

FROM CLASSICAL TO BYZANTINE ARCHAEOLOGY: RUSSIA IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE 19th CENTURY

In Russia, in the 18th and the first half of the 19th century, classical archeology was the predominant area of historical and archaeological science. It developed mainly in St. Petersburg: at the Academy of Sciences and at the Hermitage, at the University and other institutions. In the first quarter of the 19th century, scholarly societies and archaeological museums were also established in southern Russia – in Odessa and Kerch. The heyday of Byzantine Studies in St. Petersburg comprises the last quarter of the 19th century and the early 20th century (up until 1917). This new field of research was institutionalized with the establishment of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society (1882) and the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople (1894). The formation of the Eastern, Byzantine and Coptic collections at the Hermitage significantly broadened the scope of research there. Many scientists' biographies show a similar pattern of evolution from classical philology and epigraphy through Byzantine philology, history, hagiography to Byzantine epigraphy and archaeology: Vasily Vasilyevich Latyshev (1855–1921), Ivan Vasilyevich Pomyalovski (1845–1906), Yulian Andreevich Kulakovskij (1855–1919), Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov (1844–1925). The methods of classical philology, epigraphy, numismatics and archeology were the basis for the study of Byzantine sources and monuments. In the study of Byzantine art, a new field at the time, the methods of study of iconography and style go back, on the one hand, to the comparative-historical analysis in philology, and on the other, to the concepts of Johann J. Winkelmann's aesthetics.

Keywords: antiquities, classical archaeology, philology, Byzantine art and archaeology, Latyshev, Pomyalovsky, Rostovtsev, Kondakov.

В России в XVIII и первой половине XIX века классическая археология была доминирующей областью исторической и археологической науки. Она развивалась в основном в Санкт-Петербурге: в Академии наук и Эрмитаже, в университете и других учреждениях. В первой четверти XIX века научные общества и археологические музеи были созданы также на юге России – в Одессе и Керчи. Расцвет византиноведения в Санкт-Петербурге приходится на последнюю четверть XIX и начало XX века (вплоть до 1917 года). Это новое направление исследований было институционализировано с учреждением Императорского православного Палестинского общества (1882) и Русского археологического института в Константинополе (1894). Создание Восточной, византийской и коптской коллекций в Эрмитаже значительно расширило сферу его научных исследований. Биографии многих ученых демонстрируют схожую эволюцию от классической филологии и эпиграфики через византийскую филологию, историю, агиографию к византийской эпиграфике и археологии: Василий Васильевич Латышев (1855–1921), Иван Васильевич Помяловский



(1845–1906), Юлиан Андреевич Кулаковский (1855–1919), Никодим Павлович Кондаков (1844–1925). Методы классической филологии, эпиграфики, нумизматики и археологии легли в основу изучения византийских источников и памятников. В изучении византийского искусства, новой для того времени области, методы изучения иконографии и стиля восходят, с одной стороны, к сравнительно-историческому анализу в филологии, а с другой – к концепциям эстетики Иоганна Й. Винкельмана.

Ключевые слова: древности, классическая археология, филология, византийское искусство и археология, Латышев, Помяловский, Ростовцев, Кондаков.

In Russia, at the inception of interest in Byzantine Studies, we see a gradual transition from classical philology to the study of written sources on the history of early Christianity and Byzantium, and a similarly transition from the philological studies to historical and archaeological and art historical studies. The heyday of Byzantine Studies in St. Petersburg comprises the last quarter of the 19th century and the early 20th century, up until the early 1920's, the time of the establishment of the Soviet Government with its Marxist ideology. In St. Petersburg, the Imperial Archaeological Commission (1859–1919) was the main agency established to guide the archaeological field works for all of Russia. The first specialized center was the Christian Museum at the Academy of Fine Arts (1856) (Khrushkova 2011: 229–252). Unlike St. Petersburg, Moscow saw the development of Slavonic and Old Russian archaeology and art history, including the Byzantine dimension, and also a broad study of the Caucasus. In 1864, Count Aleksey Sergeevich Uvarov (1828–1884) (Khrushkova 2012a: 1263–1264) founded the Moscow Archaeological Society. Every three years in different cities of Russia, the Society convened Archaeological Congress. An important role was played by the museums: the Moscow Public and the Rumyantsev Museums (1862) and the Moscow Museum of History (1883). Specialized Museums of ecclesiastical antiquities existed at the Theological Academies in Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kiev.

Thus, by the early 1870's, when systematic Byzantine studies were widespread in Russia. The special interest Russian scientists took in the Christian East was reflected in the creation of two major research centers: the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society (1882) and the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople (1894) (Khrushkova 2012b: 220–232). We note one special nuance. In Russia, in the 1860's–1870's, Classical studies were especially cultivated. There was belief in the conservative government and public circles that the values of classical culture contribute to the strengthening of the moral fabric of society, while the natural sciences were thought to contribute to the spread of materialism and atheism. The methods of research of written, epigraphic and archaeological sources (*the critical analysis*) of the classical era were developed earlier than in the field of Byzantine Studies. Many scientists' biographies in

Russia show a similar pattern of evolution from classical philology and epigraphy through Byzantine philology, history and hagiography to Christian and Byzantine epigraphy, numismatics and archaeology.

One of the founders of Latin philology and epigraphy in Russia was Ivan V. Pomyalovskiy (1845–1906) (Khrushkova 2012a: 1032–1033). After graduating from the St. Petersburg University (1868), Pomyalovskiy spent several years studying epigraphy at the Universities of Berlin and Leipzig, and then in Rome and in other Italian cities. In 1873 Pomyalovskiy defended his doctoral thesis *Epigraphic Studies* and he moves on to the study of Christian epigraphy. In 1881 he published his *Collection of Greek and Latin inscriptions from the Caucasus*, from both the Classical and the Christian eras. Then he turned to the study of important sources on the history of Early Christian Palestine and Jerusalem. In the Orthodox Palestinian Collection (*Pravoslavnyi Palestinskii Sbornik*), Pomyalovskiy made a series of Russian translations of the most important narrative and hagiographic sources. Palestine was where Russia's classical philology came face-to-face with the activities of the Russian Orthodox Church. Research of Palestine had been started by the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in 1843–1844 under the leadership of Archimandrite Porfiryi Uspenskiy. Later the Mission further expanded its activities, thanks to the energy of Archimandrite Antonin Kapustin (1817–1894), who led the mission in 1865–1894. This activity was continued by the Orthodox Palestine Society. An important source that attracted general interest was the Pilgrim's Diary of the last quarter of the 4th century. In 1881, the Italian archaeologist Giovanni Francesco Gamurrini (1835–1923), discovered a medieval manuscript. It contained a description of a similar journey undertaken in the 4th century. Several years later, Gamurrini published the *Editio Princeps* of the source (Gamurrini 1886: 1–97). A mere 3 years after Gamurrini's publication, came Pomyalovskiy's Russian translation. Pomyalovskiy's publication actually became the first edition of *Peregrinatio* provided with detailed scientific comment, which greatly exceeds the volume of the text itself.

Next Pomyalovskiy published Russian translations of a number of sources about the geography and topography of Palestine: *Theodosius de situ terrae sanctae*, of the early 6th century, *Onomastikon* of Eusebius of Caesarea, St Jerome's *On the location and name-places of Jewish localities* (p. 388), *Antonini Placentini Itinerarium*, late 6th century, *Description of the Holy Land* by Bishop Arculf, *Arculfi relatio de Locis Sanctis* (p. 670). During the same period, Pomyalovskiy published several translations of hagiographical sources. Philological and historico-archaeological commentary on the text of the sources ran to hundreds of pages. Pomyalovskiy's editions were distinguished by a wide comparative analysis of Latin, Greek and Slavonic versions of the sources, with the addition of the precise textual analysis developed by classical philology. In Russia, Pomyalovskiy's translation became the basis for the study of early Christian archaeolo-



gy in Palestine. Byzantine art historian Dmitriy Vlas'evič Ainalov (1862–1939), explored the Palestinian motives in the early Christian mosaics in Rome, the topography of Constantinian structures in Palestine and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem (Khrushkova 2012a: 53–54). Ainalov's discussion with Josef Strzygowski (1852–1940) about the original appearance of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is also based on Pomyalovskiy's works (Khrushkova 2013: 551–560; 2015: 173–189).

Vasilij Vasil'evič Latyšev (1855–1921) was an Academician of the Petersburg Academy of Sciences (1893), a Corresponding Member of the Academies of Berlin, Paris, Rome and Athens, and of many other scientific societies (Khrushkova 2012a: 792–793). If Pomyalovskiy was Russia's leading Latinist, then Latyshev was the outstanding Russian Hellenist. In 1882 he began to work on the development of a fundamental Corpus of Greek and Latin inscriptions from the southern regions of Russia. This Corpus, published in Latin (Latyshev 1885, 1890, 1901) was reprinted in Germany as well (Latyshev 1965). Some works by Latyšev on Greek epigraphy were published in the *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, the Athens Department* (Latishev 1884: 209–231; 1885: 113–130). In 1890–1900 he carried out a great deal of work in the museums in Western Europe. At that time, he embarked on a major new work: the publication of excerpts from works of six hundred Greek and Latin authors, which contain information about the peoples and tribes that had lived on the territory of the Russian Empire (*Scythica et Caucasica*). The authors were primarily from the classical era. The need to extend the chronological framework of the work led Latyšev to an analysis of a complex of Byzantine narrative and hagiographical sources. These were published in a separate volume (1916). After the death of Latyšev, came the publication of Reports of Byzantine authors on the North Black Sea.

In the 1890's, Latyšev turns broadly to Christian and Byzantine themes. He publishes *Studies on Byzantine epigraphy* and *Collection of Christian inscriptions from the South of Russia*, which included 117 inscriptions. Beginning in 1906, Latyšev publishes a number of hagiographical sources from Greek manuscripts. In addition, Latyšev studied manuscripts preserved in the Library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate and the Sinai monastery. In 1909 Latyšev publishes a collection of articles on the ancient history, geography, archaeology and epigraphy of the Black Sea. Together with Afanasyi I. Papadopulo-Kerameus (1856–1912), Latyšev published the series *The Passions of Palestinian and Syrian Saints*, with the Greek text and the Russian translation, and *Materials for the history of the Archdiocese of Mount Sinai*. Among Latyšev's significant works from this period was the publication of the Russian translation of *The Passion of St George*. Then he published *The Passion of St. Bishops of Chersoneses*, the most important source on the history of early Christianity in the Crimea. *The History of Christi-*

anity in the Caucasus was written on the basis of a group of Byzantine lapidary inscriptions found on the Caucasian Black Sea coast. The Byzantine theme in Latyšev's work was further continued with his study of a group of Byzantine church calendars: the so-called *Royal Menologium* (*Tsarskaya Mineya*) and *Menologii anonymi byzantini saeculi decimi quae supersunt*, reprinted in Leipzig in 1970. The *Passion the Patriarch of Constantinople Theophane the Confessor*, was published in 1918. In the Soviet period, when atheism was vigorously asserted as the only ideology, it was virtually impossible to continue research in this area. Latyšev began translating texts of Byzantine authors for the *Constantinus Porphyrogenitus* Commission, created by the Academy of Sciences in April 1918. It went on for five years under the extremely difficult conditions of civil war and general devastation. Latyšev's works used the multi-disciplinary approach, many of his works retain their relevance to this day (Khrushkova 2007: 96–98; 2008: 141–142).

Yulian Andreevič Kulakovskiy (1855–1919) represented the Moscow philological school. After graduating from the Historico-Philological Faculty of the Moscow University in 1876, he spent two years (1878–1880) studying classical philology at the Universities of Bonn, Tübingen and Berlin. He attended a course in Roman Epigraphy read by Theodor Mommsen. The main theme of his research: the history of the early period of Rome, this would become the subject of his doctoral thesis. Kulakovskiy did much work in the field of Antique history and archaeology of the southern regions of Russia. On request from the Imperial Archaeological Commission, he excavated the ancient monuments in the eastern part of the Crimea, in the ancient Panticapaeum. In the Roman-era necropolis on the slopes of Mount Mithridates, he discovered two tombs with Christian paintings (the “Catacombs”), one of them depicting crosses and a Psalm text, exactly dated to 491, a very rare instance of precise dating for an Early Christian painting. The history of Christianity became a major theme of Kulakovskiy's work. At first his interest is directed towards Roman antiquity. In April 1903, Rome hosted the International Congress of Historical Sciences, which was attended by about 250 historians, including 10 scholars from Russia. Kulakovskiy delivered a presentation about the features of a group of ancient graves containing bones painted with red paint. He also participated in international congresses of historians in Berlin (1909) and Leiden (1912). Next Kulakovskiy systematically studies Byzantine history, specifically the relationship of the Eastern Roman Empire with its neighbours. He published a series of works about the spread of Christianity among the tribes in the Crimea and the Caucasus: the Gothi, the Alani and the Abazgi. Kulakovskiy's major book is his *History of Byzantium* in three volumes. He believed that “history as an entity enters the broad concept of philology”, and by philology he meant “a living knowledge of the monument”, written or archaeological (Khrushkova 2012a: 769–770).



Nikodim Pavlovič Kondakov (1844–1925) is one of the most important Russian scholars, one of the pioneers in the study of Byzantine art in Europe and the founder of this branch of science in Russia (Кызласова 1985; 2004; Foletti 2011; 2017; Khrushkova 2012a: 751–754; 2012b: 90–106; Хрушкова 2018: 260–295). One of Kondakov's students, Mikhail Ivanovič Rostovtsev (1870–1952) (Бонгард-Левин 1997) gave this assessment of his teacher's contribution to Byzantine studies: “There was a need to create a new discipline, to construct a new branch of knowledge, to demolish entrenched prejudices... Nikodim Pavlovič can be truly considered the creator of a scientific history of Byzantine art” (Ростовцев 1916: 3). At the heart of the formation of Kondakov's research methods was his experience of the study of classical art, which for decades had been based on the principles of classical aesthetics of Johann Joachim Winkelmann (1717–1768). Kondakov's teacher was Karl Karlovič Görtz (1820–1883), Professor of Art History at the Historico-Philological Faculty of the Moscow University, who read a course on the history of Greek Classical art (Малеин 1912: 106–107). In 1870 Kondakov himself took the chair of Art History at the Novorossiysk University.

In his first public lecture, “The Science of Classical Archaeology and the Theory of Art”, Kondakov examines problems of theory, in particular, the relationship between archaeology and history of art. He would continue to ponder this issue, evolving a preference for a multilateral approach, based on analysis of all aspects and all sources examined in their historical context. Thus, in his book on Constantinople, he aims to “paint a living picture” of the history of the Byzantine capital. At the time, the term “multi-disciplinary method” did not exist, but that is, in essence, what Kondakov has in mind, when he speaks of the “separation” of archaeology and art history as unnecessary, “one-sided and abnormal” (Кондаков 1872). The topic of Kondakov's Master's thesis was the symbolism of Greek Classical art. It used the example of the so-called “*Harpy Monument*” of *Xanthos in Lycia* (Кондаков 1873). Kondakov engaged in practical field archaeology: over the course of 1876–1891, he excavated Antique and Byzantine monuments in the Crimea: in Chersonesos, Panticapaeum, Nymphaion, and in the Kuban region, in the North-East Black Sea Coast.

Among Kondakov's other teachers was philologist and art historian Fedor Ivanovič Buslaev (1818–1897), Professor of the Moscow University (Medvedkova 2012: 385–404; Khrushkova 2012a: 248–249). Early in his career, he spent over two years in Italy, exploring museums and monuments with the then obligatory small volume of Winkelmann in his hands. It is no accident that the Russian translation (1798) of the famous work “*Geschichte der Kunst bei den Alten*” (Winkelmann 1764) was published in pocket format designed specifically for travelers. In his study of Old Russian manuscript art and iconography, Buslaev used the method of comparative analysis developed by philology. The

same method is applied by Kondakov in his dissertation on Byzantine miniature. Much of this work was written in Rome, a city that he especially loved (and to which he paid nearly twenty visits). On his first trip in 1875, Kondakov studies the topography, archaeology and art of ancient Rome, attending the lectures of Rodolfo Lanciani (1845–1929) (Palombi 2012: 782–784), Wolfgang Helbig (1849–1915) and other Roman archaeologists.

But the main purpose of Kondakov was the study of Byzantine manuscripts in the *Bibliotheca Apostolica*. Kondakov's work was the first presentation of a coherent history of Byzantine manuscript art, setting out the stages of its evolution based on dated monuments. Translated into French, this book made Kondakov well-known in Western Europe (Kondakov 1886–1891). Kondakov's deep knowledge of classical art enabled him to develop the idea of the long-term preservation of classical tradition within Byzantine art as an important feature of Byzantine tradition. The importance of this finding was highlighted in the Introduction to the book by Leipzig University Professor Anton H. Springer (1825–1891): "*L'auteur russe nous prouve que l'antiquité classique a longtemps vécu à travers les formes byzantines*" (Springer 1886: 12). Later, the idea of the vitality of the Classical heritage in the Byzantine tradition was to be developed in the works of Russian and French archaeologists and art historians: Kondakov's student Dmitryi V. Ainalov (1862–1939) (Khrushkova 2012b: 53–54) and Gabriel Millet (1867–1953) (Heid 2012: 913–914).

In Russia one of the first researchers who offered detailed and well-founded critical analysis of Joseph Wilpert's substantial study on Roman catacombs was Dmitryi Ainalov. His main theses were, firstly, that the style and technique of the catacomb's paintings have necessary been studied in the context of the art history in general and, secondly, that complete comparison is required between early Christian paintings and pieces of the pagan art, in particular, with the paintings from Pompeii (Khrushkova 2015: 173–189). Ainalov's thesis about the existence of close relations between Christian and pagan art anticipated the attitudes of Theodor Klauser (1894–1984) (Heid 2012: 738–740) and other representatives of the Bonn School that fiercely argued against Josef Wilpert's (1857–1944) (Heid 2012: 1323–1325) ideas in 1960–70-s. In the recent studies by the Roman School of Christian Archaeology the opinions similar to Ainalov's view are put forth, though of course western scholars haven't been acquainted with his works (Saxer 1998: 126–127; Bisconti 2007: 249–259).

The renowned modern Byzantinist Cyril Mango made accurate observations about the method used by Kondakov and Ainalov. In the Preface to the English translation of Ainalov's book, *The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Art*, he writes that this method is primarily philological in its broader application: "artifacts are used as intermediary links in a chain of transmission leading up to some lost original"; "Just as the classical scholar is able, on the basis of a few



medieval manuscripts, to reconstruct the text of an ancient author”, so Ainalov sought to define the roles of Alexandria, Antioch and Palestinian schools in the formation of Byzantine art (Mango 1961: XII). A similar thought is expressed by Kondakov. As we can see, in the study of Byzantine art, a new field at the time, the methods of study of iconography and style go back to the comparative-historical analysis of Classical philology.

Together with Ivan Ivanovič Tolstoy (1858–1916), Kondakov published, over ten years, the monumental series “Russian Antiquities” in six volumes (Кондаков, Толстой: 1889–1899). The first three volumes examined Classical monuments, the other three volumes were devoted to Medieval and Byzantine monuments. Salomon Reinach (1858–1932) published a French translation of the first three volumes (Kondakov, Tolstoï, Reinach: 1891–1893). In Western Europe, there was a greater interest in the monuments of Classical Antiquity in Russia. However, for Kondakov, these widely diverse “Russian Antiquities” were united by historical concept aptly formulated by Rostovtsev: Kondakov “was the first to arrive at a productive understanding of the intimate, century-old connection of Russian art with the Greek world, on the one hand, and with the East, on the other”, which is why he treated the Classical monuments of southern Russia as part of the “Russian Antiquities” (Ростовцев 1916: 3).

Mikhail Ivanovič Rostovtsev (1870–1952) was to become probably the best known of Kondakov’s students. Though never becoming a Byzantinist, this distinguished historian of the ancient world twice attended the course of lectures read by August Mau (1840–1909) on the ruins of Pompeii. Rostovtsev took part in the excavation of the city and formed a long-running interest in ancient painting. It was at that time that Rostovtsev began studying funerary painting of the Roman era in Kerč, in the necropolis on the slopes of Mount Mithridates. Rostovtsev’s study of the Hellenistic-Roman architectural landscape was published first in Russian and in German (Rostovcev 1911).

Rostovtsev was particularly interested in the evolution of the Pagan landscape in the Early Christian painting. This innovative approach was developed in his monumental work on ancient decorative painting in the South of Russia. The notion of the link between the geometric dissection of surface of walls and arch paintings of the Roman catacombs on the one hand, and the simplified Pompeian styles on the other, has become widely accepted (Bisconti 2006: 73–77). After recent hot discussions concerning the chronology of the funeral paintings in Crimea, the Rostovtsev’s plausible view, that they are dated to 4–5th centuries has again prevailed (Khrushkova 2015: 183–184). Rostovtsev came to similar conclusions over a century ago, however his monograph on ancient paintings in southern Russia has only recently become known to Western readers through translation into French (Rostovtseff 2003–2004). According to Louis Duchesne, Theodor Mommsen “<...> entre dans l’érudition ecclésiastique comme un rhi-

nocéros dans un champ de vigne, écrasant à droite et à gauche, sans s'émouvoir du dégât" (from the letter of Louis Duchesne to Giovanni B. de Rossi, dated 13 November 1892. Saint-Roch 1995: 688). The book on ancient paintings in southern Russia, one of Rostovtsev's best works, was dedicated to his teacher Kondakov, another sign that in Russia, studies of the classical world and Byzantium existed in a common and undivided space.

References

- Bisconti, Fabrizio. "Prime decorazioni nelle catacombe romane. Prove di laboratorio, invenzioni e remakes". [In:] N. Fiocchi, J. G. Vincenzo (eds.) *Origine delle catacombe romane. Atti del giornata tematica dei Seminari di Archeologia Cristiana* (Roma, 21 marzo 2005). Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana 2006: 65–90.
- Bisconti, Fabrizio. "Giuseppe Wilpert: iconografo – iconologo – storico dell'arte". [In:] S. Heid (ed.) *Giuseppe Wilpert. Archeologo Cristiano. Atti del Convegno* (Roma, 16–19 maggio 2007). Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 2007: 249–259.
- Foletti, Ivan. *Da Bisanzio alla Santa Russia. Nikodim Kondakov (1844–1925) e la nascita della Storia dell'arte in Russia*. Roma: Viella, 2011.
- Foletti, Ivan. *From Byzantium to Holy Russia. Nikodim Kondakov (1844–1925) and the Invention of the Icon*. Roma: Viella, 2017.
- Gamurrini, Gian Francesco. "*S. Silviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta annis fere 385–388*". *Studi e documenti di storia e diritto* VII, 1886: 1–97.
- Heid, Stefan. "Fortuné-Eugène-Gabriel Millet". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 913–914.
- Heid, Stefan. "Josef/Giuseppe Wilpert". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 1323–1325.
- Heid, Stefan. "Theodor Klauser". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 738–740.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Krim (Chersonesus Taurica)". *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* VII, 22, 2007: 75–125.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Chersonesos in the Crimea: the First Christian Buildings (4th–5th centuries)". *Antiquité Tardive* 16, 2008: 141–158.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Geschichte der Christlichen Archäologie in Russland vom 18. bis ins 20. Jahrhundert" (1. Folge). *Römische Quartalschrift* 106, 3–4, 2011: 229–252.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Aleksij Sergeevič Uvarov". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 1263–1264.



- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Dmitrij Vlas'evič Ajnalov". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 53–54.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Fedor Ivanovič Buslaev". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 248–249.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Geschichte der Christlichen Archäologie in Russland vom 18, bis ins 20. Jahrhundert" (2. Folge). *Römische Quartalschrift* 107, 1–2, 2012b: 74–119.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Geschichte der Christlichen Archäologie in Russland vom 18, bis ins 20. Jahrhundert" (3. Folge). *Römische Quartalschrift* 107, 3–4, 2012b: 202–248.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Geschichte der Christlichen Archäologie in Russland vom 18, bis ins 20. Jahrhundert" (5. Folge). *Römische Quartalschrift* 109, 1–2, 2014: 134–165.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Ivan Vasilievič Pomyalovskij". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012a: 1032–1033.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Josef Strzygowski, Joseph Wilpert and the Russian School of Byzantine Studies". *Cahiers Archéologiques* 56, 2015: 173–189.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Nikodim Pavlovič Kondakov". S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner 2012a: 751–754.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Vasilij Vasil'evič Latyšev". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012: 792–793.
- Khrushkova, Liudmila G. "Viktor Nikitič Lazarev". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten*. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012, 799–801.
- Kondakov, Nikodim. *Histoire de l'art byzantin considéré principalement dans les miniatures*, 2 vols. Paris–London: Bibliothèque internationale de l'art, 1886–1891.
- Kondakov, Nikodim, Ivan Tolstoj, Salomon Reinach. *Antiquités de la Russie méridionale*. Vols. 1–2. Paris.: E. Leroux, 1891–1893.
- Kulakovsky, Yulian A. "Eine altchristliche Grabkammer in Kerč aus dem Jahre 491". *Römische Quartalschrift* 8, 1894: 49–87.
- Latischev, Vasiliy V. "Die in Russland befindlichen griechischen Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 9, 1884: 209–231.
- Latischev, Vasiliy V. "Die in Russland befindlichen griechischen Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 10, 1885: 113–130.
- Latischev, Vasiliy V. *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxinii graecae et latinae*. I, 1885; II, 1890; IV, Supplementa. 1901, I (2nd ed.), Petropoli: 1916.
- Latischev, Vasiliy V. *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxinii graecae et latinae*. Hildesheim, 1965.

- Mango, Cyril. "Editor's Preface". [In:] D. V. Ainalov. *The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Art*, New Brunswick: N. J. Rutgers University Press, 1961.
- Mau, August. *Geschichte der dekorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji*. Berlin: G. Reimer 1882.
- Medvedkova, Olga. "Fedor Buslaev (1818–1897) à l'origine de l'histoire de l'art médiéval en Russie". *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 53/2–3, 2012: 385–404.
- Palombi, Domenico. "Amedeo Rodolfo Giuseppe Filippo Lanciani". [In:] S. Heid, M. Dennert (Hg.) *Personenlexikon zur christlichen Archäologie*. Forscher und Persönlichkeiten. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2012, 782–784.
- Rostovtzeff, Michael I. *Hellenistisch-römische Architekturlandschaft*. Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung. Bd. 26, 1–2. Rom: 1911.
- Rostovtzeff, Mikhail I. *La peinture décorative antique en Russie Méridionale*. Paris: De Boccard 2003–2004.
- Saint-Roch, Patrick (ed.). *Correspondance de Giovanni Battista de Rossi et de Louis Duchesne (1873–1894)*. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1995.
- Saxer, Victor. "Cent ans d'archéologie chrétienne: La contribution des archéologues romains à l'élaboration d'une science autonome". [In:] N. Cambi, E. Marin (eds.) *Acta XIII Congressus internationalis archaeologiae christianae*, Split-Poreč 25.9.–1.10.1994. Vol. I. Città del Vaticano-Split: Arheološki muzej, 1998: 115–162.
- Springer, Anton. "Introduction". N. Kondakoff. *Histoire de l'art byzantine considéré principalement dans les miniatures*. Vol. 1. Paris: Bibliothèque internationale de l'art 1886.
- Wes, Marinus Antony, Michael Rostovtzeff. *Historian in Exile. Russian Roots in an American context*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990.
- Winkelman, Joachim J. *Geschichte der Kunst bei den Alten*. Wien: Akademischen Verlage, 1776.
- Кызласова, Ирина Л. *История изучения византийского и древнерусского искусства в России (Ф. И. Буслаев, Н. П. Кондаков: методы, идеи, теории)*. Москва: Издательство Московского Университета 1985.
- [Kyzlasova, Irina L. *Istoriia izucheniiā vizantiiskogo i drevnerusskogo iskusstva v Rossii (F. I. Buslaev, N. P. Kondakov: metody, idei, teorii)*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta 1985]
- Кызласова, Ирина Л. (сост.) *Мир Кондакова. Публикации, статьи, Каталог выставки*. Москва: Русский Путь, 2004.
- [Kyzlasova, Irina L. (sost.) *Mir Kondakova. Publikatsii, stat'i, Katalog vystavki*. Moskva: Russkii Put', 2004]
- Хрушкова, Людмила Г. «Н. П. Кондаков в зарубежной научной литературе». [В:] В. В. Майко, Т. Ю. Яшаева (ред.) *Археология античного и средневекового города. Севастополь – Калининград: РОСТ-ДООАФК*, 2018, 260–295.
- [Khrushkova, Liudmila G. «N. P. Kondakov v zarubezhnoi nauchnoi literature». [V:] V. V. Maiko, T. Iu Iashaeva (red.) *Arkheologiiā antichnogo i srednevekovogo goroda. Sevastopol' – Kaliningrad: ROST-DOAFK*, 2018, 260–295]



Људмила Г. Хрушкова

ОД КЛАСИЧНЕ ПРЕМА ВИЗАНТИЈСКОЈ АРХЕОЛОГИЈИ: РУСИЈА У ПОСЛЕДЊИМ ДЕЦЕНИЈАМА 19. ВЕКА

Резиме

У 18. и у првој половини 19. века у Русији је преовлађујућа област историјске и археолошке науке била класична археологија. Развијала се углавном у Санкт Петербургу: у оквиру Академије наука и Ермитажа, на универзитету и у другим установама. У првој четвртини 19. века научна друштва и археолошки музеји били су основани и на југу Русије – у Одеси и Керчу. Процват византологије у Санкт Петербургу пада на последњу четвртину 19. и почетак 20. века (све до 1917. године). Тај нови правац истраживања био је институционализован оснивањем Императорског православног Палестинског друштва 1882. и Руског археолошког института у Константинопољу 1894. године. Заснивање источне, византијске и коптске колекције у Ермитажу значајно је проширило сферу његових научних истраживања. Биографије многих научника показују сличан развој од класичне филологије и епиграфике преко византијске филологије, историје и хагиографије до византијске епиграфике и археологије: Василиј Васиљевич Латишев (1855–1921), Иван Васиљевич Помјаловски (1845–1906), Јулијан Андрејевич Кулаковски (1855–1919) и Никодим Павлович Кондаков (1844–1925). Методе класичне филологије, епиграфике, нумизматике и археологије легле су у основу проучавања византијских извора и споменика. У проучавању византијске уметности, у то време новој области, методе проучавања иконографије и стила с једне стране потичу од филолошке упоредно-историјске анализе, а с друге од естетичких концепција Јохана Ј. Винкелмана.

Кључне речи: старина, класична археологија, филологија, византијска уметност и археологија, Латишев, Помјаловски, Ростовцев, Кондаков.