

*Vladimir Kashcheev*

NIKODIM P. KONDAKOV  
AND MIKHAIL I. ROSTOVTTZEV:  
A TEACHER AND HIS DISCIPLE

*In memoriam Heinz Heinen*

In his *An Introduction to Archaeology* (1923), S. A. Zhebelev called Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov (1844–1925) “a famous archaeologist” and showed that his scholarly and literary activity “in its entirety covers almost all branches of archaeology”, from classical and Byzantine to Old Russian, Slavic and western European.<sup>1</sup> He was the founder of a research school whose main representatives were the Russian archaeologists and art historians D. V. Ainalov, E. K. Redin and Ya. I. Smirnov. According to a fair assessment by Sergei A. Zhebelev, “The entire modern generation of Russian archaeologists can be considered to have passed through ‘the Kondakov school’”.<sup>2</sup> But the school’s graduates also included many Russian historians of antiquity and classical philologists. Interesting and instructive in this respect is the research career of Mikhail Ivanovich Rostovtzev (1870–1952), whose achievements in ancient history made it possible for Karl Christ, after the death of Mikhail Ivanovich, to quite reasonably compare him with Theodor Mommsen.<sup>3</sup> As one of the most famous students of the academician Kondakov, Mikhail I. Rostovtzev was obviously influenced by his teacher in many ways. It is of interest to trace the main lines of influence of Nikodim P. Kondakov and his school on the formation and development of Rostovtzev as a researcher.

The life and scholarly activities of N. P. Kondakov and M. I. Rostovtzev are quite similar. Both were energetic researchers, possessed a powerful creative temperament and sharp intellect, and had unusually broad scholarly interests and rich professional and life experience. Both belonged to the St Petersburg school of history and philology, although their conscious life paths began in different places: Kondakov’s in

---

<sup>1</sup> Zhebelev 1923 [С. А. Жебелёв, *Введение в археологию. Ч. 1. История археологического знания*], 134.

<sup>2</sup> Zhebelev 1923, 133–134.

<sup>3</sup> Christ 1972, 334.

Moscow and Rostovtzev's in Kiev. Both received recognition as researchers at home and abroad even before emigrating from Russia. Both were elected members of the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences, in 1900 and 1917 respectively. Both made numerous trips to collect material for their research, and both led archaeological excavations: Kondakov in the Crimea, Taman and Kuban, Rostovtzev in Dura-Europos. Both lived quite long lives and were buried outside Russia: Kondakov at the Olshansky Cemetery in Prague, Rostovtzev at the Glove Street Cemetery in New Haven, Connecticut. Both had pupils and followers in Russia and abroad; their scholarly achievements had a significant impact on the development of world scholarship in the twentieth century.

N. P. Kondakov studied at the Faculty of History and Philology of Moscow University from 1861 to 1865, where his main university teacher was Fedor Ivanovich Buslaev (1818–1897), who was not only an art historian, but primarily a historian of Russian literature and the Russian language.<sup>4</sup> Nikodim Pavlovich called him “the famous Russian scholar” and his “unforgettable teacher”<sup>5</sup> and considered him “a real Westerner” and “a European in the true sense of the word”.<sup>6</sup> In his papers on Russian archaeology and art history, N. P. Kondakov saw “a light imprint of those rosy impressions” that Buslaev had experienced during his travels abroad in 1839–1840.<sup>7</sup> They undoubtedly bear the imprint of the works the young Buslaev read, including those by Johann Joachim Winckelmann,

---

<sup>4</sup> Ainalov 1928 [Д. Айналов, “Академик Н. П. Кондаков как историк искусства и методолог”], 312.

<sup>5</sup> Kondakov 1908 [Н. П. Кондаков, “Предисловие”, in: Ф. И. Буслаев, *Сочинения по археологии и истории искусства*], III.

<sup>6</sup> Kondakov 2002 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Воспоминания и думы*], 72. He believed that, among Russian scholars, Buslaev was “not only a European scholar par excellence, but, in his way, the most happily formed thinker and writer” (Kondakov 1908, III).

<sup>7</sup> Kondakov 1908, II. In his memoirs, F. I. Buslaev writes about this journey: “Suddenly, an immense and alluring perspective opened up in front of me from the Baltic Sea through Germany and the Alps to wide Lombardy, from the Adriatic Sea to Venice, and from there through the Alps to Florence, Rome and finally to the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, with Naples and Vesuvius, with Herculaneum and Pompeii. My spirit was occupied, my head was spinning; I didn't feel my legs under me in the impetuous expectation of seeing, feeling and experiencing all this, stimulating the mind and imagination”. And then the memoirist, who by that time had long outlived his passion for Romanticism, continues: “The promised land for enthusiastic souls was then Italy, empty, wretched and enslaved in its present and so inexhaustible and powerful in the artistic monuments of its past, like an immense cemetery of world giants who once built the babel of European civilization” (Buslaev 1897 [Ф. И. Буслаев, *Мои воспоминания*], 157).

Karl Otfried Müller, Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Kant, Hegel, Schelling, August Schlegel and Wilhelm Humboldt.<sup>8</sup> Fedor Ivanovich admitted that even in his student years he had heard the name of Jacob Grimm from Professor M. P. Pogodin. He noted that the German scholar “with his numerous and varied studies later had such a charming effect on me, so inspired me that I became one of his most zealous and devoted followers”.<sup>9</sup>

The formation of N. P. Kondakov as a scholar was influenced by a number of Buslaev’s works on the history of the Slavic language and Russian icon painting.<sup>10</sup> It was under the influence of his teacher that Kondakov, after graduating from the university, took up the study of Christian and Byzantine art. Fedor Ivanovich spoke at the debate on the doctoral dissertation of his student,<sup>11</sup> who many years later recalled this with gratitude.<sup>12</sup> The surviving correspondence between F. I. Buslaev and N. P. Kondakov testifies to close scholarly and personal ties between teacher and pupil, which continued even after the latter left Moscow.<sup>13</sup>

N. P. Kondakov’s research activities and teaching at the university during the Odessa period of his life (1869–1888) were undoubtedly important for his further development as a scholar of ancient and Byzantine art. Nevertheless, his stay in St Petersburg was the most eventful and fruitful time of his academic career.

---

<sup>8</sup> Buslaev 1897, 144; 155–156; 177; 184; 186, etc.; see Kyzlasova 2018 [И. Л. Кызласова, *Академик Н. П. Кондаков: поиски и свершения*], 55–57.

<sup>9</sup> Buslaev 1897, 128.

<sup>10</sup> Buslaev 1848 [Ф. И. Буслаев, *О влиянии христианства на славянский язык. Опыт истории языка по Остромирову евангелию*]; it was his master’s thesis, in which, using the material of the Church Slavonic language of the Holy Scriptures, he established a close connection between the history of the language and the life of the people who were its bearers, with their morals, customs, traditions and beliefs. See also Buslaev 1844 [*О преподавании отечественного языка*]; Buslaev 1866 [*Общие понятия о русской иконописи*].

<sup>11</sup> Kondakov 1876 [Н. П. Кондаков, *История византийского искусства и иконографии по миниатюрам греческих рукописей*]. In this work, N. P. Kondakov, in particular, formulated the idea, close to F. I. Buslaev’s views, that artistic culture acts as “an indispensable, full and unique expression of the life of every nation” (Kondakov 1876, 50).

<sup>12</sup> N. P. Kondakov writes about this in a letter to V. V. Stasov dated April 21, 1895; see Kyzlasova 2018, 261 n. 68.

<sup>13</sup> Between December 1875 to January 1891, N. P. Kondakov wrote nine letters to F. I. Buslaev, and Buslaev wrote six to his former student. The letters are kept in the Research and Development Department of the RSL, RGALI and St Petersburg FA RAS; see Kyzlasova 2018, 188–211.

Here, for a short time, N. P. Kondakov lectured at St Petersburg University (1888–1892) and the Higher Courses for Women (1890–1891). He began teaching the art history for the first time, organized, in the Hermitage, the Department of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and served on the Archaeological Commission. He also did productive work at the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences, and the Academy of Arts owed him its new charter (1893). He founded the Icon Painting Committee and began to study the works of ancient Russian fine art systematically. He took part in the activities of the Russian Archaeological Society,<sup>14</sup> the Society of Lovers of Ancient Literature and the Orthodox Palestinian Society. His diverse and successful activities were witnessed not only by his colleagues, but also by his pupils, for whom he was always a model scholar.

N. P. Kondakov's influence on M. I. Rostovtzev, his other pupils and disciples and those who could only indirectly consider themselves to be his pupils took place at different times and in different forms. The lecture courses that Nikodim Pavlovich taught at St Petersburg University (and earlier at Novorossiysky University) played an important role in this process. After graduating from the Kiev Gymnasium with a silver medal in 1888 and studying for two years at the Faculty of History and Philology at the University of St Vladimir in Kiev, young Rostovtzev enrolled in St Petersburg University in September 1890.<sup>15</sup> There he attended courses given by N. P. Kondakov on archaeology and art history, including classical art.<sup>16</sup> It is known that in the spring semester of the 1890–1891 academic year, Nikodim Pavlovich lectured and conducted seminars on the history and archaeology of Christian art.<sup>17</sup> Later M. I. Rostovtzev confessed: “I was a baby in the field of archaeology, a novice classicist.

---

<sup>14</sup> S. A. Zhebelev describes N. P. Kondakov's time in St Petersburg as “the most brilliant, fruitful period of his activities” (Zhebelev 2002 [С. А. Жебелёв, “ОЕУС ТА ПРАГМАТА”], 218); see Tunkina 2008 [И. В. Тункина, “Биографический словарь-указатель,” in: В. П. Бузескул, *Всеобщая история и ее представители в России в XIX и начале XX века*], 620; Kashcheev 2021a [В. И. Кашеев, “Кондаков Никодим Павлович,” in: *СПА*], 368.

<sup>15</sup> Zuev 1997a [В. Ю. Зуев, “М. И. Ростовцев. Годы в России. Биографическая хроника”, in: Г. М. Бонгард-Левин (ред.), *Скифский роман*], 51–52.

<sup>16</sup> Rostovtzev 2002 [М. И. Ростовцев, “Странички воспоминаний”], 211; see Alipov 2017 [П. А. Алипов, “А. Май, Н. П. Кондаков и М. И. Ростовцев: к вопросу о научной кооперации историков”, *Вестник РГГУ. Серия: Политология. История. Международные отношения*], 29.

<sup>17</sup> Tikhonov 2003 [И. Л. Тихонов, *Археология в Санкт-Петербургском университете. Историкографические очерки*], 59.

For the first time I heard about the history of art and about archaeology from N. P., in his lectures ... on the history of ancient art”.<sup>18</sup>

A circle was formed under the leadership of N. P. Kondakov at the Museum of Antiquities at St Petersburg University. Its senior members were Alexander N. Shchukarev, Dmitriy V. Ainalov and Yegor K. Redin.<sup>19</sup> The group of younger participants – in addition to Mikhail I. Rostovtzev himself – included Yakov I. Smirnov and Sergey A. Zhebelev, who were joined by Boris A. Turaev, Grigory F. Tsereteli and later Boris V. Farmakovskiy.

According to M. I. Rostovtzev, it was the circle around Kondakov, not Kondakov himself, that conveyed to him a sense of his teacher’s “enthusiasm for antiquity ... love of monuments and method for strict and accurate knowledge”.<sup>20</sup> Here, the influence of N. P. Kondakov was always felt, along with the invisible presence of Fedor Fedorovich Sokolov (1841–1909), with whom Rostovtzev never personally interacted,<sup>21</sup> but who in his Friday *privatissima* developed close ties to S. A. Zhebelev and A. N. Shchukarev.<sup>22</sup> Members of the circle at the Museum of Antiquities were called “factolaters” (*фактопоклонники*, < “idolaters”), but Mikhail Ivanovich did not regard them, N. P. Kondakov, or even F. F. Sokolov as such. From the members of the circle and their teachers, he learned that the most important thing was to honor facts; the essential first step was “to establish the facts, strictly and accurately ... according to the sources”.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 211. It is interesting to look at these lectures from the other perspective. Noting the indifference of students to his lectures in Odessa, N. P. Kondakov admitted: “Only at St Petersburg University, where I taught for just four years, ... did I feel much better at my lectures, because from the very beginning I knew that there were two to three students who were studying my subject” (Kondakov 2002, 139). Now we can guess who these students were.

<sup>19</sup> Both of them, as candidates of Novorossiysky University, were seconded for scholarly studies at St Petersburg University; see Tikhonov 2001 [И. Л. Тихонов, “Становление классической археологии в Санкт-Петербургском университете: школа Н. П. Кондакова”, in: *Никодим Павлович Кондаков. 1844–1925. Личность, научное наследие, архив. К 150-летию со дня рождения*], 28.

<sup>20</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 212.

<sup>21</sup> V. Yu. Zuev states that Rostovtzev shied away from being taught by F. F. Sokolov, and suggests that this was due to the influence exerted on the young Rostovtzev by I. V. Pomyalovsky (see Zuev 1997a, 53), who was the dean of the Faculty of History and Philology at St Petersburg University from 1887 to 1897 (see Tunkina 2008, 719).

<sup>22</sup> Kashcheev 2021b [В. И. Кашеев, “Соколов Фёдор Фёдорович”, in: *СПА*], 696.

<sup>23</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 212; cf. Alipov 2019 [П. А. Алипов, “Научное наследие Н. П. Кондакова в историографическом осмыслении его учеников и коллег”, in: *Вестник РГГУ. Серия: Политология. История. Международные отношения*], 18.

In this circle, a prominent figure was Yakov Ivanovich Smirnov (1869–1918), whom Mikhail Ivanovich characterized as “the closest” to Kondakov, “the most brilliant” of his students and “undoubtedly, the most powerful and whole-hearted person” in this association of young people.<sup>24</sup> According to S. A. Zhebelev, “He was a ‘great critic’, a great skeptic, an amazing ‘paradoxographer’, but behind his eternal intractability was a surprisingly kind, gentle, nobly pure, absolutely honest, extremely truthful soul”.<sup>25</sup> There is no doubt that N. P. Kondakov highly appreciated Smirnov and later, according to B. V. Varneke’s memoirs, he said about his disciple:

That I took him to the academy<sup>26</sup> is perhaps the best deed of my life, although many people attacked him for not publishing enough. But everything he publishes is real gold, and no one in our country now feels the historical style as much as Yakov Ivanovich. Such experts, perhaps, only exist in the British Museum ... I learned a lot from him myself.<sup>27</sup>

Ya. I. Smirnov enjoyed deep and sincere respect and there can be little doubt that his studies in archaeology significantly influenced M. I. Rostovtzev as a researcher both in his student years and afterward. It is no coincidence that Mikhail Ivanovich once called Ya. I. Smirnov “my constant teacher in the field of archaeology”.<sup>28</sup> However, despite this, he

---

<sup>24</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 213.

<sup>25</sup> Zhebelev 1993b [С. А. Жебелев, “Из воспоминаний о Я. И. Смирнове”], 182. Based on the analysis of the published works of Ya. I. Smirnov and the works about him by his contemporaries, L. G. Klimanov notes his features as a researcher and personality: he was “a deeply and broadly educated person with a strong university background and a strong critical mind; an expert on research literature, which he closely followed and meticulously studied; an all-round expert on monuments ... who had a strong memory and a keen analytical eye, capable to make attribution of them; a scholar who was keenly interested in research and therefore knew the interests of his colleagues and always shared his knowledge with them in a disinterested, enthusiastic and generous way; a hardworking and diligent museum worker”; see Klimanov 1999 [Л. Г. Климанов, “Я. И. Смирнов: из рукописного наследия”, in: И. П. Медведев (ред.), *Рукописное наследие русских византинистов в архивах Санкт-Петербурга*], 445.

<sup>26</sup> In 1917, Ya. I. Smirnov was elected an ordinary academician in the Department of Russian Language and Literature at the Russian Academy of Sciences; see Tunkina 2008, 750.

<sup>27</sup> Cited in Tunkina 1995 [И. В. Тункина, “Н. П. Кондаков: обзор личного фонда,” in: И. П. Медведев (ред.), *Архивы русских византинистов в Санкт-Петербурге*], 98.

<sup>28</sup> Rostovtzev 1914 [М. И. Ростовцев, *Античная декоративная живопись на Юге России. Текст*], IX.

admits: “I don’t know what I took from him personally and what through him from N. P., but along with others, these influences played a significant role in my life. For the first time I began to feel that without archaeology in the history of antiquity you cannot go far. And this, of course, came directly from N. P.”.<sup>29</sup>

It was in this circle that M. I. Rostovtzev turned to archaeology and the fine arts of Pompeii. He presented his first essay on the characteristics of Pompeian artistic and decorative styles at the seminar of N. P. Kondakov. In 1892, under the supervision of N. P. Kondakov and Faddey (Tadeusz) Frantsevich Zelinsky (1859–1944), he wrote and presented his thesis on the topic in order “to correct and supplement Nissen’s urban Pompeian chronicle on the basis of the latest research and excavations”.<sup>30</sup> Thanks to a decision by the Council of Professors of the Faculty of History and Philology, it was awarded a gold medal.<sup>31</sup> Later, Rostovtzev repeatedly recalled this university work and believed that in it, as well as in a youthful essay he had written in his senior year at gymnasium,<sup>32</sup> he had presented “ancient history, focusing on the problems of state structure, social and economic life, and archaeology, considering everything in terms of what insights it can provide into ancient history”.<sup>33</sup>

It is no coincidence that in 1893, after graduating from university, M. I. Rostovtzev traveled to Italy and visited Pompeii. There he took

---

<sup>29</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 213. Beginning in his student years, S. A. Zhebelev was on friendly terms with both M. I. Rostovtzev and Ya. I. Smirnov (Kashcheev 2021c [В. И. Кашеев, “Жебелев Сергей Александрович”, in: *СПА*], 257). In “Autonecrologue”, written in 1932, Sergei Alexandrovich describes the circumstances that awakened his interest in archaeology. Perhaps the most important were his “close relations with N. P. Kondakov, whom Zhebelev considers to be rather the godfather of the field of archaeology, then his teacher”; see: Zhebelev 1993a [С. А. Жебелев, “Автонекролог”, *ВДИ*], 179.

<sup>30</sup> The wording of this topic presupposes a critical analysis of H. Nissen’s research (Nissen 1877); Rostovtzev calls this book a “gem” among the works about Pompeii (Rostovtzev 1909 [М. И. Ростовцев, “Август Май. (Некролог)”, *ЖМНП* 5 (Май). Отд. II], 33).

<sup>31</sup> Zuev 1997a, 54; Tyzhov 2000 [Тыжов А. Я. “Михаил Иванович Ростовцев”, in: М. И. Ростовцев, *Общество и хозяйство в Римской империи* 1], 7 n. 1.

<sup>32</sup> For this work, titled “On the Governance of Provinces in the Last Century of the Republic”, the young Rostovtzev received the N. I. Pirogov Prize (Zuev 1997a, 51). But in his autobiographical essay “The Academic Career of Professor M. I. Rostovtzev, Yale University” (June 7, 1940), he refers to it under another title: “Administration of the Roman Provinces at the Time of Cicero”; see Bongard-Levin 1997 [Г. М. Бонгард-Левин, “Автобиографические материалы М. И. Ростовцева”, in: Г. М. Бонгард-Левин (ред.), *Скифский роман*], 46.

<sup>33</sup> As he wrote in his autobiographical essay in 1940 (Bongard-Levin 1997, 46).



part in archaeological excavations and, thanks to Augustus Mau (1840–1909), became acquainted with the topography, architecture and fine art of the ancient city.<sup>34</sup> Rostovtzev calls this researcher and expert on Pompeii “an old Pompeian, but a Pompeian armed with all the means of modern research”.<sup>35</sup> The very first publication by M. I. Rostovtzev is devoted specifically to the materials from excavations in Pompeii.<sup>36</sup> In it he used the classification system that A. Mau developed for Pompeian painting styles. The young Rostovtzev considered it useful for dating archaeological sites with monumental painting.<sup>37</sup> Mikhail Ivanovich continued to study Pompeii and its architectural landscape even later.<sup>38</sup> His early works on Pompeii<sup>39</sup> were the first steps toward an important study of ancient decorative painting in the south of Russia.<sup>40</sup>

It can be assumed that Rostovtzev’s first trip and his visit to Pompeii once again strengthened his conviction that archaeological material was of special importance for the study of ancient history. On the one hand, thanks to N. P. Kondakov, Mikhail Ivanovich came to the conclusion that the study of the history of antiquity was impossible without archaeology; on the other, as a pupil of F. F. Zelinsky, he was aware of the importance of classical philology for his studies. As M. I. Rostovtzev notably confessed, “I have not become a pure archaeologist, just as I have not become a classical

---

<sup>34</sup> Zuev 1997a, 55.

<sup>35</sup> Rostovtzev 1909, 34.

<sup>36</sup> Rostovtzeff 1894 [М. И. Ростовцев, “О новейших раскопках в Помпеях”, *ЖМНП* 1–2 (Январь–февраль). Отд. V], 45–101.

<sup>37</sup> M. I. Rostovtzev considers A. Mau’s work on the history of decorative painting (1882) to be his best work. “The change of styles ... is proved here with mathematical precision; their chronological sequence is determined with an accuracy of almost ten years” (Rostovtzev 1909, 33). In his first work on Pompeii, Mikhail Ivanovich provides a brief description of the four styles and indicates their approximate dating (Rostovtzev 1894, 49 n. 1).

<sup>38</sup> See Rostovtzev 1896 [М. И. Ростовцев, “Помпеи за 1893–1895 гг.”, *Записки Русского Императорского Археологического Общества*], 307–393; Rostovtzeff 1904, 103–126; M. I. Rostovtzev, 1908 [М. И. Ростовцев, *Эллинистическо-римский архитектурный пейзаж*]. It is highly noteworthy that in her book about Pompeii, M. E. Sergeenko, a pupil of Rostovtzev in the Higher Courses for Women, also examines in detail four styles of Pompeian painting (Sergeenko 1949 [М. Е. Сергеевко, *Помпеи*], 198–205).

<sup>39</sup> Later, in an article about Tatiana S. Varsher, a graduate of the Higher Women’s Courses and his pupil as well, who lived in Italy and studied Pompeii, M. I. Rostovtzev wrote: “My early love was Pompeii”; see C. Cadamagnani 2015 [Ч. Кадамьяни, “Страсть к античности: Михаил Ростовцев, Татьяна Варшер и изучение помпейских руин. Новые материалы”], 183.

<sup>40</sup> Rostovtzev 1914; see also Rostovtzev 1913a [М. И. Ростовцев, *Античная декоративная живопись на Юге России. Альбом*].



philologist. But I have tried and am trying to be a historian of antiquity, based on my knowledge of archaeology and classical philology”.<sup>41</sup>

The meetings and communication with N. P. Kondakov during his research trips abroad were important for the development of M. I. Rostovtzev as a scholar. In order to study the art monuments of the “West and the Greek East”, Nikodim Pavlovich made many trips to the countries of western and southern Europe, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, the Transcaucasia, Crimea, Kuban and the central provinces of Russia.<sup>42</sup> N. P. Kondakov’s journeys fall into two groups. The first includes the major research trips to Sinai to study the Sinai monastery and the manuscripts of its library (1881); to Constantinople to explore Byzantine churches and monuments (1884); to the Caucasus to investigate the monasteries of Mingrelia, Imereti and Georgia (1889); to Syria and Palestine for the study of Christian antiquities (1891); to Athos to inspect the antiquities of Orthodox monasteries (1898);<sup>43</sup> and to Macedonia and adjacent lands for the study of Slavic antiquities (1900). The fruits of his “archaeological travels” were publications that played an important role in the study of both specific monuments (architectural works, monumental painting and applied art, icons, illuminated manuscripts, etc.) and the history of fine art in general.<sup>44</sup> The second group consists of less significant research trips: to the East, to western Europe and especially to the provinces of Russia. In the late 1890s, Kondakov began to pay closer attention to issues of ancient Russian art and archaeology.<sup>45</sup>

At the end of 1894, Rostovtzev planned his second trip abroad, set to last one year, in order to work on his master’s thesis. F. F. Zelinsky helped draw up the itinerary. The trip began on March 15, 1895, and, after the settlement of various formalities, lasted a total of three years. Constantinople was the first important destination.

---

<sup>41</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 213.

<sup>42</sup> See Tunkina 2001 [И. В. Тункина, “Материалы к биографии Н. П. Кондакова”, in: *Никодим Павлович Кондаков. 1844–1925. Личность, научное наследие, архив. К 150-летию со дня рождения*], 14–19.

<sup>43</sup> Zhebelev 1923, 133.

<sup>44</sup> Kondakov 1882 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Путешествие на Синай в 1881 году. Из путевых впечатлений. Древности Синайского монастыря*]; Kondakov 1886 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Византийские церкви и памятники Константинополя*]; Kondakov 1890 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Опись памятников древности в некоторых храмах и монастырях Грузии, составленная по Высочайшему повелению*]; Kondakov 1901 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Памятники христианского искусства на Афоне*]; Kondakov 1904 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Археологическое путешествие по Сирии и Палестине*]; Kondakov 1909 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Македония. Археологическое путешествие*] et al.

<sup>45</sup> Zhebelev 1923, 133; Kashcheev 2021a, 368.

From May to June 1895, Mikhail Ivanovich constantly communicated, primarily in Athens, with two other members of the “Kondakov circle”, Ya. I. Smirnov and B. V. Farmakovsky, a master’s student at Novorossiyskiy University.<sup>46</sup> Then Rostovtzev, Smirnov and Farmakovsky, together with E. M. Pridik, a graduate of the University of Dorpat, took part in a trip to the islands of the Aegean Sea (Aegina, Paros, Evia, Delos), led by Wilhelm Dörpfeld and organized by the German Archaeological Institute.<sup>47</sup> Four young Russian researchers also visited Cape Sunius, the town of Oropus in central Greece and Assos on the coast of Asia Minor. On Delos, Mikhail Ivanovich took an interest in private houses. In terms of their design, they reminded him of the houses in Pompeii.<sup>48</sup> This trip, which M. I. Rostovtzev considered his most important, included a visit to Troy and a lecture by W. Dörpfeld on the stratification of that ancient city. Back in Athens, Rostovtzev attended lectures on ancient sculpture and vase painting in the museums of the Greek capital. The stay in Greece ended with a long journey across the Peloponnese (Corinth, Sparta, Tiryns, Mycenae, Olympia and Epidaurus), which Rostovtzev undertook with his young colleagues Ya. I. Smirnov and E. M. Pridik.<sup>49</sup>

From July to October, M. I. Rostovtzev was in Italy, where he worked in the Rome branch of the German Archaeological Institute. During this time, he also made a trip to Pompeii. He spent the winter semester of 1895–1896 at the University of Vienna, where he studied Latin epigraphy in the seminar of E. Bormann, a pupil of Th. Mommsen, and archaeology in a course given by O. Bendorf.<sup>50</sup>

In April 1896, N. P. Kondakov arrived in Vienna from St Petersburg; on behalf of the Academy of Arts, he traveled to cities and museums in Italy and especially Spain. It was in Vienna that the teacher and his pupil M. I. Rostovtzev met. Accompanied by the Russian artist and

---

<sup>46</sup> M. I. Rostovtzev notes that “fate constantly brought me together [with Ya. I. Smirnov] during my European-Asian wanderings: in Greece, Turkey, Italy and London” (Rostovtzev 2002, 213–214).

<sup>47</sup> S. A. Zhebelev calls this trip the “Inselreise” (Zhebelev 1993b, 188).

<sup>48</sup> He concluded that the decoration of houses on Delos should be attributed to the first Pompeian style and dated to the end or middle of the second century BC; Tikhonov 1989 [И. Л. Тихонов, “Заграничные командировки 1893–1898 гг. М. И. Ростовцева: становление археолога”, in: *Скифия и Боспор. Археологические материалы к конференции памяти академика М. И. Ростовцева*], 13.

<sup>49</sup> According to S. A. Zhebelev, it was a “Peloponnesosreise” (Zhebelev 1993b, 188). Mikhail Rostovtzev’s report on his trip to Greece is held in the Central State Historical Archives of St Petersburg (F. 14. Op. 27. D. 617 [Fund 14, Inventory 27, Case 617]); see Zuev 1997a, 56, 79 n. 37; Tikhonov 1989, 12–13.

<sup>50</sup> Zuev 1997a, 56; Tyzhov 2000, 7; cf. Alipov 2017, 31.

architect L. M. Brialovsky, they both proceeded to Italy, where they were joined by Ya. I. Smirnov.<sup>51</sup> From April 25 to May 7, they visited the museums of Venice, Verona, Milan and Genoa. They arrived in Spain on May 10, and their route took them through Barcelona, Tarragona, Zaragoza, Madrid, Cordoba, Granada and Seville. On June 7, they left Madrid for Paris, thus ending their trip through Spain's cities, museums and archaeological sites.<sup>52</sup>

As M. I. Rostovtzev recalled: "During this unforgettable trip, N. P. taught us absolutely nothing. He did not 'lead' us or 'show' us anything. He traveled with us, looking on his own and assuming ... that we were also looking for something and collecting material for something". But this time the young Rostovtzev did not collect material for his research. Rather, he did something else: "I just drove and looked. It is more accurate to say I learned to look and see. Few people know how difficult that is. I learned this difficult task from N. P. and from Ya. I., although they never taught it to me, but only watched and shared with me what they saw".<sup>53</sup> This was clearly an important trip for M. I. Rostovtzev.

His second work on Pompeii, in which his exploratory look at works of fine art is more intent and more accurate than before, dates to this time. In it, Mikhail Ivanovich investigates in detail one architectural monument of the ancient city, "a large, rich and luxurious aristocratic house, located not far behind the famous Casa di Meleagro". It was the so-called house of the Vettii, although he does not call it such himself.<sup>54</sup> He describes the decor of numerous rooms, including the atrium and the peristyle, and analyzes in detail the narrative plots depicted by the paintings in the house. At the same time, he not only uses the literary texts of Euripides, Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes and other Greek authors, who describe the corresponding mythological plots, but also determines the ratio of the paintings to other monuments depicting these plots.<sup>55</sup> The young philologist was naturally attracted by the Latin graffiti on the walls in the vestibulum of the house and willingly examines them.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> However, according to Rostovtzev's evidence, Ya. I. Smirnov already accompanied N. P. Kondakov in Vienna (Rostovtzev 2002, 213–214).

<sup>52</sup> Zuev 1997a, 56; Tunkina 2001, 16.

<sup>53</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 214.

<sup>54</sup> Rostovtzev 1896, 308–309; 393 n. 1. In her book about Pompeii, M. Ye. Sergeenko does not ignore this house (see Sergeenko 1949, 24; 64; 92; 171–175, fig. 52; 202–205, fig. 68; 211–214 and fig. 73–74; 225).

<sup>55</sup> See for the analysis of plots: Pentheus, torn apart by the bacchantes (Rostovtzev 1896, 342–345); Apollo after the massacre of Python (*ibid.* 363–365); Iphigenia at Tauris (*ibid.* 365–366); cf. Alipov 2017, 34–36.

<sup>56</sup> Rostovtzev 1896, 311.

During this trip, M. I. Rostovtzev also learned, by following his more experienced colleagues, to record what he saw. In the fall of 1895, his friend Ya. I. Smirnov traveled to Asia Minor,<sup>57</sup> where, in the notebook “Epigraphy: From a Trip to Asia Minor, 1895”, he recorded the Greek and Latin inscriptions from Roman times that he found and saw there, as well as reliefs on stone, architectural details, tombstones, church crosses, etc. Smirnov measured and sketched all the inscriptions and reliefs he encountered.<sup>58</sup> N. P. Kondakov’s notebooks were the usual way he collected material for his research. They contain, for example, a diary of excavations at Nymphaea in 1876. The notebook “Russian Miniatures” from the same year describes manuscripts from the collection of F. I. Buslaev. There is also one called “Archaeology, Athos, Macedonia” with notes taken during his trips to Mount Athos, Macedonia and the adjacent lands in 1898–1900. “Legends” contains materials about the Russian national character, and “Ethnography” features ethnographic records about the Avars, Bulgarians, Huns, Cumans, Rus people and other ancient peoples.<sup>59</sup>

Like his colleagues, M. I. Rostovtzev took notes when he traveled. Most of his notebooks date from his travels abroad in 1893 and in 1895–1898. They contain the notes he took of the lectures given by A. Mau in Pompeii in 1893 and 1895, W. Dörpfeld in the Troade in 1895, and E. Bormann in Vienna in 1896. Additional notebooks are filled with Rostovtzev’s descriptions of the monuments in Rome and Pompeii, which he examined on his own.<sup>60</sup>

A very interesting notebook titled “Kerch, Smirnov (1890), Sorak, Feldshtein” (entry by M. I. Rostovtzev) contains notes and sketches of ancient monuments in Kerch, made by Ya. I. Smirnov in 1890, including

<sup>57</sup> Regarding this trip, see Zhebelev 1993b, 188.

<sup>58</sup> For example, in the cemetery north of the village of Kilisse-Gissar in Cappadocia, Ya. I. Smirnov discovered a monument and wrote: “A round marble pillar that twice served as a tombstone; only one inscription was published, which may be explained by the fact that the copy was made when the monument not standing but lying on the ground, as now”. This notebook is currently held in the manuscript archive of the Institute for the History of Material Culture RAS (F. 11. D. 34. L. 7); see Klimanov 1999, 447. Also preserved is the “Notebook of 1896–97”, which contains information about Ya. I. Smirnov’s visits to museums and libraries and about his meetings with colleagues in Rome, Paris and London from December 1896 to December 1897 (F. 11. D. 48); see Klimanov 1999, 447–448.

<sup>59</sup> All are kept in SPbF ARAN (F. 115 [Kondakov N. P.]. Op. 1); see Tunkina 1995, 103–105.

<sup>60</sup> Thirty-two notebooks of M. I. Rostovtzev are kept in the Russian State Historical Archive (F. 1041. Op. 1, D. 85–117); see Zuev 1997b [В. Ю. Зуев, “Рукописное наследие М. И. Ростовцева в архивах России. Краткий обзор”, in: М. Г. Бонгард-Левин (ред.), *Скифский роман*], 19.

the plan of the Sorak (Soracus) crypt. As can be assumed, in 1905 Yakov Ivanovich gave this notebook to Rostovtzev, who at the time was studying the crypts and their decorative paintings. Its new owner continued recording his observations in it, starting from June 15 that year. It contains, among other things, a plan of the crypt at Feldshtein's estate.<sup>61</sup> Later, M. I. Rostovtzev used the material in the notebook when discussing the architecture and murals of the Sorak<sup>62</sup> and Feldshtein<sup>63</sup> crypts in the first part ("Bosporan Kingdom") of the first volume of his studies on ancient decorative painting in the South of Russia.

M. I. Rostovtzev kept a diary of the trips he took to Sicily, Tunisia and Algeria between April 23 and May 28, 1897.<sup>64</sup> During this time, he traveled one thousand kilometers through the territory of North Africa, visiting and examining several dozen towns, settlements and archaeological sites.<sup>65</sup> The diary contains fairly accurate sketches and descriptions of a number of monuments, including the mosaic *Farewell of Dido and Aeneas* (its another name is *Hercules and Augus*, now in the Bardo National Museum, Tunisia) and the mosaic *Herd of Horses* (located in the Sousse Archaeological Museum). The young explorer examined and copied two Latin inscriptions from Thala in situ (entry dated May 20).<sup>66</sup>

Upon returning to Russia, the young scholar continued to be influenced by his teacher. According to M. I. Rostovtzev, Kondakov's house was "a real 'Liberal Academy'". S. A. Zhebelev recalls the "unforgettable" *jours fixes*, which took place in the apartment of Nikodim Pavlovich at Liteynaya Street 15, initially on Saturday evenings and then in the afternoon. They were attended by almost all Russian scholars and scientists interested in archaeological, humanities and natural historical knowledge.

<sup>61</sup> The Russian State Historical Archive (F. 1041. Op. 1, D. 85); see Zuev 1997 b, 22 n. 14.

<sup>62</sup> M. I. Rostovtzev attributed this crypt (no. XX) to the group of "flower style" monuments of the Roman imperial period (Rostovtzev 1914, 244–252). He reports that soon after its opening (in 1890 by Yu. A. Kulakovsky), "the crypt was visited by Ya. I. Smirnov, who made accurate measurements and took beautiful ... photographs of some of the most important parts of the painting" (Rostovtzev 1914, 244). Mikhail Ivanovich published a plan of the crypt from the notebook (Rostovtzev 1914, 245 fig. 53) and one of the photographs taken by Ya. I. Smirnov (Rostovtzev 1913a, table LXV, 4).

<sup>63</sup> The researcher attributed this crypt (no. XXIV) to the "pure inlay style" monuments of the Roman imperial period (Rostovtzev 1914, 260–271; Rostovtzev 1913a, plates XXVI–LXX).

<sup>64</sup> Litvinenko–Spichenko 2003 [Ю. Н. Литвиненко, Н. К. Спиченко, "Путешествие М. И. Ростовцева в Тунис и Алжир весной 1897 г.", in: Г. М. Бонгард-Левин, Ю. Н. Литвиненко (ред.), *Парфянский выстрел*], 407–443.

<sup>65</sup> Litvinenko–Spichenko 2003, 408.

<sup>66</sup> Litvinenko–Spichenko 2003, 410, 418–419 and fig. 16.

The participants were united by “cordiality and easy communication”, enjoying an environment in which “serious conversations were interspersed with witty and humorous talk [and] scholarly and everyday anxieties were discussed, because all of these various interests were close to the heart and mind of N. P.; they all excited him”.<sup>67</sup> Here talk about archaeology, as can be assumed, was frequent, since “everyone was more or less engaged in it”.<sup>68</sup> The political issues included the activities of the State Duma and the military operations during the Russo-Japanese War and the Great War. All the visitors “learned, relaxed, and had fun”. S. A. Zhebelev emphasizes that “over all visitors towered the figure of N. P., sometimes gloomy, sometimes sarcastic, but even more often illuminated by the bright rays of inspiration, enthusiasm and courtesy”.<sup>69</sup> Thus, according to M. I. Rostovtzev, his connection with N. P. Kondakov and his influence were not interrupted: here, “as well as in Spain, he never, at least to me, gave advice or direct instructions”.<sup>70</sup>

Three months before his death, Nikodim Pavlovich, in a letter to S. A. Zhebelev, asked the latter, on his behalf, to “bow deeply ... to the members of ‘our’ academy [the Liberal Academy – *V. K.*], who remember me”.<sup>71</sup> As we might guess, the basis of this academy, similar to the circle at the Museum of Antiquities, was, in addition to N. P. Kondakov himself, his disciples Smirnov (before his death in 1918), Zhebelev and Rostovtzev.

The personal meetings of M. I. Rostovtzev with N. P. Kondakov were another important way the teacher influenced his disciple. Nikodim Pavlovich was “interesting and instructive” in his talks with each of his pupils. V. N. Muromtseva-Bunina provides valuable material about the personality traits of N. P. Kondakov, which brings us closer to understanding how he communicated with others, including his nearest and dearest: “Being very strict and almost picky in matters pertaining to his own person, he was strict with others. Any manifestation of weakness aroused in him a feeling of contempt, which he expressed with ruthlessness and directness. When he encountered dignity in others, he valued it very highly”.<sup>72</sup> There is no

---

<sup>67</sup> Zhebelev 2002, 219.

<sup>68</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 215.

<sup>69</sup> Zhebelev 2002, 219–220.

<sup>70</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 215; cf. Alipov 2019, 19–20.

<sup>71</sup> Letter dated November 25, 1924, from Prague (see Tunkina 2004 [И. В. Тункина, “Академик Н. П. Кондаков: последние годы жизни (по материалам эпистолярного наследия)”, in: И. П. Медведев (ред.), *Мир русской византистики. Материалы архивов Санкт-Петербурга*], 739).

<sup>72</sup> Muromtseva-Bunina 2002 [В. Н. Муромцева-Бунина, “Н. П. Кондаков (к пятилетию со дня смерти)”, 349.



doubt that Smirnov, Zhebelev, and Rostovtzev were among those with whom N. P. Kondakov discussed academic and private matters. According to V. N. Muromtseva-Bunina, Nikodim Pavlovich spoke “with special tenderness” about his disciple M. I. Rostovtzev.<sup>73</sup>

From the end of the 1890s on, due to pulmonary disease, N. P. Kondakov mostly spent his winters in Yalta<sup>74</sup> and often went to St Petersburg in the summer months. This made it possible for his disciples to meet and talk to him personally. S. A. Zhebelev recalls how almost every evening he went to N. P. Kondakov’s house at the corner of Gorokhovaya and Bolshaya Morskaya Street and spent evenings with him there. “At first, we talked in a stuffy room, then we went for a walk – usually along the same route ... we regularly went to buy cheese and returned home to drink tea. And during all these hours we talked... I felt both content and cheerful, and I have the most vivid recollection of these conversations”.<sup>75</sup> We can assume that Mikhail Ivanovich also had personal talks with his teacher. According to him, N. P. Kondakov never “gave answers or direct instructions”, but simply talked about his own works, and this was highly instructive.<sup>76</sup>

Kondakov’s scholarly works had a diverse and powerful influence on M. I. Rostovtzev as a researcher of ancient civilizations.

The art of the nomads of Eurasia was a topic investigated by N. P. Kondakov in several of his works.<sup>77</sup> In his opinion, the barbarian antiquities of the early Middle Ages across a large area of southern Europe – from the Caspian Sea to France, England and Spain – were linked by a common style and formed a unified whole. This style prevailed from the second to the seventh centuries CE. “The unity of this style is revealed, first of all, by the manner of decorating objects with colored stones or glass inlays, covering the surface with geometrical patterns, carving the extremities with animal forms; the style is determined by the technique of metalworking – carving and filigree – and by the very

---

<sup>73</sup> Muromtseva-Bunina 2002, 353.

<sup>74</sup> Kashcheev 2021a, 368.

<sup>75</sup> Zhebelev 2002, 220.

<sup>76</sup> Rostovtzev 2002, 215.

<sup>77</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1889 [И. И. Толстой, Н. П. Кондаков, *Русские древности в памятниках искусства. Вып. 2. Древности скифо-сарматские*]; Tolstoy–Kondakov 1890 [И. И. Толстой, Н. П. Кондаков, *Русские древности в памятниках искусства. Вып. 3. Древности времен переселения народов*]; Tolstoy–Kondakov 1897 [И. И. Толстой, Н. П. Кондаков, *Русские древности в памятниках искусства. Вып. 5. Курганные древности и клады домонгольского периода*]; Kondakov 1892 [Н. П. Кондаков, *История и памятники византийской эмали. Собрание А. В. Звенигородского*]; Kondakoff–Tolstoi–Reinach 1891–1893; Kondakov 1909.



selection of objects, their shape and purpose”.<sup>78</sup> Objects made in this style were concentrated in the territory of southern Russia. It is there that the earliest known examples were found and one can “observe the various connections of this style with the art of ancient, oriental, primitive and barbarian art itself”.<sup>79</sup>

As an example of the combination of the ancient Greco-Eastern animal style and the new Arab style in Russia, N. P. Kondakov refers to a pair of aurochs horns in a silver frame found in the Chernigov burial mound known as the “Black Grave”. He dates these to the tenth century and sees them as the earliest manifestation of the animal style in antiquities of Russian origin.<sup>80</sup> The horns are an early example of oriental art which, thanks to Syrian production and Arab trade, spread to far eastern and far western Europe. Forms of this art were developed in southern Europe and spread through Germany to northern Europe.<sup>81</sup> N. P. Kondakov shows that the influence of nomadic art was also felt after the seventh century. The oriental animal style did not disappear, but became the heritage for folk art – for example, in glazed ceramics – and “survived until the twelfth century, when it again passed into the ornamentation of northwestern Europe under the title of the Romanesque style”.<sup>82</sup>

Nikodim Pavlovich examined in detail the unique collection of gold works found in Siberia and stored in the Hermitage (in the so-called Siberian Collection of the Hermitage). All were made in an animal style.<sup>83</sup> Most of the items are large openwork plates of massive gold that apparently served as buckles. They depict scenes from the life of animals: a reindeer, a yak, a wild boar, a tiger, a mythical griffin and others. Some of the scenes portray animal fights or hunts for different animals. According to the researcher, “naturalism, the exaggerated depiction of reality in the images, stark details and a stark manner of work” point to the Persian origin of these images.<sup>84</sup>

N. P. Kondakov reflected on questions of nomadic art and the animal style from the late 1890s until his death. This is evidenced not only by his publications, but also by numerous records in his personal archive. These deal with the animal style in the art of the peoples of Eurasia (1899?–1900), the religious symbols and subjects of the animal style, and

---

<sup>78</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1890, 3–4.

<sup>79</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1890, 4.

<sup>80</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1897, 14–19.

<sup>81</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1897, 19.

<sup>82</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1897, 20.

<sup>83</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1890, 43–66 and fig. 43–76.

<sup>84</sup> Kondakov 1909, 57–58.

the animal style in the stone decoration of the Dmitrievsky Cathedral in Vladimir (1915?).<sup>85</sup> In a letter to N. Ya. Marr dated December 26, 1922, N. P. Kondakov writes: “I am now giving a course on the history of the Middle Ages in eastern Europe, and writing an essay ‘*On the Animal Style*’ [emphasis in the original – V. K.] as a part of this course which is completely new and builds mainly on the history of the barbarian transfer of Asian cultural heritage – the heritage of China, Central Asia, Persia and Armenia – which they have got from other peoples. By barbarians I mean the Turkic, Iranian, Slavic and German nomads”.<sup>86</sup> Obviously, this “essay” became part of the posthumously published book by N. P. Kondakov on the history of medieval art and culture.<sup>87</sup>

Nikodim Pavlovich considered the art of the nomads to be one of the main forces in the history of art. For him, it was the key to discovering the specifics of Byzantine art.<sup>88</sup> In his and I. I. Tolstoy’s edition of *Russian Antiquities*, he showed for the first time how the Scythian culture was replaced by the Sarmatian one, and the latter by the culture dominated by the style of the Migration Period. He also made clear that this development concerned the peoples of all of Eurasia. According to Ellis H. Minns, “From here comes the research of [O. M.] Dalton, [J.] Strzygowski, [M. I.] Rostovtzev. From here comes some understanding of the ‘animal style’ and its importance for the entire history of art from Assyria to the Romanesque era”.<sup>89</sup>

M. I. Rostovtzev investigated the problem of the animal style in his fundamental study *Scythia and the Bosphorus*<sup>90</sup> and several other works.<sup>91</sup> He described the most characteristic features of the Scythian animal style as follows:

---

<sup>85</sup> Tunkina 1995, 103–105.

<sup>86</sup> See: Tunkina 2004, 685.

<sup>87</sup> Kondakov 1929 [Н. П. Кондаков, *Очерки и заметки по истории средневекового искусства и культуры*] (non vidi).

<sup>88</sup> Vernadsky 2002b [Г. В. Вернадский, “О значении научной деятельности Н. П. Кондакова. К восьмидесятилетию со дня рождения (1844–1924)”], 237–238.

<sup>89</sup> Minns 2002 [Э. Миннс, “Область южнорусских и скифских древностей”], 206.

<sup>90</sup> Rostovtzev 1925 [М. И. Ростовцев, *Скифия и Боспор. Критическое обозрение памятников литературных и археологических*].

<sup>91</sup> Rostovtzev 1918 [М. И. Ростовцев, *Эллинизм и иранство на Юге России*]; Rostovtzev 1922 (the author dedicated the book to Count A. A. Bobrinsky, N. P. Kondakov and E. H. Minns, in memory of V. V. Latyshev, Ya. I. Smirnov, V. V. Škorpil and N. I. Veselovsky, to whom, as he noted, he was indebted for his knowledge of the history of South Russia); Rostovtzev 2003 [М. И. Ростовцев, “Юг России и Китай – два центра развития звериного стиля”, in: Г. М. Бонгард-Левин, Ю. Н. Литвиненко (ред.), *Парфянский выстрел*], 548–563; see also some titles on the list of his articles published in Russia and abroad from 1918 to 1924 (Rostovtzev 1925, IV).

It was at once very primitive and highly refined. The main principle is the purely ornamental treatment of the animal figure... In general, the animals are treated realistically, and the realism is vigorous and powerful. But at the same time the animal figure is used exclusively as ornament... The artist's sole preoccupation is to decorate the object with a number of figures. The only type of group is the antithetic or heraldic. For the sake of ornamental effect, the artist does not hesitate to place his animals in attitudes that are sometimes taken from nature, but are immoderately exaggerated and occasionally quite fantastic. He sometimes takes the liberty of cutting the animal into pieces and using the head of a bird, for instance, as if it were an ornament. The bird's head is often repeated dozens of times and is employed to form friezes and borders. A common practice is to shape the extremities of animals as birds' or griffins' heads.<sup>92</sup>

In an important assessment, M. I. Rostovtzev notes that this style was not born "on the soil of ancient Scythia and can therefore be called Scythian only to a limited extent; it arrived in Scythia already fully developed". He sees the closest analogies in the finds of Archaic Elam, the ancestor of Iranian art in general.<sup>93</sup>

The animal style spread widely and was found in the steppes of southern Russia, the Urals, along the Bug and Dniester and further west in Romania and Bulgaria.<sup>94</sup> Mikhail Ivanovich showed that it existed in Thrace, which had close contacts with the Bosphorus and Scythia, and demonstrated the variety of forms of the Thracian-Scythian animal style based on objects found in Craiova and stored in the museums of Bucharest and Sofia.<sup>95</sup>

The advantage of M. I. Rostovtzev's approach to the question of the animal style is that he showed the connection between China and the Iranian regions in the south of Russia in the fields of archaeology and art history, including in relation to the animal style. He cited evidence of

---

<sup>92</sup> Rostovtzeff 1922, 51; cf. Rostovtzev 1918, 44; Rostovtzev 2003, 549.

<sup>93</sup> Rostovtzev 1918, 45.

<sup>94</sup> Rostovtzev 2003, 551.

<sup>95</sup> Rostovtzeff 1941, I, 111–118. On one of the plates in his work on the social and economic history of the Hellenistic world, M. I. Rostovtzev presented images of several silver plaques, including those from Craiova that formed part of horse trappings: "(a) triquetra of stylized horse protomes, (b) triquetra derived from the first, the horses' heads being transformed into imitations of Greek plant ornaments, (c) head of a stag with stylized horns, (d) two hind legs of lions, the paws forming birds' heads on their ends, crowned with a highly stylized griffin's head, (e) a lion's head with a wide open mouth" (Rostovtzeff 1941, I, 115, and plate XVI). For finds in Craiova, see Rostovtzeff 1931, 491 sqq.

“a close link between Chinese and Iranian art in the most ancient stage of their development”. Mikhail Ivanovich was convinced that both branches of artistic creation “were fed from a common source”, which has not yet been established, but which was undoubtedly associated with the ancient art of Mesopotamia. “In the third and fourth centuries BC, the Iranians took their animal style to the West and East for the second time. The western branch existed for a long time in the south of Russia and from there spread to central and northern Europe, to Scandinavia. The eastern branch again came into contact with China during the Han dynasty”.<sup>96</sup> New archaeological finds, in particular from the Arzhan burial mound (Tuva), confirm M. I. Rostovtzev’s hypothesis that the Scythian animal style comes from Central Asia.<sup>97</sup>

N. P. Kondakov provided evidence that “mixing one’s own (local) and other people’s forms can lead to the creation of something new” in both culture and art. This concept, which L. S. Klein called “combinationism”,<sup>98</sup> was developed by Kondakov’s pupil B. V. Farmakovsky on the basis of the archaic Scythian culture of the Caucasus. It was valued by M. I. Rostovtzev, who applied it to the example of Scythia and the Bosphorus.

In the work he did between 1910 and 1914, M. I. Rostovtzev strove to define the most essential features of the relationship between the Greeks and the barbarians. Studying the archaeological sites of Scythia and the Bosphorus, he came to understand Scythian culture as an Iranian one.<sup>99</sup> In 1915, Mikhail Ivanovich began his fundamental work *Studies in the History of Scythia and the Bosphorus Kingdom*, in which he intended to examine the history of Scythia, primarily in the Hellenistic era, against the backdrop of the cultural life of the northern Black Sea region, starting from the Eneolithic era.<sup>100</sup> Of the two volumes planned, only the first, *Scythia and the Bosphorus* (1925), was published.<sup>101</sup> Here the author was able to solve the difficult methodological problem of the simultaneous use of different sources (literary, epigraphic and archaeological) within the framework of a single study.

---

<sup>96</sup> Rostovtzev 2003, 562.

<sup>97</sup> Bongard-Levin–Ivanchik 2003 [Г. М. Бонгард-Левин, А. И. Иванчик, “Юг России и Китай – два центра развития звериного стиля. (Вступительная заметка)”, in: Г. М. Бонгард-Левин, Ю. Н. Литвиненко (ред.), *Парфянский выстрел*], 547.

<sup>98</sup> Klein 2011 [Л. С. Клейн, *История археологической мысли*], 664–665.

<sup>99</sup> Zuev 1991 [В. Ю. Зуев, “Творческий путь М. И. Ростовцева (к созданию ‘Исследования по истории Скифии и Боспорского царства’)”, *ВДИ*], 169.

<sup>100</sup> Zuev 1991, 169–170.

<sup>101</sup> Rostovtzev 1925. This volume was also published in German (Rostovtzeff 1931; see Heinen 1999, 52).

M. I. Rostovtzev approached Scythia and the Bosphorus as a philologist, epigraphist, archaeologist and historian.

*As a philologist*, he produced a short, meaningful essay that shows the evolution of the literary tradition about the northern and eastern Black Sea regions and testifies to the wealth of information available to researchers.<sup>102</sup> Mikhail Ivanovich saw his task not only in reading and assimilating literary sources, but also in critically examining them, establishing a genetic connection between them, and determining the dependence of some sources on others.<sup>103</sup> He focused attention mainly on those parts of the tradition that characterize the state, culture and life not only of the Scythians, but also of the other tribes that lived in the vicinity of the Scythians, the Greek cities in the northern Black Sea region, and the Bosphorus Kingdom itself.<sup>104</sup> M. I. Rostovtzev's research aimed "at studying the fate of the Bosphorus Kingdom, Crimea and a part of the northern coast of the Black Sea, close to the Bosphorus" – not throughout their historical existence, but only during the period in which they played an independent political role, up to approximately the third century CE. Thus, he was interested in the "Bosphorus, [in] Scythia, which was closely connected with it as a political and cultural unit, [and in] a few Sarmatian tribes that were closely bound up with the Bosphorus and Scythia".<sup>105</sup>

*As an epigraphist*, M. I. Rostovtzev noted in a brief review of inscriptions that many gaps in the literary tradition could be filled with data obtained from numerous Greek and rare Latin inscriptions.<sup>106</sup> He argued that "the composition of our relatively extensive epigraphic material is accidental and could be significantly replenished by systematic excavations".<sup>107</sup>

*As an archaeologist*, M. I. Rostovtzev proceeded from the fact that grave goods constituted the main archaeological material and the basis

---

<sup>102</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 1–11.

<sup>103</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 12.

<sup>104</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 14.

<sup>105</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 15.

<sup>106</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 144.

<sup>107</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 153. Since *Scythia and the Bosphorus* was first written and published, the number of Greek and Latin inscriptions found in the northern Black Sea region has grown significantly, and important collections have been published, most notably *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani* (Struve 1965 [B. В. Струве (ред.), *Корпус боспорских надписей*]) and *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani: Album Imaginum* (Gavrilov–Pavlichenko–Keyer–Karlin 2004 [А. К. Гаврилов, Н. А. Павличенко, Д. В. Кейер, А. В. Карлин (ред.), *Корпус боспорских надписей: Альбом иллюстраций*]).

for studying the “evolution of external culture and partly the religious views of the inhabitants of the cities of the Bosporus Kingdom”. They could also be drawn on to investigate the settled and nomadic peoples of Scythia.<sup>108</sup> When studying specific monuments, Mikhail Ivanovich strictly separated the necropolises of Greek cities from those of semi-Greek settlements as well as from those of the settled inhabitants of the Scythian Kingdom. As a special category, he singled out necropolises and individual burials grounds “that belonged to the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes of the steppes of southern Russia”.<sup>109</sup> This division allowed him to correctly assess archaeological sites and use the material to achieve historical goals.

As a historian, M. I. Rostovtzev traced the processes of interaction between the Hellenic principle and the Scythian-Sarmatian (Iranian) culture in various spheres of life, especially in the Hellenistic and Roman eras. For example, he showed how, during the reign of the last Spartocids, the Iranian element freely spread to the Greek population of the cities of the Bosporus. “Behind the Greek outward form, even in the Greek centers, local elements increasingly appeared, changing all the foundations of political, economic, social, cultural and religious life”.<sup>110</sup>

It should be emphasized that, in terms of its broad treatment of literary, epigraphic and archaeological sources, the thoroughness of its analysis, and the importance of the historical conclusions drawn on the basis of this analysis, *Scythia and the Bosporus* remains a singular work in Russian and international scholarship even today, one hundred years after it was written.<sup>111</sup>

The similarity of the positions of N. P. Kondakov and M. I. Rostovtzev can be seen in their attitude toward the important ideas dominating the humanities and social sciences of their age. The idea of social/historical progress in its pure form was alien to Kondakov. Georgy V. Vernadsky (1887–1973), who was the intellectual disciple of Nikodim Pavlovich, rightly noted that “the idea of transformation or evolution”

---

<sup>108</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 157.

<sup>109</sup> Rostovtzev 1925, 159.

<sup>110</sup> Rostovtzev 1918, 112.

<sup>111</sup> Professor Heinz Heinen (1941–2013), inspired by the studies of M. I. Rostovtzev, planned to create a general work on the ancient history of the northern Black Sea region, but his early death prevented him from realizing this project. He published six well-written articles on the topic (see Heinen 2006b, 151–304; 320–358), which in 2006 were supplemented by the small book *Antike am Rande der Steppe* with the notable subtitle *Die nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe* (Heinen 2006a).

was inherent element of his teacher's understanding of history. Such evolution can take different forms: either progress in its pure form, decline or simply "lateral deviation". "The development of civilization ... does not follow one ascending line, but simultaneously different lines going in different directions".<sup>112</sup> According to N. P. Kondakov, in various periods of history, some very distant from us, there have been cultural achievements that, "in terms of their methods and creative processes, have not yet been surpassed by mankind".<sup>113</sup> Some of the achievements that remain unrivaled to the present day are, for example, filigree, carvings, enamels, miniatures and wax paintings. In a number of his fundamental works, Nikodim Pavlovich studied in detail such outstanding works of art, which were objects of people's everyday lives. He showed that Byzantine enamel art began in the eighth century, reached its peak in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and fell into decline at the beginning of the thirteenth century.<sup>114</sup> As an art historian, N. P. Kondakov described the features of the best of these artworks:

The main advantage of Byzantine enamels is the harmony of colors and the purity and intensity of the tones. The main disadvantage is the absence of modeling reliefs and the schematism of the figures and especially the draperies ... in Byzantine enamels, the beauty and physicality of the color of hands and faces are especially striking, but at the same time, a pure bodily tone, with a slight pinkish and olive tint, is found only in the tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries... A well-known feature of ancient enamels is also the transparent emerald enamels and milky white body paint... The final process of enamel production is the grinding of the finished surface after firing. This grinding or polishing achieved a high level of perfection in the hands of the Byzantine craftsmen, similar to the polishing of precious stones.<sup>115</sup>

Accordingly, N. P. Kondakov appropriated the art achievements of some peoples and some eras as outstanding, although many other researchers usually did not think so and therefore did not study them.<sup>116</sup> In the issue of *Russian Antiquities* on barrow antiquities and treasures of the pre-Mongol period, N. P. Kondakov expressed an important idea: "The life of the nomads in a certain era was more advanced than the life of the agricultural peoples in terms of the assimilation of cultural forms, even if these forms

---

<sup>112</sup> Vernadsky 2002a [Г. В. Вернадский, "Никодим Павлович Кондаков"], 319.

<sup>113</sup> Vernadsky 2002a, 319–320; Vernadsky 2002b, 254–255.

<sup>114</sup> Kondakov 1892, 87, 250.

<sup>115</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1897, 37.

<sup>116</sup> Vernadsky 2002b, 255.



were exclusively related to personal decorations, headdresses, and what has hitherto been called wealth among the people”.<sup>117</sup>

The idea of historical progress in its “pure form” was not embraced by M. I. Rostovtzev either. He did not see an opportunity to apply it to the field of art and made the following argument: “Evolution in this area is clear. Many epochs have achieved perfection in expressing the spirit inherent to them, and all epochs have found an artistic language corresponding to this spirit”. Mikhail Ivanovich raised several questions: “But what about the idea of continuous progress? Where are the steps taken by art as it strives to attain some ideal?” He sees the answer in the fact that “in the field of art, ideals are a myth and do not exist at all. Each epoch has its culminating point, and these culminating points are generally incommensurable”.<sup>118</sup>

M. I. Rostovtzev limited the application of the theory of progress to the field of science – that is, to the sphere of human creativity in which this theory appeared. Here progress can be proven, but with time constraints, since in science long periods of “weakness and decay” are replaced by short periods of “intense creativity”. However, we have no right to consider “the development of science to be constant and unlimited”.<sup>119</sup>

In his work *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, M. I. Rostovtzev briefly but quite definitively formulated his view of the historical process that since the time of Edward Gibbon had generally been designated “the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, or rather of ancient civilization in general”. In this context, he defined the very essence of the problem as follows: “The decline and fall ... have two aspects: first, the political, social and economic, and second, the intellectual and spiritual”.<sup>120</sup> The main phenomenon underlying the process of decline was “the general absorption of the educated classes by the masses and the resulting simplification of all the functions of political, social, economic, and intellectual life, which we call the barbarization of the ancient world”.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> Tolstoy–Kondakov 1897, 25.

<sup>118</sup> Rostovtzev 2004 [М. И. Ростовцев, “Идея прогресса и ее историческое обоснование,” in: К. А. Аветисян (ред.), *Miscellanea: из журналов Русского зарубежья (1920–1939)*], 56 (this article was first published in the journal *Sovremennye zapiski* [Современные записки, “Contemporary Notes”], Paris 1921).

<sup>119</sup> Rostovtzev 2004, 56.

<sup>120</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, 478; Rostovtzeff 1957, 2, 532.

<sup>121</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, 486; Rostovtzeff 1957, 2, 541.

Being an enthusiastic researcher of antiquity, M. I. Rostovtzev clearly formulated conclusions, the correctness of which he did not doubt. But as a passionate citizen of the world and a man of his time, he encouraged his contemporaries to learn from history.<sup>122</sup> He wrote:

The evolution of the ancient world has a lesson and a warning for us. Our civilization will not last unless it is a civilization not of one class, but of the masses. The Oriental civilizations were more stable and lasting than the Greco-Roman, because, being chiefly based on religion, they were nearer to the masses. Another lesson is that violent attempts at levelling have never helped to uplift the masses. They have destroyed the upper classes, and resulted in accelerating the process of barbarization. But the ultimate problem remains like a ghost, ever present and unresolved: Is it possible to extend a higher civilization to the lower classes without debasing its standard and diluting its quality to the vanishing point? Is not every civilization bound to decay as soon as it begins to penetrate the masses?<sup>123</sup>

M. I. Rostovtzev was worried about what was happening in his contemporary world, and he was looking for answers. Modernity had also invaded Kondakov's usual measured life, and he, too, was worried about the fate of his country and the world.<sup>124</sup> But despite all the external difficulties, both scholars continued their academic activities, and their contribution to world scholarship is enormous.

N. P. Kondakov was the founder of a research school that, according to I. V. Tunkina, united representatives of various disciplines in the humanities: historians, art historians, archaeologists, Orientalists, antiquities scholars, Slavists and Byzantinists.<sup>125</sup> Many scholars – not only Russian,

---

<sup>122</sup> This is what Oswald Spengler did in his *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (1918–1922), Johan Huizinga in *In de schaduw van morgen* (1935) and Arnold J. Toynbee in *A Study of History* (1934–1961).

<sup>123</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, 486–487; Rostovtzeff 1957, 2, 541. Clearly influenced by M. I. Rostovtzev, Frank W. Walbank (1909–2008), known as a researcher of Polybius and the history of the Hellenistic world, wrote a work titled *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West* (Walbank 1946). In later editions, the author expanded the title to include a phrase from E. Gibbon, “the awful revolution”, in which “awful” means not only “terrible”, but also “causing a feeling of horror” (Walbank 1969).

<sup>124</sup> In a letter to S. A. Zhebelev dated March 29 (16 in the Julian calendar), 1918, he wrote: “In the twentieth century, you cannot live in a country where there are no property rights, or where they exist only for some classes, while others are ‘outlawed’. It is no longer possible for a Russian to live in Russia. Soon it will be as dangerous as a convict prison, and it will therefore be necessary to leave it” (see Tunkina 2004, 662).

<sup>125</sup> Tunkina 1995, 98.

but also European – considered him their teacher. N. P. Kondakov was convinced that his teacher F. I. Buslaev had laid the foundation for Russian archaeological scholarship. According to S. A. Zhebelev, N. P. Kondakov himself erected a strong and powerful edifice on this foundation: he applied “those methods of historical and analytical research thanks to which archaeology is transformed into the history of art”. Furthermore, S. A. Zhebelev clarified what exactly this method consisted in: “N. P. Kondakov is undoubtedly the first archaeologist and art historian who in his research of Christian monuments relied on a thorough and comprehensive study of their style and conducted all his research on a broad historical basis, constantly using the comparative method”.<sup>126</sup>

Having graduated from Kondakov’s school, M. I. Rostovtzev completely mastered its characteristic method and was able to conduct a stylistic analysis of the most diverse (and, in fact, almost all) works of art. But unlike his famous teacher, he did not become an art historian, perhaps because he had another teacher, the celebrated philologist F. F. Zelinsky, thanks to whom, as a researcher, he was able to profit from the life-giving source of St Petersburg philology. The inclination of Mikhail Ivanovich to popularize scholarly knowledge came not from N. P. Kondakov, but from F. F. Zelinsky, and he also owed his “passionate participation in the most pressing issues of that desperate time”, especially during the years of exile, to Zelinsky.<sup>127</sup> M. I. Rostovtzev was able to combine the merits of both of his very different teachers. He “advanced Russian scholarship precisely because he combined the harsh skeptical attitude of ‘fact-worshippers’ with the contemplative courage of Zelinsky. Relentlessly adhering to sources, Rostovtzev ... did not abandon general conclusions and believed in the power of scholarly thought”.<sup>128</sup>

In 1913, M. I. Rostovtzev outlined an ambitious research program that over the next few decades he was able to implement in his writings on the history of the Hellenistic world. He proceeded from the fact that

---

<sup>126</sup> See Tunkina 2004, 645. Similarly, art critic N. P. Sychev (1883–1964) described the features of the subject and method of research in this school as follows: “Art history in Kondakov’s school was not limited to subjective observations or the study of works of personal creativity and an aesthetic and stylistic analysis of such works. Its subject was the vast and substantial material from antiquity. It saw reflected in this material processes of growth, deformation and decline ... it did not limit itself to studying only one branch because it wished to leave open the possibility of a comparative analysis of forms and; therefore; be the sole tool for scholarly work” (Klimanov 1999, 470–471).

<sup>127</sup> See Gavrilov 2012 [А. К. Гаврилов, “Фаддей Францевич Зелинский в контексте русской культуры”, in: *Древний мир и мы*], 38.

<sup>128</sup> Gavrilov 2012, 43.

it was impossible to recreate the political history of this world without a definite idea: first, “about that culture, which was the basis of people’s life in infinitely diverse countries”; second, “about the social and economic structure of these countries”; third, about “the evolution of forms of life, household items, features of architecture and the fine arts”; and, finally, about the peculiarities of the religious development of each country. The data, taken from literary texts, especially from the “historical and geographical tradition”, and combined with epigraphic materials (and not only Greek ones) and understood on the basis of the archaeological material of each country – all this data should be combined to form an overall picture, which, though possibly incomplete, is able to convey all the main and the principal features of history. M. I. Rostovtzev believed that the essence of historical work lay not in a retelling of what ancient historians wrote, but in something more valuable and important.<sup>129</sup> He continues:

Anticipating the enrichment of our materials and the refinement of the historical method, we must now, having grouped all the material available for our attempts at understanding, try to clarify the features and significance of the main processes in a given geographical area and in a given epoch, link these processes with the past and future and ... against this backdrop, portray the political history of the state and era.<sup>130</sup>

M. I. Rostovtzev implemented this program partly in *Scythia and the Bosphorus* (1925)<sup>131</sup> and to a greater extent in both *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (1926)<sup>132</sup> and his grandiose study *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (1941).<sup>133</sup> His reputation as an ancient historian is based on his last two monographs. These differ in significant ways from the previous three monographic works published before 1913, which also dealt with questions of ancient social and economic history<sup>134</sup> – the first with state ransom in the Roman Empire (1899), the second with Roman *tesserae* tokens, made from lead (1903), and the third with the Roman *colonatus* (1910). These differences

---

<sup>129</sup> Rostovtzev 1913b [М. И. Ростовцев, “Эллинистическая Азия в эпоху Селевкидов (по поводу книги: А. Bouché-Leclercq. Histoire de Seleucides. Paris 1913)”, in: *Научный исторический журнал, издаваемый Н. И. Кареевым*], 42; cf. Zuev 1991, 166–167.

<sup>130</sup> Rostovtzev 1913b, 42; cf. Zuev 1991, 166.

<sup>131</sup> Rostovtzev 1925; see also Rostovtzeff 1931; Rostovtzeff 1993.

<sup>132</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926; see also Rostovtzeff 1957, 1–2.

<sup>133</sup> Rostovtzeff 1941, 1–3.

<sup>134</sup> Schneider 2014, 545.

are the result of the experiences Mikhail Ivanovich had while studying ancient monuments of archaeology and the fine arts.

M. I. Rostovtzev dedicated his famous work *Ancient Decorative Painting in the South of Russia* (1913–1914), which was of crucial importance for the further study of the history, archaeology and art in the northern Black Sea region, to N. P. Kondakov. Rostovtzev explained: “He was the first to open my eyes to monuments, with him I took one of my first archaeological trips, [and] in conversations with him I learned to look and see”. He also offers an important judgment: “I have not become an art historian like him, but those scholars who approach monuments as historians and archaeologists are not useless, perhaps for the scholarship of antiquity”.<sup>135</sup> Thus, in this dedication, M. I. Rostovtzev clearly expresses the most important thing that he, as a researcher, received from his teacher. In addition, he describes the fundamental difference between his own approach and his teacher’s to the monuments of the fine arts and archaeology.

In his two main historical works about the social and economic history of the Roman Empire and the Hellenistic world, Mikhail Ivanovich used many plates as an important part of his research – reproductions of works of fine art and archaeological monuments. It is noteworthy that he analyzed these works not as an art historian or art critic, as N. P. Kondakov would have done, but primarily as a historian and archaeologist. Explaining the purpose of illustrations in his works, M. I. Rostovtzev wrote that they

are not intended to amuse or please the reader. They are an essential part of the book – as essential, in fact, as the notes and quotations from literary or documentary sources. They have been taken from the large store of archaeological evidence that for a student of social and economic life is just as important and indispensable as the written evidence. Some of my inferences and conclusions are largely based on archaeological material.<sup>136</sup>

One example can be found in the chapter about the Roman Empire under the Flavians and Antonines in *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Plate XXXVI (in the second edition, plate XLVII), which is titled

---

<sup>135</sup> Rostovtzev 1914, IX. It is noteworthy that N. P. Kondakov, having read the book *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* (1922), made the following entry in his diary on August 10, 1923: “I read Rostovtzev – it was not an archaeological, but a historical book!” (see Tunkina 2004, 740 n. 12). In a letter sent to S. A. Zhebelev from Prague on November 25, 1924, Kondakov wrote that he did not like the book very much (see Tunkina 2004, 739).

<sup>136</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, XIV; Rostovtzeff 1957, 1, XVII.

“Life in South Russia”, presents three fragments of mural paintings from the tombs at Panticapaeum: (1) a landowner on his estate, (2) a landowner fighting the Scythians, and (3) a landowner fighting a Taurian.<sup>137</sup> Before the fragments appeared in Rostovtzev’s book, they were published in the French edition of *Russkie drevnosti* by N. P. Kondakov and I. I. Tolstoy, edited by S. Reinach.<sup>138</sup> M. I. Rostovtzev referred to these images at least twice: they appear in his atlas *Ancient Decorative Painting in the South of Russia*,<sup>139</sup> as well as in the English edition of his work *Iranians and Greeks in the South of Russia*.<sup>140</sup> The first fresco bears a Greek inscription: Ἀνθεστήριος ὁ Ἥγησιππου ὁ καὶ Κτησαμένος (*IosPE* II. 123).<sup>141</sup> Rostovtzev describes the fresco as follows:

The scene represents the rural life of a large landowner of Panticapaeum. The dead man, armed and followed by a retainer, is riding towards his family residence, a tent of true nomadic type. His household (wife, children, and servants) is assembled in the tent and beside it, under the shade of a single tree; beside the tree is his long spear, while his quiver hangs from a branch. It is of course summer, and in summer during the harvest season the landowner, who lived as a rule in the city, went out to the steppes, armed and accompanied by armed servants. He supervises the work in the fields, and defends his labourers and harvesters from the attacks of neighbours, the Taurians from the mountains and the Scythians from the plains.<sup>142</sup>

This is an excellent example of an ekphrasis put to effective use in historical research.

In “Autonecrologue”, S. A. Zhebelev formulated an important criterion for determining whether a researcher was an archaeologist: he must “deal with material monuments as such” and, most importantly, “study material monuments themselves, and not just their images”.<sup>143</sup> In this respect, N. P. Kondakov was clearly an archaeologist, which is highlighted

<sup>137</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, between 240 and 241; Rostovtzeff 1957, 1, between 260 and 261.

<sup>138</sup> Kondakoff–Tolstoï–Reinach 1893, 203, fig. 187; 209, fig. 192.

<sup>139</sup> Rostovtzev 1913a, plates LI, 6; LXXIX and LXXVIII, 1 respectively.

<sup>140</sup> Rostovtzev 1922, plates XXVIII, 1; XXIX, 3, and XXIX, 1 respectively.

<sup>141</sup> Rostovtzev 1914, 172. For a description of the painting and its analysis, see Rostovtzev 1914, 172–175.

<sup>142</sup> Rostovtzeff 1926, 240; Rostovtzeff 1957, 1, XVII.

<sup>143</sup> Zhebelev 1993a, 179. In this sense, S. A. Zhebelev did not consider himself an archaeologist, despite the fact that, when it was necessary, he included archaeological material in his research, lectured on archaeology at the university and published the work *An Introduction to Archaeology* (see *ibidem*).

by the fact that he also supervised archaeological excavations during the Odessa period of his academic activity. However, this fact does not prevent us from classifying him, first and foremost, as an art historian and a Byzantinist.

By the same token, M. I. Rostovtzev can rightfully be considered an archaeologist – all the more because from 1928 to 1937 he directed large-scale excavations of the ancient city of Dura-Europos in Syria and published a book based on the materials from these studies.<sup>144</sup> The publishers of *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* considered these activities sufficient reason to call Rostovtzev a “Russian-born archaeologist”.<sup>145</sup> Still, archaeology was not the main area of his scholarly interests.

In *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Lev S. Klein forms his own judgment about who can be considered a true creator in scholarship. “Usually, outstanding creators were ... those who put the interests of science above their own, who were ready to work in this field without prospects for quick or significant success, but who – and this is the most important thing – were always ready for it”. These creators were individuals “who have always striven to do their jobs with the greatest skill and assuming the greatest responsibility”. L. S. Klein counts Mikhail Rostovtzev among such creators, placing his name on par with Sophus Müller and Gray Clark, those outstanding archaeologists of the early twentieth century.<sup>146</sup>

M. I. Rostovtzev was undeniably “a true creator in scholarship”. Unlike his teacher N. P. Kondakov, he did not create his own school, but was nevertheless one of the very rare universal scholars of that era. He was able to work professionally in various branches of classical studies, including the history of ancient literature, Greek and Latin epigraphy, papyrology, ancient numismatics, the history of ancient art, the history of religion and, of course, classical archaeology. However, he was mainly an ancient historian who was able to view the history of the peoples of the ancient world as a union of politics, economics, social relations, religion, culture and everyday life. If we want to define the role played by Mikhail I. Rostovtzev in scholarship as one of the most outstanding researchers

---

<sup>144</sup> Rostovtzeff 1938. This book was based on the lectures given by M. I. Rostovtzev at University College, London, and at the Collège de France, Paris, in 1937. The lectures were held after he had completed his excavations at Dura Europos, although by that time not all reports on the excavations had been published (Rostovtzeff 1938, VII).

<sup>145</sup> However, Britannica also describes him as “one of the 20th century’s most influential authorities on ancient Greek and Roman history, particularly their economic and social aspects” (*The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* <sup>15</sup>1994, 10, 198).

<sup>146</sup> Klein 2011, 2, 489.



of antiquity in the twentieth century, we must bear in mind the research tradition associated with the city of St Petersburg, to which his prominent teachers Nikodim P. Kondakov and Faddey (Tadeusz) F. Zelinsky belonged – and to which he belonged as well.

Vladimir Kashcheev  
Saratov State University

kascheev@gmail.com

### Bibliography

- D. Ainalov, “Akademik N. P. Kondakov kak istorik iskusstva i metodolog” [“Academician N. P. Kondakov as an Art Historian and Methodologist”], in: *Seminarium Kondakovianum. Recueil d’études. Archéologie. Histoire de l’art. Études byzantines* 2 (Prague 1928) 311–321.
- P. A. Alipov, “A. Mau, N. P. Kondakov i M. I. Rostovcev: k voprosu o nauchnoj kooperacii istorikov” [“A. Mau, N. P. Kondakov and M. I. Rostovtzev: on the Issue of Scholarly Cooperation of Historians”], in: *Vestnik RGGU. Seriya: Politologiya. Istoriya. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* 2017: 1, 28–38.
- P. A. Alipov, “Nauchnoe nasledie N. P. Kondakova v istoriograficheskom osmyslenii ego uchenikov i kolleg” [“Scholarly Heritage of N. P. Kondakov in the Historiographical Comprehension of His Disciples and Colleagues”], in: *Vestnik RGGU. Seriya: Politologiya. Istoriya. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* 2019: 2, 12–23.
- G. M. Bongard-Levin, “Avtobiograficheskie materialy M. I. Rostovceva” [“Autobiographical Materials of M. I. Rostovtzev”], in: G. M. Bongard-Levin (ed.), *Skifskij roman* (Moscow 1997) 43–49.
- G. M. Bongard-Levin, A. I. Ivanchik, “Yug Rossii i Kitaj – dva centra razvitiya zverinogo stilya (Vstupitel’naya zametka)” [“South of Russia and China, Two Centers of Development of the Animal Style (Introductory Note)”], in: G. M. Bongard-Levin, Yu. N. Litvinenko (eds.), *Parfyanskij vystrel* (Moscow 2003) 543–548.
- F. I. Buslaev, *O prepodavanii otechestvennogo yazyka* [About Teaching Language of Our Country] (Moscow 1844).
- F. I. Buslaev, *O vliyanii khristianstva na slavyanskij yazyk. Opyt istorii yazyka po Ostromirovu evangeliyu* [About the Influence of Christianity on the Slavic Language. Experience of the History of Language According to the Ostromir Gospel] (Moscow 1848).
- F. I. Buslaev, *Obshchie ponyatiya o russkoj ikonopisi* [General Concepts of Russian Icon Painting] (Moscow 1866).
- F. I. Buslaev, *Moi vospominaniya* [My Memories] (Moscow 1897).
- C. Cadamagnani, “Strast’ k antichnosti: Mikhail Rostovcev, Tat’yana Varsher i izuchenie pompejskikh ruin. Novye materialy” [“Passion for Antiquity: Mikhail Rostovtzev, Tatiana Varsher and the Study of Pompeian Ruins. New Content”], in: *Archivio russo-italiano* 10 (2015) 183–202.

- K. Christ, *Von Gibbon zu Rostovtzeff. Leben und Werk führender Althistoriker der Neuzeit* (Darmstadt 1972).
- A. K. Gavrilov, “Faddej Francevich Zelinskij v kontekste russkoj kul’tury” [“Faddey Frantsevich Zelinsky in the Context of Russian Culture”], in: *Drevnij mir i my* [*The Ancient World and Us*] 4 (St Petersburg 2012) 32–45.
- A. K. Gavrilov, N. A. Pavlichenko, D. V. Keyer, A. V. Karlin (eds.), *Korpus bos-porskikh nadpisej: al’bom illyustracij* [*Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani: Album Imaginum*] (St Petersburg 2004).
- H. Heinen, “Rostovtzeff et la Russie méridionale”, in: A. Marcone (ed.), *Rostovtzeff et l’Italie* (Naples 1999) 45–61.
- H. Heinen, *Antike am Rande der Steppe: die nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe* (Stuttgart 2006a).
- H. Heinen, *Vom hellenistischen Osten zum römischen Westen: Ausgewählte Schriften zur Alten Geschichte* (Stuttgart 2006b).
- V. I. Kashcheev, “Kondakov Nikodim Pavlovich”, in: *SPA* (St Petersburg 2021a) 365–372.
- V. I. Kashcheev, “Sokolov Fedor Fedorovich”, in: *SPA* (St Petersburg 2021b) 692–698.
- V. I. Kashcheev, “Zhebelev Sergey Alexandrovich”, in: *SPA* (St Petersburg 2021c) 255–263.
- L. S. Klein, *Istoriya arkheologicheskoy mysli* [*A History of Archaeological Thought*] I–II (St Petersburg 2011).
- L. G. Klimanov, “Ya. I. Smirnov: iz rukopisnogo naslediya” [“Ya. I. Smirnov: from His Manuscript Heritage”], in: I. P. Medvedev (ed.), *Rukopisnoe nasledie russkikh vizantinistov v arkhivakh Sankt-Peterburga* (St Petersburg 1999) 444–477.
- N. P. Kondakov, *Istoriya vizantijskogo iskusstva i ikonografii po miniatyuram grecheskikh rukopisej* [*History of Byzantine Art and Iconography from Miniatures of Greek Manuscripts*] (Odessa 1876).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Puteshestvie na Sinaj v 1881 godu. Iz putevykh vpechatlenij. Drevnosti Sinajskogo monastyrya* [*Travel to Sinai in 1881. From Travel Impressions. Antiquities of the Sinai Monastery*] (Odessa 1882).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Vizantijskie cerkvi i pamyatniki Konstantinopolja* [*Byzantine Churches and Monuments of Constantinople*] (Odessa 1886).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Opis’ pamyatnikov drevnosti v nekotorykh khramah i monastyryakh Gruzii, sostavlennoye po Vysochajshemu poveleniyu* [*Inventory of Ancient Monuments in Some Churches and Monasteries of Georgia, Compiled by the Highest Command*] (St Petersburg 1890).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Istoriya i pamyatniki vizantijskoj emali. Sobraenie A. V. Zvenigorodskogo* [*History and Monuments of Byzantine Enamel. Collection of A. V. Zvenigorodsky*] (St Petersburg 1892).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Pamyatniki khristianskogo iskusstva na Afone* [*Monuments of Christian Art on Mount Athos*] (St Petersburg 1901).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Arkheologicheskoe puteshestvie po Sirii i Palestine* [*Archaeological Travel through Syria and Palestine*] (St Petersburg 1904).

- N. P. Kondakov, "Predislovie" ["Foreword"], in: F. I. Buslaev, *Sochineniya po arkheologii i istorii iskusstva I* (St Petersburg 1908).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Makedoniya. Arkheologicheskoe puteshestvie* [*Macedonia. An Archaeological Travel*] (St Petersburg 1909).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Ocherki i zametki po istorii srednevekovogo iskusstva i kul'tury* [*Essays and Notes on the History of Medieval Art and Culture*] (Prague 1929).
- N. P. Kondakov, *Vospominaniya i dumy* [*Memories and Thoughts*] (Moscow 2002).
- N. P. Kondakoff, I. I. Tolstoï, S. Reinach, *Antiquités de la Russie méridionale* (Paris 1891–1893).
- I. L. Kyzlasova, *Akademik N. P. Kondakov: poiski i sversheniya* [*Academician N. P. Kondakov: Searches and Accomplishments*] (St Petersburg 2018).
- Yu. N. Litvinenko, N. K. Spichenko, "Puteshestvie M. I. Rostovtzeva v Tunis i Alzhir vesnoj 1897 g." ["Trip by M. I. Rostovtzev to Tunisia and Algeria in the Spring of 1897"], in: G. M. Bongard-Levin, Yu. N. Litvinenko (eds.), *Parfyanskij vystrel* (Moscow 2003) 407–443.
- E. Minns, "Oblast' yuzhnorusskikh i skifskikh drevnostej" ["The Sphere of South Russian and Scythian Antiquities"], in: Kondakov 2002, 205–207.
- V. N. Muromtseva-Bunina, "N. P. Kondakov. (K pyatiletiyu so dnya smerti)" ["N. P. Kondakov. (On the Fifth Anniversary of His Death)"], in: Kondakov 2002, 258–323.
- The New Encyclopedia Britannica* 10 (Chicago etc. <sup>15</sup>1994).
- H. Nissen, *Pompeianische Studien zur Städtekunde des Alterthums* (Leipzig 1877).
- M. I. Rostovtzev, "O novejsikh raskopkakh v Pompeyakh" ["About the Newest Excavations in Pompeii"], *ZhMNP* 1894: Jan.–Feb. V, 45–101.
- M. I. Rostovtzev, "Pompei za 1893–1895 gg." ["Excavations in Pompeii 1893–1895"], in: *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Russkogo Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva* 8: 3–4 (1896) 307–393.
- M. Rostowzew, "Pompeianische Landschaften und römische Villen", *JDAI* 19 (1904) 103–126.
- M. I. Rostovtzev, "Avgust Mau (Nekrolog)" ["August Mau (Obituary)"], *ZhMNP* May. II (1909) 30–34.
- M. I. Rostovtzev, *Antichnaya dekorativnaya zhivopis' na Yuge Rossii. Al'bom* [*Antient Decorative Painting in the South of Russia. Album*] (St Petersburg 1913a).
- M. I. Rostovtzev, "Ellinisticheskaya Aziya v epohu Selevkidov (po povodu knigi: Bouché Leclercq. Histoire de Seleucides. Paris 1913)" ["Hellenistic Asia in the Seleucid Era (Regarding the Book: Bouché Leclercq. Histoire de Seleucides. Paris 1913)"], in: *Nauchnyj istoricheskij zhurnal, izdavaemyj N. I. Kareevym* [*Scholarly Historical Journal Published by N. I. Kareev*] 1 (St Petersburg 1913b) 39–63.
- M. I. Rostovtzev, *Antichnaya dekorativnaya zhivopis' na Yuge Rossii* [*Antient Decorative Painting in the South of Russia. Text*] (St Petersburg 1914).
- M. I. Rostovtzev, *Ellinstvo i iranstvo na Yuge Rossii* [*Hellenism and Iranianism in the South of Russia*] (Petrograd 1918).
- M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia* (Oxford 1922).

- M. I. Rostovtzev, *Skifiya i Bospor. Kriticheskoe obozrenie pamyatnikov literaturnykh i arkheologicheskikh* [*Scythia and Bosphorus. A Critical Review of Literary and Archaeological Monuments*] (Leningrad) 1925).
- M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1926).
- M. Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosporus. Kritische Übersicht der schriftlichen und archäologischen Quellen* (Berlin 1931).
- M. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and Its Art* (Oxford 1938).
- M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World I–III* (Oxford 1941).
- M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire I–II* (Oxford 1957).
- M. Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosporus. Wiederentdeckte Kapitel und Verwandtes* (Stuttgart 1993).
- M. I. Rostovtzev, “Stranichki vospominanij” [“Memories Pages”], in: Kondakov 2002, 111–116.
- M. I. Rostovtzev, “Yug Rossii i Kitaj – dva centra razvitiya zverinogo stilya” [“The South of Russia and China, Two Centers of Development of the Animal Style”], in: G. M. Bongard-Levin, Yu. N. Litvinenko (eds.), *Parfyanskij vystrel* (Moscow 2003) 548–563.
- M. I. Rostovtzev, “Ideya progressa i ee istoricheskoe obosnovanie” [“The Idea of Progress and Its Historical Basis”], in: K. A. Avetisyan (ed.), *Miscellanea: Iz zhurnalov Russkogo zarubezh'ya (1920–1939)* [*Miscellanea: From the Journals of the Russian Diaspora (1920–1939)*] (St Petersburg 2004) 44–58.
- H. Schneider, “Rostovtzeff, Mikhail”, in: P. Kuhlmann, H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's History of Classical Scholarship. New Pauly. A Biographical Dictionary* (Leiden–Boston 2014) 544–547.
- M. E. Sergeenko, *Pompei [Pompeii]* (Moscow–Leningrad 1949).
- V. V. Struve (ed.), *Korpus bosporskikh nadpisej* [*Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani*] (Moscow–Leningrad 1965).
- I. L. Tikhonov, “Zagranichnye komandirovki 1893–1898 gg. M. I. Rostovceva: stanovlenie arkheologa” [“Foreign Research Trips of M. I. Rostovtzev in 1893–1898: the Formation of an Archaeologist”], in: M. Yu. Vakhtina, Yu. A. Vinogradov, V. Yu. Zuev, B. A. Raev (eds.), *Skifiya i Bospor. Arkheologicheskie materialy k konferencii pamyati akademika M. I. Rostovceva* (Novocherkassk 1989) 12–14.
- I. L. Tikhonov, “Stanovlenie klassicheskoy arkheologii v Sankt-Peterburgskom universitete: shkola N. P. Kondakova” [“Formation of Classical Archaeology at St Petersburg University: the School of N. P. Kondakov”], in: *Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov. 1844–1925. Lichnost', nauchnoe nasledie, arkhiv. K 150-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya* (St Petersburg 2001) 27–34.
- I. L. Tikhonov, *Arkheologiya v Sankt-Peterburgskom universitete. Istoriograficheskie ocherki* [*Archaeology at St Petersburg University. Historiographic Essays*] (St Petersburg 2003).

- I. I. Tolstoy, N. P. Kondakov, *Russkie drevnosti v pamyatnikakh iskusstva. Vyp. 2. Drevnosti skifo-sarmatskie* [Russian Antiquities in the Monuments of Art. Issue 2. Scythian-Sarmatian Antiquities] (St Petersburg 1889).
- I. I. Tolstoy, N. P. Kondakov, *Russkie drevnosti v pamyatnikakh iskusstva. Vyp. 3. Drevnosti vremen pereseleniya narodov* [Russian Antiquities in the Monuments of Art. Issue 3. Antiquities of the Times of the Migration of Peoples] (St Petersburg 1890).
- I. I. Tolstoy, N. P. Kondakov, *Russkie drevnosti v pamyatnikakh iskusstva. Vyp. 5. Kurgannye drevnosti i klady domongol'skogo perioda* [Russian Antiquities in the Monuments of Art. Issue 5. Kurgan Antiquities and Treasures of the Pre-Mongol Period] (St Petersburg 1897).
- I. V. Tunkina, "N. P. Kondakov: obzor lichnogo fonda" ["N. P. Kondakov: A Review of the Personal Fund"], in: I. P. Medvedev (ed.), *Arkhivy russkikh vizantinistov v Sankt-Peterburge* [Archives of the Russian Byzantinists in St Petersburg] (St Petersburg 1995) 93–119.
- I. V. Tunkina, "Materialy k biografii N. P. Kondakova" ["Materials for the Biography of N. P. Kondakov"], in: *Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov. 1844–1925. Lichnost', nauchnoe nasledie, arkhiv. K 150-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya* (St Petersburg 2001) 9–23.
- I. V. Tunkina, "Akademik N. P. Kondakov: poslednie gody zhizni (po materialam epistolyarnogo naslediya)" ["Academician N. P. Kondakov: The Last Years of His Life (Based on the Materials of the Epistolary Heritage)"], in: I. P. Medvedev (ed.), *Mir russkoj vizantinistiki. Materialy arkhivov Sankt-Peterburga* [The World of Russian Byzantine Studies. Materials from the Archives of St Petersburg] (St Petersburg 2004) 441–765.
- I. V. Tunkina, "Biograficheskij slovar'-ukazatel'" ["Biographical Dictionary Index"], in: V. P. Buzeskul, *Vseobshchaya istoriya i ee predstaviteli v Rossii v XIX i nachale XX veka* (Moscow 2008) 477–831.
- A. Ya. Tyzhov, "Mikhail Ivanovich Rostovtzev", in: M. I. Rostovtzev, *Obshchestvo i khozyajstvo v Rimskoj imperii 1* (St Petersburg 2001) 5–12.
- G. V. Vernadsky, "Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov", in: Kondakov 2002a, 258–323.
- G. V. Vernadsky, "O znachenii nauchnoj deyatel'nosti N. P. Kondakova. K vos'midesyatiletiyu so dnya rozhdeniya (1844–1924)" ["On the Significance of N. P. Kondakov's Scholarly Activity. On the Occasion of the Eightieth Birthday (1844–1924)"], in: Kondakov 2002b, 228–257.
- F. W. Walbank, *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West* (London 1946).
- F. W. Walbank, *The Awful Revolution: The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West* (Liverpool 1969).
- S. A. Zhebelev, *Vvedenie v arkheologiyu. Ch. 1. Istoriya arkheologicheskogo znaniya* [An Introduction to Archaeology. Part 1. A History of Archaeological Knowledge] (Petrograd 1923).
- S. A. Zhebelev, "Avtonekrolog" ["Autonecrologue"], *VDI* 1993a: 2, 177–201.
- S. A. Zhebelev, "Iz vospominanij o Ya. I. Smirnov" ["From the Memoirs of Ya. I. Smirnov"], *VDI* 1993b: 3, 181–187.

- S. A. Zhebelev, "ΟΕΥΣ ΤΑ ΠΙΡΑΓΜΑΤΑ", in: Kondakov 2002, 217–222.
- V. Yu. Zuev, "Tvorcheskij put' M. I. Rostovceva. (K sozdaniyu 'Issledovaniya po istorii Skifii i Bosporskogo carstva')" ["The Creative Path of M. I. Rostovtzev. (On the Creation of 'Research on the History of Scythia and the Bosphorus Kingdom')"], *VDI* 1990: 4, 148–153; 1991: 1, 166–176.
- V. Yu. Zuev, "M. I. Rostovcev. Gody v Rossii. Biograficheskaya khronika" ["M. I. Rostovtzev. Years in Russia. Biographical Chronicle"], in: G. M. Bongard-Levin (ed.), *Skifskij roman* (Moscow 1997a) 50–83.
- V. Yu. Zuev, "Rukopisnoe nasledie M. I. Rostovceva v arkhivakh Rossii. Kratkij obzor" ["Manuscript Heritage of M. I. Rostovtzev in the Archives of Russia. Short Review"], in: G. M. Bongard-Levin (ed.), *Skifskij roman* (Moscow 1997b) 17–23.

The influence of the outstanding scholar N. P. Kondakov and his research school on M. I. Rostovtzev as a scholar was multifaceted and powerful. The main lines of this influence are traced here: the young Rostovtzev's attendance of his teacher's lectures on art history and archaeology at the university, his participation in the circle established by Kondakov at the Museum of Antiquities, their joint research trips, especially to Italy and Spain in 1896, Rostovtzev's visits to the *jours fixes* in Kondakov's home (the so-called Liberal Academy), his personal meetings and talks with Kondakov and Kondakov's pupils, especially with Ya. I. Smirnov and S. A. Zhebelev, and his study of Kondakov's scholarly works. M. I. Rostovtzev took a new approach to the animal style, which his teacher had researched for many decades. Kondakov's idea that "mixing one's own (local) forms and the forms of another people leads to the creation of something new" in culture and art was developed in detail by Rostovtzev using the example of Scythia and the Bosphorus. This essay shows that the idea of progress in its pure form, which was relevant to the humanities and social sciences of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was alien to both teacher and disciple. Having passed through Kondakov's school, M. I. Rostovtzev had completely mastered its characteristic method and was able to conduct a stylistic analysis of the most diverse works of art. However, he did not become an art historian, perhaps because he had another teacher, the celebrated philologist F. F. Zelinsky, thanks to whom, as a researcher, he was able to profit from the life-giving source of classical philology. N. P. Kondakov was first and foremost an art historian and a Byzantinist, but also an archaeologist. For his part, M. I. Rostovtzev can rightfully be considered an archaeologist, all the more so because he directed the excavations at Dura-Europos in 1928–1937. However, archaeology was not the main focus of his scholarly interests. He was one of the very rare universal scholars of antiquity in this era who was capable of working professionally in many branches of classical studies. Most of all, he was an ancient historian who was able to view the history of the ancient world as a kind of union of politics, economics, social relations, religion, culture and everyday life. M. I. Rostovtzev, as well as his prominent teachers N. P. Kondakov and F. F. Zelinsky, belongs to the classical tradition associated with St Petersburg.



Влияние выдающегося ученого Н. П. Кондакова и его научной школы на М. И. Ростовцева как исследователя было многосторонним и мощным. Здесь прослежены основные линии этого влияния: посещение молодым Ростовцевым лекций его учителя по истории искусства и археологии в Университете, его участие в созданном Кондаковым *кружке при Музее Древностей*, их совместные исследовательские поездки, особенно по Италии и Испании в 1896 году, посещение *журфиксов* в доме Кондакова (так называемая *Свободная Академия*), личные встречи и общение Ростовцева с учителем и его учениками, особенно с Я. И. Смирновым и С. А. Жебелёвым, а также влияние на него научных трудов Кондакова. М. И. Ростовцев по-новому подошел к изучению проблемы звериного стиля, которую его учитель исследовал на протяжении многих десятилетий. Идея Н. П. Кондакова о том, что “смешение своих собственных (местных) форм и форм другого народа приводит к созданию чего-то нового” в культуре и искусстве, была детально развита М. И. Ростовцевым на примере Скифии и Боспора. Здесь показано, что актуальная для гуманитарных и социальных наук конца XIX – начала XX века идея прогресса в ее чистом виде была чужда и учителю, и ученику. Пройдя школу Кондакова, М. И. Ростовцев всецело овладел присущим ей методом и мог проводить стилистический анализ разнообразных произведений искусства. Но искусствоведом он не стал, возможно, потому что у него был еще один учитель, знаменитый филолог Ф. Ф. Зелинский, благодаря которому он как исследователь мог черпать силы из живительного источника классической филологии. Н. П. Кондаков, несомненно, был археологом, но прежде всего искусствоведом и византистом. Равным образом и М. И. Ростовцева по праву можно считать археологом, тем более что он руководил раскопками в Дура-Европос (1928–1937). И все же археология не была основной областью его научных интересов. М. И. Ростовцев был одним из очень редких для его времени универсальных исследователей античности, способных профессионально работать во многих областях антиковедения. Но прежде всего он был историком античности, способным рассматривать историю древнего мира как некое единство политики, экономики, социальных отношений, религии, культуры и повседневной жизни. М. И. Ростовцев, как и его выдающийся учитель Н. П. Кондаков и Ф. Ф. Зелинский, принадлежит той классической традиции, которая связана с Петербургом.



# CONSPECTUS

ALEXANDER GAVRILOV, DENIS KEYER	
Preface .....	5
MICHAEL POZDNEV	
Das historisch-philologische Vorgehen bei Aristoteles und in der Wissenschaft seiner Zeit: Einige Randbemerkungen .....	9
ALEXANDER K. GAVRILOV	
The Scholarly Program of M. I. Rostovtzeff .....	30
ARNALDO MARCONE	
Rostovtzeff and Italy: A Long History .....	37
VLADIMIR KASHCHEEV	
Nikodim P. Kondakov and Mikhail I. Rostovtzev: A Teacher and his Disciple. ....	50
ALAIN SCHNAPP	
Des monuments à l'histoire : la raison des ruines et Michel de Montaigne	86
WJATSCHESLAW K. CHRUSTALJOW	
Michail Rostovtzeff als Universalhistoriker .....	99
LEONID ZHMUD	
Mikhail Rostovtzeff and the Modernization of Antiquity .....	115
DMITRI PANCHENKO	
Rostovtzeff and his <i>Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire</i> : A Comment on a Scholarly Masterpiece .....	134
STEFAN REBENICH	
Die wissenschaftliche Internationale der Altertumskunde: Ein Brief Michael I. Rostovtzeffs an Alfred von Domaszewski .....	144
DENIS KEYER	
Interpreting Horace in Th. Zielinski's and M. Rostovtzeff's Critique of I. Grevs .....	161
Keywords .....	176