

PREFACE

The international workshop “The golden age and crisis of classical scholarship in Europe and Russia – people, institutions, ideas (ca. 1870 – ca. 1930)” was organised by the *Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana* in cooperation with the *Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Bern* and sponsored by *Fritz Thyssen Stiftung* and the *Staatsekretariat für Bildung, Forschung und Innovation (SBFI)* in Bern. It was held in St Petersburg, from 25 to 27 September 2014.

Two previous conferences on the history of classical scholarship organised by the *Bibliotheca Classica* in 2003 and 2009 were devoted to Russian-Western relations in scholarship on a personal level and to Russian and Western institutions from a comparative perspective (the papers are published in *Hyperboreus* 10 [2004] and 19 [2013] respectively). The present workshop also concentrated on personalities, on the eve of the editing of the *Dictionary of Saint Petersburg Classical Scholars 1800–1920*, the current project of the *BiCl*. It seemed reasonable to address a word mainly, but not exclusively, to the authors of the *Dictionary*, particularly to the representatives of the younger or even the youngest generations of Saint Petersburg scholars, who with great engagement turned, often for the first time, to the history of scholarship. It should give more scope to the important findings made during this work and also to representing the views of the past of classical scholarship of those who contribute to its development in the present or will contribute to it in the next future.

As previously, focusing on the history of Russian scholarship, the organisers aimed at putting it into the international context. The main aspect of the present workshop and the resulting volume is indicated by its title: the papers shed light on less-known episodes of the history of the classics in its most flourishing period, outlining the achievements together with their causes, but also the challenges, dramatic losses and symptoms of future decay.

The last decades of the 19th and the first decades of the 20th century were indisputably the zenith of classical studies and also of its position in academic science, university and school. This time brought an incredible accretion of new material (inscriptions, papyri, monuments of art, archaeological material), including the discovery of previously unknown civilisations (Minoan and Mycenaean Greece). It contributed both to the enormous growth of the fascination of the classical heritage and to the development of powerful methodology in scholarship in various fields of classics (lexicology, text criticism, epigraphy, historical and philosophical *Quellenforschung*, history of art, methodology of archaeological research), which had a considerable impact on the other branches of the humanities. The development of the huge, sometimes century-long, specialised projects of editing the texts and monuments (*Inscriptiones Graecae et Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* etc.) gave classics enormous importance at the academies and the universities. The prevailing of classical education at schools also contributed to this flourishing of scholarship and gained justification from it.

But precisely these highest achievements created tensions both within classical scholarship itself and in its relation to society. The advances in methodology brought about a growing diversification of classical studies. Although the ideal of a unified, all-embracing *Altertumswissenschaft* (August Boeckh) retained its vital force through all this period, the appearance of separate teaching and research institutions for philology, history, art etc., first in Germany and then in the other countries, made this unity increasingly problematic. It also proved difficult for highly specialised scholarship to remain responsive both to academic science's demands for synthesis and to the society's strong demand for the popularisation of the new achievements.

Along with the development of a system of didactics for classical languages and its successful combination with mathematics, which made the German Gymnasium the most advanced and attractive kind of secondary school throughout this period, classics also slowly but steadily retreated in the school curriculum under the pressure of the demand for education more open to the achievements of the natural sciences, more dedicated to the study of national languages and literatures, and of course more attuned to the needs of practical life. In Germany, where classics held the strongest position at school, it was able to retain its importance until today, but already in 1870 the classical schools lost their monopoly

on preparing students for universities, some faculties now becoming available to the graduates of the *Realgymnasien*. Forceful attacks on classical education for having proved unable to prepare for the challenges of war, which started in Great Britain and the US during the First World War (“the Assault on Humanism” as Paul Shorey called it) led to reforms that lessened the role of classics but maintained their presence at schools in some grades.

The same greatest advances – and crisis symptoms along with them – can be observed in the history of Russian classics, except that the period of flourishing was more short-lived and the crisis had a much more destructive character. Classical tradition was never as deeply rooted in Russian culture as in the West, but due to the active and often forceful promotion of classics by the Empire government from the beginning of the 1860s, Russia experienced a rapid, intense and extensive growth of classical education. In spite of its ultimate failure, the classical school reform of 1871 was part of the education of understanding personalities in science and scholarship. One of the immediate results was an advance of classics at universities; the best scholars attained the highest standards of West European scholarship at the end of 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The importance of classics at schools definitely increased people’s interest in the classical heritage in literature, theatre and the arts.

At the same time, society’s negative reaction to this forceful and even revolutionary classicisation was much more visible in Russia than in Western Europe and the US. It remains to be investigated how anti-classicist sentiment, which became strong in Russian society, was related to the almost total abolition of classics in the wake of the revolution of 1917, accompanied by the physical annihilation of many of its scholars, whom the Bolsheviks regarded as representatives of the “Old Regime”. Nevertheless, there seems to be at least an indirect causal connection, among the enforced classical school reform, society’s strong opposition to it, and the hatred of classics that the most radical leftist ideologists felt.

The case studies in the present volume explore the general tendencies of this period and their specific character in Russia. In his discussion of Count Dmitri Tolstoy’s school reform, Michael Pozdnev argues that the character of teaching classical languages enforced in 1871 (the “hard” Prussian system with its emphasis on translations from Russian into Greek and Latin instead of the initially planned humanistic school aimed at understanding classical texts) can do more to explain the final failure of strong classical education than can the directly ideological

conservative background of the reform (it was conceived as a weapon against revolutionary ideas).

Two papers discuss the era's rapidly growing interest in the classical heritage in the fields of art, literature and theatre as typical of this period: Maria Kazanskaya's article on the history of the Collection of Giovanni Pietro Campana, which was acquired by the Russian government and played the most important role in forming the Hermitage collection of classical art, demonstrates the extraordinary role of the state in the promotion of Russian classicism; Anna Uspenskaja shows the famous Russian symbolist writer Dmitri Merezhkovskij from his little known side as the graduate of one of the most classicist Russian grammar schools, inspired since his childhood by the classical ideal he later tried to promote in his translations of classical drama, by means of which he hoped to reform the Russian theatre and its audience.

The largest part of the volume is devoted to the history of classical scholarship, which became highly diversified in this period. The paper by Vsevolod Zeltchenko contains new material on the St Petersburg period of the life of Viktor Hehn, the German-Baltic philologist and historian of culture, the author of a book on the domestication of plants and animals in ancient times, which founded this field as an area of classical studies. The Russian context is important in his biography, although Hehn did not belong to the Russian academic establishment: Nicholas I exiled him to Tula because of his liberal views; and after his liberation during the reign of Alexander II, he worked as a librarian in St Petersburg before moving to Berlin in 1873, where he published his *opus magnum* and his criticism of the Russian state.

The other papers deal with the persons who played a significant, even pioneering role in the development of different fields of Altertumswissenschaft that were new for Russia. Andrey Vasilyev shows the significance of the Russian Institute of Roman Law (1887–1896) for the scholarly development of I. A. Pokrovskij, but also the remarkable fortune of the Institute itself, which contributed considerably to the education of specialists in this field that Russian Empire badly needed, but which came under fire from both conservative and liberal circles and was soon closed. Sofia Egorova follows the dramatic fortunes of the brothers David and Erwin Grimm, specialists in Roman Law and the history of the Roman Empire respectively, who, in succession, were the rectors of St Petersburg University in the difficult years between the revolutions of 1905 and 1917.

Jekaterina Druzhinina's paper takes a look at Nikolaj Glubokowskij, who was one of the first outstanding Hellenists in the field of the New Testament and patristics and who applied the critical method in his study; the language barrier has kept his work unknown to Western scholars, but the approval of his Master's Degree by the coryphée in the field, A. von Harnack, who read Russian because of his Dorpat origin, encouraged Glubokowskij, whose early work was not approved by the Russian experts.

Vyacheslav Khrustalyov analyses Vladislav Buzeskul's views of Pericles in the context of the entire academic career of this outstanding representative of the study of ancient history and the first historian of universal history in Russia (ancient history attained its importance as an autonomous discipline in the last decades of the 19th century, after philologists dominated this field for almost a century). This paper shows the paradoxical situation of the scholar, whose work was very responsive to the development of his discipline in the West and who developed his own view of Pericles' personality, based on careful analysis of the sources. This approach overcame the extremes of his contemporaries, but remained practically unknown to his colleagues abroad, because of the language barrier he did not seek to overcome.

In contrast, W. Schröder's paper on Zielinski and J. von Ungern-Sternberg's on E. von Stern are devoted to the scholarly fortunes of two outstanding personalities, each of whom attained an international reputation while living in Russia and then continued their activities in the West (Zielinski in Poland, Stern in Germany). Both papers contribute also to a more balanced estimation of the achievements of the two scholars. In his analysis of Zielinski's recently discovered autobiography, W. Schröder corrects some of the great scholar's estimations of himself and his outstanding St Petersburg colleagues. Ungern-Sternberg's analysis of Stern's works on the Roman revolution shows both the importance of the Russian experience for his analysis of Gracchi and the significance of Stern's Roman studies for scholarship, thus restoring a proper balance to his reputation in Russia, where he is renowned mainly for his archaeological work in the northern Black Sea area.

The dramatic aspects of the development of this discipline that might seem most removed from life but that in fact often finds itself in the focus of political struggle, are intensely visible in all the papers in this volume. But Olga Budaragina's paper on Iurij S. Liapunov, a young, very promising scholar whose life was broken by the Great War and

the Revolution – like many other scholars in Russia and in the West – may serve as an epitaph for the great epoch of Russian classicism of the 19th century.

The organizers of the workshop tried to combine a Russian focus with a focus on the processes in their international context: this was important not only because the interweaving of Russian and Western scholarship on the personal and institutional level was one of the most characteristic features of the period, but also because a better understanding of the Russian phenomena cannot be attained without taking into account the period's general tendencies in the world, as well as how the further investigation of classicism in Russia brings more light on its universal history. We attempted to preserve this international context by inviting eminent specialists in the history of classical scholarship to speak at the workshop and to chair the sessions. The workshop and this volume profited greatly from their comments on the papers and of course from their own papers.

Two papers in this volume discuss activities that have no special relation to Russian classics. They seem nevertheless to be highly congenial to the subjects discussed, since they show tendencies in this period that were at work in Russia, too. The paper by Tatiana Kostyleva on the complicated relations between U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and G. Murray not only addresses the new material on Murray's editing of Euripides and Wilamowitz's role in it, as reflected in Wilamowitz's copy of this edition. More generally, her essay compares the friendship and tensions between two outstanding personalities, one the great representative of the epoch with his mastery of painstaking text criticism and meticulousness in his approach both to literature and life, and the other the great promoter of classics, struggling primarily for its powerful presence in education, literature and art.

Last but not least, Stefan Rebenich analyses the history of the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, one of the most famous enterprises of German scholarship, showing how the project, which initially did not list the most outstanding classics scholars and could even be called parochial, produced magnificent works of synthesis in many fields and simultaneously the most adequate tools of research for more than a century of work in the field. Should we look at this exemplary monument of the unity and diversity of the *Altertumswissenschaften* nostalgically or with a hope for the future? It depends on classical scholarship itself, and of course on the historical perspectives of our world.

It remains a pleasant task to name those who made the workshop productive and pleasant. The participants in the workshop were Olga Budaragina (Saint Petersburg State University/Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana), Jekaterina Druzhinina (Saint Petersburg State University), Sofia Egorova (Saint Petersburg State University/Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana), Alexander Gavrilov (Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg/Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana), André Hurst (University of Geneva), Benedikt Hauser (*Staatsekretariat für Bildung, Forschung und Innovation [SBFI]*, Bern), Maria Kazanskaya (Saint Petersburg State University), Vyacheslav Khrustalyov (Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia), Tatiana Kostyleva (Saint Petersburg State University), Bernd Manuwald (University of Cologne), Reinhart Meyer-Kalkus (Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin), Michael Pozdnev (Saint Petersburg State University/Universität Trier), Stefan Rebenich (University of Bern), Anatolij Ruban (Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana), Bernd Seidensticker (FU Berlin/Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften), Natalie Tchernetska (Riga), Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg (University of Basel), Anna Uspenskaya (Saint-Petersburg Humanitarian University of Trade Unions), Andrey Vasilyev (Gymnasium Classicum Petropolitanum), Alexander Verlinsky (Saint Petersburg State University/Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana) and Vsevolod Zeltchenko (Gymnasium Classicum Petropolitanum/Saint Petersburg State University/Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana).

The organizers of the workshop express their gratitude to the Gymnasium Classicum Petropolitanum, particularly to its Director Sergey Burjachko and its Vice-Director Vsevolod Zeltchenko, who is also a member of the BiCl. This school provided, as ever, the most hospitable framework for some of the sessions, demonstrating again the vital bonds that connect scholarship, teaching and learning in this remarkable school; this was made vivid also by the spectacle of the school theatre, which dramatized the episodes of real life as reflected in Greek papyri of Egypt. The lecture by Alexander Gavrilov, the Founding Director of the Bibliotheca Classica, on the history of this institution was a both educational and inspiring example of studying the history of classical scholarship while making it at the same time. Olga Budaragina, academic secretary of the BiCl, Anatolij Ruban, its administrative director and librarian, and Denis Keyer, the assistant to the direction, played the most important role in organizing the workshop and coordinating its activities; Konstantin Katenin provided technical support for the workshop.

The editors and organizers of the workshop are grateful to the *Fritz Thyssen Stiftung* for its generous financial support as a part of the larger project “Blütezeit und Krise von Klassischer Bildung und Antike-Rezeption in Russland und ihre Verflechtung mit Westeuropa 1870–1930”, developed under the aegis of this foundation; they are also grateful to the *Staatsekretariat für Bildung, Forschung und Innovation (SBFI)* in Bern, which financially supported the participation of the Swiss scholars in the workshop. They also gratefully acknowledge the help of the *Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin* in conceiving the idea of the workshop (Reinhart Meyer-Kalkus), in logistics (Joachim Domnick) and in the copy-editing of its papers (Sophia Pick).

Alexander Verlinsky
State University of St Petersburg;
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana
verlinsky@mail.ru

December 2015

CONSPECTUS

ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
Preface	187
MICHAEL POZDNEV	
Aufstieg und Niedergang des Schulklassizismus in Russland im 19. Jh.	195
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
Victor Hehn en 1851 : un philologue de Dorpat et la <i>haute police</i> russe	216
MARIA KAZANSKAYA	
Collection Campana et sa contribution à la collection de l'art étrusque au musée de l'Ermitage	230
ANDREY VASILYEV	
Russian Institute of Roman Law in Berlin in Light of I. A. Pokrovskij's Scholarly Training	241
TATIANA KOSTYLEVA	
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931) and G. Murray (1866–1957): Correspondence 1894–1930 Revisited	249
VYACHESLAV KHRUSTALYOV	
Image of Pericles in Vladislav Buzeskul's Works and German Classical Scholarship: Some Notes	271
JÜRGEN VON UNGERN-STERNBERG	
Ernst von Stern über Catilina und die Gracchen	281
WILT ADEN SCHRÖDER	
Thaddäus Zielinski im Lichte seiner Autobiographie	305
JEKATERINA DRUZHININA	
Nikolaj Glubokowskij und Adolf von Harnack	326

STEFAN REBENICH

Das Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft:

Enzyklopädisches Wissen im Zeitalter des Historismus 339

ANNA USPENSKAJA

Dekadenz und Klassik: Dmitri Mereschkowskis Übersetzungen

der griechischen Tragödien 355

SOFIA EGOROVA

Die Brüder David und Erwin Grimm: zwischen der Universität

und dem Ministerium 365

OLGA BUDARAGINA

Iurij S. Liapunov – a Lost Classicist of the Great War Generation 373

Key Words 382

Indices

Index nominum 384

Index institutorum 389

Правила для авторов 392

Guidelines for Contributors 394