

CLASSICAL STUDIES
IN THE ST PETERSBURG IMPERIAL ACADEMY
OF SCIENCES IN THE 19th – EARLY 20th CENTURIES

Status of Classical Studies in the Academy of Sciences

The St Petersburg Academy of Sciences was founded in 1724, and, since its foundation, Classical studies have played an important role there. In accordance with wishes of Peter the Great, the Academy consisted of 11 fellows and was divided into three classes – mathematics, physics, and humanities (*humaniora*). The latter had two chairs – a chair of Classical Philology and Antiquities, and a chair of Ancient and Modern History.¹

New regulations of the Academy, approved in 1747, abolished the class of humanities (*humaniora*), and this situation lasted until the beginning of the 19th century, when further new regulations, approved in 1803, returned history to the range of the Academy's disciplines.² In 1830 the class of historical and political sciences was restored, in which the chair of Greek and Roman antiquities was foreseen.

According to the regulations of 1836 the Academy numbered 21 ordinary fellows, including two for Greek and Roman antiquities.³ There were also extraordinary and adjunct fellows, but places that became vacant from time to time were not appointed for the one or the other chair. Thanks to this arrangement, in the late 19th century the Academy had three Classical scholars: two ordinary fellows and one adjunct, out of total on some 40 fellows.

Besides the fellows there were also honorary members of the Academy and corresponding members, who were supplementary staff. The number of the latter was limited: in the Department of Classical Philology and

¹ “Проект положения об учреждении Академии наук и художеств, 22 января 1724 г.” [“The draft statute of the Academy of sciences and arts, 22 January 1724”], in: *Уставы Российской Академии наук. 1724–2009* (Moscow 2009) 50.

² “Регламент Императорской Академии наук” [“The Regulations of the Imperial Academy of Science”], 1803. § 3, *ibid.* 82.

³ “Устав Санкт-Петербургской академии наук” [“The Statute of the Imperial Academy of Science”], 1836. § 4, 5, *ibid.* 114.

Archaeology their number did not exceed 20 by the end of 19th century. Among the honorary members and corresponding members one can find the names of the most famous Russian and foreign Classical scholars.

The regulations of 1836 remained valid until 1927, when the regulations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences were adopted. Today, the structure and composition of the Academy has changed; it has more than 1200 ordinary fellows but only a tiny proportion consists of Classicists.

Academic Classical studies in the 18th century

The main purpose of Classical studies in the Academy of Sciences during 18th century was not so much to conduct scholarly research, as to service the needs of the University and the gymnasium, which were set up under the auspices of Academy; the teaching language there was Latin.⁴ Peter the Great hoped that a Classical education would bring Russians closer to the traditions of European culture. Gottlieb Siegfried Bayer, who was an expert on the ancient languages and the first professor in the chair of Greek and Roman antiquities and Oriental languages, was appointed head of the gymnasium of the Academy.⁵

The University and gymnasium were engaged in the process of selecting and initial educating of Russian young men. But at least in the first instance that was not an easy task, since in Russia of the time there were no students for the University, and they had to be invited from abroad, together with professors. At first, there were twice as many professors as students. According to recollections of Gerhard Friedrich Müller, one of the first university students who later on became an academician renowned for his studies in Russian history, professors attended each other's lectures just to fill up the audience.⁶ As for the gymnasium which was supposed to prepare Russian boys for the University, there was a serious problem of a language barrier between teachers and their pupils. Nevertheless, in spite of all organizational imperfections, the University and gymnasium educated dozens of capable leaders who managed to succeed in all spheres of social and state life. Moscow University was established in 1755

⁴ N. Hans, *History of Russian Educational Policy, 1701–1917* (New York 1931).

⁵ Готлиб Зигфрид Байер – академик Петербургской Академии наук. Сб. статей [Gottlieb Siegfried Beyer – member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Science: collection of essays] (St Petersburg 1996).

⁶ Д. А. Толстой, “Академический университет в XVIII столетии, по рукописным документам архива Академии наук” [“The Academic University in the 18th century: Manuscript documents of the Academy of Science archive”], *Записки Имп. АН* 51 (St Petersburg 1885) Suppl. no 3, p. 4.

through a direct participation of scientists from the Academy of Sciences, and soon after the opening of Moscow University, the academic university ceased to exist.

Academic Classical studies in the early 19th century

The renaissance of the studies of Classical antiquities in the early 19th century was made possible thanks to the support of Serguei Uvarov who was president of the Academy for 37 years, from 1818 to 1855.⁷ S. S. Uvarov (1786–1855), a godson of Catherine the Great, handsome and a minion of fortune, made a brilliant career. In 1818, at the age of 24, he became the curator of the schools in St Petersburg (1810–1821). Later, from 1833 to 1849, he was the Minister of national Education. He clearly understood the importance of state propaganda and ambitiously adopted the role of the main ideologue of the Russian Empire. Uvarov made a program which was built on the historical principles of Russian statehood and culture the basis of the activities of the Ministry of national Education. In other words, in the interests of Russia's prosperity and power, general education should be adapted to the Russian national spirit and be based on the three historical principles of autocracy, orthodoxy, and national roots. Later, these three principles became the official doctrine, which was known as the theory of 'official nationalism'.

Uvarov was a talented person and had a reputation as an outstanding autodidact of his time. He was interested in cultural pursuits and was capable of communicating with people holding opposite views. He was a member of the circle of A. Olenin, of the literary society *Arzamas*, as well as the circle of connoisseurs of Russian literacy.

In 1811 Uvarov was elected honorary member of the Academy, and in 1818, at the age of 32, he became its President. His ambition was to make the Russian Academy as respected and scholarly institution as sound the Academies abroad, and, being a skilful administrator, he succeeded in this task. He fully reformed the Academy and attracted celebrities such as representatives of the Dorpat school – the physicist Lenz, the zoologist Karl Baer, the chemist Hermann Hess, as well as an alumnus of the Paris school of mathematics Michael Ostrogradsky. In this time the Pulkovo Observatory was established, led by one of the best astronomers Friedrich von Struve; soon Pulkovo was recognised as the astronomical capital of the world.

⁷ C. H. Whittaker, *The origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786–1855* (DeKalb 1984). Russian translation: Виттекер Ц. Х., *Граф С. С. Уваров и его время* (St Petersburg 1999).

In the Academy Uvarov partly carried out his plan for an Asian Academy. This project, prepared by him in 1811 in consultation with the leading Orientalists of the Academy of Sciences, was favourably reviewed in Russia as well in the West. The project reflected the growing interest of the Russian state in its Eastern neighbours and was in tune with the interest in Oriental studies in the West. When he was appointed president, Uvarov presented to the academicians the Asiatic Museum as the first realization (embodiment) of his ambitious plans.

Uvarov recognised the important role of the Orient in the history of civilization, but he also acknowledged the first importance of the cultural proximity of Russia and Western Europe and considered Classical antiquity as their common source. In particular, he was convinced that Greek culture was essential to Russian history and literature. The idea of the fundamental value of Greek culture, borrowed by him from German scholars, formed the basis of Uvarov's education policy.

As a young man, Uvarov learned the principles of neohumanism, which revived the idea of *humanitas* and admired the education ideals of Classical antiquity. He admired Goethe, respected Friedrich Wolf, and was inspired by Wilhelm von Humboldt, who had reformed the Prussian system of education and placed Classical languages at its centre. Neohumanists considered the study of Classical languages, especially Greek, as the best way to develop a well-rounded personality, and Uvarov shared their slogan 'Bilde dich griechisch!'

Uvarov is considered the architect of Classical education in Russia, and this is justified. The central place of Classical studies was established during his term of office. The teaching of Classical languages and literature was intensified in schools, studies of Greek and Roman literature and history expanded in universities.

Uvarov began his reform of education in 1810, around the time when he met Friedrich Graefe, then the best expert in ancient languages and literature in St Petersburg.⁸ Graefe was a pupil and follower of Gottfried Hermann, master of textual criticism, an expert on poetry and familiar with the methods of comparative linguistics. His main work was the edition of the epic poem *Dionysiaka* by Nonnus of Panopolis, an author of the fifth century AD.⁹

For several years Graefe and Uvarov read this huge poem together and under the guidance of Graefe Uvarov wrote a special work "Nonnos

⁸ G. Schmid, "Zur Russischen Gelehrten-geschichte. S. S. Uwarow und Chr. Fr. Gräfe", *Russische Revue* 26 (1886) 77–108; 156–167.

⁹ *Nonni Panopolitae Dionysiacorum libri XLVII. Suis et aliorum coniecturis emendavit et illustravit D. Fridericus Graefe* I–II (Lipsiae 1819–1826).

von Panopolis, der Dichter” which could be considered as a preface to Graefe’s edition of the poem.¹⁰ Uvarov dedicated his work to Goethe and sent it to him begging him to excuse his German. According to Uvarov, Goethe in a letter to him praised his work and even complimented him on his German, albeit quite ironically: “You should use to your advantage the fact, that you do not know German grammar; for thirty years, I have been trying to forget it, but in vain” (notice that this letter has been not found among the Uvarov’s documents as yet). One can hear an echo to this compliment in the words the aged Graefe said to Uvarov in 1850, when Uvarov had already ceased to be Minister: “Such a pity that you became a Minister. Otherwise, you would have become an excellent Hellenist – had you dedicated more time to Greek grammar, though, which you have never respected”.¹¹

Uvarov took pride in his scholarly pursuits and in his friendship with Graefe, which should remind us of the relations between Wilhelm von Humboldt and Wolf, who were not only friends but also studied ancient authors together. For Uvarov, the collaboration with Graefe gave him an impulse to his scholarly and literary activities. He enlisted the services of Graefe at the St Petersburg gymnasium, the Pedagogic Institute reorganised by Uvarov into the University in 1819. Graefe’s teaching experience was long and extensive; he lectured in Latin which he mastered perfectly. Colleagues and pupils considered Graefe a giant of erudition; students called him ‘the terrible Graefe’, as he was extremely irascible; he could not tolerate mistakes and threw himself on such a pupil with clenched fists.¹²

To emphasise the important role of Classical studies in his new educational program, Uvarov recommended Graefe to the Academy. In 1818, Graefe was elected a corresponding member, in 1820 an ordinary

¹⁰ S. Uwarow, *Nonnos von Panopolis, der Dichter. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Poesie* (St Petersburg 1817).

¹¹ С. С. Уваров, “Воспоминание об академике Фр. Грефе. Письмо президента Императорской Академии наук (Читано в заседании 6 февраля 1852 г.)” [“Memoirs of Fr. Graefe, Member of the St Petersburg Academy of Science: A Letter from the President of the Imperial Academy of Science (Read at the Session on 6 February 1852)”], *Ученые записки Императорской академии наук по первому и третьему отделениям* I: 1 (St Petersburg 1852) 50.

¹² А. В. Никитенко, *Записки и дневник (1826–1877)* [Notes and diary (1826–1877)] I (St Petersburg 1893) 201; *Историческая записка 75-летия С.-Петербургской второй гимназии. Ч. I: Первые 25 лет существования гимназии. 1815–1823* [A Historical note on the Occasion of the 75th anniversary of the St. Petersburg Second Classical Grammar School. Pt. I: The First 25 years of the School. 1815–1823] (St Petersburg 1880) 82.

fellow with a personal chair of Greek and Roman literature, established thanks to Uvarov.¹³ The academic title strengthened Graefe's reputation and reinforced Classical studies in St Petersburg during the first half of the 19th century.

Graefe taught several generations of Classicists; some of his disciples became later his colleagues; for example, M. Kutorga, one of the founders of Russian Classical studies; K. Luegebill, N. Blagoveshchensky, G. Destunis. However, none of Graefe's disciples became fellow of the Academy.

Academic Classical philologists and Dmitry Tolstoy's educational reform

Graefe's successor at the University was Ivan Steinmann, his pupil and son in law, who played an important role in the educational reform carried out by count Dmitry Tolstoy (1823–1889), known as the "Classical count".¹⁴ Grammar schools, or gymnasia, received their new Statute in 1871, and the modern secondary schools, or real schools, a year later. When discussing the Statute of gymnasia Tolstoy encountered strong opposition from the majority of the State Council (that voted against it), and his draft was defeated. Alexander II, however, confirmed the view of the minority, and the new Statute became law. The same thing happened with the Statute for real schools.

The educational reform was one in a row of reforms initiated by Tzar Alexander II.¹⁵ They are justly called "great" reforms as they renovated all state institutions according to the Western model and firmly put Russia on the path paved by the European culture. That was not just a slavish

¹³ [С. С. Уваров], *О назначении особого академика для греческой и латинской словесности при Академии наук: Сборник постановлений по Министерству народного просвещения* [On the Appointment of the Special Member of the Academy of Science for Greek and Latin: Collection of Acts Related to the Ministry of Public Education]. Vol. I: Царствование императора Александра I, 1802–1825 [The Reign of the Emperor Alexander I, 1802–1825] (St Petersburg 1825) 1282–1283.

¹⁴ A. Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoi* (Cambridge 1973); Г. П. Измestьева, "Дмитрий Андреевич Толстой", *Вопросы истории* 2006: 3, 70–87.

¹⁵ P. L. Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford, California 1969); Г. П. Измestьева, *Классическое образование в истории России XIX века* [Classical Education in the 19th Century Russia] (Moscow 2003); Е. Л. Стафёрова, *А. В. Головин и либеральные реформы в просвещении (первая половина 1860-х гг.)* [A. V. Golovnin and liberal reforms in public education (the first half of the 1860ies)] (Moscow 2007).

imitation or apish borrowing of European forms of government or social structure but rather an attempt to turn Russia to basic intellectual and spiritual values of the West. It was enlightenment and education that had to play the role of a vitalizing and all-embracing force, with a European spirit to permeate all reforms and transformations. Therefore, the Russian school system, which was to produce a large number of properly educated statesmen capable of implementing the government's goals and objectives, also had to become subject to deep transformation that would assimilate it into the dominant European system of education. The implementation of that reform was associated with the name of Tolstoy who somewhere said about himself, "I am Russian in the first place, and I fervently wish Russia to be great in a European sense".¹⁶

As a result of Tolstoy's educational reform, the teaching of the ancient languages in the Classical grammar schools was intensified. The number of Latin lessons was brought up to 5–6 per week, and Greek lessons up to 6–7, that accounted for about 60% of school hours. Distinctive features of the so called Tolstoy's gymnasia were the grammatical method of teaching, and special emphasis on written translation from Russian into Latin and Greek. Though Classical studies dominated curriculum as well as the examinations, the gymnasia of Count Tolstoy were more like German Real Gymnasia than German Classical Gymnasia.

Access to universities and other high schools was opened only to the graduates of grammar schools. This was a painful process, as alternative route to university education and all the advantages it implied did not exist. The reform was extremely unpopular, but the system survived until the end of the 19th century.

Count Dmitry Tolstoy was one of the most prominent statesmen of Post-reform Russia. Russian Tzar Alexander II as well as Alexander III both followed Tolstoy's advice and acknowledged his steadfastness, administrative efficiency and indifference to public opinion. According to the contemporaries, count Tolstoy's personality had all the makings of a Bismark.

Tolstoy was a convinced monarchist and in the early 1880-s made a prediction, which was later, unfortunately, to come true, that the autocracy in Russia could be replaced only by communism.¹⁷ Tolstoy was essentially a man of action and did insist upon full use of autocratic

¹⁶ *Речи и статьи графа Д. А. Толстого* [*Speeches and essays by count D. A. Tolstoy*] (St Petersburg 1876) 49.

¹⁷ М. А. Алпатов, *Армагеддон. Записные книжки. Воспоминания. Портреты современников* [*Armageddon. Note Books. Memoirs. Portraits of Contemporaries.*] (Moscow 2006) 374.

power against revolutionary elements. That explains why Tolstoy was held as a symbol of reaction and the personification of all the evils of autocracy. Almost all his life Tolstoy spent in state chancelleries. For fifteen years he was responsible for both the Synod and the education Ministry. He would never use charm, warmth, or friendliness to achieve his goals.

Tolstoy's scholarly aspirations formed an essential part of his personality. A distinguished scholar of Russian history, he produced a significant array of monographs and articles. His two-volume study on the Catholics in Russia earned him a doctorate from Leipzig.¹⁸ Tolstoy also contributed to studies on the Russian school system of the 18th century, which was closely connected with the Academy of Sciences.¹⁹ For the latter, Tolstoy used to order folios of documents to be delivered to his cabinet from the Academic Archives, but he returned them back so quickly, that the permanent secretary of the Academy, who was responsible for the Archives, thought the count to have only scratched the surface. However, a little bit later, in his own words, he was made to feel ashamed, as one day Tolstoy opened in his presence a special bookcase, containing piles of extracts from academic minutes and other documents, all of them were recorded in his own hand. Having darted a farewell glance at his spadework, Tolstoy said with some regret, that he had been encouraged to do history himself instead of writing it. And indeed, shortly before that Tolstoy had held a post of Minister of the Interior.²⁰ Nevertheless, in regard to his extensive scholarly interests, in 1882 Tolstoy was appointed President of the Academy of Sciences. He appreciated the importance of learning and science and did everything to promote their success in Russia.

¹⁸ D. Tolstoy, *Le Catholicisme Romain en Russie: Études historique I–II* (Paris 1863–1864).

¹⁹ Д. А. Толстой, *Взгляд на учебную часть в России в XVIII столетии до 1782 года* [*Essay on the System of Education in Russia in the 18th Century up to 1782*] (St Petersburg 1883); idem, “Академическая гимназия в XVIII столетии, по рукописным документам архива Академии наук” [“The Academic Classical Grammar School in the 18th century: Manuscript documents of the Academy of Science archive”], *Записки Имп. Академии наук* 51 (1885) Suppl. 2; idem, “Академический университет в XVIII столетии, по рукописным документам архива Академии наук”, *ibid.*, Suppl. 3.

²⁰ *Отчет Императорской Академии наук по Физико-математическому и Историко-филологическому отделениям за 1889 год неперменного секретаря академика К. С. Веселовского* [*The Annual Report of the Imperial Academy of Science (Branches of Physics and Mathematics and of History and Philology) for 1889 by the Secretary of the Academy K. S. Veselovskij*] (St Petersburg 1889) 2–3.

Tolstoy's educational reform made Classical studies widespread, and brought about a flourishing of scholarship and Russian culture in the late 19th – early 20th century. When Tolstoy was a president of the Academy, the first fellow in Classical philology and archaeology of Russian origin, Petr Nikitin, was elected. This election can be considered as a culmination to all the efforts of Tolstoy to support proper Russian scholars and intellectuals as a whole.

Tolstoy's reform had been prepared in advance and well planned; in particular, it required enormous effort as it presupposed the availability of numerous teachers of ancient languages for expanding school network. The classics lacked most teachers, offering over 65 vacancies a year. As the University could not provide such a sizable number, Tolstoy set up a new type of teacher training institution and improved the preparation of Classicists in accordance with European standards.

The least costly and a rather efficient means of recruiting Classical teachers for gymnasia was mass import into Russia of young Classical scholars from abroad: Austrian Slavs, who were graduates and advanced students of Prague and Vienna Universities.²¹ They were young people, most of them Czech, who had completed a real Classical European school and were able with respective ease and in short time to learn Russian, the language related to their own, to the level that would enable them to teach Classical languages at secondary school. They improved their knowledge in Classical philology and learned Russian under supervision of special tutors in the Institute of Slavic Stipendiats in St Petersburg. A promise of handsome salary acted as a spur to the stipendiats, yet their sympathy towards Russians as well as their antipathy towards Germans being of some importance. The latter caused a scandal in St Petersburg, when the stipendiats had refused to be examined in Greek and Latin by German professors.

The Institute counted 175 graduates who worked all over Russia and wrote over 40 school manuals. Most of them took Russian citizenship and even adopted Orthodoxy. When Tolstoy introduced new statute, Slav scholars were the main instructors of Greek at senior high school. For 25 long years foreign classicists became a common feature at Russian gymnasia.

²¹ Е. Ю. Басаргина, “Из истории классического образования в России: Учительский институт славянских стипендиатов” [“From the History of Classical Education in Russia: The Teachers College for Slavic Grant holders”], *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология-XIV (чтения памяти И. М. Тронского). Материалы Международной конференции, проходившей 21–23 июня 2010 г.* I (St Petersburg 2010) 93–104.

Equally, Tolstoy turned to the German philological school in search of specialists. In 1873, under the auspices of Leipzig University, the Russian Philological Seminar was established, directed by Fr. Ritschl. Students from Russia and other countries spent three years in Leipzig on full scholarship from the Imperial Treasury. They had to attend university lectures and review Greek and Latin at the Seminar. The Seminar counted 110 graduates, about 20 annually. T. Zielinski was the most famous among them.

As a part of his reform, Tolstoy established two historic-philological institutes, one in St Petersburg (1867–1918), another in Nezhin, Ukraine (1873–1920), which trained teachers of ancient languages, Russian language and literature as well as history. For producing competent, efficient and politically reliable staff of gymnasium teachers of classics, Tolstoy preferred the professional school rather than universities.

The Institute in St Petersburg, which attracted prominent representatives of the German school of philology and promoted intellectual effort, diligence and rigour was more significant for the training of teachers of ancient languages.

The Institute in St Petersburg patterned after *École Normale Supérieure* became the most significant institution for teachers training. In contrast to universities, the Institute was directly subordinated to the Minister and all its affairs were under his vigilant surveillance. Its four-year curriculum pursued mainly a utilitarian aim. The first two years the emphasis was made on the study of Greek and Latin. Only in the last two years did students specialize in the subject they planned to teach, it could be ancient languages, history, Russian language and literature. They also had to focus on practice teaching in a gymnasium set up at the institute. For more than 50 years the Institute turned out approximately 900 instructors of classics, history and Russian literature.

As a rule, students came from poor families and therefore all of them were stipend holders and were provided with board and lodging. Tolstoy considered that the strict regime of boarding school would help students accustom themselves to proper life and shield them from the influence of revolutionary propaganda. As a result those who studied at the Institute could not enjoy the rights and freedom of university students. Moreover, in exchange for free education and full board students were to be assigned for 6 years to a gymnasium in the part of Russia indicated by Minister of Education.

However, the Institute tried to rival with the Historic-Philological Faculty of St Petersburg University and had some advantage in personnel. Most professors combined jobs at the Institute and at the University, besides that, the Institute attracted several prominent representatives

of the German school of philology. Thanks to Tolstoy's efforts, Lucian Müller from Germany, an expert in the Latin poetical language and metrics, accepted the professorship of Latin.

Greek was taught by August Nauck (1822–1892) who was invited to come to St Petersburg by the Academy in 1859.²² Nauck had graduated from the Pforta and was perfectly well aware of the advantages of Classical education and participated in discussions about Classical and practical models of education in Russia. In 1866 he published in an academic journal "Some observations on the educational significance of ancient languages". Nauck was professor for 14 years, from 1869 to 1883, which was the most difficult period of the Institute. The best pupils of Nauck achieved that level of knowledge, when "abundant and thorough reading of works of Classical literature became a source of precept and delight".²³

All the three successive rectors of the Institute were the Classical philologists to the core, just to mention Ivan Steinmann and academician Vasili Latyshev in the first place. All of them forever maintained the principles of 'classicism' as the basis of Institute's curriculum.

Thus, the state education policy was based mainly on the authority of the Academy as the higher scholarly institution of the country. Fellows of the Academy took an active part in the training of classicists, which was a key to the success of Classical education in Russia. Until the late 19th century the figure of an academic professor prevailed, like Graefe and Nauck, who combined their research with teaching and trained several generations of Classical philologists. As the result, the St Petersburg school of Classical studies was formed.

The most talented disciples of Nauck later became fellows of the Academy themselves and succeeded him after his death in the Academy and the Institute as well.

Petr Nikitin (1849–1916), an expert on Greek literature, a fine interpreter of ancient texts and inscriptions, became professor of the Historic-Philological Institute, then rector of the University, fellow and later vice-president of the Academy.²⁴

²² T. Zielinski, "August Nauck", *Biographisches Jahrbuch für Altertumskunde* XVI (1893) 1–65; П. В. Никитин. "Август Карлович Наук (некролог)", *ЖМНП* Part 285 (1892: January) 22–52.

²³ *Ibid.* 32.

²⁴ Е. Ю. Басаргина, "Petr Nikitin, the Disciple of August Nauck", *Hyperboreus* 10 (2004) 115–121; eadem, *Вице-президент Императорской Академии наук П. В. Никитин: Из истории русской науки (1867–1916 гг.)* [*The Vice-President of The Imperial Academy of Sciences P. Nikitin: From the History of Russian Science (1867–1916)*] (St Petersburg 2004).

Another disciple of Nauck, Vasili Latyshev (1903–1918), a prominent epigraphist of the Black Sea region, was director of the Historic-Philological Institute for 15 years, from 1903 to 1918.²⁵

Viktor Jernstedt (1854–1902), the first Russian papyrologist, proudly considered himself a pupil of Nauck.²⁶

These three fellows formed the section of Classical philology and Archaeology of the Academy at the end of the 19th century. The dominant position of Classical philology in the educational program resulted in the fact that in the Academy of Sciences in the 19th – early 20th centuries only philologists were represented and there were no pure ancient historians, although, according to the regulations, one of the fellows should specialise in Greek and Roman antiquities, that is, in archaeology.

Academic Archaeology

A significant role in development of Classical archaeology was played by the annexation of the Crimea in 1783, after which Russian museums received numerous finds from the Northern Black Sea region. The best specimens went to the Hermitage, which opened as a museum in 1852 and became an important centre for research in archaeology and art history. With the coming to the Hermitage of the scholars of the Academy the Imperial depository turned into a solid scholarly centre.

The first expert in ancient art was E. Koehler (1765–1838), a fellow of the Academy. Ancient art was studied by fellows of the Academy F. Graefe and especially by Ludolf Eduard Stephani (1816–1887), who in 1850 through a recommendation of Gotfried Hermann occupied the chair of Greek and Roman antiquities. For more than 30 years, Stephani was keeper of Classical antiquities in the Hermitage and conducted research on new finds. His main publication is the volume on the Bosphorus antiquities in the Hermitage. Fellows of the Academy working in the Hermitage defined principles for sorting, cataloguing, treating and editing objects of art. Thus, a new type of academic scholar emerged, who combined his research with curatorial work.

The Academy itself also owned a collection of Greek and Roman coins and other ancient objects of art, kept in the so-called Museum of Classical Archaeology, which was transferred to the Hermitage in 1894.

²⁵ И. В. Тункина, “В. В. Латышев: жизнь и ученые труды (по материалам рукописного наследия)” [“V. V. Latyshev: Life and Works (A Study of his Manuscript Heritage)”], *Рукописное наследие русских византинистов в архивах Санкт-Петербурга* (St Petersburg 1999) 172–288.

²⁶ И. В. Кукулина, “В. К. Эрнштедт: Обзор научного рукописного наследия” [“V. K. Ernstedt: A Survey of Scholarly Manuscript Heritage”], *ibid.* 68–130.

In 1859, the Archaeological Commission was set up. It was a state institution that supervised all the archaeological projects in Russia. Stephani and Latyshev collaborated with the Commission for many years. Latyshev was its deputy director from 1900–1919 and almost held a monopoly on the publication of all the ancient inscriptions found in Russia.

Special features of Academic Classical studies at the turn of the 20th century

The Russian scholars who had succeeded their German teachers in the Academy at the end of the 19th century combined European scholarly rigour with Russian originality, which was particularly manifest in the choice of themes and language for research.²⁷

One of the characteristics of the Classical studies of the period was their close links to Byzantine studies, for which Russia had a particular attention. I. Medvedev sees the reasons for this phenomenon in the fact that Byzantine world was less known, was somewhat mysterious and at the same time congenial to the Russian soul. Moreover, Russian scholars aspired to search the truth *suo Marte*, and not to follow in the steps of their Western precursors.²⁸

The flourishing of Byzantine studies in Russia evokes the name of Vasili Vasil'evsky (1838–1899), whose works encouraged Western Byzantinists to learn Russian. Vasil'evsky did not master modern languages well and avoided any personal contacts with his Western colleagues. Only Karl Krumbacher, who learned Russian in order to read Vasil'evsky in the original, came to Russia to meet Vasil'evsky and managed to establish good contact with him. Krumbacher believed that the Russian language would become some day a *lingua franca* of culture and scholarship, together with German, French, and English. Unfortunately, this did not come true (yet), but Russian Classicists liked Krumbacher's idea. The idea was very attractive to Nikitin, who wrote his works mainly in Russian, though he knew they would not receive much response in the West. He did it on principle defending competent position of Russian science.

Another important feature of Classical studies of the time was the fellows' care of the publication of the works of their deceased colleagues. Stephani edited Koehler's collected works, that opened for him the

²⁷ Е. Ю. Басаргина, *Императорская Академия наук на рубеже XIX–XX веков (Очерки истории)* [The Imperial Academy of Science at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries (Historical Essays)] (Moscow 2008).

²⁸ И. П. Медведев, *Петербургское византиноведение. Страницы истории* [Byzantine Studies in St. Petersburg: Historical Essays] (St Petersburg 2006).

doors of the Academy. Nikitin considered it to be his duty to complete the works of his colleagues, even when it impeded his own studies. So, he prepared for publication several works of Nauck, Vasil'evsky and Jernstedt. In fact, Nikitin was their co-author, but normally he did not put his name on the title, not even as an editor. Special commissions, which included Nikitin and Latyshev, were set up to edit the works of Vasil'evsky, of Porfiry Uspenski, a palaeographer and manuscript collector who discovered *inter alia* the famous Codex Sinaiticus, of K. Goerz, a researcher of antiquities of the Black Sea coast. This editorial activity can be considered as a tribute to the deceased scholars and at the same time as an honour for the editors.

By 1917, the section of Classical Philology and Archaeology of the Academy counted only one fellow, Latyshev, as Jernstedt had died in 1902 and Nikitin in 1916. In 1917, Michael Rostovzev²⁹ (1870–1952), the founder of the social-economical current of Classical studies in Russia, was elected fellow of the Academy. Latyshev promoted Alexander Nikitsky (1859–1921), an epigraphist, whose election was considered by some scholars as insult to T. Zielinski (1859–1944), the brilliant representative of the cultural-historical current, who was elected honorary fellow in 1916, which was a much lower title than ordinary fellow.³⁰ According to a joke wide-spread in the academician milieu the difference between *ordinary fellow* and *honorary fellow* was almost the same as between *Sir* (in addressing the Emperor) and *dear sir*.

After the 1917 October Revolution, the system of values in Russia changed, and Classical studies became irrelevant. Latyshev and Nikitsky died in 1921, Rostovzev left Russia in 1918, Zielinski in 1921. They both had successful careers in the West. In 1928, the Soviet Academy stripped Rostovzev of his title and rehabilitated him only in 1990. As for the Department of Literature, where Zielinski was honorary fellow, it ceased to exist in 1918.

Ekaterina Basargina

*Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
St. Petersburg Branch*

akhos@mail.ru

²⁹ G. Bongard-Levin (ed.), *Скифский роман [Scythian Novel]* (Moscow 1997); G. Bongard-Levin, Yu. Litvinenko (eds.), *Парфянский выстрел [Parthian Shot]* (Moscow 2003).

³⁰ А. К. Гаврилов, “Ф. Ф. Зелинский в контексте русской культуры” [“F. F. Zielinski in the Context of Russian Culture”], in: А. К. Гаврилов, *О филологах и филологии* (St Petersburg 2010) 101–121.

The article embraces the history of Classical studies in the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences, from its foundation in 1724 up until 1917. The author sketches the activity of Sergei Uvarov and Dmitry Tolstoy's educational reform, outlines the foundations of the Teachers College for Slavic Grant holders and Historic-philological institutes in St Petersburg and Nezhin, and describes the outstanding representatives of St Petersburg Classical scholarship of the 2nd half of the 19th and the early 20th century. In closing some data regarding the history of Russian Classical archaeology and Byzantine studies is adduced.

Статья охватывает историю российской классической филологии от создания Академии наук до 1917 г. Автор уделяет особое внимание деятельности С. С. Уварова, образовательной реформе Д. А. Толстого, рассказывает о создании Института славянских стипендиатов и историко-филологических институтов, рассматривает достижения историков и филологов кон. XIX – нач. XX вв. В заключение приводится материал по истории российской античной археологии и петербургской школы византистики.

CONTENTS

Preface	7
---------------	---

ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES AS CENTERS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP

EKATERINA BASARGINA	
Classical Studies in the St Petersburg Imperial Academy of Sciences in the 19 th – early 20 th centuries	11
ALEXANDER GAVRILOV	
Russische Institutionen des 19. Jhs und der Akademiker Avgust Karlovič Nauck	26
STEFAN REBENICH	
Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Zeit von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931), A. von Harnack (1851–1930) und E. Meyer (1855–1930) ...	44
BERND SEIDENSTICKER	
Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Berliner Akademie: Rückblick und Gegenwart	72

CLASSICS IN UNIVERSITIES: EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

WILT ADEN SCHRÖDER	
Das russische philologische Seminar in Leipzig: das Seminar unter Ritschl und Lipsius (1873–1890) und der Versuch der Wiederbegründung (1911–1913)	91
JÜRGEN V. UNGERN-STERMBERG	
Gustav Wilmanns, ein Schüler Mommsens, an der Kaiserlichen Universität Dorpat (1869–1872)	147
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
<i>Philologia inter Disciplinas</i> : The Department of Classics at St Petersburg University 1819–1884	162

ORGANIZING CLASSICS FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY

BRIAN A. SPARKES	
Classical Associations and Societies in the United Kingdom	205
CHRISTOPHER STRAY	
The Absent Academy: the Organisation of Classical Scholarship in Nineteenth-century England	214

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIETIES

YURI KALASHNIK	
Gangolf von Kieseritzky and the Classical Department of the Hermitage in the Last Decades of the 19 th Century	229
JURIJ A. VINOGRADOV	
Die Kaiserliche Archäologische Kommission und die Erforschung der klassischen Altertümer im nördlichen Schwarzmeergebiet (1859–1917) . . .	239

CLASSICAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ANNA USPENSKAJA	
Das dritte Petersburger Gymnasium	275
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
Gymnasium Classicum Petropolitanum	289
Key Words	297
Indices	
Index nominum	299
Index institutorum, sodalitatum, actorum	307
Правила для авторов	316
Guidelines for Contributors	318