i moldo-vlakhiiski kirilski rŭkopisi v sbirkata na M.P. Pogodin*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata Akademiia na naukite.
- Jagić, Vatroslav. 1877. Kako se pisalo bugarski prije dvjesti godina. *Starine* 9: 137–71.
- . 1899. Ein fünfter bibliographischer Beitrag. Slavica der Laibacher Lycealbibliothek (A fifth bibliographic contribution. Slavic materials in the Ljubljana Lyceum Library.) *Anzeiger der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: philosophisch-historische Classe von 18. October XXXVI. Jahrgang* 1899, No 1 – XXVII: 122–34.

- Karadžić, Vuk. 1908. *Vukova prepiska, knjiga prva, (državno izdanje)*. Belgrade: Štampano u državnoj štampariji kraljevine Srbije.
- . 1913. *Vukova prepiska, knjiga sedma, (državno izdanje)*. Belgrade: Štampano u državnoj štampariji kraljevine Srbije.
- Kopitar, Bartholomäus [Jernej]. 1836. *Glagolita Clozianus id est Codicis Glagolitici inter suos facile antiquissimi, olim, dum integer erat veglae in thesauro Frangepaniano, habiti pro S. Hieronymi bibliis croaticis, supparisque ad minimum exarato a ·MLVII· cyrilliano Ostromiri novogradensis, Αειψωνον foliorum ·XII· membraneorum, servatum in Bibliotheca ILL^{mi} Comitis Paridis Cloz Tridentini*. Vindobonae: Prostat apud Carolum Gerold Bibliopolam.
- . 1945. Bibliothekarischer Bericht bei Gelegenheit der zwölf Altslav. MSS von Berge Athos (Librarian report on the twelve Old Slavic manuscripts from Mount Athos). In *Jerneja Kopitarja Spisov II Del: Srednja doba: Doba sodelovanja V 'Jahrbücher der Literatur,' 1818-1834, 2. Knjiga 1825-1834*, ed. R. Nahtigal, 171–87. Ljubljana: Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti.
- Krushel'nitskaia, Ekaterina. 2012. Peterburgskaia chast' Suprasl'skoi rukopisi kodikologicheskie osobennosti i istoriia postupleniia v Publichnuu Biblioteku. In *Preotkrivanie: Suprasl'ski sbornik starobŭlgarski pametnik ot X vek* (Rediscovery: Bulgarian Codex Suprasliensis of the tenth century), ed. Anisava Miltenova, 217–24. Sofia: Institut za Literatura (Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite).
- Lamanskii, V.I. 1869. Neporeshennyi vopros. *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosvieshcheniia za iiun'* 143 (1869): 349–78; 144 (1869): 84–123.
- Lencek, Rado L. 1982. Kopitar's share in the evolution of Slavic philology. In *Papers in Slavic Philology 2: To Honor Jernej Kopitar 1780-1980*, ed. Rado L. Lencek and Henry R. Cooper, Jr., 1–24. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Lukan, Walter. 1995a. Bartholomäus Kopitar's 'Bibliothekarischer Bericht'—Ein Dokument des Austroslawismus und die Probleme seiner Veröffentlichung (Library report—A document of Austroslavism and the problems of its publication). *Österreichische Osthefte* 37.1 (1995): 147–94.
- . 1995b. Kopitar's Privatbibliothek. In *Bartholomäus (Jernej) Kopitar: Neue Studien und Materialien anlässlich seines 150. Todestages, herausgegeben von Walter Lukan*, 220–337. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.
- . 2000. *Jernej Kopitar (1780-1844) in evropska znanost v zrcalu njegove zasebne knjižnice: Vodnik po razstavi. Mestna galerija Ljubljana 13.januar - 31. marec 2000*. Ljubljana: Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica.
- Miltenova, Anisava, ed. 2012. *Preotkrivanie: Suprasl'ski sbornik starobŭlgarski pametnik ot X vek* (Rediscovery: Bulgarian Codex

- Suprasliensis of the tenth century). Sofia: Institut za Literatura (Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite).
- Mladenova, Olga. 2015. Leksikalni belezhki II. 3. Ima li prilagatelno *opachin* v Zhitieto na Ioan Zlatoust? 4. Tŭlkuvane na formata toitu v Zhitieto na Mariia Egipetska. *Bŭlgarska rech* 21.4 (2015): 90–99.
- Mladenova, Olga, and Boriana Velcheva. 2013. *Loveshki damaskin: Novobŭlgarski pametnik ot vek*. Sofia: Natsionalna biblioteka “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodii.”
- Mošin, Vladimir A. 1971. *Kopitarjeva zbirka slovanskih rokopisov in Zoisov cirilski fragment iz Narodne in univerzitetne knjižnice v Ljubljani*. Translated by Marijan Ozvald. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.
- Nahtigal, Rajko, ed. 1944. *Jerneja Kopitarja Spisov II. Del: Srednja doba, doba sodelovanja v “Jahrbücher der Literatur,” 1818–1834, 1. Knjiga*. Ljubljana.
- Novaković, Stojan. 1874. Bugarški zbornik, pisan prošloga veka narodnim jezikom. *Starine* 6: 24–59.
- Novalja, Alen, and Ines Jerele. 2012. The 118 leaves of Cyrillic mysteries: The Slovenian part of *Codex Suprasliensis*.” In *Preotkrivanje: Suprasŭlski sbornik starobŭlgarski pametnik ot X vek* (Rediscovery: Bulgarian Codex Suprasliensis of the tenth century), ed. Anisava Miltenova, 275–95. Sofia: Institut za Literatura (Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite).
- Shmidt, S.O. ed. 1984. *Svodnyi katalog slaviano-russkikh rukopisnykh knig, khraniashchikhsia v SSSR: XI–XIII vv*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Silvestre, J. B. 1843. *Evangelia Slavice quibus olim in regnum Francorum oleo sacro inungendorum solemnibus uti solebat ecclesia Remensis; vulgo, Texte du sacre*. Ad exemplaris similitudinem descripsit et edidit; evangelia Latine vertit eandemque interpretationem Latinam e regione adjecit B. Kopitar. Paris.
- Solovjev, Aleksandr V. 1928. *Zakonodavstvo Stefana Dušana cara Srba i Grka*. Series Knjige skopskog naučnog društva 2. Skopje; Belgrade: Sv. Sava.
- Stempniak-Mincheva, Vanda. 2012. O. Mikhail Bobrovskii—otkryvatel’ Suprasl’skogo kodeksa.” In *Preotkrivanje: Suprasŭlski sbornik starobŭlgarski pametnik ot X vek* (Rediscovery: Bulgarian Codex Suprasliensis of the tenth century), ed. Anisava Miltenova, 297–307. Sofia: Institut za Literatura (Bŭlgarska akademiia na naukite).
- Thomson, Francis J. 1999. Jernej Kopitar and the acquisition of Slavonic codices from Chilandari and Zographou for the Imperial Court at Vienna in 1827. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 45: 201–18.
- . 2003. Konstantin (in religion Porphyry) Uspensky and the Hilandar Monastery Collection of Manuscripts. In *Monastic traditions: Selected proceedings of the Fourth International Hilandar*

- Conference (The Ohio State University, 14–15 August 1998)*, ed. Charles E. Gribble and Predrag Matejic, 305–41. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Tvorogov, O.V., and V.M. Zagrebin, ed. 1988. *Rukopisnye knigi sobraniia M.P. Pogodina: Katalog*, vyp. 1. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka im. M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina.
- Vidmar, Luka. 2016. *A Slavic Republic of Letters: The Correspondence between Jernej Kopitar and Baron Žiga Zois*. Translated by Timothy Pogačar. Series Thought, Society, Culture: Slovenian and South Eastern European Perspectives 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Voskresenskii, G.A. 1883. Slavianskii rukopisi, khраниashchiasia v zagranichnykh bibliotekakh: Berlinskoi, Prazhskoi, Vienskoi, Liublianskoi, Zagrebskoi i dvukh Bielgradskikh. *Sbornik Otdeleniia russkago iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* 31 (1): 1–58.
- Winter, E. 1958. Eine grundlegende Urkunde des Austroslawismus: Der Brief B. Kopitars an Metternich vom 7. April 1827 mit bibliothekarischem Bericht" (A basic act of Austroslavism: The letter of B. Kopitar to Metternich of 7 April 1827 with a Librarian's Report). *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 3.1: 108–23.

POVZETEK

KOPITARJEVA ZBIRKA SLOVANSKIH KODEKSOV: NASTANEK IN UREDITEV

Jernej Kopitar je zbral ogromno knjižnico, ki ni vsebovala le novejših knjig, predvsem s področja jezikoslovja in posebej slavistike, ampak tudi inkunabule in stare slovanske rokopise. »Kopitarjeva zbirka slovanskih kodeksov«, danes shranjena v Narodni in univerzitetni knjižnici (NUK) v Ljubljani, zajema 33 rokopisov, ki so bili nekoč last tega slavnega jezikoslovca in znanstvenika. Avtorica – kustosinja za stare slovanske tiske in rokopise v Raziskovalni knjižnici Hilandar (Državna univerza v Ohlu) – v članku razbira razvojno strategijo zbirke, o kateri danes pričajo Kopitarjevi kodeksi in rokopisi v NUK, in se ukvarja z usodo te zbirke po Kopitarjevi smrti. Njena analiza znamenj, ki jih vsebujejo posamezni rokopisi, pokaže, kako so to gradivo popisovali, urejali in nazadnje rekontekstualizirali njegovi skrbniki.