

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὔροις
ἔς Ἑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29-30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA
DENIS KEYER DMITRI PANCHENKO
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 19

2013

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H.BECK MÜNCHEN

INSTITUTIONS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP
in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

INSTITUTIONEN DER ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT
in den 19. und 20. Jahrhunderten

АНТИКОВЕДЧЕСКИЕ ИНСТИТУТЫ
В XIX–XX ВВ.

EDIDERUNT

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA DENIS KEYER
DMITRI PANCHENKO ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

adiuvantibus

Valentina Khodareva Daria Kondakova
Natalia Kuznetsova Jr. Tatiana Shaburina
Arsenij Vetushko-Kalevich Vera Zhizhina-Gefter

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
PETROPOLI
MMXIV

INSTITUTIONS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP
in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

INSTITUTIONEN DER ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT
in den 19. und 20. Jahrhunderten

АНТИКОВЕДЧЕСКИЕ ИНСТИТУТЫ
в XIX–XX вв.

ПОД РЕДАКЦИЕЙ

Н. А. АЛМАЗОВОЙ, А. Л. ВЕРЛИНСКОГО (*отв. ред.*),
С. К. ЕГОРОВОЙ, Д. В. КЕЙЕРА, Д. В. ПАНЧЕНКО

при участии

А. А. Вегушко-Калевича, В. Б. Жижиной-Гефтер,
Д. Д. Кондаковой, Н. А. Кузнецовой-мл.,
В. А. Ходаревой, Т. В. Шабуриной

Санкт-Петербург
BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
2014

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-STERNBERG	
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

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English

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

PHILOLOGIA INTER DISCIPLINAS:
THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
AT ST PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY 1819–1884*

The following essay is the first attempt at a history of the Department of Classics at St Petersburg University in the nineteenth century. Starting out as a rather modest pedagogical institution for the teaching of Greek and Latin to students who had poor Latin and Greek at school, in the 1880s and the era of classicist reform it emerged as an educational and scholarly center. By the end of the century it had four chairs for ordinary professors and numbered among its professors such famous classicists as F. F. (Th.) Zielinski, M. I. Rostovcev, G. F. Cereteli and S. A. Zhebelev. Remaining philological not only in its official name but in its prevailing methods of teaching and scholarship, it also embraced *Hilfsdisziplinen* such as paleography, epigraphy, and papyrology; even archeology, art history, and ‘pure’ history itself were represented by Rostovcev and Zhebelev.

This institute was destroyed after the October Revolution of 1917, officially closed in 1926, and was restored in 1932 though on a very modest scale, being reduced to its initial form of a purely philological department with a small teaching staff again designed to educate Greekless and Latinless students since Classical languages had been abandoned in the schools. The surviving members of the old department and its students – Zhebelev, A. I. Malein, I. I. Tolstoj – helped the old habits of teaching and scholarship to persist even in the years when Classics were almost completely prohibited. This tradition of teaching grammar and reading the Classical texts is the primary link to the department’s glorious past. But the Soviet and post-Soviet eras also kept the universalist historic-philological tradition of the old department alive with outstanding scholars

* I gratefully acknowledge my debt to the forthcoming articles written by Professor Vera Smyshljaeva for the *Словарь Петербургских Антикovedов = СПА* [Dictionary of St Petersburg Classical Scholars] (the edition of the Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana, in progress) that will be further cited. I am grateful also to G. B. Kotov, who helped me in collecting material on personal membership, teaching subjects and defence of dissertations. Thanks also to Kevin McAleer for quick and effective language corrections.

such as S. Ia. Lur'e = Salomo Luria (Greek Epigraphy and History, Antiphon and Democritus, Greek mathematics), A. I. Dovatur (studies of Herodotus and of Aristotle's *Politics* and *Athenaion Politeia*), A. I. Zaicev (the phenomenon of Greek wonder, science and philosophy) and even Ia. M. Borovskij (work on Lucretius), the most philological of them all. It is hoped that it will survive into the future even if the present situation for Russian scholarship is not exactly encouraging.

This paper is by no means a history of this institution. Any such history is still to be written on the basis of archival documents which will certainly correct much of what is said here. I am relying mainly on printed sources and gratefully acknowledge my debt to the literature as cited in the notes. I have tried to trace certain tendencies in the department's initial development, stressing the relation between classical philology and ancient history and focusing on its institutional, scholarly and educational aspects both inside the department and beyond – though it proved impossible to pursue this study beyond the year 1884 when Classical studies at the university were forcibly expanded. I hope to revisit the remaining part of this pre-revolutionary history as well as the post-revolutionary period on some future occasion.

I. Foundation: Christian-Friedrich Graefe

The history of the Department of Classics starts in 1819, the date of the re-foundation of St Petersburg University. The first professor, Christian Friedrich Graefe (Gräfe / Fedor Bogdanovich Grefe, 1780–1851),¹ a native of Chemnitz in Saxony, studied at Chemnitz Lyceum

¹ For Graefe's biography see Memoir of Graefe with his autobiographic notes in *Годичный Торжественный Акт в императорском Санкт-Петербургском университете, бывший 8 февраля 1852 года* [*The Annual Ceremonial Act at the Imperial St Petersburg University*] (St Petersburg 1852); Ф. Фортунатов, "Воспоминания о Санкт-Петербургском университете за 1830–33 г." [F. Fortunatov, "Memoir of St Petersburg University in the Years 1830–1833"], *Русский архив* 11 (1869 [1870]) 306–340; В. Григорьев, *Императорский С.-Петербургский университет в течение первых пятидесяти лет его существования. Историческая записка* [V. Grigorjev, *The Imperial St Petersburg University in the Course of the First Fifty Years of Its Existence*] (St Petersburg 1870); С. Bursian, "Gräfe, Christian Friedrich", *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 9 (1879) 555 f.; Georg Schmidt (Егор Шмид), "Zur russischen Gelehrten Geschichte. S. S. Uwarov und Christian Friedrich Gräfe", *Russische Revue* 26 (1886) 77–108, 156–167; J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* III (Cambridge 1908) 388 f.; Э. Д. Фролов, *Русская наука об античности* [E. D. Frolov, *Russian Classical Scholarship*] (St Petersburg 2006) 169–170, and now В. П. Смышляева, "Ф. Б. Грефе" [V. P. Smyshljaeva, "F. B. Graefe"] in *СИА* (n. *).

and then at the University of Leipzig (1799–1805), first devoting himself to theology (Cand. Theol. 1803) and then to Classics with Gottfried Hermann (1772–1848); Graefe belonged to the first generation of pupils studying under the great Hellenist (Master's degree = PhD, 1805).² In 1806 Hermann offered him a position as tutor in Livonia, which he accepted after long hesitation. Graefe spent four years here in the family of a distinguished and well-educated Livonian nobleman, Karl Gustav Samson von Himmelstjerna zu Urbs, who was at that time the *Landrath* and afterward the *Landmarschall* of Livonia;³ later, in 1812, as a professor in St Petersburg, he married Hedwig, the third daughter of Karl Gustav Samson. In 1810 Graefe arrived in St Petersburg as a professor of Greek at the Theological Academy.⁴

Soon after his arrival Graefe made the acquaintance of the young enlightened Russian aristocrat and admirer of Classicism, Sergej Semenovich Uvarov (1786–1855)⁵ and became his Greek tutor (Uvarov later

² Hermann became extraordinary professor in 1798 and soon after that founded the *Griechische Gesellschaft*, which was his seminar. Graefe was a member of the seminar *inter alios* with F. W. Thiersch (1784–1860) and F. Passow (1786–1833; future author of the *Handwörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*). See Graefe's warm recollection of his conversion from theology to philology, of the *Griechische Gesellschaft* and his fellow students in the Preface to the edition of Greek inscriptions (below n. 27) dedicated to his teacher. Graefe's discipleship to Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812), also a native of Chemnitz, mentioned by Fortunatov (n. 1) 316, could not be traced; provided that it is correct, it would mean that Graefe spent some time at Göttingen during his university years.

³ On von Himmelstjerna zu Urbs see the biography of Reinhold, Karl Gustav's son, the outstanding public figure of Lifland who studied philosophy and law in Leipzig from 1796 to 1798, somewhat earlier than Graefe: W. v. Bock, "Samson von Himmelstjerna, Reinhold", *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 30 (1890) 317 ff.

⁴ At this time, in the absence of a university, the Academy became the most important educational institution in St Petersburg. According to the *Memoir* (n. 1), the chair of Greek at the Academy was established for Graefe in 1809 by M. M. Speranskij, who at the time was head of the Russian government, apparently in connection with reform of the Academy in accord with the new ordinance (Speranskij himself was an alumnus and later professor of the Academy). Graefe came only a year later, after his official designation by Prince A. N. Golitsin, the head of the Church administration (обер-прокурор Синода). The circumstances of this invitation are not entirely clear. According to Schmidt (n. 1) 80, Graefe was called by Speranskij based on the recommendation of Graefe's employer, K. G. S. von Himmelstjerna zu Urbs. But Fortunatov (n. 1) 317 n. 8 cites the recollection of Karl August Böttiger (Беттиг(х)ер 1779 [1777?] – 1848), former Lutheran superintendent in Odessa and the teacher in the family of Graf N. P. Panin, that Graefe was invited on his advice.

⁵ Uvarov (later Graf) held prominent positions during the reign of Alexander I – he was curator of the St Petersburg educational district (1810–1821) and president of the Academy of Sciences (1818–1855); he had to leave the former position during the

carried on a correspondence with Goethe).⁶ Uvarov recognized the gaps in his Classical education – he did not know Greek – so he began taking lessons with Graefe and for the next fifteen years he would regularly read Greek authors.⁷ It was from this point on that Graefe's fortunes became intimately conjoined to those of Russian state Classicism. Very soon, in late 1810, the 24-year-old Uvarov, son-in-law of the then Minister of Education, Graf A. K. Razumovskij, was appointed curator of the St Petersburg educational district. Ten months after his appointment Uvarov elaborated the project of school reform, which was first effected in the St Petersburg district; in 1819 it was implemented in the other districts of empire.⁸ The reform abandoned the “universalist” (“encyclopaedic”) trend at the secondary school level, which was regarded by most noblemen as the final stage of their education, instead making it the preparatory step for the university. Classical languages as well as Russian grammar were strengthened at the expense of French and German.⁹

In 1811 the District Grammar school in St Petersburg was reformed along lines of the new project: Latin became the preeminent subject and Greek was introduced, for practically the first time, as obligatory in the state

reactionary last phase of the reign of Alexander I, but under Nicholas I he became a member of the Committee for arrangement of educational institutions of the Ministry of Education, and then the Minister of Education (1833–1849). For an impressive picture of his activities – ambiguous but on the whole very fruitful for the Russian school – see the monograph by C. Whittaker, *The Origins of Modern Russian Education: An Intellectual Biography of Count Sergei Uvarov, 1786–1855* (Northern Illinois University Press 1985); only a Russian translation was available to me: Ц. Х. Виттекер. *Граф Сергей Семенович Уваров и его время*. Пер. Н. Л. Лужецкой (St Petersburg 1999). It duly corrects a reputation that was often one-sidedly reduced to the sadly remembered motto “Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality”. On his attitude to Classical scholarship see Фролов (n. 1) 140–154, and especially Schmidt (n. 1).

⁶ See G. Schmidt, *Goethe und Uvarow und ihr Briefwechsel* (St Petersburg 1888). It was to Goethe whom Uvarov dedicated his essay on Nonnus (1817), which was the fruit of his studies with Graefe.

⁷ Е. Шмид, *История средних учебных заведений в России* [E. Schmid, *History of Russian High Schools*] Пер. с нем. А. Ф. Нейлисова с доп. по указанию автора (St.Petersburg 1878) 82–83; on this remarkable teaching which took place three times in a week, interrupted only in cases when Uvarov was busy with pressing state affairs or laid low with illness, see Schmidt (n. 1). Most of the poets on which Graefe worked were read and discussed; in one of his letters, Uvarov mentions the emendation he proposed for Soph. *Electr.* 163 (λήματι instead of βήματι), approved by Graefe, and ironically asked to make it public – “so erhalte ich vollends an Ihrer Hand die Unsterblichkeit” – which did not happen (Schmidt [n. 1] 87, who notices that the same attractive emendation was later proposed by A. Meineke).

⁸ Schmidt (n. 1) 78.

⁹ Виттекер (n. 5) 79.

school.¹⁰ We do not know what the exact nature of Graefe's personal role in elaborating the reform was, but he certainly became its most important instrument.¹¹ In 1811 he was appointed to the reformed District school as a teacher of Greek and Latin,¹² and in that same year he became a professor of Latin at the Pedagogic Institute in St Petersburg, which was reformed in accordance with the Classicist trend, its program approaching that of a university,¹³ of which there was still none in St Petersburg at the time;¹⁴ after the death of Belin de Ballu in 1815, Graefe changed the chair of Latin at the institute to that of the more beloved Greek.¹⁵

In 1819 Uvarov's struggle to re-found St Petersburg University was crowned with success, the Pedagogic Institute finally attaining to the status of the university,¹⁶ and Graefe became its ordinary professor of Greek. The opening of the university was Uvarov's last victory in the educational field; the political climate grew colder, and as a result of his struggles with reactionaries in the ministry, D. P. Runich and M. L. Magnitskij, Uvarov was forced to tender his resignation. It was soon after that there began the "cleansing" of the university of liberal professors (1821). Graefe showed personal courage in trying to support the accused colleagues, and he was punished by being appointed professor of Latin instead of Greek (this latter more congenial to Graefe) to replace the dismissed

¹⁰ Greek was previously taught at the boarding school in the St Petersburg District School (later the Second grammar school) starting in 1806 but was abandoned in 1810 with resignation of the teacher (Шмид [п. 7] 84).

¹¹ Baron Stein, the Prussian minister, who influenced Uvarov in terms of his reform, read Thucydides with Graefe and Uvarov in the evenings during his visits to St Petersburg (Шмид [п. 7] 83).

¹² Виттекер (п. 5) 80; 297 н. 21. He remained in this position until 1822 (Smyshljaeva [п. 1]).

¹³ Graefe was appointed Professor of Latin since the Greek chair had been filled by the renowned scholar Jacques Nicolas Belin de Ballu (1753–1815), an émigré who had previously taught in Charkov (Шмид [п. 7] 84; В. П. Смышляева, "Я. Я. Белен де Баллю" [V. P. Smyshljaeva, "J. J. Belen de Balju"], *СПА* [п. *]). The institute was founded in 1804 and was expanded and renamed the Chief Pedagogic Institute in 1816, at which time its program was brought into closer alignment with that of a university (Виттекер [п. 5] 90).

¹⁴ The University of St Petersburg was officially founded in 1724 as part of the Academy of Sciences and later merged with the Academic Grammar School, which was closed in 1805 (Г. А. Тишкин. "Объяснение об университете и гимназии в XVIII в." [G. A. Tishkin, "An Explanation about the University and the Grammar School in the 18th Century"], in: idem (ed.), *Материалы по истории Санкт-Петербургского университета XVIII в. Обзор архивных документов* [St Petersburg 2001] 3–36).

¹⁵ In 1814, according to Григорьев (п. 1) 19; in 1815, according to Bursian (п. 1).

¹⁶ Виттекер (п. 5) 90.

K. F. Radlov (see below n. 30). D. P. Popov, Graefe's student at the Pedagogic Institute, who only had a Master's degree, was on the side of the "cleansers" and was thus awarded the Greek chair with the rank of extraordinary professor.¹⁷ But this probably had no long-term effect, since in 1824 Graefe is mentioned again as a professor of Greek,¹⁸ presumably because the decisions connected with this affair were not affirmed by the ministry; as of 1824 Graefe is always mentioned as the holder of both Greek and Latin chairs.

Graefe's scholarly and pedagogical duties constantly grew. From 1822 he also held the Latin chair at the university; in 1829 he became the professor of Greek at the Chief Pedagogic Institute, which was re-founded in 1828 because the university was unable to train the necessary number of schoolteachers. With its strict teaching in Classical languages, the Institute was very close in type to the German grammar school (or lyceum); not only was the teaching done in Latin but the pupils were required to speak in the language. In the course of its forty-year existence (it was closed in 1859) the Institute produced not only a number of schoolmasters, but some excellent Classical scholars as well.¹⁹

¹⁷ Григорьев (n. 1) 40.

¹⁸ Григорьев (n. 1) 51.

¹⁹ On the Chief Pedagogic Institute see: А. Смирнов, *Краткое историческое обозрение действий главного педагогического института. 1828–1859* [A. Smirnov. *A Concise Historical Survey of the Activities of the Chief Pedagogic Institute*] (St Petersburg 1859); Григорьев (n. 1) 233; Шмид (n. 7) 272–277, Е. Ю. Басаргина, *Вице-президент Императорской Академии наук П. В. Никитин* [E. Yu. Basargina, *Vice-president of the Imperial Academy of Science P. V. Nikitin*] (St Petersburg 2004) 14. The Institute was placed in the same building as the university (from 1823 to 1838 the university was in the corner building on Cabinetaskaia Street, next to the barracks of the Semenovskij Regiment, and then it moved to the rebuilt building of the *Twelve Collegia*, its main building today). The Institute's director was an excellent pedagogue F. I. Middendorf (on him see В. П. Смышляева, "Ф. И. Миддендорф", *СПА* [n.*]). The professors were the same as at the university: at first it was Graefe alone, later it was he and F. K. Freytag, and after them N. M. Blagoveshchenskij and I. B. Steinman. Graefe's pupils at the Institute were A. I. Menshikov (later professor in Moscow) and Blagoveshchenskij. Though by no means impartial, one of Blagoveshchenskij's students, V. I. Modestov, who was compelled to complete his studies at the university after closure of the institute, greatly preferred the teaching at the latter (М. И. Ростовцев, "В. И. Модестов: Некролог" [M. I. Rostovcev, "V. I. Modestov: Obituary"], *ЖМНП* 1907: 7, 76). After closure of the institute, pedagogic courses were introduced to the university; but already in 1859 Blagoveshchenskij opted to re-open the Institute (И. Помяловский, "Н. М. Благовещенский" [I. Pomjalovskij, "N. M. Blagoveshchenskij"], *Биографический словарь профессоров и преподавателей Императорского Санкт-Петербургского университета* [St Petersburg 1896] I, 62).

From the beginning Graefe also performed important duties at the Academy of Sciences; when Uvarov was appointed President of the Academy in 1818, Graefe was promoted to corresponding member and in 1820 to its ordinary member; as of 1821 he was also Curator of the Cabinet of Antiquities and Coins at the Hermitage and from 1840 the Honorary Director of the Cabinet.

Graefe's scholarly field was Hellenistic and late Greek poetry. His extraordinary knowledge of both Classical languages (he spoke and wrote not only fluent but elegant Greek and Latin) as well as his merits as conjectural critic were summed up by G. Hermann on the occasion of his entering into service as a tutor in Livonia. Hermann predicted that his favourite pupil – as he called him – would go on to considerable scholarly achievements, even though he had published nothing to that point (his Master's remained unpublished) and thus indicating the extraordinary demands he was placing on himself at the time.²⁰ The prediction came true in St Petersburg, where in contrast to Livonia he gained access to the libraries as well as feeling the impulse for scholarly work more strongly. He edited the epigrams of Meleager (1819), Nonnus' *Dionysica* (1819–1826, 2 vols.), his greatest achievement, and the ecphrastic poems of Paulus Silentiarius together with those of John of Gaza (1822); he published studies on bucolic poetry and anthology as well as on the poets of Nonnus' age – Triphiodorus, Coluthus and Musaeus. All these monographs and editions appeared from 1811 to 1826, for the most part with German publishing houses but some with publishers in St Petersburg, one after the other. Gottfried Hermann not only followed his work closely, but also helped in placing it with publishers, as witnessed in Hermann's letters to Graefe (he impelled him to edit Nonnus, pressed him for quicker completion and himself read the proofs).²¹ The merit of this work is occasionally mentioned in the literature, but on the whole it seems not to have received the praise it merited.²²

²⁰ The attestation is published by Schmidt (n. 1) 161.

²¹ See Hermann's letters in Schmidt (n. 1) 99–102; he also conveys the positive responses of other scholars (such as Gottfried Heinrich Schaefer) and notes occasional disagreement with the bolder emendations, nevertheless evaluating the whole in very encouraging fashion.

²² Bursian (n. 1) 555 f. briefly notes Graefe's merits as a connoisseur of Greek and textual criticism. Since Graefe's achievements in this field are rarely mentioned (but see the high estimation of him by H. Köchly, the next editor of Nonnus, also Hermann's pupil, as cited by Schmidt [n. 1] 102), one should cite in full the estimation of the recent editor of *Paulus Silentiarius*, Claudio De Stefani, which shows that Graefe's edition (as well as his Nonnus) by no means deserves this oblivion; note also how this *elogium* fits Hermann's characterization of young Graefe as having a strong inclination toward

After 1826 Graefe published nothing more on Greek poetry. The reasons for this are unknown – probably he was suffering from lack of a conducive scholarly environment,²³ was overburdened with pedagogical and scholarly duties, and of course the lack of good libraries available might also have played a role.²⁴ Accidentally or not, about this time he also stopped his Greek studies with Uvarov, who in 1826 returned to his important position at the Ministry of Education. Even if Graefe was not exactly left to his own devices in St Petersburg, the study-evenings with his high-ranking pupil were certainly much more inspiring for Graefe's work than his official teaching. In short, with Uvarov's departure, Graefe lost his audience.²⁵ He now turned to linguistics and under the impact of the achievements of comparatist studies learned Sanskrit; publishing works on Greek and Slavic languages from a comparative perspective, he moved in part by the desire to bring Greek closer to his Russian audience.²⁶ This part of his work was not very original and generated no real response in the academic world, but it seems to have had an impact on Graefe's pupils, Ivan Steinman and especially on Karl Lugebil, who worked on Greek grammar and comparative linguistics.²⁷ More productive was Graefe's work on the Black Sea inscriptions. Much preferring, as did his great teacher Hermann, the chefs-d'oeuvre of literature to the study of inscriptions, he nevertheless happily applied his philological knowledge to this field (like Hermann again), especially to inscriptions of a poetic

solving difficult problems: “nemo in Silentiarii carminibus castigandis tantum profecit quantum Graefe: quod vix miraberis, cum consideraveris quam bene ille de Nonni Dionysiacis meritis sit. Salmasius enim, Ducangius, Bekker ac vel etiam Scaliger menda plerumque leviora, orthographica vel syntactica, sine magno negotio sustulerunt; Friedländer ipse rem interdum male gessit; Graefe autem ad nodos et aenigmata solvenda se feliciter contulit. quin etiam quaedam ex eius coniecturis, quae usque adhuc in apparatu editionis Lipsiensis neglecta iacebant, dignae sunt quae in textum recipiantur, cum locos emendatione egentes pulchre expedient” (Paulus Silentarius, *Descriptio Sanctae Sophiae. Descriptio Ambonis* [Berlin – New York 2011] xx).

²³ Smyshljaeva (n. 1) cites this sad remark made to his pupil Vladimir Pecherin (В. С. Печерин, “Замогильные записки” [“Sepulchral notes”], in: *Русское общество 30-х годов XIX в. Люди и идеи. Мемуары современников* [Moscow 1989] 270).

²⁴ The latter is evident from the letters to him from Uvarov (Schmidt [n. 1]).

²⁵ Schmidt (n. 1) 102–103 mentions Graefe's uncompleted *Observationes* on the text of Nonnus and the commentary on which he long worked; the fortune of these in manuscript left works is unknown.

²⁶ Smyshljaeva (n. 1).

²⁷ While it is not necessary to overestimate Graefe's merits in this field, we should also not forget the importance of these works, with their sound methodology, for those students at the time suffering under the etymology exercises in quite a Cratylean spirit imposed on them by Graefe's colleague in the chair for Russian, J. V. Tolmachev (see Фортунатов [n. 1] 330).

character. Graefe was thus firmly in the noble tradition of philological interpretations of the Black Sea inscriptions, which attracted St Petersburg scholars though not necessarily epigraphists.²⁸

The teaching staff in Graefe's era was neither numerous nor strong. Graefe was assisted by colleagues who were teachers rather than scholars, all three of whom were approximately the same age as him. Two of them, German by birth, F. F. Gedike and K. F. Radlov, taught only for a short time. Fedor Fedorovitch Gedike (Гедике, Gedicke?, c. 1783 – after 1820) was already an adjunct professor at the Pedagogic Institute and was appointed extraordinary professor of Latin at the newly founded university, retiring a year later in 1820 due to poor health, he a connoisseur of Classical languages but not a scholar.²⁹ Gedike was succeeded by Karl Friedrich Radlov (Radloff, Radlow, 1782–1842), a Saxon like Graefe, who had studied in Leipzig at about the same time as Graefe and who later became presumably his relative (they married sisters). However, he soon had to leave the university, in 1822, owing to its “cleansing” by the reactionaries after dismissal of Uvarov.³⁰ Dmitri Prokopjevich Popov

²⁸ His larger work in this field, *Inscriptiones aliquot Graecae, nuper repertae, restituantur et explicantur* (St Petersburg 1841) contains *inter alia* the *editio princeps* of the famous poetic epitaph from Bosphorus (*EG* 538 = *IPE* II. 197 = *CIRB* 146). Graefe's emendations were for the most part approved by A. Boeckh and later editors.

²⁹ On him see Григорьев (n. 1) 19, 32; the details of his biography are discovered by Smyshljaeva (В. П. Смышляева, “Ф. Ф. Гедике” [“F. F. Gedike”], *СИА* [n. *]).

³⁰ Radlov graduated from Leipzig in 1802; his wife was Philippina Marianne von Samson-Himmelstjerna (1791–1833, born in Urbs), in all probability the daughter of Karl Gustav Samson von Himmelstjerna zu Urbs, Graefe's father-in-law. Before his appointment he was a teacher at Muralt's boarding school, and later a teacher at St Petersburg District Grammar School and at the Petrischule. He probably left St Petersburg soon after his dismissal and lived in the area of Dorpat where he owned an estate (probably inherited from his father-in-law) and founded here the school; later he moved to Fellin where he also founded a town school and a boarding school. See Григорьев (n. 1) 32, 39, Suppl. 15; *Amburger-Archiv*, 42256. From him stem a number of generations of Classical scholars and teachers. His son Leopold (Lev) Fedorovich Radlov (1816–1865), linguist and ethnologist, best known as the curator of the Ethnographic Museum of the Academy of Sciences, was a graduate of the Chief Pedagogic Institute (Graefe's pupil?), taught Classical languages and at the end of his short life was the director of Larin School and of the Sixth Grammar School; his son Ernst Leopoldovich Radlov (1854–1928), classicist and philosopher, the friend of philosopher Vladimir Solovjev, sometime the director of the Public library, translated the *Nicomachean Ethics*; Ernst's son Sergei (1892–1958), classicist, was a student of Zielinski; present-day members of this family are Professor Nikolai Nikolaevich Kazansky, the classical philologist and member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and his daughter Maria who defended her PhD in Classics at ENS Paris and St Petersburg University.

(1780–1864), Grafe’s oldest pupil at the Chief Pedagogic Institute, taught at the university from 1819 as an adjunct professor and from 1824 as extraordinary professor of Greek; in 1835 he was dismissed during reform of the university since he did not have a doctorate.³¹ Starting in 1825 Graefe and Popov were assisted in their capacity as professors by A. I. Brut and I. Ia. Sokolov. Alexander Ivanovich Brut (1800–1841), who taught mainly ancient and medieval geography while a candidate for the Master’s degree and later as adjunct professor, also had those students with poor Latin translate Caesar (he taught until 1835).³² Ivan Iakovlevich Sokolov (c. 1792–1848) taught elementary Greek grammar (1823–1848 and was adjunct professor from 1831 to 1835).³³ Graefe and Popov read Greek and Latin authors with the more advanced students;³⁴ elementary Latin was not taught, for its knowledge was assumed for all those entering the university. But in fact their knowledge was generally quite poor in their first years at the university, most students incapable of understanding the lectures held in Latin.

³¹ On Popov see Григорьев (n. 1), 19, 110; В. П. Смышляева, “Д. П. Попов” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “D. P. Popov”, *СИА* [n. *]]. Popov studied at the Chief Pedagogic Institute from 1810 to 1814 and graduated very late at the age of 34. Alongside his teaching he was also director of the university’s library (1822–1835), gaining a fine reputation in this capacity; he also held a position at the Public library (1815–1864). After Popov’s retirement from the university, he produced Greek and Latin textbooks for Russian schools as well as adaptations of Buttman’s Greek grammar and Jacob’s Latin grammar, which were regarded as good for their time; he taught also at the First Grammar School (1830–1849) and was regarded as a connoisseur of Classical languages.

³² Григорьев (n. 1) 56, 64, 73; *С.-Петербургский университет в первое столетие его деятельности 1819–1919: Материалы по истории С.-Петерб. ун-та*. Собр. и изд. И. Л. Маяковский и А. С. Николаев. Под ред. С. В. Рождественского. Т. 1. 1819–1835 [*St Petersburg University in the First Hundred Years of its Activities: Materials for the History of St Petersburg University I. 1819–1835*] (Petrograd 1919) 905.

³³ On Sokolov see Григорьев (n. 1) 229 (cf. 95); В. П. Смышляева, “И. Я. Соколов”, [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “I. Ia. Sokolov”], *СИА* [n.*]. Sokolov taught Greek after graduation from the university and was tolerated for a very long time despite his faults as teacher (see further) because of Graefe’s goodwill toward him (Sokolov himself was a kind person) – or perhaps because there was simply nobody to replace him. He retired soon before his death, in 1848; he was ill, and finally a substitute for him had been found (I. B. Steinman). Apart from two textbooks, which were mainly translated from German ones, he published nothing in all his 25 years of service; he also taught at the Chief Pedagogic Institute (the secretary of its conference) and performed duties as its librarian (editing the systematic catalogue of its valuable library, which was after closure of the Institute conjoined with the university library, Григорьев [n. 1] 288).

³⁴ Григорьев (n. 1) 56.

V. V. Grigorjev (1816–1881), himself an Orientalist, in his history of the university, while emphasizing the merits of Graefe as scholar, nevertheless paints a rather unattractive picture of the teaching of Classics at this time, relying both on his own recollections and on the notes of Blagoveshchenskij, Graefe’s pupil and future ordinary professor of Latin (who was, however, his student at the Pedagogic Institute, not at the university): “Brut and Sokolov were nothing more than schoolmasters, the latter being a very bad one and discouraging beginners from the study of Greek. The continued study of Classical languages was solely due to the energy, exactingness and authority of Graefe, who was viewed as a giant of scholarship. But one cannot say that his teaching contributed to dissemination of a desire to acquire knowledge of antiquity through its writers and artwork. And this could not happen *when the subject was taught to Russian students in Latin* [my italics. – A. V.]. Graefe was the single support of Classics, but even his teaching was purely grammatical and aesthetic; history and ‘archaeology’ were missing altogether; moreover, he belonged to that category of teacher which did not regard it as necessary to go into historical and archaeological detail and limited his teaching to grammatical and aesthetic commentary on the authors he read”.³⁵

The negative aspects of this judgment are of course partly justified, but in order to achieve a more balanced picture³⁶ it is useful also to cite the memoir of Graefe’s pupil F. N. Fortunatov, who was a student from 1830 to 1833 and did his graduate work under the guidance of Graefe; he was recommended by Graefe for continuing his studies at Dorpat, but preferred the career of schoolmaster in part because of material circumstances. Fortunatov depicts the teaching in the department more fully and much more favourably.³⁷ Greek and Latin were taught in three courses, which were geared to students of varying ability but in general corresponded to three years of study (Fortunatov took Greek during all three years, but not Latin at the lowest level, since his school Latin was

³⁵ Григорьев (n. 1) 72–73. This corresponds to Blagoveshchenskij’s judgment of Graefe (Григорьев, *op. cit.*, 2nd pagination, 25): “I only heard him lecturing on Latin literature – dry aesthetic criticism of an inferior level, he was regarded favorably only by those who were not exposed to the real connoisseurs”.

³⁶ Blagoveshchenskij’s remark (cited in Григорьев [n. 1] 2nd pagination, 25) that Graefe preferred Germans – although he appreciated all able students, he did not promote the Russian ones, which was compensated for by such adjuncts as Sokolov – seems to be both contradictory and unjust. It was possibly inspired by his resentment of Graefe, for he himself was forced to begin his teaching career in Kazan, not in St Petersburg.

³⁷ Fortunatov (n. 1) 325–329 .

sufficient); at the lowest level Latin was taught by Brut and Greek by Sokolov; at the intermediate level both languages were taught by Popov, and at the highest level, by Graefe. The law students had to attend these lectures together with the philologists, but they were not obliged to take an examination administered by Graefe at the highest level. There were two Greek and two Latin lectures per week of two hours each. In the first course the students of Greek were trained in grammar (translations from Greek into Latin and Russian), and then they read the works of Homer and Herodotus; in the second course Thucydides was read the first semester (sixty chapters) and Livy in Latin. Graefe, whose lectures Fortunatov attended for three semesters instead of the usual two (Popov was on leave), managed to read three tragedies of Sophocles at this time; in Latin he read Horatius – all three books of odes, both books of satires, and a part of the epistles were explicated in three semesters (who would not envy this?). He also trained those students who wished to make translations from Greek to Latin (presumably the Greek texts he was elucidating).

Fortunatov writes enthusiastically about Graefe as person and teacher (the elegant Latin of his teaching, attention paid to the difficult passages of the authors, readiness to accept students' proposals, and mild and encouraging criticism of proposals of which he did not himself approve).³⁸ But his estimation of the *di minores* of the department is closer to the judgments of Grigorjev and Blagoveshchenskij; he only studied with Popov for a semester, so he was unable to draw any conclusions regarding him (except for the fact that his spoken Latin was not very good and he was repetitive); but Sokolov, whose teaching of Greek grammar Fortunatov found useful, was ever digressing into alien subjects (by the end of the year Fortunatov noted the thick notebook filled with these digressions).

Even taking into account the fact that Fortunatov was less exacting than Grigorjev and Blagoveshchenskij, the real cause of the latter's dissatisfaction was of course the difference between the trend they represented (historic-philological) and Graefe, who was a pure philologist

³⁸ This was by no means his unique personal impression; see the words of the Rector P. A. Pletnev, as cited by Fortunatov ([n. 1] 334) and spoken to students in the department at the end of his very remarkable lecture course on the history of Russian literature, which was held for the first time at the university: "I know that the inspired lectures on Classical languages held by Graefe were for you much more fascinating than mine and prompted you for the most part to assiduously study Classics". Polite as these words are – from a representative of the new discipline with respect to that master of the old – they attest to the high esteem in which Classics was held by the faculty.

in the traditional sense. Both in his scholarship and teaching Graefe was the faithful pupil of Gottfried Hermann, the leading proponent of *Wortphilologie*, which emphasized the emending and critical editing of Classical texts as well as the profound study of grammar, word-meaning and metrics. Blagoveshchenskij's retrospective attack on him is of course reminiscent of the fierce polemics of August Boeckh and Ottfried Müller against Gottfried Hermann.³⁹ The struggle at that time within European Classical philology did not lead to a split into two separate disciplines, history and philology; it did not even lead to two different approaches within the field (grammatic-critical versus historic-antiquarian). Rather, in the next generation, the most outstanding representatives of each, F. Ritschl and T. Mommsen, aimed to overcome the extreme tendencies of both, and it was gradually recognized that a division between "formal" and "real" should pose no hindrance to peaceful coexistence and even cooperation between scholarship and teaching.⁴⁰ Blagoveshchenskij's reaction to Graefe's manner of teaching reflected not only his dissatisfaction as a student, but the changes he later introduced in his own teaching as well as his attempt to combine "formal" and "aesthetic" categories in the study of Classical texts along with greater emphasis on the investigation of "realities" through monuments and inscriptions.⁴¹

But while admitting the value of this turn from pure philology to *Altertumswissenschaft* in the 1850ties, it is still difficult for a historian to concur with the rebukes leveled at Graefe in his capacity as scholar, teacher and even as an organizer of scholarship (perhaps apart only from his long tolerating Sokolov in the department, for which he might have had sound reasons). The department's system of education was adapted to the main needs of the time, namely to educate schoolmasters who were in high demand after start of Uvarov's reforms and especially after their resumption in the 1830s; scholarship in and of itself was a luxury. The department had to compensate, especially in the early years, for students'

³⁹ In 1825, with publication of the first fascicle of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* by Boeckh, in which he criticized the modern "grammarians" who betray true *philology*, which is the heir of Eratosthenes (*Sachphilologie*) and the comprehensive study of all available evidence (Boeckh emphasized the importance of inscriptions) for the sake of a better understanding of Classical life. See E. Vogt, "Der Methodenstreit zwischen Hermann und Böckh" (1979), in: idem, *Literatur der Antike und Philologie der Neuzeit. Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin – Boston 2013) 299–316, with the earlier literature.

⁴⁰ Vogt (n. 39) 312, argues convincingly against Bursian's view that the Boeckh–Hermann struggle led to the division of philology into two schools.

⁴¹ See the balanced evaluation of Graefe by his another pupil, G. S. Destunis (cited by Григорьев [n. 1], second pagination, 59–60 n. 371).

inadequate preparation in Classical languages at school and carried out these modest but indispensable tasks. The staff at first consisted of former schoolmasters of German origin and of Russian pupils of Graefe who themselves entered the University with a poor knowledge of Greek and Latin. There were no individuals like Blagoveshchenskij available to Graefe at the time, and even were this the case, they would have hardly been happy to teach those Greekless and almost Latinless students of the first decades. Graefe, though a student of “pure poetry” and himself “a poet in his soul” (as K. Lugebil, his student, said of him⁴²), taught various authors and was ready to investigate the fields which he regarded as important to the university and Russian scholarship – even if they did not always accord with his personal predilections.

As views of his teaching were so varied, more weight should be assigned to the actual results of Graefe’s instruction. In the course of his long teaching life he educated many school-teachers of Greek and Latin (he being a schoolteacher himself) and this was probably his greatest service to Russian Classics. He also managed to fill vacancies at the university with Russian students of the first generation, who in spite of scholarly deficiencies were fitted to the tasks of those first decades and thus enabled Graefe not only to educate teachers, but to turn them into savants. In the second part of his academic career, after the caliber of students increased due to the development of Classics at the secondary school level and the institutional reform which took place (University Ordinance of 1835; see below), Graefe was able to educate scholars⁴³ such as Blagoveshchenskij, Steinman, Lugebil (the latter was his greatest service to the department and to university Classics), and his lifelong relationship to Gottfried Hermann helped his students to maintain similar connections with outstanding scholars during their period of study abroad.⁴⁴ It is to Graefe’s credit that after his death the Classical chairs at the university were never again filled by non-Russian professors.⁴⁵

⁴² В. К. Ернштедт, “Некролог К. Я. Люгебиль” [V. K. Jernstedt, “K. Ia. Lugebil. An Obituary”], *ЖМНП* 1888, апрель, 127.

⁴³ In the first part of his career Graefe had only one pupil who taught at the university – Dmitri Popov, a solid teacher of Greek, but by no means a scholar.

⁴⁴ Schmidt (n. 1) 161–162 published Hermann’s letter (May 1842) to Graefe, which was occasioned by the arrival of the latter’s students – Blagoveshchenskij, Steinman and V. N. Jurgeвич – for their period of study in Leipzig (see below) and Hermann now conveying the favorable impression that he had of them.

⁴⁵ However, it is only fair to note that after Graefe’s death there were two prominent German scholars of Classics who were called to the Academy of Sciences – Ludolf Stephani and August Nauck.

II. After the Ordinance of 1835

The position of Classics at the university was strengthened by the new University Ordinance of 1835. Behind it was Uvarov, the main promoter of Classicism, who was now again in a seat of power, this time as Minister of Education (Graefe greeted him with a poem in Latin which began “hoc erat in votis”). According to the new ordinance two chairs of Greek and Latin were introduced at each Russian university. The ordinance brought with it a significant curtailment of university liberties in comparison with the liberal ordinance of 1804, while yet fostering considerable growth in the teaching staff, in terms of financial capacity, and with respect to the number of students.⁴⁶ In order to ensure the supply of fresh scholars, in 1833 obligatory retirement after 25 years was instituted; in 1835 a doctorate became the necessary prerequisite for holding the position of professor, both extraordinary and ordinary (professors who did not have a doctorate had to defend their doctoral dissertation in the course of one year or abandon their position); the position of adjunct professor (equal to an assistant professorship) now required that the candidate have successfully defended his Master’s thesis.

The result of all this was that at the University of St Petersburg thirteen professors were dismissed.⁴⁷ The vacant slots were filled by younger professors who had spent some years abroad; a considerable number of them had graduated from the Professorial Institute founded in 1827 at the University of Dorpat, which with its mainly German teaching staff was the strongest of all Russian universities.⁴⁸ Students of the Professorial Institute were selected from the all-Russian universities, had to study two years in Dorpat (later this was expanded to four years) and after successful defence of their dissertation (Master’s or doctoral) then having the possibility of studying for two further years in Berlin or Paris, after which they were obliged to teach at least twelve years at Russian universities. The successful result of this enterprise was that two classes of students at the Dorpat Institute (1828 and 1832) gave Russia 32 new professors.⁴⁹ In 1843, since some professorial chairs still remained vacant, the new position of *Privatdozent* was introduced for the young scholars, who were admitted to the staff without regular payment (but also without having defended a doctoral

⁴⁶ Виттекер (n. 5) 178–182.

⁴⁷ Виттекер (n. 5) 184–185.

⁴⁸ On the Institute see G. Schmidt, “Das Professoren-Institut in Dorpat. 1827–1838,” *Russische Revue* 8 (1881) 136–166; E. В. Петухов, *Императорский Юрьевский, бывший Дерптский, университет за сто лет его существования (1802–1902): Ист. очерк I* [E. Petuchov, *The Imperial Yurjev, Former Dorpat University during Hundred Years of Its Existence. A Historical Essay*] (Yurjev 1902) 485–519.

⁴⁹ Виттекер (n. 5) 183–184; cf. Григорьев (n. 1) 110.

dissertation) provided that they presented a work *pro venia legendi*;⁵⁰ at which point they were regarded as primary candidates for a professorial chair.

The ordinance of 1835 also brought innovations to the teaching of Classics at St Petersburg University. To the designations of the Greek and Roman chairs was now added the word “Antiquities” (“Кафедры греческой и римской словесности и древностей”). This seems to have brought no immediately substantial changes to the teaching in the department, which remained primarily grammatical but with the inclusion of textual criticism (by Graefe); however, new subjects were introduced around 1848, namely “Encyclopaedia and Methodology of Antiquities” as well as Greek and Roman antiquities.⁵¹

Another result of the University Ordinance was appointment of a special professor of Latin. To this point it was Graefe who had formally occupied both chairs,⁵² and he remained the professor of Greek even though he had already served out his allotted 25 years by 1835. But the chance for real reform was not properly exploited. The professor of Latin, Theodor Friedrich (Fedor Karlovich) Freytag (1800–1859),⁵³ appointed in 1836, was born in Livonia and graduated from Dorpat University (1820). Freytag taught at Dorpat Gymnasium⁵⁴ and was then a professor at Richelieu Lyceum in Odessa. He was probably chosen for his teaching rather than his scholarly abilities,⁵⁵ but even then he only

⁵⁰ Григорьев (n. 1) 297; Виттекер (n. 5) 184. The adjunct professors existed until the University Ordinance of 1864, when the position of *Dozent* (штатный доцент) was introduced instead. This latter position was abolished by the Ordinance of 1884, according to which the former lecturers were converted to either extraordinary professors or subsumed under the rubric *Privatdozent*.

⁵¹ The “Methodology” and Roman antiquities were taught by Schlitter from 1844 to 1846 and from 1846 to 1848 respectively (Григорьев [n. 1] 232); the course on Greek antiquities was probably taught by I. Sokolov, who around 1848 compiled a textbook on antiquities which ultimately never saw print (Смышляева [n. 33]).

⁵² Latin was in fact the prerogative of Popov, a good schoolmaster, but by no means a scholar, who was now dismissed since he had not obtained a doctorate.

⁵³ On Freytag see Григорьев (n. 1) 231–232; E. Tamm, H. Tankler, “Klassische Philologen an der Universität Tartu (Dorpat, Jurjew) und ihre Kontakte zu St Petersburg”, *Hyperboreus* 10 (2004) 55 (lit.); В. П. Смышляева, “Ф. К. Фрейтаг” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “F. K. Freytag”], *СИА* [n.*].

⁵⁴ He taught Russian to professorial students in Dorpat, M. Kutorga among them, during that period when they were obliged to improve their Latin, and he seems to have been successful as a teacher.

⁵⁵ Two scholarly works of his are known – an edition of humanist letters (*Virorum doctorum epistolae selectae ad Bilib. Pirhemium, Isach. Camerarium. Car. Clusium et Julium Episcop. Herbip. datae* [Leipzig 1831]) and an annotated edition of the first two books of the *Iliad* (*Homeri Iliadis primi duo libri* [St Petersburg 1837]), which was regarded with favour by K. F. Nägelsbach.

enjoyed moderate success.⁵⁶ Along with the professorship he acquired manifold other responsibilities – similar to Graefe, he was saddled with additional teaching duties, and at the Hermitage he was obliged to compile catalogues of medals and antiques.⁵⁷ He retired in 1852, probably owing to poor health, and resettled in Germany. Freytag did not have any high-profile pupils of his own, but as Vera Smyshljaeva notes, as a Latinist he played a role in educating the next generation of Classicists.⁵⁸

Freytag was assisted from 1836 to 1848 by Eduard Egorovich Shlitter (Schlüter, 1800–1848), who replaced A. Brut; and then, after Shlitter's death,⁵⁹ from 1848 to 1851, was aided by Ivan Steinman, who taught mainly Greek.⁶⁰

A much more important effect of the new University Ordinance was establishment of a chair of universal history. Mikhail Semenovich Kutorga (1809–1886)⁶¹ was appointed to hold lectures on ancient and

⁵⁶ Fortunatov (n. 1) 321 draws a sharp contrast between his arrogant manner of teaching and that of the open and occasionally self-critical Graefe. See also the unfavorable opinion of him expressed by N. G. Chernyshevskij, cited by Smyshljaeva (n. 53) – “petty pedant with a threatening child-tutor's voice”.

⁵⁷ He was adjunct professor of Latin at the Chief Pedagogic Institute (1848–1851), associate librarian at the First Department of the Hermitage (from 1837) and an assistant to the director of the arsenal and the library in the imperial palace of Tsarskoe Selo; he also taught at the Medic-Chirurgic Academy.

⁵⁸ Smyshljaeva (n. 53). From him stems the information on Russian classicists in the histories of Classical scholarship by Creuzer and Sandys.

⁵⁹ Little is known of him (Григорьев [n. 1] 110, 128, 232; Tamm, Tankler [n. 51] 55–56; Amburger-Archiv): he was from Riga, studied theology in Dorpat (1822–1825) and later also in Berlin and Jena (PhD 1830, neither the dissertation itself nor other scholarly works by him are known). He was a teacher at the First and the Third St Petersburg grammar schools. He initially taught Latin to law students and those majoring in Oriental subjects or the natural sciences, and later in beginning courses for philologists (exercises in translating Latin and in spoken Latin, some Latin authors, and in the last years of his lectures on “Encyclopedia and Methodology of Antiquities” and on “Roman antiquities”). He died from cholera. He was a lecturer, not an adjunct professor (Григорьев [n. 1] 232), presumably because he did not defend dissertation in Russia.

⁶⁰ Григорьев (n. 1) 232.

⁶¹ On Kutorga see: Г. С. Дестунис, “М. С. Куторга. Воспоминания и очерки”, [G. S. Destunis, “M. S. Kutorga. Memoir and Essays”], *ЖМНП* 1886, июль, 3–14; Фролов (n. 1) 192–201; on the Dorpat period see the well documented study by Ю. К. Мадиссон, “Молодой Куторга (к вопросу о возникновении русской исторической науки об античности)” [Yu. K. Madisson, “Young Kutorga (on the Question of the Emergence of Russian Historical Scholarship of Antiquity)”, *Учёные записки Тартуского университета* 43 (1956) 3–37 (marred by his lip service paid to Soviet ideology, with its hostility to “formalism”); see also: А. М. Скворцов. *Научная школа в отечественном антиковедении: М. С. Куторга и его ученики.*

medieval history and started lecturing in January 1836 (his predecessor had been the great Russian writer, Nicolaj Gogol, who of course never studied history professionally, but some of his lectures were memorized by his students for their literary merits).⁶² Kutorga was not an impressive lecturer from a rhetorical standpoint, but he fascinated his audience through his critical treatment of sources, something which was entirely alien to the hitherto purely narrative courses on history at the university.

Kutorga was a graduate of the Third St Petersburg grammar school (1827) where the Classics were especially strong; after a short period of study at St Petersburg University he was sent to the Dorpat Professorial Institute where he spent four years and graduated in 1832 with a Master's dissertation on *De tribus Atticis eorumque cum regni partibus nexu*. In it he discussed the still unresolved question as to the origin of the four Attic pre-Cleisthenic ("Ionian") tribes and followed the lead of Gottfried Hermann in arguing against a surprisingly influential theory at the time, as posited by August Boeckh (in part also of B. G. Niebuhr), that these tribes were similar to Egyptian and Indian castes.⁶³

Kutorga owed his historical training to Dorpat, where his teacher was Professor of universal and Russian History Friedrich Kruze (1790–1866), the renowned specialist in ancient geography. At Kruze's lectures and home seminar Kutorga learned the critical method in treatment of ancient sources; and it is to the "distant" influence of Niebuhr that one can trace Kutorga's remarkable use of painstaking micro-interpretations of historical texts to draw grand theoretical generalizations – to ascend through the study of political institutions of various nations to the "laws of historical development", as he says in the preface to his Dorpat dissertation. Dorpat was also important in that it improved his Greek and Latin. (K. Morgenstern, professor of Classics, found the prior education of Kutorga and his St Petersburg comrades unsatisfactory, especially their spoken and written Latin, and urged them to attend the courses being offered in Classical languages.)

The next three years that he spent in Berlin were not so important for Kutorga's development. Having suffered a disappointment with his

Автореферат канд. дис. ... ист. н. [A. M. Skvortsov, *Academic School in Russian Classical Scholarship: M. S. Kutorga and his Pupils*. Abstract of PhD thesis] (Moscow 2012); his previous papers on Kutorga are also cited here.

⁶² See the memoir of his student Destunis (n. 61) 4–5.

⁶³ A. Boeckh, "De tribus Ionicis [1812]", in: A. Boeckh, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften* IV (Leipzig 1874) 43–60 and other works; cf. B. G. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte* I (1811) 225–226. Niebuhr later changed his view in the face of criticism leveled by Gottfried Hermann, while Boeckh remained unconvinced by his opponents all his life.

Dorpat dissertation – he receiving only a Master’s and not a doctorate, as he and his teacher had hoped, because of the non-fluent Latin he employed at his doctoral examination (*rigorosum*) – Kutorga wanted to move to other fields of study such as early Russian history or medieval French institutions. But he did not obtain permission to change his specialization or to study in what for him was the more attractive Paris as opposed to Berlin. He spent two years in libraries studying books and manuscripts for his intended *opus magnum* on French medieval institutions (and on the “German element” in European history). For his own good and that of Russian scholarship he soon returned to Classical studies.⁶⁴

After returning to Russia in 1835 Kutorga was first appointed as lecturer and then as adjunct professor to the newly founded chair of universal history, which encompassed lectures on ancient, medieval and modern history. In 1837 he published a book on the political institutions of Germans up to the sixth century AD, but after that he turned decisively and finally to Greek history. In 1838 his famous book *Колена и сословия аттичeskue* (*Attic Tribes and Estates*) appeared, which expanded on his Dorpat dissertation and which was defended in the same year as the doctoral dissertation. A French translation of this book and the monograph on German institutions were published together⁶⁵ and received very warmly, most of all because of the richly represented material documenting the sources of the tribal organization of various peoples.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ There is no evidence that Kutorga was in touch with other Classical scholars in Berlin. He did not attend Boeckh’s lectures, as did his two Dorpat classmates M. M. Lunin and V. S. Pecherin, who were also in Berlin at the time in their capacity as classical philologists.

⁶⁵ *Essai sur l’organisation de la Tribu dans l’antiquité*. Translated from the Russian by M. Chopin (Paris 1839).

⁶⁶ References to this work were usual in the standard works on Greek History and *Altertumskunde* (e. g. W. Wachsmuth, *Hellenische Altertumskunde*. vol. I² [1844] 355–356, 368, who cites it as the most important on the Attic tribes); it also played a role in refuting Boeckh’s extravagant theory and became obsolete together with this theory, but the modern specialist in Greek tribal organization (D. Roussel, *Tribu et cité: Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique* [Paris 1976]) can still find its reading rewarding. Kutorga’s own theory of the origin of tribes (the four clans of Ionic invaders who settled in Attica in four already existing geographical districts) was based on an ingenious but much too bold treatment of very poor evidence and was given a chilly reception, as was typical with other similar theories. See the criticism of G. Grote, *History of Greece* III [London 1847] 83, though he did write approvingly that Kutorga “has traced out and illustrated the fundamental analogy between the social classification, in early times, of Greeks, Romans, Germans, and Russians”. The book was also appreciated by sociologists owing to its rich comparative material (H. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology* V: *Political Institutions* [London 1882] 554, 760 etc.).

In 1839 Kutorga was appointed the extraordinary and in 1844 the ordinary professor of universal history; it was in this capacity that he taught 25 years until 1869 when he moved to Moscow, where he taught until his retirement in 1874.⁶⁷

Kutorga's services to the study of ancient history in Russia are generally well known (although his scholarly biography is yet to be written): he was the first original historian of Classical Greece in Russian, with a very broad range of interest – political, social and economic history; he studied chronology and inscriptions; he travelled to Greece, making drawings of inscriptions and describing historical places he visited (some of these works are still today cited).⁶⁸ His scholarly work published in French and German, in both Russia and France, found an echo abroad – a very resonant one in France but a muted one in the other countries, especially in Germany, where some of his bold theories concerning Greek chronology and sources (for instance, on the date of Xerxes' death, on the beginning of the Athenian year or on Themistocles' letters against R. Bentley) were criticized. In sending future professors abroad for study at western European universities (beginning from 1855, when this practice, discontinued in the years from 1848 to 1855, was again restored), and similar to Graefe, he always chose the best hosts for his students.

The significance of Kutorga for philology at the university is not as noteworthy but should nevertheless not be underestimated. From the beginning, when he appeared at the university as one of the most brilliant products of Uvarov's reform, it was through his lectures and scholarly work that he played a considerable role in moving the next generation of philologists beyond the borders of "formal" philology in the direction of "realities", as testified by the memoir of his student G. Destunis, future professor of Greek philology.⁶⁹ This was possible because Kutorga himself, having been a "pure" historian, was at the same time a staunch and passionate supporter of Classical languages at both the secondary school and university level not only in his scholarship and manner of teaching but in his public statements. By the 1860s his defence of Classics already seemed old-fashioned to many of his colleagues and students.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ See the memoir of his pupil, V. V. Bauer, in Григорьев (п. 1) 213–218.

⁶⁸ He visited France for the first time in late 1838, and when journeys abroad were again allowed by the government he travelled to Greece and France in 1859, 1861 and 1870.

⁶⁹ Дестунис (п. 61).

⁷⁰ See А. В. Никитенко, *Дневник* [A. V. Nikitenko, *Diary*] II (Moscow 1955) 21, 83 for his failed attempt – in the face of the entire faculty's resistance – to make Greek language skills compulsory for all historians (1859 and 1860); it was accompanied by his statements that *the school teachers* of history ought to master perfectly not only Latin,

The effects of the University Ordinance of 1835 are evident from the growing number of defences of Master's (= German doctorate) and doctoral (= German habilitation) dissertations, especially starting in the 1840s when the degrees became compulsory for holding positions at the university).⁷¹ From 1843 to 1868 there were a total of sixteen Master's and four doctoral dissertations in Classical philology which were successfully defended (the latter by Th. Struve, I. Steinman, G. Destunis, K. Lugebil), three of these latter members of the department.⁷² Apart from graduates of St Petersburg University and the Chief Pedagogic Institute, there were three masters from Dorpat – Theodor (Fedor) Struve (Master's 1843, doctorate 1846); Claus (Nikolaj) Mohr (Master's 1845); K. K. Traugott Katterfeld (Master's 1856).⁷³ During the same period there were eight Master's and two doctoral dissertations (M. Kutorga, M. Stasjulevich) in universal history (ancient period) which were successfully defended in the department. Most defences during this period fell between the years 1845 and 1852. Presumably the University Reform of 1835 was finally bearing fruit. In spite of the virtual prohibition of Classical studies at the university after 1848, dissertation defences still took place from 1848 to 1850, but after 1851 they become rare until the mid-1860s. This was related to the anti-classicist politics of the government from 1848 to 1855 and (after Classics were restored in the mid-1850s) to those student agitations at the university which ended with its temporary closure in late 1861.

Practically all those taking a Master's in history later became university professors, while among philologists the vast majority became schoolteachers (the situation only changed in the 1860s). Apart from certain personal advantages of Kutorga as a teacher of future scholars over Graefe and some of his successors, this certainly reflects the cardinal difference in the purposes of education of ancient historians and Classical philologists at the time: the specialists in ancient history were needed only at the university, whereas Classical philologists were in demand not

but Greek too. Extravagant as this desideratum seemed, it was in fact understandable in view of Kutorga's commitment to the notion that the teaching of history, whether at the university or at the grammar school levels, should be explicitly source-based, viz. treat the texts. The correctness of such a view is of course contingent on the aim of instruction and the character of the studentry. What would seem to be unequivocally true, however, is that this type of teaching is ideal, although difficult to attain, for future scholars, both historians and philologists. It is also amazing how Kutorga's words were an uncanny if gloomy harbinger of the gap that would eventually separate history from philology.

⁷¹ The material on defences was worked on by G. B. Kotov.

⁷² See the list of defences from 1835 to 1868 in Григорьев (n. 1), Приложение, I–XXIV.

⁷³ On Struve see Tamm, Tankler (n. 51) 26 n. 16; 28 n. 23; on Mohr see *ibid.*, 28–29.

only at the university but also in grammar schools with their emphasis on Classics especially in the capital city. But just this limited need for specialists in ancient history was a hindrance to development of ancient history as a special discipline at the university: it remained a part of universal history with very limited possibilities of specialization inside the department. Most of Kutorga's students who defended their Master's or even doctoral theses in ancient history had to afterward teach several or even all periods of universal history and then moved on to specialize in other fields such as medieval or modern history (V. M. Vedrov, M. M. Stasjulevich, N. A. Astafjev, V. V. Bauer). For this reason one can only qualifiedly speak of Kutorga's school in *ancient history*: in this field he failed to remain the direct heir to St Petersburg University not (or at least not exclusively) due to his authoritarian character⁷⁴ but mainly because of the institutional weakness of ancient history at this time – and of course not only in Russia.⁷⁵ The possibilities for educating ancient historians were also limited: apart from lectures for all students of humanities (who were called philologists) there were no special lectures or seminars. Only when lectures on ancient history were prohibited after the events of 1848 did Kutorga start his home seminar, following the example of his Dorpat teacher Kruze, and established a tradition of just such informal studies among historians and philologists.

On the contrary, the philological department, which had as its primary purpose the training of future schoolmasters in languages, a seemingly narrow field, had every possibility of educating a considerable number of specialists, among which the percentage of scholars constantly grew.⁷⁶ The study of Classical languages at school and, accordingly, at the university, traditionally entailed hermeneutics relating to Classical texts

⁷⁴ As posited by A. M. Skvortsov (A. M. Скворцов, “М. С. Куторга и его антиковедческая школа” [“M. S. Kutorga and his School of Ancient History”]), *Вестник Челябинского государственного университета*. 2009: № 12 (150), История (Вып. 31) 128.

⁷⁵ The sole and only partial exception was P. I. Lupersolskij, who taught ancient history in Nezhin and continued his scholarly studies for some time but then abandoned them. No exception at all was V. G. Vasiljevskij, who was not Kutorga's student in the proper sense but wrote his Master's under his tutorship and clashed with him; he then moved on to Byzantine studies and became the real founder of the Byzantinist school at the university, having an impact on the other fields comprised within the universal history. F. F. Sokolov, who was the real successor of Kutorga in ancient history in the department, was not a pupil of him in a direct sense.

⁷⁶ Григорьев (n. 1) 299: As of 1835 the money was assigned for the special exercises in four departments (1) History, Geography and Statistics, (2) Mathematics and Physics, (3) Greek and Latin, and (4) Russian Literature and Logic. There was no special training in ancient history.

and thus philological departments became more appropriate for developing techniques of historical research that demanded *inter alia* linguistic competence for such things as the study of inscriptions and papyri. When the state turned to Classics as both an educational and ideological instrument later in 1860ties, Russian philology was already in a position to transform this political program into a means for future progress of the discipline itself. Being the art of multi-level hermeneutical investigation of a text, philology developed into a complex system of historical disciplines that were unified and configured by philological knowledge. “History” in the strict sense, for all the aforementioned reasons, was much slower in adapting and applying philological methods.

By end of the 1840s, however, the Classics had suffered a heavy blow. After the revolutions of 1848 Nicholas I maintained that Classicism represented one of the main threats to the foundations of the Russian Empire. As of 1849, Greek had been almost completely removed from the school curriculum and Latin had been reduced considerably. Uvarov was forced to leave his ministerial post, and in 1849 the universities lost their remaining freedoms, the number of students being reduced and practically only the noblemen able to enter the university (most of the Classics students came from the democratic strata) and with scholarly journeys abroad now prohibited.

III. Graefe’s Heirs: Between *Wortphilologie* and *Altertumswissenschaft* 1851–1884

During this momentous period for Russian universities there was a generational changing of the guard in both of the Classical chairs with the death of Graefe in 1851 and the retirement of Freytag in 1852. Graefe was succeeded in both of his Greek chairs – at the university and the Chief Pedagogic Institute – by his son-in-law I. B. Steinman. Freytag’s successor in both Latin chairs was N. M. Blagoveshchenskij from the University of Kazan. The young professors undertook their duties in an atmosphere that was inauspicious for Classics, but this soon changed. Russia’s defeat in the Crimean War, which showed up the country’s economic backwardness, meant the bankruptcy of the bureaucratic and militarist system of Nicholas I, whose arrogance in foreign policy had engendered the enmity of all the great European states. With his death in 1855 (many believe that he poisoned himself) the road was thus paved for the urgent political, economic and educational reforms of his successor Alexander II.

University life began to return to normal. In 1850, when Graefe was still alive, the Historic-Philological Faculty was restored. In 1855 the journeys abroad of future professors were again permitted. Although the liberalization provoked the immediate growth of an anti-government

movement throughout the country – the student riots among them, which led to temporary closure of the university in late 1861⁷⁷ (the authorities reopening it in 1863)⁷⁸ – the government attempted to regulate university life with yet another ordinance that wisely did not curtail but broadened the liberties of the academic corporation.

This new ordinance restored the autonomy of the universities, which had been undermined by the University Ordinance of 1835, all professors and courses now having to be approved by the faculty.⁷⁹ The new ordinance also decreed an increase in the teaching staff and an expansion of teaching in Classical studies and other disciplines. The new position of *Dozent* (штатный доцент) was introduced for lecturers who had defended their Master's dissertation, and they were also considered candidates for professorial chairs.⁸⁰ The change not only increased the number of university teachers but thus gave young scholars an audience, which in turn freshened the content and manner of teaching. In 1866 the post-graduate positions (аспирант) were officially established, these often but not always supported by state grants.⁸¹

These positive changes were happily exploited by the Department of Classics. Its head at the time, Nikolai Mikhajlovich Blagoveshchenskij (1821–1892),⁸² studied under Graefe in the Chief Pedagogic Institute, spent two years after that in Leipzig (1842–1843) where he became a student of Gottfried Hermann on the special recommendation of

⁷⁷ The famous conflict between Kutorga (not the easiest person) and his students took place at this time, in 1859.

⁷⁸ Григорьев (n. 1) 313–316. Studies in the Oriental Faculty were restored by the beginning of the next year, 1862, those in the Physics-Mathematics Faculty in the autumn of 1862, and those in the Law and Historic-Philological Faculty only in the autumn of 1863.

⁷⁹ The introduction of democratic procedures brought with it such cases as Kutorga's failure to be reelected as professor in 1864 (his colleagues were irritated by his frequent trips abroad); he was saved by intervention of the ministry, which appointed him supernumerary professor with the same duties and salary as before.

⁸⁰ Григорьев (n. 1) 323.

⁸¹ Григорьев (n. 1) 429. In 1869 in the Historic-Philological Faculty there were four such students (including two Classical scholars, I. V. Pomjalovskij and A. V. Prakhov). Another option for post-graduates was to have them work as librarians or laboratory and museum assistants, as is the case today.

⁸² Григорьев (n. 1) 233. On Blagoveshchenskij see: И. В. Цветаев, “Сорок лет учено-литературной деятельности Н. М. Благовещенского (1848–1888)” [I. V. Cvetaev, “Forty Years of the Scholarly and Pedagogic Activities of N. M. Blagoveshchenskij”] (St Petersburg 1888); И. В. Помяловский, “Н. М. Благовещенский. Некролог” [I. V. Pomjalovskij, “N. M. Blagoveshchenskij. An Obituary”], *ЖМНП* 1892. ч. 283, сент., 28–37; И. В. Помяловский (n. 19), В. П. Смышляева, “Н. М. Благовещенский” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “N. M. Blagoveshchenskij”], *СПА* (n. *).

Uvarov.⁸³ Here he was accepted as a participant in the seminar and studied primarily with a rising star from Leipzig, Moritz Haupt (1808–1874), pupil and son-in-law of Hermann, the outstanding textual critic of Latin poetry and one of the first proponents of Lachmann’s method as well as being one of the founders of German philology. Blagoveshchenskij also attended the lectures on “realities” of two other of Hermann’s pupils – Anton Westermann (1806–1869), who introduced the study of antiquities at Leipzig,⁸⁴ and Wilhelm August Becker (1796–1846), author of the famous *Charikles* and *Gallus*, who was just now (1843) beginning work on his compendium of Roman antiquities (later continued by J. Marquardt and Th. Mommsen) as well as writing on Roman topography.⁸⁵ The remarkable atmosphere of Leipzig with its felicitous resolution of the earlier conflicts between *Wortphilologie* and *Sachphilologie* was very congenial to Blagoveshchenskij, and practically all the subjects just noted would appear in his future work.⁸⁶ During the two semesters that Blagoveshchenskij spent in Heidelberg (1843–1844) he was an auditor of old Fr. Creuzer (1771–1858), who in these years had already ceased to defend his famous and perverse *Symbolik*, while lecturing on “archeology”.⁸⁷

⁸³ On Blagoveshchenskij’s studies abroad see Григорьев (n. 1) 234; Помяловский (n. 82) 29.

⁸⁴ On Westermann as the founder of studies on Greek antiquities in Leipzig, see J. H. Lipsius “Das philologische Seminar,” in: *Festschrift zur Feier des 500-jährigen Bestehens der Universität Leipzig* IV/1 (Leipzig 1909) 9. In the summer semester of 1842, Westermann taught the course *Griechische Staatsalterthümer, mit Ausnahmen von Attika* (http://histvv.uni-leipzig.de/dozenten/westermann_a.html).

⁸⁵ K. L. von Urlichs, “Becker, Wilhelm Adolf”, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 2 (1875) 229–231.

⁸⁶ J. H. Lipsius (n. 84) 9, who was himself a philologist but studied the field which today certainly belongs to history (Greek law and state institutions), notes that Hermann, who considered an all-embracing understanding of Classical texts to be the main purpose of philology, educated a number of outstanding pupils in the field of “realities” (Chr. Lobeck, K. F. Hermann, H. Sauppe, A. Westermann) despite his hostile counterattacks on *Sachphilologie* in his polemical disputes with Boeckh. Later, starting in 1847 in Leipzig, a special chair was created for *Altertumswissenschaften* (Otto Jahn); the institutionalization of ancient history as a special discipline took place much later, in 1891. See U. Wilcken, “Das Seminar für Alte Geschichte”, in: *Festschrift* (n. 84) 145 f.

⁸⁷ Cf. Sandys (n. 1) III, 67. Other teachers at Leipzig were Gottfried Stallbaum (1793–1861), the learned editor of Plato, and Reinhold Klotz (1810–1870), at that time renowned as the conservative editor of Cicero and other authors. At Heidelberg, Blagoveshchenskij attended the lectures of Chr. F. Bähr (1798–1872), who was a student of Creuzer and editor of Herodotus, on the history of Latin literature; of the famous Aristotelian Leonard Spengel (1803–1880) and those of the “pure” historian, Fr. Schlosser (1776–1861).

Still studying abroad, he was appointed to the University of Kazan, where he spent five years (1845–1851), fascinating his students with the new spirit of *Altertumswissenschaft*. In Kazan he received his Master's in Latin and archaic Greek art (1847)⁸⁸ and his doctorate in Roman tragedy (1851).⁸⁹ In 1852 he was appointed extraordinary professor to replace Freytag at his *alma mater*, the Chief Pedagogic Institute in St Petersburg. In 1852, at the age of 30, he also became the ordinary professor of Latin at the university.

From the very beginning, in both his study and teaching of literature, Blagoveshchenskij tried to transcend the lines of demarcation between the formal school (see his criticism of Graefe's manner of teaching) and the study of antiquities, especially in the spheres of topography and art. Along with Kutorga he was one of the most popular lecturers; the two were authors of the almanac *Пропилеу (Propylaeae)*, 5 vols., 1850–1855), edited in Moscow by P. M. Leont'ev (Blagoveshchenskij's comrade during his period of study abroad), in which they tried to popularize the science of antiquity as an all-embracing discipline (literature, history, archeology, arts). Blagoveshchenskij strengthened the teaching of antiquities in the curriculum of the university, which before him had been very formally and irregularly taught, following his Leipzig teachers; he gave the introductory course on Roman antiquities (the period of kings and the republic; the imperial period was studied using Western textbooks); and he lectured on the topography of Rome, drawing on fresh impressions from his journey there in 1862 and 1863. Blagoveshchenskij introduced the lecture course on ancient literature, in the manner of Friedrich August Wolf – as opposed to studying it exclusively in the form of commentary on authors, as was typical for Graefe – and it is with Blagoveshchenskij that the teaching of Classics in Russian begins (at the university; at the Chief Pedagogic Institute he and his colleagues continued to lecture in Latin). The grammatical analysis of texts was left to students in the introductory courses, while Blagoveshchenskij himself lectured on his favorite Latin authors (Horace, Persius, Juvenal), concentrating on aesthetic criticism and realities (satiric poetry was his favorite field).⁹⁰ As a teacher Blagoveshchenskij was very successful. He himself was not an epigraphist, but he began teaching Latin epigraphy and thus took the first step in placing the study of “realities”

⁸⁸ *De hieratica quae dicitur artis Graecorum statuarum periodo* (unpublished); the revised Russian version: “О гиратике в древнем греческом искусстве”, *Пропилеу* I (1851) 3–42.

⁸⁹ *De Romanorum tragoedia* (also unpublished), the earlier Russian version: Н. Благовещенский, “О судьбах римской трагедии” [N. Blagoveshchenskij, “On History of Roman Tragedy”], *ЖМНП* 1848, июнь, отд. II, 167–210.

⁹⁰ Григорьев (п. 1) 234; Помяловский (п. 82) 31.

on a firm basis. Two of his pupils, I. V. Pomjalovskij, his successor to the chair, and especially Ivan Vladimirovich Cvetaev,⁹¹ professor at the University of Moscow, were the eminent authorities in this field. The third, Vasilij Modestov, whose university career was blocked by the minister Dmitri Tolstoj because he opposed the radical Classicism of the school reform, became a very prolific scholar in various fields – Latin language and literature, history, epigraphy and archeology – positing some original but often farfetched theories. All three pupils were typical representatives of *Altertumswissenschaft* as their teacher understood it. It seems that Fedor Sokolov (future professor of ancient history and future teacher of St Petersburg philologists in Greek epigraphy) also owed his interest in inscriptions to the impact of Blagoveshchenskij.

Blagoveshchenskij's scholarly achievements were more limited. His *Opus magnum*, a beautiful and learned book on Horace,⁹² an attempt to paint a psychological portrait of his beloved poet, can still be read with pleasure because of its sober judgments and literary merits; but it hardly signaled an advance in scholarship. The author does not go into the interpretation of particulars in Horatius' text, which alone can solve certain disputed points of his literary biography. Of all his works, Blagoveshchenskij himself most valued his annotated translation of the difficult Persius' satires,⁹³ in which he paid unusual for him attention to textual criticism; but as with all his works, it was written in Russian and so remained unnoticed by Horatius' scholars. He also wrote on the third great satirical poet, Juvenal, and translated his satires into Russian. Impressed by recent discovery of the Pergamon Altar, he returned to the first love of his youth and wrote an essay on Hellenistic sculpture, attacking Winckelmann's (!) periodization of Classical sculpture.⁹⁴ On the whole the remarkable scope of Blagoveshchenskij's gifts made him the ideal promoter of the all-encompassing *Altertumswissenschaft* as opposed to the *Wortphilologie* of

⁹¹ Cvetaev owed his further development in this field to F. Bücheler, with whom he studied in Bonn. His most important works are: I. Zvetaieff, *Sylloge inscriptionum Oscarum* (St.Petersburg – Leipzig 1878); *Inscriptiones Italiae mediae dialecticae* (Leipzig 1884); *Inscriptiones Italiae inferioris dialecticae* (Mosquae 1886, repr. Olms 2003). On him see В. П. Смышляева, “И. В. Цветаев” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “I. V. Cvetaev”], *СПА* (n.*).

⁹² *Гораций и его время* [*Horatius and His Time*] (St Petersburg 1864; Warsaw 2¹⁸⁷⁸).

⁹³ *Сатиры Персия* [*Persius' Satires*] (St Petersburg 1878).

⁹⁴ *Винкельман и поздние эпохи греческой скульптуры* [*Winckelman and the Later Epochs of Greek Sculpture*] (St Petersburg 1891). On criticism of this work by the specialists, who found it interesting and finely written but largely outdated and in general amateurish, see Смышляева (n. 82).

the previous epoch; but his scholarship was the continuation of his lectures and was addressed mainly to students and a broad lay public, both of which were very receptive audiences. In the end of 1872 Blagoveshchenskij was appointed the rector of the University of Warsaw and returned in St Petersburg only after his retirement in 1883.

This new trend of *Altertumswissenschaft* was not at first noticeable at the department's Greek chair. Graefe's successor to both his Greek chairs, at the university and the Chief Pedagogic Institute, was his pupil and son-in-law, Ivan Bogdanovitch Shteinman (Johannes Friedrich Steinman, 1819–1872),⁹⁵ a typical representative of *Wortphilologie*. After graduating from the university (1840), like other of Graefe's pupils he spent six semesters abroad (1840–1843), in Berlin and in Leipzig, and at the same time as Blagoveshchenskij. In Russia he wrote his Master's thesis on Plutarch's *Moralia* (1845)⁹⁶ and his doctoral dissertation on Greek etymology (1851).⁹⁷ His career was very successful,⁹⁸ but he left scholarly studies early, and had no lasting impact on students. Similar to Graefe and in contrast to Blagoveshchenskij, he combined teaching at the university and the Pedagogic Institute with activities as a schoolmaster; he taught at several grammar schools and from 1857 to 1867 was director of the Petrischule, the German grammar school, one of St Petersburg's best when it came to the Classics.

Meanwhile the political climate in Russia had become quite favorable for cultivation of the Classics. The government planned to reform Russian schools, taking as their model the German grammar school, which at that time was considered the best in Europe. In 1864, under Minister A. V. Golovnin, the new School Ordinance restored compulsory Greek and the courses in Latin were increased; but owing to a lack of teachers the Ordinance the ordinance was implemented only very slowly. The university, which was charged with the education of teachers after closure of the Pedagogic Institute in 1859, was unequal to this task, as were other

⁹⁵ On Steinman see Григорьев (n. 1) 230; Басаргина (n. 19) 16; В. П. Смышляева, "И. Б. Штейнман" (V. P. Smyshljaeva, "I. B. Shteinman"), СПА (n.*).

⁹⁶ *Plutarchi symposiacarum quaestionum ultimam* (IX, 15) interpretatus est I. F. Steinmann (St Petersburg 1845).

⁹⁷ *Quaestiones de derivatione vocabulorum* (St Petersburg 1851). I am unaware of any scholarly notice taken of Steinman's two dissertations.

⁹⁸ After defence of his Master's thesis he obtained the position of *Privatdozent* (1847), adjunct professor to the Greek and Latin chair (1848), and after defending his doctoral dissertation (1851), in 1853 he became the extraordinary professor of Greek and also the ordinary professor of Greek at the Chief Pedagogic Institute; he was not, however, appointed the ordinary professor at the university until closure of the Institute in 1859.

Russian universities, which educated only a small number of teachers.⁹⁹ It was for this reason that in 1866 the new minister, Graf Dmitri Tolstoj, opened the Teacher Institute of Slavic Grant-Aided Students.¹⁰⁰ But of greater importance to St Petersburg Classical studies was the Historic-Philological Institute, which was rapidly conceived and opened in 1867. Because of Steinman's pedagogic experience and energetic defence of Classical education in scholarly periodicals,¹⁰¹ he was appointed the founding director of the Institute and played a prominent role in its development; in the year of the Institute's opening he retired from his chair at the university. Steinman died in 1872 at the age of 53 as the director of his very successful creation.

The Institute educated the teachers in Classical languages, in the Russian language and its literature, and in history.¹⁰² In terms of the Classics (which constituted the main faculty) the Institute was conceived as an educational establishment imposing strict discipline similar that of the former Pedagogic Institute. Most of its first class of students were graduates of church schools (in contrast to the university, education at the Institute was tuition-free and available to members of the lower classes) who were in general less well prepared than students of the university. But the Institute's educational program combined the subjects of the best German grammar schools with the university's humanities program and thus enabled its students fill in the gaps in their education. Moreover the emphasis on linguistic training (intensive reading of texts, teaching in Latin, translating from Greek into Latin, and obligatory spoken Latin) gave them considerable advantages as compared with the university where the universalist trend of *Altertumswissenschaft* most definitely prevailed. This by itself could however only produce teachers, not scholars. But following the example of the old Pedagogic Institute where Graefe taught, two outstanding German classicists, August Nauck (1822–1892)¹⁰³ und

⁹⁹ Басаргина (n. 19) 12 f. Additionally, from the early 1860s, teachers were enrolled in special university courses offered by their historic-philological faculties, but the result was not significant (no more than twenty persons per year).

¹⁰⁰ The main contingent at the Institute (1866–1882) was that of the Slavic students (mainly Czech) from Austria, of whom many later became teachers of Greek and Latin in Russian grammar schools.

¹⁰¹ See Смышляева (n. 95) on Steinman as a proponent of “humanism” as opposed to “realism” in his publication treating the schools in Western Europe and defending the entrance examination in Latin at universities.

¹⁰² On the Institute's system of education see Басаргина (n. 19) 16–24.

¹⁰³ On Nauck see the obituaries written by P. V. Nikitin, *ЖМНП* 1893, январь, 22–52 (repr. in Басаргина [n. 19] 306–334), and Th. Zielinski, *Biographisches Jahrbuch für Altertumskunde* 78 (1893) 1–65, and A. Gavrilov's paper in this volume. The essence of Nauck's scholarly and teaching method is succinctly described by

Lukian Mueller (1836–1898),¹⁰⁴ were invited as the chief professors of Greek and Latin respectively.¹⁰⁵ Their expertise in textual criticism and metrics was complemented by the happy circumstance that they were graduates of the best German grammar schools, Pforta and the Joachimsthalsches Gymnasium in Berlin, and themselves had experience as schoolmasters. This teaching on the part of excellent philologists, almost from the very beginning (1870), was also duly balanced by the lectures and seminars of a gifted historian, Fedor Fedorovich Sokolov (1841–1909), who was simultaneously a *Dozent* (later professor) at the university. The formidable learning that informed Sokolov’s sometimes pedantic lectures was perhaps not ideal for imbuing all students with a love of Classical antiquity,¹⁰⁶ but he was able to convey the fundamentals of critical method to the best of them both at the university and the Institute during his private seminars devoted primarily to the reading of inscriptions, but also to authors such as Thucydides. These studies were seminal in creating the St Petersburg “historic-philological school”, which grew conspicuous in the 1870s.

The combination of this strict program and excellent scholarship produced the requisite results (and last but not least, the best graduates of the Institute had the possibility of continuing their studies abroad), which far surpassed not only the expectations but even the desires of Tolstoj and Steinman. The Institute not only provided the school with competent teachers – which was the reform’s first real yield in 1871, the year of the

Nikitin: one should fully comprehend the text at all levels (realities, psychology, context, logic, and naturally grammar and meaning) in order to diagnose a fault and emend it through conjecture. Learning this “simple” method of course takes a lifetime of scholarly dedication.

¹⁰⁴ On Mueller see W. Unte, “Müller, Lucian”, *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 18 (1997) 453; В. П. Смышляева, “Лукиан Миллер (Мюллер)” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “Lucian Miller (Müller)”], *СПА* (n. *).

¹⁰⁵ Nauck was invited to Russia earlier, in 1859, to become a member of the Academy of Sciences, and Mueller was specially called to the Institute by Steinman in 1870. Whether or not this was their express purpose, the ministry and Steinman thereby attained a level of instruction in the Classics which surpassed that at the university.

¹⁰⁶ В. В. Варнеке, though noting the terrifying volume of facts which Sokolov’s students had to learn and certain peculiar features of his outward appearance (there was a rumor afoot that Sokolov was the prototype for Fedor Pavlovich Karamazov), considers nevertheless that Sokolov came closer to grasping Classical life than any of the scholars with whom he studied; his lectures on sacral antiquities he holds the best he attained either in St Petersburg or abroad (Б. В. Варнеке, “Старые филологи”. Публикация И. В. Тункиной [В. В. Varneke, “Old Philologists”. Ed. by I. V. Tunkina], *ВДИ* 2013: 4, 122–124).

Institute's first graduating class)¹⁰⁷ and remaining a permanent source of pedagogic manpower until its closure in 1918 – but it became the alma mater of outstanding Classical scholars such as P. V. Nikitin, professor of Greek at the university and later the Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences; V. V. Latyshev, Russia's greatest epigraphist, and future director of the Institute; the outstanding epigraphists A. V. Nikitskij (professor at the University of Moscow) and N. I. Novosadskij (professor at the University of Warsaw and later of Moscow); and B. V. Varneke, specialist in Roman drama, professor in Kazan and Odessa.

With its intensive “formal” education (presided over by true connoisseurs of subjects which were congenial to students), the Institute proved to actually have greater consanguinity with *Realphilologie* than the university with its universalist approach, which dominated under Blagoveshchenskij. Even more important, especially later when a number of university professors taught at the Institute and vice versa,¹⁰⁸ was the growing diversification and subsequent cooperation between philologists of different kinds as well as with ancient historians. Instead of a small group of all-knowing *eruditi*, there gradually emerged an association of specialists who had the ability to teach various subjects beyond their own scholarly specialization and thus able to cooperate with each other.

As for the university department, Steinman's successor to the Greek chair was Gavriil Spiridonovitch Destunis (1818–1895). Destunis' career was not that of your typical university professor. Educated by his father, S. Ju. Destunis (1782–1848), a private scholar and Greek diplomat stationed in Russia, he studied at the university in the time of Graefe (1834–1838), but admired the historian Kutorga most of all. He had to abandon a university career because of poor health, but he recovered after two years residence in Athens, and in 1848, in his own words, he turned “to the study of the Greek world, having added to the Classical period the study of Byzantine and modern Greece”. He was on the staff of the Ministry of Internal Affairs as a translator from modern Greek, he taught modern Greek at various institutions, in 1860 he was invited to the university as a lecturer on modern Greek as well as on Byzantine antiquities and literature (without salary), in 1864 after the university

¹⁰⁷ According to the Ordinance of 1871 the so-called “Tolstoi” Grammar School (where instruction in both Classical languages was compulsory) was seen as only one path to the university, the number of such schools increasing twofold as compared with previously. The emphasis was on a “grammatical” way of teaching.

¹⁰⁸ The Historic-Philological Faculty of the University and the Historic-Philological Institute occupied neighbouring buildings on the banks of the Neva, the “Twelve Collegia” (nowadays the university's main building), and the former palace of Peter II (today housing the Philological and Oriental Faculties).

reopened he resumed teaching as a *Privatdozent*, and in 1865 he was awarded an honorary doctorate. In 1867 he was appointed extraordinary professor of Greek to replace Steinman and in the same year became the ordinary professor. He remained in this position until 1879 when he retired because of illness; in 1894 he was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences. Although not a classicist in terms of his field of research, he taught ancient Greek in the department (annotated readings of authors) and his expert knowledge of manuscripts played a role in the rapid growth of Byzantine studies at the university.¹⁰⁹ He had a particular impact on V. K. Jernstedt, a future outstanding scholar in palaeography.

Karl Joakimovitch Lugebil (1830–1887),¹¹⁰ the last of Graefe's pupils among the university professors, taught at the university from 1862 to 1886 and had the same importance for Greek studies there as did Blagovetschenkij for Latin studies. Graefe, for whom Lugebil always retained warm feelings, died when Lugebil was still a student; since the scholarly junkets were prohibited at the time of his graduation (1852), he was sent abroad only later, from 1860 to 1861, after defence of his Master's ("De Venere Coliade Genetyllide" [Petropoli 1858], dedicated to Graefe).¹¹¹ In between he taught at grammar schools. During his study abroad (four semesters in Berlin, Göttingen, Munich, Rome and Greece) he studied the entire classicist program along lines of *Altertumswissenschaft*, particularly those aspects for which there were no experts in Russia. He thus studied

¹⁰⁹ Григорьев (п. 1) 328, 378; *Биографический словарь* I (п. 19) 225–234 (autobiogr., bibliogr.); А. Э. Шукурова "Из эпистолярного наследия Г. С. Дестуниса: письма к Ф. И. Успенскому" [A. Shukurova, "From Epistolary Heritage of G. S. Destunis. Letters to F. I. Uspenskij"], in: I. P. Medvedev (ed.), *Рукописное наследие русских византистов в архивах Санкт-Петербурга* (St Petersburg 1999) 568–573; В. П. Смышляева, "Г. С. Дестунис" [V. P. Smyshljaeva, "G. S. Destunis"], *СПА* (н.*).

¹¹⁰ On Lugebil see the obituaries by his pupils, V. K. Jernstedt (п. 42) and L. F. Vovodskij (L. Wojewódzki, "Karl Heinrich Lugebil," *Biographisches Jahrbuch* 57 [1890] 26–32); В. П. Смышляева, "Люгебиль, Карл Якимович" [V. P. Smyshljaeva, "Ljugebil', Karl Jakimovich"], *СПА* (н.*) There are also short notices in В. П. Бузескул, *Всеобщая история и ее представители в России в XIX и начале XX в.* [V. Buzeskul, *World History and its Representatives in Russia in the 19th and the Early 20th cent.*], сост. И. В. Тункина (Moscow 2008) 247 and Фролов (п. 1) 236–237.

¹¹¹ The Master's treated an obscure Athenian cult of Aphrodite called *Kolias*; it was evaluated positively by scholars like L. Preller (*Jahrbücher für Philologie* [1859] 511 ff.); the emendation of Arsph. *Lys.* 2 made in this work by Lugebil (it results in identifying *Kolias* with *Genetyllis*), as Jernstedt notes (Ернштедт [п. 42] 128 н. 1), remained unknown to the editors; it was later again posited by Wilamowitz (*Lysistrata*, 1928), who was unaware of the fact that he had been preempted.

art and archaeology with Fr. Wieseler,¹¹² in Rome (1861) he maintained friendly relations with H. Bruun, a historian of art, and W. Henzen, an epigraphist, and became a corresponding member of the Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica, and in Greece he studied monuments of art. As for “pure” philology, in Göttingen he became a student of Hermann Sauppe (1809–1893), the pupil of G. Hermann, the outstanding textual critic of Attic orators, whose interests later expanded to encompass state antiquities and inscriptions.¹¹³ Like Graefe, Lugebil took seriously recent achievements in the area of linguistics and studied with Theodor Benfey and Georg Curtius, the author of the first Greek grammar founded on principles of comparative linguistics (1852). All these fields were later present in his later scholarship and teaching.

After his return to St Petersburg Lugebil started teaching at the university as a *Privatdozent* (1862), then as a *Dozent* (штатный доцент) (1864) and, as V. Jernstedt said of him, gave all his life to the university and scholarship. He was not a brilliant lecturer in the mold of Kutorga and Blagoveshcenskij (a weak voice, poor diction), but he was a teacher of many future specialists, admirably learned in various fields, while at the same focusing on important scholarly problems.

In the first part of his career Lugebil worked on the history of Athenian state institutions. The assertions that Lugebil was influenced by Kutorga are not supported by any evidence; to the contrary, he was rather critical of some of Kutorga’s views. More important for Lugebil’s development in terms of history, or rather ‘antiquities’, was the influence of German scholars and most of all Sauppe. During his stay in Germany, under the guidance of Sauppe, he wrote and published a monograph on ostracism.¹¹⁴ His doctoral dissertation (published in Russian and then in

¹¹² Friedrich Wieseler (1811–1892), an expert in theater antiquities and a representative of “statistical” archaeology, which aimed at collecting all the extant remains of ancient art and interpreting them in the light of literary and artistic evidence (see Sandys [n. 1] III, 223).

¹¹³ See the unstinting praise of Sauppe as textual critic on the part of Wilamowitz, *Geschichte der Philologie* (Leipzig³ 1959 = 1927), 63, who was not usually so charitable and who also notes his outstanding combination of profound linguistic knowledge together with the broad scope of his scholarly interests in terms of “realities”; cf. above (n. 84) Lipsius on the *Realphilologie* as developed by Hermann’s pupils.

¹¹⁴ “Ueber das Wesen und die historische Bedeutung des Ostrakismos in Athen”, *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Supplem. 4 (1861) 117–175 (with thanks to Sauppe, his main teacher, and also to L. Spengel, presumably because of his advice regarding Aristotle’s *Politics*). Against the prevailing view that ostracism was introduced so as to remove those powerful politicians who threatened state order, Lugebil argued that it was rather a means of strengthening the prevailing party and thus avoiding the extremes that accompany intense political struggle. For a long time it was

a revised form in German) treated development of the primeval Athenian monarchy and the difficult problem of when the appointment of Athenian archons by sortition took place.¹¹⁵ Whereas G. F. Schömann attributed this reform to Cleisthenes, Lugebil argued that it occurred much later and no earlier than Ephialtes' reform.¹¹⁶ Schömann, one of the great authorities in this field, responded with an angry review.¹¹⁷ This was the last of Lugebil's work in the field of antiquities. In 1873 after several bouts with pneumonia, he suffered a stroke; after a slow and incomplete recovery he then turned to Greek linguistics, in which he had been interested already earlier, before his illness. In spite of weak health he produced some important works in this field and published (typically for him) both in Russian and in German.¹¹⁸ At this time he also worked

cited as an important work on the subject (e. g. G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* [Munich 1892] 162, 263, who basically agrees with Lugebil; for the counterposition, see R. Pöhlmann, *Grundriss der griechischen Geschichte* [Munich 1896] 76). Of course the discovery of Aristotle's *AP* made it obsolete along with many works of this kind, but it was not entirely forgotten (e. g. O. W. Reinmuth, "Ostrakismos", *RE* 18. 2 [1942] 1685); the *opinio communis* today does not favour Lugebil's view of the purposes of ostracism.

¹¹⁵ К. Люгевиль, *Историко-филологические исследования* [K. Lugebil, *Historic-Philological Studies*] (St Petersburg 1868); "Zur Geschichte der Staatsverfassung von Athen", *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Supplem. 5 (1871) 537–700.

¹¹⁶ Here too the *AP* brought new evidence to bear: see В. Бузескул, *Введение в историю Греции* [V. Buzeskul, *Introduction to the History of Ancient Greece*] (St Petersburg 1915 = 32005) 370–371. But it is not true that Lugebil's view had been refuted by *AP*, since it asserted (8, 1) that the sortition had already been introduced under Solon (Фролов [n. 1] 237 rightly reporting what was said by *AP* 8, 1, also finds that it puts Lugebil in the wrong). In fact we know today that at the time of Solon they introduced the sortition of archons from those who had been previously *elected* – not the sortition *tout court* (*AP* 8, 1); that Ephialtes did not change this mode of selection and that after him, in 457/6 BC, the archons were still chosen from those previously elected (*AP* 26, 2). But we still do not know when they introduced the procedure which was current in the fourth century BC, i. e. the sortition from the candidates previously *selected by lot* in each tribe, as according to *AP* 55, 1 (see P. J. Rhodes, *Commentary on Aristotle's Athenaion Politeia* [Oxford 21991] 146–148, 271–274). Nevertheless, it certainly took place after Ephialtes' reform, i. e. considerably later than all Lugebil's opponents believed and so generally in accord with his cautiously stated view.

¹¹⁷ G. F. Schömann, *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* 1872, 145–168.

¹¹⁸ The largest of them was "Der genetivus singularis in der sog. zweiten altgriechischen Deklination", *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Supplem. 12 (1880) 191–248, which was provoked with one antiquated view of his friend August Nauck (who, like many classical philologists, ignored the achievements of linguistics). Lugebil answered with his own reconstruction of the development of the Homeric

on the translation of Curtius' *Etymology*, with additions and corrections that purported to update the work. Apart from these two main fields of research – state antiquities and linguistics – Lugebil also studied and taught other subjects such as inscriptions and manuscripts; along with literary texts (he preferred Homer and Lysias) his teaching encompassed Greek grammar (as a linguistic discipline), epigraphy, “antiquities”, and art history. As noted by Jernstedt, as a teacher his aim was not to convey the ready-made materials but rather to demonstrate scholarly methods, which was of course most suited to the needs of advanced students (he sometimes overestimated the capacity of the beginners, as testified by his youngest student Zhebelev).¹¹⁹ This aporetic manner of teaching together with very solid erudition in tandem with great humanity made him an ideal *Doktorvater* for students with widely varying interests. Only one of his direct pupils, the palaeographer V. Jernstedt, later taught in the department; but among his numerous pupils, both scholars and schoolmasters, were three future professors at other universities – L. F. Voevodskij (Odessa), D. F. Beljaev (Kazan), later the outstanding Byzantine scholar, and P. I. Alandskij (Kiev). Lugebil also had an impact on two of Blagoveshchenskij's pupils, the epigraphists Pomialovskij and Cvetaev,¹²⁰ and on the first professional historian of Classical, Byzantine and ancient Russian art at the University (later in Kiev), A. I. Prakhov (1846–1916).¹²¹ He died in 1887, soon after retirement from the university and just when his friend A. Nauck recommended him as the successor to L. Stephani at the Academy of Sciences; it was expected that he might continue his scholarly work there free of teaching.

After Graefe's death and up until Blagoveshchenskij's move to Warsaw the educational duties were normally divided among the four professors, two for upper-division courses and two for lower-division ones (both junior and senior classmen generally attended the same lectures).¹²²

ending -οιο to the Attic -ου, that was based on textual criticism of Homer and on the analysis of data from inscriptions. His views were taken in account for instance by E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* I (Munich 1939) 555, who wrote eighty years later. For a richly documented survey of Lugebil's other linguistic works see Смышляева (п. 110).

¹¹⁹ See С. А. Жебелев, “Из университетских воспоминаний (1886–1890)” [S. A. Zhebelev, “From the Memoirs of the University (1886–1890)”] (1922), *ВДИ* 1968: 3, 163–164.

¹²⁰ On Lugebil's role in Cvetaev's turn from literary criticism (Tibullus) to the study of Latin historical grammar and inscriptions see В. П. Смышляева, “И. В. Цветаев” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “I. V. Cvetaev”], *СПА* (н.*).

¹²¹ See *Биографический словарь* (н. 19) II (1898) 130.

¹²² The information on teaching was worked on by G. B. Kotov.

Latin for the senior classmen was taught by Blagoveshchenskij, and junior classmen (from 1852 to 1882) were taught by Grigorij Ivanovich Lapshin (1813–1884), an excellent connoisseur of language and a severe teacher of the Graefe school (he did not publish).¹²³ I. V. Pomjalovskij (1845–1906) started lecturing in 1869, and after a period of scholarly travel abroad (1869–1871) he became Blagoveshchenskij’s successor; after defence of his doctoral dissertation in 1873 he then filled the position of extraordinary professor. In 1875 I. A. Shebor became the third Latinist lecturer and was later a *Privatdozent*.¹²⁴

The two professors of Greek were Destunis (for upperclassmen) and Lugebil (for junior classmen). A third Hellenist, V. K. Jernstedt, joined them as a lecturer in 1877, and after defence of his Master’s in 1880 and a period of scholarly travel abroad (1880–1883) he taught as a *Privatdozent*. Replacing Destunis upon his retirement in 1878 was P. V. Nikitin, Nauck’s pupil, who had earlier taught at Nezhin’s Lyceum (Jernstedt did not have a degree; Lugebil’s candidate, his pupil L. F. Voevodskij, lost in the faculty voting to Nikitin).¹²⁵

A new generation made its presence known in the department with the arrival of Pomjalovskij, Jernstedt, Nikitin and Shebor. Ivan

¹²³ Lapshin was also a teacher at several pedagogic instalments and the professor of Latin; he later was the ‘observer’ (“наблюдатель”) of teaching Latin at St Petersburg grammar schools on the whole; on his biography and extraordinary pedagogic activity (he was the teacher of Latin inter alios of I. V. Pomjalovskij and A. I. Prakhov), see В. П. Смышляева, “Г. И. Лапшин” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “G. I. Lapshin”], *СИА* (n.*).

¹²⁴ Two professors of the Historic-Philological Institute taught Latin for a short time in the department’s lower-division courses, namely Alexander Osipovich Ionin (1834–1882) from 1873 to 1875, and Vladimir [Woldemar Alexander] Vasiljevich Musselius (1846–1920) from 1878 to 1882, the author of the well known Russian-Latin dictionary (see *Биографический словарь* [n. 19] II, 63).

¹²⁵ The other professors at the Greek chair for underclassmen: Ivan Ivanovich Lunjak (1847–1935), a *Privatdozent* from 1882 to 1885. He was of Czech origin, alumnus of a Russian seminar at Leipzig University, and after St Petersburg he taught at the universities of Kazan and Moscow and in 1892 was appointed ordinary professor in Odessa (*Биографический словарь* I [n. 19] 406–408); after the October Revolution he was professor at Ljubljana University in Yugoslavia from 1920 to 1929, and following his retirement he spent his final days in Prague: P. Ш. Ганелин et al. (ed.), *Сетевой биографический словарь профессоров и преподавателей Санкт-Петербургского университета 1819–1917* [*Web Biographical Dictionary of Professors and Lecturers of St Petersburg University* (St Petersburg 2012–2014): <http://bioslovhist.history.spbu.ru/component/fabrik/details/1/155.html>. Another *Privatdozent* Dmitri Pavlovich Lebedev (1882–1883), a former lecturer at Odessa University where he taught Greek and ancient philosophy (Ганелин et al. [see above] <http://bioslovhist.history.spbu.ru/component/fabrik/details/1/801.html>).

Vasiljevich Pomjalovski,¹²⁶ the pupil of Blagoveshchenskij and Lugebil, although a professor of Latin, combined both Greek and Latin expertise in his scholarship. At first a disciple of Blagoveshchenskij's literary studies and sharing a similar interest in Roman satire (his Master's was on Varro's *Menippean*),¹²⁷ during his travel abroad he came under the influence of F. Ritschl and began to study Latin epigraphy and linguistics, later becoming (together with I. V. Cvetaev) one of the founders of this disciplinary approach in Russia. He published an important investigation of Latin curse tablets and columbaria,¹²⁸ but he was able to more fully apply his methodology only later in editing and studying agiographic texts of late antiquity and the Byzantine era (projects of the Palestine Society).¹²⁹ In the department and simultaneously at the Historic-Philological Institute he effectively proselytized this cutting-edge scholarship in his lectures on literature and Roman antiquities and particularly in his epigraphic Latin seminars.

Petr Vasil'evich Nikitin (1849–1916)¹³⁰ followed the Nauckian tradition of textual criticism; during his travels abroad he received additional impulses for his work from F. Ritschl (textual criticism) and G. Curtius (linguistics). He penned two valuable monographs, his Master's thesis and doctoral dissertation, which showed him to be an expert in the Greek language, textual criticism and inscriptions.¹³¹ He did not publish much but he did complete and edit A. Nauck's *Tragicæ Dictionis Index* (1892) as well as some of Jernstedt's works. He occupied the positions of Rector of the University (1890–1897), Dean of the Faculty (1897–1900) and the Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences (1900–1916) which amounted to that of President (the official president was the Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich). He taught in the department until 1900, namely Greek literature and language inclusive the dialects, and in general he exercised a notable influence.

¹²⁶ В. П. Смышляева, “И. В. Помяловский” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “I. V. Pomjalovskij”], *СПА* (n. *) with further lit.

¹²⁷ Марк Теренций Варрон Реатинский и Мениппова сатура [M. Terentius Varro Reatinus and Menippean Satira] (St Petersburg 1869).

¹²⁸ Эпиграфические этюды [Epigraphic Etudes] (St Petersburg 1873).

¹²⁹ И. П. Медведев, “И. В. Помяловский и его вклад в византиноведение: по материалам архива ученого [I. P. Medvedev, “I. V. Pomjalovskij and His Contribution to Byzantine Studies: The Materials of the Scholar's Archive”], in: idem (ed.), *Мир русской византистики* (St Petersburg 2004) 207–240.

¹³⁰ On him see the valuable monograph: Басаргина (n. 19).

¹³¹ П. В. Никитин, *Об основах для критики текста эолических стихотворений Феокрита* [On the Principles of Textual Criticism of Theocritus' Aeolic Poems] (Kiev 1876); *К истории афинских драматических состязаний* [On the History of Athenian Dramatic Competitions] (St Petersburg 1882).

Viktor Karlovich Jernstedt (1854–1902),¹³² a graduate of the department, the pupil of Lugebil and of Sokolov in epigraphy, was also under the sway of Nauck in matters of textual criticism,¹³³ his Master's treating the manuscript tradition of Greek orators.¹³⁴ Jernstedt was hardly prolific in terms of scholarship, but he did leave behind some excellent short studies on Greek paleography and textual criticism. (The only exception is the outstanding edition of the fragments of Menander's *Ghost* which he discovered on parchment sheets from the collection of Porphyry Uspenskij, acquired by the Public library; his doctoral dissertation.¹³⁵) By no means a popular lecturer (in this regard similar to his teacher Lugebil), it was still by dint of his lectures on Greek authors and on Greek palaeography and due to the strict methodology which he promoted that he ultimately exercised a considerable influence on future scholars who followed his example in devoting themselves primarily to the study of *Hilfsdisziplinen* (M. N. Krashennikov, S. A. Zhebelev, N. Ja. Shubin, R. Ch. Leper).¹³⁶ Already a mature scholar, he attended lectures on papyrology in Berlin and in the last years of his short life he was working toward publication of

¹³² On Jernstedt see П. В. Никитин, “Памяти В. К. Ернштедта” [P. V. Nikitin, “V. K. Jernstedt. In Memoriam”] (1902), in: Басаргина (n. 19) 334–340; Жебелев (n. 119) 164–165; Фролов (n. 1) 248–253; В. П. Смышляева, “В. К. Ернштедт” [V. P. Smyshljaeva, “V. K. Jernstedt”], *СПА* (n.*).

¹³³ Jernstedt spent two years (1880–1882) in Greece pursuing archaeological and epigraphic studies under the guidance of Ulrich Köhler and Paul Foucart (directors of the French and German Institutes at Athens) and together with another Sokolov's pupil V. V. Latyshev, for whose career as epigraphist this traveling became seminal. Jernstedt himself, who later wrote very competently on inscriptions, derived greater profit from the study of manuscripts in European libraries (1882–1883).

¹³⁴ “Об основах текста Исея Динарха, Антифонта и Ликурга” [“On the Foundations of Isaeus', Dinarchus', Antiphon's and Lycurgus' Text”], *ЖМНП* 1879, апрель – май (republished in *Victoris Jernstedt Opuscula* [St Petersburg 1907] 33–102), this dense argument accompanied by polite, but often devastating expert criticism of his predecessors. His Master's remained unrecognized beyond Russian borders, as did most of Jernstedt's work; though able to write perfectly in German and in Latin, he nevertheless preferred to use Russian, presumably pursuing the noble but hopeless goal of making Russian a language of scholarship. But the achievements of the edition of Antiphon's speeches which immediately followed (*Antiphontis orationes*, edidit Victor Jernstedt [Petropoli 1880], dedicated to Nauck whom the author thanks for reading and making improvements) was duly appreciated by F. Blass (criticized by Jernstedt) in his second edition of Antiphon (Teubner 1884).

¹³⁵ A. Körte in the preface to his edition (*Menandrea* [Leipzig 1910] xlviii f.), praising Jernstedt's reconstruction of the text, notes that the Russian language of this publication and T. Kock's stubborn refusal to attribute the fragments to Menander hindered opportune appreciation of Jernstedt's achievement.

¹³⁶ Жебелев (n. 119) 164–165.

the papyri of the Public library in St Petersburg. He himself was only able to publish one papyrus, but his student and Russia's leading papyrologist G. F. Cereteli later edited (with his pupils O. O. Krüger [Krugler] and P. V. Jernstedt, the son of V. K. Jernstedt) the *Papyri Russischer und Georgischer Sammlungen* (1925–1935). Also in his role as editor of the philological section of the *Journal of the Ministry of People's Education*, Russia's most important Classical journal, Jernstedt played a considerable role in shaping the intellectual attitude of the next scholarly generation.

Josif Antonovich Shebor (1848–1928), the beloved pupil of Blagoveshchenskij, taught from 1875 to 1896 simultaneously at the university (as lecturer and later as *Privatdozent*; he passed his Master's exams but never defended his thesis) and at the Historic-Philological Institute, where he was first an extraordinary and then the ordinary professor (1883). A gifted teacher, he left behind some papers on textual criticism and school editions of Latin authors. He left Russia in 1896.

The Department of universal history, where ancient history was taught, was not in the best state after restoration of Classical studies in 1855. Kutorga gradually distanced himself from teaching and devoted more time to travel and his scholarly work; his gifted pupils V. V. Bauer and N. A. Astafjev shifted their focus to more recent periods of history. But from the late 1860s, as already mentioned, F. F. Sokolov taught ancient history and held seminars on epigraphy; he had enormous influence on the development of *Hilfsdisziplinen* and, to a lesser degree, on the study of ancient history; but his impact was greater in the philological than in the history department. Only A. N. Shchukarev (1861–1900) of his intimate pupils later taught in the Department of History; all others (V. V. Latyshev, A. V. Nikitskij, N. I. Novosadskij, S. A. Zhebelev, B. V. Varneke) were trained as philologists and later taught in philological departments (this naturally also holds for Jernstedt and Nikitin, who also studied with Sokolov). This was related to the fact that ancient history had not yet established itself as a separate discipline (this occurred only after the revolution of 1917). Apart from his extraordinary personal qualities and devotion to his subject, the effect of Sokolov's teaching on philologists can be explained by his own solid philological erudition (he could teach texts to philologists and wrote excellently on philological matters).¹³⁷ It is also necessary to keep in mind that he was not alone in his efforts, which were complemented by Nauck's and Lugebil's expert knowledge in matters of textual criticism and later that of Nikitin and Jernstedt. The creation of St Petersburg's historic-philological school was thus the result of the work of several generations of philologists and historians who taught in a collaborative fashion.

¹³⁷ See Варнеке (n. 106) 125–126.

Epilogue. The Ordinance of 1884

The Classics experienced a reversal of fortune with the University Ordinance of 1884, which was definitely in accord with the spirit of reaction which came after the assassination of Alexander II. All liberties granted in 1864 were rescinded. The important aspect was a desperate attempt to make the humanities the dominant curriculum at the university just as Classics exercised hegemony at the secondary school level.¹³⁸ The number of lectures in Classics grew enormously; moreover all (!) students in the Historic-Philological Faculty now had to do graduate work in the Classics. The reform aimed to institute a purely grammatical style of teaching à la Tolstoj Grammar School. The university classicists (Pomjalovskij and Nikitin) vainly protested against these undesirable and very burdensome “privileges” and, typical of Russian intellectuals, ultimately feigned compliance with the ordinance while foregoing any further struggle.¹³⁹

According to the University Ordinance the chairs of Greek and Latin were transformed into the Chair (Department) of Classical Philology. The position of *Dozent* was abandoned and the former *Dozenten* were either made *Privatdozenten* or promoted to extraordinary professors. This latter was the case with Nikitin and Jernstedt as well as Sokolov, who occupied the chair for universal history. In that same year of 1884 Pomjalovskij became the second ordinary professor besides Lugebil and the department gained a new professor, Faddej Francevich Zielinski (1859–1944),¹⁴⁰ alumnus of the Russian Philological Seminar at Leipzig University, who had done his PhD there under the supervision of O. Ribbeck. After the defence of his Master’s in St Petersburg in late 1883, he started teaching as *Privatdozent* (lectures on Attic comedy) in 1884. After Lugebil’s retirement in 1886 Pomjalovskij became head of the department and Nikitin the ordinary professor in place of Lugebil. In 1887 Zielinski filled the now vacant slot of extraordinary professor owing to the patronage of A. I. Georgievskij (who was at the head of the Scholarly committee of the Ministry and directed the reform). Worthy candidate that he was, he would not have been able to fill the chair so early in his career, had election by faculty members not been jettisoned by the new ordinance, as he himself admitted. With Zielinski the chair acquired a gifted and a very productive scholar

¹³⁸ On this period see Жебелев (n. 136), and further Басаргина (n. 19) 58–69.

¹³⁹ See, in this volume, W. A. Schröder on the seminar.

¹⁴⁰ See Zielinski’s autobiography: J. Axer, A. Gavrilo, M. von Albrecht (ed.), *Th. Zielinski, Mein Lebenslauf – Erstausgabe des deutschen Originals’ und Tagebuch 1939–1944* (Frankfurt a. M. etc. 2012), with annotations by A. I. Ruban; on the department see p. 92–95, 106–112.

who later became a brilliant lecturer and to a certain degree the spiritual leader of the next generation of Classical philologists. Zielinski filled the chair of the third ordinary professor in 1890 (faculty elections having been restored) and was thus promoted ahead of Jernstedt, who was five years older; the latter first defended his doctoral dissertation in 1891 when he was finally elected ordinary professor and thus becoming the fourth man to have obtained this position. The growth in educational tasks because of the University Ordinance contributed to an increase of the educational staff; the *Privatdozenten* now shared duties with the professors (among them scholars of the rank and caliber of V. V. Latyshev and V. I. Modestov). These events ushered in the last phase of the department when it saw a gradual transformation, at both the organizational and personal level, of the philological chair into the Institute for *Altertumswissenschaft*. The department would soon achieve the apogee of its success – before suffering alarming attacks from enemies of Classics on both the right and the left and culminating in its destruction in the wake of 1917.

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

The author surveys the history of the Department of Classics at St Petersburg University from 1819 to 1884 – from its humble beginnings to its impressive growth in the course of the classicizing reform. Stress is laid on different tendencies in Classical philology (*Wortphilologie* versus *Altertumswissenschaft*) as mirrored in teaching and scholarship within the department as well as on the complicated but ever fruitful relations between classical philologists and ancient historians at the time.

Статья представляет собой попытку дать первый очерк истории Санкт-Петербургской кафедры классической филологии от ее скромного начала до вступления в эпоху расцвета во время классицистских реформ школы и университета (1819–1884). Преимущественное внимание уделено различным тенденциям внутри филологического сообщества (формалистическое и универсальное направления), а также сложным и в целом плодотворным взаимоотношениям классической филологии и античной истории в Петербурге того времени.