Excavating Byzantium: Russia's Archaeologists and *Translatio Imperii*

Louise McReynolds

Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 21, Number 4, Fall 2020, pp. 763-789 (Article)

Published by Slavica Publishers
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/kri.2020.0040*

Excavating Byzantium

Russia's Archaeologists and *Translatio Imperii*

Louise McReynolds

> The Greeks of Constantinople … held in their lifeless hands the riches of their fathers, without inheriting the spirit which created and improved that sacred patrimony: they read, they praised, they compiled, but their languid souls seemed alike incapable of thought and action.
>
> —Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 1788

In his six-volume *tour de force* of the downfall of what he clearly perceives to have been a remarkable imperial civilization, Edward Gibbon structured a historical paradigm that effectively separated West from East, much to the detriment of the latter. The most significant reason for the collapse of "the grandeur that was Rome," in Gibbon's accounting, was the rise of Christianity, with its intolerance for cosmopolitan pluralism. This delighted anticlerical Enlightenment *philosophes* such as Voltaire, but for others it was simply too much to blame an undifferentiated version of their own faith. They could, however, find conviction in the Great Schism of 1054, when Christianity itself split between West and East. Once again, the East would suffer in comparison. Western Catholicism had flowered into a variety of Protestant sects, inspired by the humanistic Renaissance, and civilization was reborn in the heart of the former Roman Empire. Eastern Orthodoxy appeared changeless, therefore stagnant in comparison. As Georg Hegel, the first and most influential historian to succeed Gibbon, adduced the situation in the 1830s, one could have presumed that in the East, those "civilized peoples in possession of Greek science and a highly refined Oriental culture," and who had not been subjected to barbarian invasions would surely rise. But such was emphatically not the case: "The history of the highly civilized Eastern Empire—where as we might suppose, the

I thank Lynn Mally and the two peer reviewers of *Kritika* for invaluable comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Spirit of Christianity could be taken up in its truth and purity—exhibits to us a millennial series of uninterrupted crimes, weaknesses, basenesses and want of principle; a most repulsive and consequently a most uninteresting picture."[1]

Russians, heirs to Byzantium's "Spirit of Christianity," found themselves reduced in stature under this Western gaze. In the first half of the 19th century, Western historians controlled the narrative and followed the lead built by Gibbon and Hegel. The Russian *intelligent* and *enfant terrible* Petr Chaadaev bought into Hegel, and in his excoriation of his society he blamed its Byzantine legacy for what he deemed its cultural sterility.[2] This, though, registered as more a philosophical than a historical verdict.[3] The impetus to "take the Byzantine turn" came from Tsar Nicholas I (r. 1825–55), supported by Minister of Education Sergei Uvarov, who articulated the imperial ideology of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality." The Orthodox cornerstone here prompted an official architectural movement away from the neo-Classicism that had dominated from the end of the 18th century to a "Byzantine Revival." Introduced with the Church of Christ the Savior, "neo-Byzantine" came to dominate as the new imperial style of the Russian Empire.[4] This contributed to a second ideology, never clearly articulated but often presumed, that of *translatio imperii*, whereby the Russian Empire viewed itself as the continuum of the fallen Byzantine Empire. Rather than a spurious wish fulfillment of the apocryphal doctrine of "Moscow, the Third Rome," this idea rested on the assumption that imperial structures of governance would hold sway over the upstart nationalists, and that Russia would supersede the weakening Ottomans in the former Byzantine Orthodox territories.[5] At the crux of this lay the religious inheritance of Orthodoxy.[6] Archaeologists, themselves struggling

[1] G. W. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, with a preface by Charles Hegel, trans. J. Sibree (Kitchener, Ont.: Batoche Books, 2001), 355.

[2] Ivan Foletti, *From Byzantium to Holy Russia: Nikodim Kondakov (1844–1925) and the Invention of the Icon*, trans. Sarah Melker (Rome: Viella, 2017), 40.

[3] The two mastodons of Russia's history in the 19th century, S. M. Solov´ev and V. O. Kliuchevskii, both sons of Orthodox priests and themselves devout in their faith, bypassed direct engagement with this question by focusing on the socioeconomic relations between Slavs and "the Greeks." See Paul Dukes, "Soloviev's *History of Russia*," *Historical Journal* 31, 1 (1988): 187–94; and Robert F. Byrnes, "Kliuchevskii's View of the Flow of Russian History," *Review of Politics* 55, 4 (1993): 565–91.

[4] Dmitry Shvidkovskiy, *Russian Architecture and the West*, trans. Antony Wood (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 291–340.

[5] Stephen L. Baehr, "From History to National Myth: Translatio Imperii in Eighteenth-Century Russia," *Russian Review* 37, 1 (1978): 1–13.

[6] Adalberto Mainardi, "Conflicting Authorities: The Byzantine Symphony and the Idea of Christian Empire in Russian Orthodox Thought at the Turn of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," *Review of Ecumenical Studies* 11, 2 (2018): 170–85.

to establish the disciplinary boundaries of a profession just then coming of age, played a prominent role in how this transition could be imagined.

The two beneficiaries of Byzantium, the Russian and Ottoman Empires, were themselves separated by a sprawling, porous border, just as both were peopled with multiconfessional minorities inhaling the fresh breath of 19th-century nationalism. The Ottomans controlled the physical geography of the former Byzantine Empire, and Russia had inherited the Orthodox culture celebrated by Slavic brethren in the Balkans, under Ottoman suzerainty. To add another layer, the Holy Lands—the territory where Christ had been born, crucified, and resurrected—were located now in the Islamic Ottoman Empire. The possibility of unearthing material fragments from the life of Christ sparked a popular interest in archaeology in all Christian countries in the 19th century, which complicated international relations and contributed directly to the Crimean War in 1855.[7] In addition, the formative Christian societies of Georgia and Armenia, intimately connected to Eastern Orthodoxy, lay along the permeable imperial borderlands in the Caucasus. Folding in Syria and Coptic Egypt, these territories collectively formed the "Christian East," part of the Byzantine-*cum*-Ottoman Empire and a subtle reminder of the heterogeneity of early Christianity.

These first Christian sects abounded in visual and material culture, which provided critical sources for archaeology to become a distinctive discipline. It had begun as one facet of art history in the 1760s with Johann Winckelmann's documentation of precise details to establish categories of Greek and Roman techniques that distinguished the two from each other. Winckelmann had also contributed to the reception of the Renaissance as the source of a superior humanistic culture, "returning art to antiquity."[8] In the 1820s, Academician A. E. Olenin taught Russia's first course on archaeology at the Academy of Arts, inspecting art rather than excavating artifacts. Russia's first native scholar of Byzantium,[9] V. G. Vasilevskii, had studied under the celebrated Roman specialist Theodor Mommsen at the University of Berlin in the

[7] Neil Asher Silberman, *Digging for God and Country: Exploration, Archaeology, and the Secret Struggle for the Holy Land, 1799–1917* (New York: Knopf, 1982), explores the nationalist connections between the various Christian confessions and their differing interpretations of a number of the 19th-century excavations.

[8] N. P. Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki v Konstantinople," *Trudy 6-ogo arkheologicheskogo s"ezda v Odesse* (Odessa: A. Shults, 1887), 3:ii.

[9] Philipp Krug, the first to teach about Byzantium in Russia, was German-educated and did not affect the discourse. The Academy of Sciences published his *Kritischer Versuch zur Aufklärung der Byzantinischen Chronologie* in 1810 (Alexander A. Vasiliev, "Byzantine Studies in Russia, Past and Present," *American Historical Review* 32, 3 [1927]: 539–45).

1860s.[10] What Vasilevskii learned from Mommsen was positivism, derived from the scientific analysis of sources, and he also identified philosophically with French scholar Ernest Renan, a specialist in early Christianity whose ideas about pluralistic nationalisms had cast a distinctive imperialist shade in the 19th century and resonate even today.[11]

Returning to St. Petersburg University in 1870, Vasilevskii established a "school" where he trained Russian scholars who pioneered in Byzantine archaeology.[12] The student who would become imperial Russia's most celebrated Byzantologist, Nikodim Kondakov, had studied at Moscow University under F. I. Buslaev, another pioneer in archaeology for whom ""Fate spared [Russia] … from the artistic revolution known as the Renaissance."[13] Given a position in Odessa at Novorossiia University, he spent his early career excavating in the ancient Greek trading colonies that dotted the northern Black Sea littoral.[14] In his master's thesis, on the celebrated ancient Greek Harpy Tomb discovered in 1838, Kondakov began articulating his views about the influences of Eastern art moving west.[15] His doctoral dissertation, *The History of Byzantine Art: An Iconography from the Miniatures in Greek Manuscripts*, published in 1876, marks his first original forays into Byzantium, when he corrected the Western art historians who had labeled the miniatures "illustrations," not recognizing them as independent artistic

[10] As Brian Croke states, "It was fairly usual even in the German states to rely on Gibbon for a knowledge of Byzantine history," despite the "philological vacuum" in which historians who included Byzantium as an object of study worked. Mommsen, who received the Nobel Prize in Literature for his work on Rome, had an interest in Byzantium "as an integral and continuous element of Roman History" up to the reign of Justinian in the late sixth century (Croke, "Mommsen and Byzantium," *Philologus* 129, 2 [1985]: 275, 284).

[11] Most famously, Renan referred to a nation as "a daily referendum." His "What Is a Nation?" (1882) is reprinted in *Becoming National: A Reader*, ed. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 42–56.

[12] G. G. Litavrin, "Vasilii Grigor´evich Vasilevskii—osnovatel´ Sankt-Peterburgskogo tsentra vizantinovedeniia," *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 55 (1994): 5–21.

[13] Quoted in Foletti, *From Byzantium to Holy Russia*, 97. Buslaev admired Renaissance aesthetics but deplored the secularization of society represented by the humanistic figures in religious art.

[14] From the outset Kondakov expressed frustration in the fascination with ancient Greece because of the archaeological emphasis on "luxury" and "idle dreams," as opposed to "science." "O nekotorykh melkikh predmetakh drevnosti. Naidennykh v Akkermane v 1867 g.," *Trudy 2-ogo arkheologicheskogo s"ezda v S. Peterburge* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1881), 1:20–24.

[15] N. P. Kondakov, *Pamiatnik Garpii iz Maloi Azii i simvolika grecheskogo iskusstva: Opyt istoricheskoi kharakteristiki* (Odessa: Ul´rich i Shul´tse, 1873). The bibliography for this monument on the British Museum's website does not include Kondakov's text, a common oversight with respect to this Russian.

forms.[16] Kondakov embodied the symbiosis of archaeology and art history, but he wrote to Buslaev in 1885 that he wanted to "separate himself from the formalism of art history," and that he considered himself an archaeologist because in a society's material culture one could find its "thoughts, spiritual, and moral life."[17] The material culture of Byzantium lay primarily in its arts, and Kondakov developed a pathbreaking methodology that paid strict attention to minutiae, "iconography," and eschewed the aesthetic value judgments characteristic of Western studies.[18]

Orthodox artifacts would come to play an outsized role in prerevolutionary Russian archaeology, thereby reinforcing the "imperial style" associated with the Byzantine revival in architecture and the Christian East in the implicit notion of *translatio imperii*. Moreover, the explorations of Byzantium and its putative influences on Russia pulled the archaeologists into the critical deliberations about Russia's relationship to the West that colored 19th-century politics and had divided the intelligentsia between Slavophiles and Westernizers in the 1840s. Sidestepping the essentialism of this division, archaeologists of Byzantium offered new perspectives. Although writing in an age before the vocabulary of "cultural construction," in his critiques Kondakov consistently noted the ways in which politics colored Western interpretations. In his dissertation he specifically challenged the Western art historians who had reiterated the charges of "languid souls" and "uninterrupted crimes." A French translation of *The History of Byzantine Art* appeared in 1886, and although important for bringing Kondakov's work to an international audience,

[16] N. P. Kondakov, *Istoriia vizantiiskogo iskusstva i ikonografii po miniatiuram grecheskikh rukopisei*, ed. G. R. Parpulov and A. L. Saminskii (Plovdiv: n.p., 2012). Parpulov and Saminskii have edited a handwritten draft on which Kondakov made notes. Ironically, the renowned critic and academic V. V. Stasov, one of the opponents at Kondakov's defense, criticized him for paying more attention to miniatures found in Western libraries than those accessible in Russia; Kondakov agreed with him. See I. L. Kyzlasova, *Istoriia izucheniia vizantiiskogo i drevnerusskogo iskusstva v Rossii (F. I. Buslaev, N. P. Kondakov: Metody, idei, teorii)* (Moscow: Izdatel´stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1985), 173—a letter from Buslaev to Kondakov, 1867.

[17] Kyzlasova, *Istoriia izucheniia vizantiiskogo i drevnerusskogo iskusstva*, 170, in a letter to Buslaev from October 1885, after he presented at the Sixth Archaeological Congress. Later Kondakov referred to his work as the "science of art history." See N. P. Kondakov, *Arkheologicheskoe puteshestvie po Sirii i Palestine* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel´stvo Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1904), 2.

[18] As Kondakov wrote: "we consider that the science of arts and antiquities of the Orthodox East is necessary for Russian archaeological science, not only … from the perspective of our historical inheritance but because this is the only obvious path for Russian science to develop a comparative methodology. By 'comparative' I do not mean looking for obvious similarities but rather analyzing details that reveal variations and simple difference. This will allow us to understand why those particularities appeared in a specific situation; it is clear how much Russian archaeology will gain from this research" ("Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," v).

it inflected Kondakov's work with the cultural politics of the debate, which upset the Russian author.[19] In his foreword, Professor Anton Springer of Leipzig, while praising Kondakov's analysis of these critical art forms, wrote that "putting aside political aspirations, do we not see the educated Russians turning their gaze toward the Rome of the East, as towards their *patrie*, to draw inspiration from it?"[20] Springer, a historian of Roman art, did not find evidence of Byzantine influence over the West.[21]

Kondakov, to the contrary, insisted that an intellectually rigorous study of Byzantine history was necessary because it would shed light not only on Russia's history but on that of Western Europe as well. Couched in this argument was the necessity for Russian scholars to take the lead because their cultural and geographic proximity accorded them insights to which Westerners were blind. In *The History of Byzantine Art*, Kondakov criticized the German historian-archaeologist G. F. Waagen,[22] for whom Byzantine art was "motionless, dead … with a peculiar artistic style, dry and thin, that exaggerated bodily proportions."[23] Although in this piece Kondakov does not specify that Waagen is tacitly suggesting that the humanistic portrayals in Renaissance paintings elevate them over elongated Byzantine figures, he chides that Waagen "does not know Byzantine or even early Christian art, is unfamiliar with iconography, and could not interpret even the simplest subjects." For Kondakov, aesthetic appeal should be subordinated to interpretive value. He recognized that increasingly crude forms appeared after the Crusaders sacked Constantinople in 1204, acknowledging some detrimental influences of the increasingly symphonic relationship between church and state on art, but he called for a new approach to the miniatures as a product particular to Byzantium and therefore a unique source for understanding it.[24]

Kondakov's next major undertaking in Byzantine archaeology paired him with Vasilevskii and the latter's most promising protégé, Fedor Uspenskii, also on the faculty at Novorossiia University. Odessa was home to Russia's first archaeological society, the Odessa Society of History and Antiquities,

[19] The French archaeologist and historian of religion Salomon Reinach translated this and several other works by Kondakov, giving him a longer reach than most of his colleagues. In 1916, Kondakov was named an *officier* in the French Légion d'honneur.

[20] N. P. Kondakov, *Histoire de l'art byzantin, considéré principalement dans les miniatures* (Paris: Librairie de l'Art, 1886), 7. This was the first volume of a series on Byzantine art edited by the Renaissance art historian Eugène Müntz.

[21] Kondakov complained to Buslaev about these comments, and the latter responded that Springer's treatise "did not belong in the book" (Kyzlasova, *Istoriia izucheniia vizantiiskogo i drevnerusskogo iskusstva*, 168, 175).

[22] G. F. Waagen, *Kunstwerke und Künstler* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1839).

[23] Kondakov, *Histoire de l'art byzantin*, 38.

[24] Ibid., 39.

founded in 1839 with a focus on the ancient Scythian and Greek colonies along the Black Sea littoral.[25] By 1884, when the port city was preparing to host the empire's Sixth Archaeological Congress, even Odessa's archaeological connection to Greece had taken the Byzantine turn.[26] The Imperial Moscow Archaeological Society (IMAO), the official sponsor of the congresses, dispatched Kondakov to Constantinople to study Byzantine churches in the Ottoman capital.[27] In addition to Vasilevskii and Uspenskii, his party also included the Odessa photographer Iu. Raul′ (Jean Raoult), an architect, a sketch artist, and one who painted in water colors; this crew underscored the increasing importance of reproductions in archaeological explorations.[28] One major objective was to study the mosaics and frescos in what was then the Kakhrie-dzhami Mosque, formerly the Chora Church of a monastery complex and exemplars of the 14th-century Palaeologian Renaissance. The expedition resulted in a lavishly illustrated volume published in 1887, with 44 photogravures and lithographs, albeit in black and white.[29]

However dry his detailed descriptions of artifacts, Kondakov revealed his imaginative side when recounting the adventures of traveling around sites.[30] Penning the results of their excursion, Kondakov took readers through a history of Byzantium by way of its art and architecture. His extended essay served two purposes: first, to revise the Western-dominated historiography that had diminished Byzantium's cultural significance in relation to the Roman one; and second, by revisiting Russia's cultural connection to Constantinople, to remind readers of the depth of their intertwined roots. As he put it, "Let

[25] M. G. Poruzhenko, "Odesskoe obshchestvo istorii i drevnosti," *Istoricheskii vestnik* 138, 11 (1914): 544–55.

[26] A. V. Prakhov of St. Petersburg's Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, also in 1884, proposed an expedition to Greece to study Byzantine architecture because, as he argued, a clear understanding of Russia's churches depended on this. The society agreed but lacked the funds for such a venture (N. I. Veselovskii, *Istoriia Imperatorskogo russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva za pervoe piatidesiatiletie ego sushchestvovaniia, 1846–1896* [St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Upravleniia udelov, 1900], 160–61).

[27] In a letter to Buslaev, Kondakov complains about the constant problems of getting funding for research trips (Kyzlasova, *Istoriia izucheniia vizantiiskogo i drevnerusskogo iskusstva*, 170); Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich intervened to get 1,000 rubles from the Ministry of Education.

[28] Kondakov greatly valued the importance of professional photography for reproducing ancient monuments (ibid.). Kondakov had taken Raoult with him on his tour of Sinai in 1881, preferring photos to any other medium of reproduction (Foletti, *From Byzantium to Holy Russia*, 117).

[29] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," i–vi, 1–229.

[30] Kondakov's politically charged observations can be quite entertaining. See, e.g., his *Puteshestvie na Sinai v 1881 g. iz putevykh vpechatlenii* (Odessa: Tipografiia P. A. Zelenogo, 1882), and *Makedoniia: Arkheologicheskoe puteshestvie* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1909).

the final result of this study of Byzantine archaeology lie in a better awareness of Russia in antiquity [*Russkaia starina*] … the success of this research into Byzantine archaeology depends on questions posed and issues resolved through the analysis of Russian antiquities."[31] With a cleverness rarely found in his excavation diaries, he indicted Edward Gibbon, "whose wit is as strong in generalizations as it is weak in tendentious assaults on the feebleness of Christianity … typical of an 18th-century skeptic."[32]

Continually frustrated with those who had consigned Byzantium to a frozen formalism, and who celebrated instead the creativity of the Latin culture that had produced the Renaissance, Kondakov accentuated the importance of "Christian archaeology." He noted that this discipline had begun with excavations of the catacombs in Rome, where it had proven itself capable of pushing knowledge beyond anecdotes and aesthetics because it combined the form of the digs with the content of religious practice.[33] "We are confident that the study of the ancient Byzantine capital will stand equal to the science of pagan and early Christian Rome," wrote Kondakov, "and our conclusions will prove sufficiently fruitful that they will occupy one of the most important positions in the science of medieval antiquity, Christianity in particular."[34] Moreover, he added, "It would not be too much to say that, given the current conditions of this conquered city, studying the monuments here will put a thread in the hands of archaeologists and allow them to connect general historical issues, not only those of Byzantium."[35] For Kondakov, Byzantine art held the missing link in the study of Western art from the fifth century to the Fourth Crusade in 1204. Therefore, it contained a necessary historical component to understand all aspects of Europe's Middle Ages, including the Western barbarian tribes and the formations of the various governments.[36]

---

[31] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," v.

[32] Ibid., 11, 57.

[33] Russia's first journal on this topic was published intermittently by V. A. Prokhorov from 1862 to 1877: *Khristianskie drevnosti i arkheologiia*. This was succeeded in 1894 by the more professional *Vizantiiskii vremennik,* edited by Vasilevskii. In 1911, the Academy of Sciences began publishing *Khristianskii Vostok*, "dedicated to the Christians of Africa and Asia." Russia's scholars recognized Giovanni Battista de Rossi as the founder of "Christian archaeology" because of his 1854 discoveries in the Roman catacombs; they were not so much hostile to Westerners as insistent on having their own ideas included in the developing discipline (E. K. Redin, "Pamiati Dzhiovanni Battista de Rossi, osnovatelia khristianskoi arkheologii" [Khar´kov: Tipografiia Gubernogo pravleniia, 1894]).

[34] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," ii.

[35] Ibid., iii.

[36] Ibid., vi. Vasilevskii's research, too, argued for the importance of studying Byzantine structures to gain a more complete appreciation of the Middle Ages in the West.

The Basilica of San Vitale, built in Ravenna in 547 under Emperor Justinian I, provided the main bone of contention between West and East, between Roman and Byzantine stimuli. This coastal city enjoyed the prejudice of Westerners as the one-time capital, first of the Western Roman Empire in 402–76, before it was briefly supplanted by the Ostrogoths, who gave it a German connection, before surrendering to Byzantium's Justinian in 535.[37] Kondakov deplored the German art historian F. W. Unger's belief that "the antiquities in Ravenna have nothing in common with Byzantium, and relate to the art of the Goths … this style, developed in Rome, does not distinguish Gothic-Aryan from Catholic churches."[38] The French had reached similar conclusions. Auguste Choisy, an influential historian of architecture, had claimed that "after Justinian, art exhausted its power and quickly became formalistic."[39] For Kondakov, Western historians of Byzantium paid "insufficient attention to later monuments," which allowed them to denigrate Byzantine frescos as imitative of Italian art.[40] Kondakov turned to the East, as far away as Bactria, in Central Asia. "Innovations in church architecture in the sixth and seventh centuries came from Constantinople and Thessaloniki," Kondakov argued, and "this progressive connection to church architecture explains the role of the supposedly second-tiered places." Moreover, he found that "the ancient basilicas of Khersones, from the 5th to the 10th centuries, were modeled on buildings from Asia Minor; the architecture of early Georgia derived from there, and the epoch of the flowering of the Georgian kingdom from the 10th to the 14th centuries used models from Trabzon," the capital of the Empire of Trebizond on the Black Sea, the successor to Byzantium following the conquest of Constantinople in 1204.[41]

Arguing further against the apotheosis of Ravenna in Western art, Kondakov pointed to a return to Constantinople itself where, in addition to the

[37] Zuzana Frantova, "Ravenna as a Battlefield: Late Antique Monuments between Orientalism and Nationalism," in *Orient oder Rom? History and Reception of a Historiographical Myth (1901–1970)*, ed. Ivan Foletti and Francesco Lovino (Brno: Masaryk University, 2018), 83–104.

[38] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," 2, is referencing F. W. Unger's *Quellen der Byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte* (Vienna, 1878), which focused on the Christian monuments in Constantinople.

[39] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," 4. Kondakov was citing Choisy's *L'art de bâtir chez les Byzantins* (Paris, 1883), in which the author claimed that Palestine could not have influenced Byzantium, because the former used brick and the latter stones in buildings. As Kondakov pointed out, stone architecture in the East followed rather than preceded brick. He also cited as problematic André Couchaud's *Choix d'églises byzantines en Grèce* (1842).

[40] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," iii.

[41] Kondakov had already integrated Georgian architecture into questions of Byzantine artistic influences in his *Drevniaia arkhitektura Gruzii: Issledovanie* (Moscow: Sinodal´naia tipografiia, 1876).

Hagia Sophia, several churches contemporaneous with it also featured innovative stylistics, especially the ancient basilicas of the Monastery of Stoudios, built in 465 but transformed a millennium later into the Imbrokhor-dzhami Mosque.[42] Like those Westerners whose ignorance of Byzantine techniques had not allowed for an appropriate perspective on the miniatures, the French scholar Gustave Schlumberger misidentified several icons of the Theotokos.[43] Admitting that "the dark and confusing questions of the oldest iconographies of the Mother of God will not be resolved any time soon," Kondakov also understood that the misinterpretations of icons had profound implications for their use as primary historical sources.[44] One of Kondakov's most prolific students, E. K. Redin, defended his dissertation in 1896 on the mosaics of Ravenna, and like his mentor, he brought attention to views by Western scholars that could have led to different conclusions had they been able to even *see* Eastern effects.[45]

The criticism leveled at Western scholars highlighted the Russians' challenge to nationalism, with its concordant implications for *translatio imperii*. Because Westerners' views were tinted by their own national interests, they had missed the richness of the intermingling of cultures that had characterized Byzantium. Kondakov and his followers highlighted the possibilities for a pluralism that defied 19th-century nationalism. For example, he highlighted the tenth century, the era in which Byzantium was ruled by the Macedonian dynasty and "Georgians, Armenians, and Slavs sat on the throne and served in the highest administration and the military."[46] Culturally specific neighborhoods were also being formed in the capital at this time: "Greeks in Phanar; Armenians in Psamatia (Samatya); Jews in Galata; Syrians near the Golden Horn."[47] Kondakov saw what later historians termed the "Macedonian Renaissance," praising the art in particular because "we have much evidence that it was not just external and technical but also internal. It served to express

[42] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," 4.

[43] Ibid., 206–8. Gustave Schlumberger failed to distinguish between the Oranta, which showed Mary with her hands raised in prayer, and the Hodegetria, in which she holds the Christ Child on one arm. The two images had theological as well as temporal differences with implications for the development of early Christianity.

[44] Ibid., 208.

[45] Redin was dismayed that the Swiss scholar Johann Rahn had defined certain details as "Gothic," highlighting them as the first traces of German influence in Ravenna; however, similar designs had also appeared in Coptic Christian works. See E. K. Redin, "Zametki o pamiatnikakh Ravenny," *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 7, 1 (1899): 1–8.

[46] This was also the era in which Orthodox Christianity came to Rus´ by way of Grand Prince Vladimir's colorful preference for it among competing monotheistic religions, but Kondakov keeps an interpretive distance from this.

[47] Kondakov, "Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," 65–66.

not only theological dogma but also the intimate religious life of the Orthodox East."[48] Conceding that formalism can be found in some of the writing and pseudoclassicism in painting, he marveled that architecture and sculpture became "enlivened." Church architecture had been transformed "with the single large cupola being replaced by five, and the walls that supported them had longer, higher, elegant proportions." The wide church doors from antiquity were narrowing, as were the interior aisles and arches. Sculpture had become more decorative, with fewer figures and marble bas-reliefs designed for greater effect. Mosaics and frescos were being replaced by miniatures, with scenes from the Gospels and the Bible. This architecture had a "picturesque effect, noteworthy for its depth and harmony of tones," and could be found in places as distant from each other as southern Italy and Georgia.[49]

As the profession of archaeology continued to evolve throughout the 19th century, Western countries, including the United States, expanded by establishing archaeological institutes in the capitals of antiquity, Rome and Athens. Russians sought equivalencies, both to keep pace and to assert their interpretations. The Ministry of the Imperial Court had established a Rome Archaeological Commission in 1851, headed by Prince Grigorii Volkonskii, but the prince had simply been empowered to purchase objects from antiquity for the Hermitage.[50] In 1890, Vasilii Modestov, Russia's best known scholar of ancient Roman history and philology, spoke at the Eighth Archaeological Congress in Moscow about the pressing need for an institute in Rome, one with a filial in Athens. Evoking the French and German institutions in these capitals, he bemoaned the lack of attention Russians paid to this area, suggesting a related inferiority in scholarship. Russia's archaeologists wanted an institute abroad but not one in Western Europe. Also at the Eighth Congress, N. V. Pokrovskii spoke on "The Gospels in Iconography, Primarily Byzantine and Russian," a report that merited publication in a separate volume.[51] Countess Praskovia Uvarova, executive director of the IMAO, had already voiced her support for opening an archaeological institute in Constantinople. Political as well as intellectual pressure turned attention to the Christian East. The impetus to found an institute in Constantinople originated with

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., 67.

[50] Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA) f. 472, op. 17, d. 111, ll. 4, 21. The Rome Commission was placed under the Archaeological Commission when the latter was established in 1859.

[51] *Trudy 8-ogo arkheologicheskogo s"ezda v Moskve* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Upravleniia udelov, 1892), vol. 1. Nikolai Vasilevich Pokrovskii's dual role as the director of the Archaeological Institute in St. Petersburg and professor at the Petersburg Spiritual Academy underscored the profound relationship between Orthodoxy and archaeology.

the secretary to the Russian embassy at the Sublime Porte, P. B. Mansurov, whose father Boris had been one of the founders of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society in 1882.[52] Although his proposal to open a foreign institute mentioned Rome and Athens, Mansurov opined that the "Christian East is closer to our history than is antiquity."[53]

A well-placed diplomat, Mansurov had witnessed Western political incursions into the Balkans, and he recognized the potential of an institute such as this to generate a positive view of Russia, what would later be coined "soft power." With the unqualified support of his ambitious ambassador, A. I. Nelidov, these diplomats were keen to advance interpretations of the archaeological past that challenged Western analytical appropriations.[54] Naming names, Mansurov emphasized that Kondakov, Vasilevskii, and Uspenskii were developing theories that offered fresh explanations, revising those of their Western counterparts.[55] Indeed, in 1886 Nelidov had approached the young professors, who welcomed such an institute for studying the "entire expanse of the Christian and Muslim East in ethnographic, historical, archaeological, artistic and theological relations."[56] Although the "Muslim" aspect disappeared from their research once the institute opened, and relations with the Ottoman government proved uneven, this was the only foreign institute that the Porte allowed on its territory.

The politico in Nelidov specifically desired that the institute be placed under the auspices of the embassy, because "here more than anywhere else the importance for us must be felt, for the direction of our political activity, the study of these countries' pasts."[57] In the narrative of great-power diplomacy in

[52] E. Iu. Basargina has published Mansurov's report from the archives in her *Russkii arkheologicheskii institut v Konstantinopole: Ocherki istorii* (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1999), 167–70.

[53] RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 1a, l. 1. Boris Mansurov also presented on "Vizantiia, slavianstvo i Rossiia" at the Eighth Archaeological Congress in Moscow in 1890.

[54] Nelidov's extensive experience with the Ottoman Empire included early service in Bulgaria, and later he helped negotiate the Treaty of San Stefano, which ended the Turkish War of 1878 so favorably for Russia that the European great powers forced it to be rewritten in the Treaty of Berlin. The Russian Foreign Ministry relocated him to Rome in 1897 and then Paris, because of his political ambitions regarding appropriating parts of the Ottoman Empire. He maintained correspondence throughout with the institute's director, F. I. Uspenskii. Moreover, his impressive collection of "gold objects" was evaluated by the archaeologist Boris Farmakovskii upon his death, suggesting an acquisitive personal interest (T. A. Farmakovskaia, *Boris Vladimirovich Farmakovskii* [Leningrad: Naukova dumka, 1988], 171).

[55] RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 1a. This is a handwritten account of the proposal to establish the archaeological institute in Constantinople.

[56] Ibid., d. 1, l. 16.

[57] *Izvestiia Russkogo arkheologicheskogo instituta v Konstantinopole* (hereafter *IRAIK*) 16 (1912): 365.

the second half of the 19th century, the Ottoman Empire was deteriorating as the "sick man of Europe," waiting for his body parts to be parceled out; this was posed as the "Eastern Question," or "the notion that Europe had political and moral obligations to manage the Ottoman collapse."[58] Nelidov, though, posed an alternative "Eastern Question": "Was it not here, for the last 1,000 years before our era, that the subject of our studies and concerns arose and became solidified, the Eastern question—the question of the battle between the pervasive and explorative education of the West against that of Eastern delight?" He presciently termed it a "cold war," and invoked a clichéd binary worthy of Rudyard Kipling: "the carefully calculated intellectual powers of the West, [contrasted] with the burning Eastern powers of faith and love."[59] He thus engaged fully with the publicists of the era arguing for an "Eastern" identity for Russia, especially N. I. Danilevskii and Konstantin Leont´ev, both of whom polemicized about the importance for Russia of distancing itself culturally from Western Europe.[60] Byzantium could provide a base for that, and *translatio imperii* would appear to be more about cultural consonance than territorial ambitions, rendering Russia less predatory.[61]

Fedor Uspenskii, the first and only director of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople (RAIK), shared the perspectives of his mentor and his ambassador.[62] Uspenskii had written his dissertation on Christian and Muslim relations in Byzantium and was a proponent of the view that the 1204 Crusades had ushered in the Eastern Question, which for him bespoke a cultural dissonance between East and West that could still be felt

[58] Lucien J. Frary and Mara Kozelsky, eds., *Russian-Ottoman Borderlands: The Eastern Question Reconsidered* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014), 4. The first monograph to synthesize the various ways this question had been posed (including by Karl Marx in the *New York Tribune* in 1853) is J. A. R. Marriott, *The Eastern Question: An Historical Study in European Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1917). The most recent synthesis is A. L. Macfie, *The Eastern Question, 1774–1923* (New York: Longman, 1996). In her analysis of the use of the term in post-1923 Turkish textbooks, Nazan Çiçek points out that "the Eastern Question as a product of alteritist discourse that established the East as antithetical to the West was a politically constructed phenomenon that increasingly determined the Ottoman Empire's position visàvis the European powers" (quoted in *Russian-Ottoman Borderlands*, 307).

[59] *IRAIK* 1 (1896): 6. Nelidov also mentioned the "wide Slavic heart" and Russia as "the carrier of success and the driver of true enlightenment."

[60] Danilevskii's signature work was *Russia and Europe* (1869) and Leont´ev's, *Byzantinism and Slavism* (1875).

[61] Lora Gerd, *Russian Policy in the Orthodox East: The Patriarchate of Constantinople (1878–1914)* (Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2014), especially chap. 2 on "the Byzantine legacy."

[62] Kondakov recorded that although he had not thought of directing it, he harbored "dreams of a position that would give [him] a refuge on the beneficent banks of the Bosporus" (RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 1, l. 28). Technically, it was named the Russkii arkheologicheskii institut pri Imperatorskom posol´stve v Konstantinopole—that is, the Russian Archaeological Institute at the Imperial Embassy in Constantinople.

in contemporary relations.[63] The institute, which opened in 1896 and undertook numerous expeditions until the outbreak of the Great War forced its closure, enjoyed considerable authority. Despite the often tense official relations between the autocracy and the Porte, in 1897 Sultan Abdul Hamid II issued an *irade*, or decree, permitting RAIK's associates to conduct archaeological studies in the Ottoman Empire, so long as they obeyed existing Ottoman laws on antiquities and turned half of their finds over to the Ottoman Museum.[64] It was chartered to administer the on-site scientific activities of personnel from universities, academies, and institutes in Russia, as well as foreign scholars working in the territories that once constituted the Byzantine Empire and who were focusing on Christian antiquities.[65] Tying RAIK to the embassy meant excluding the other two imperial institutions heavily invested in Christian archaeology: the Holy Synod and the Ministry of the Imperial Court, under whose auspices lay both the Hermitage Museum and the Imperial Archaeological Commission.[66] Inspired by mounting interest in the Christian East, in the 1890s Orthodox laity began forming regional "church-archaeological societies" throughout the empire.[67]

---

[63] F. I. Uspenskii wrote a history of the Crusades as part of a series, Istoriia Evropy po epokham i stranam v srednie veka i novoe vremia, edited by N. Kareev and I. Luchitskii, an assertive intellectual attempt to revise West European historiography by reframing the centrality of the "Eastern Question," by which the authors and editors meant the acknowledgment of Eastern influences. Uspenskii argued that the Crusades failed because the Western warriors lacked perspective on the East, still evident at the time of his writing (*Istoriia krestovykh pokhodov* [St. Petersburg: Brokgauz-Efron, 1901]).

[64] The archival fond of the institute is littered with "misunderstandings" because its members did not forward all that they were supposed to send to the Ottoman Museum. For example, Uspenskii kept things "he didn't think would interest the museum" (RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 11, l. 6).

[65] Pinar Üre translates the charter in "Byzantine Heritage, Archaelogy, and Politics between Russia and the Ottoman Empire: Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople (1894–1914)," (PhD diss., London School of Economics and Political Science, 2014), 153–57. Point 1 of the charter is "to guide the onsite scientific activities of Russian scholars working on the history of ancient Greece, Asia Minor, and the territories that once constituted the Byzantine Empire, with a particular emphasis on the history of Christian antiquities." Territory covered by the institute included Byzantium and *peredniaia* Asia, which included European and Asiatic Turkey. The charter specifically did not mention the Slavic states in the Balkans, but that was where the archaeologists concentrated their activities (*IRAIK* 16 [1912]: *Otchet*, 366).

[66] RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 1, l. 45. Minister of the Imperial Court I. I. Vorontsov-Dashkov predicted huffily that the institute would fail.

[67] Ibid., d. 27, l. 5. Uspenskii and the four Russian spiritual academies both wanted active participation from the Church. The first such society was founded in 1872 at the Kiev Spiritual Academy, and between 1890 and 1916, 50 more sprang up throughout the empire. In addition, the Orthodox Palestinian Society had begun opening provincial departments, of which there were 16 by 1895.

In its first major foray, in 1899, RAIK picked up where Kondakov had left off with his study of Orthodox churches in Constantinople; Uspenskii et al. began cleaning off the walls to recover the frescos and mosaics in the former Chora Church.[68] Remarkably, the sultan gave a verbal agreement for the Russians to work in an active mosque.[69] Institute Secretary F. I. Shmit recognized the significance of these frescos to "the Byzantine question," which debated the relative contributions that this empire had made to European civilization.[70] Because they had coincided with the emergence of the Renaissance, these remarkable frescos fairly begged for comparison to Western art. "Byzantine monuments in both science and public opinion have not been lucky," wrote Shmit. "At this time, when not one hamlet, not one church in Italy, France, England, or Flanders has been left unstudied, the remarkable treasures of Byzantine art are frequently either completely unknown or known unsatisfactorily … the history of Byzantine art has not been written … what we have is extremely shaky because of the arbitrariness of conclusions and sharply contradictory opinions of experts." Whereas it is easy to date the Italian Renaissance, the "scholar of Byzantium does not have objective criteria; in the majority of cases he is guided by his personal feelings and tastes."[71]

The Kakhrie-dzhami Mosque was an exception to this rule. The architecture had undergone several reconstructions over the centuries, but the art work adorning the walls had been sponsored by the Byzantine statesman Theodore Metochites in the first quarter of the 14th century.[72] An important aspect of Shmit's ability to work with these frescos was that they were complemented by written sources about this particular era. Shmit's interpretive overview of the mosaics and frescos continued the challenge to Western indictments of stagnation and formalism:

> There is much stylistic variation in the paintings in Kakhrie-dzhami, undoubtedly. But the variations do not mean that the mosaics were made at different times. It means that the Byzantine artists were not simply

[68] F. I. Shmit, "Mozaiki i freski Kakhrie-dzhami," *IRAIK* 8 (1903): 119–52, notes on 140 that "Kakhre" means damnation, and that some images had been damaged, especially around the eyes. Yet he was still able to restore a significant amount of the religious art.

[69] RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 11, l. 1.

[70] Shmit, "Mozaiki i freski Kakhrie-dzhami." Tsar Nicholas II personally gave 10,000 rubles to publish the resultant album (Üre, "Byzantine Heritage, Archaeology, and Politics," 206). Uspenskii needed the new ambassador, A. I. Zinov´ev, as an intermediary, but this was still a remarkable undertaking.

[71] Ibid., 119–20.

[72] Shmit notes that the Viennese architect D. Pulgher published on aspects of the mosque, which prompted Kondakov to snip that "he obviously doesn't have even the most elementary knowledge of the archaeology of Byzantine art" (ibid., 123).

> subjects, doing everything on command, but rather, they were living people: one drew better than others, one worse. One inclined in the direction of academism, and another toward realism.[73]

Shmit's refutation of the "languid souls" of these artists incorporated them into the prevailing Russian view of multiple influences, and his presence in Constantinople eased forward some of the underlying implications of *translatio imperii*.

One critical Ottoman territory, however, put Russian and Western archaeologists at immediate loggerheads, and their respective governments as well: the Holy Lands. No country could be allowed ownership over Christianity's most sacred sites, and archaeologists from everywhere played an invaluable role in excavating them.[74] RAIK, the Russian government, and the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society provided each other with mutual support in this area.[75] The director of the Palestine Society, Archimandrite Antonin, was himself an archaeologist, a Byzantologist, and an ardent enthusiast of Russia's Eastern identity.[76] Additionally, the Russian consulate in Jerusalem stood next to the Threshold of the Judgment Gate, which Christ would have passed through on his way up Golgotha for his crucifixion, extraordinarily prime real estate.[77] RAIK, whose status always balanced precariously between politics

[73] Ibid., 134.

[74] Queen Victoria sponsored the Palestine Exploration Fund in 1865; the American Palestine Exploration Society opened in 1870, leading to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1880; the Dominican Order established the French Biblical and Archaeological School of Jerusalem in 1889; and in 1898, Kaiser Wilhelm II began funding excavations of the German Oriental Society in Berlin.

[75] Russia had established an unofficial Spiritual Mission in Palestine in 1847, necessary to administer to the thousands of Orthodox pilgrims who made the annual trek, which was originally funded by the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich transformed Russia's mission into the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society in 1882. For more, see Theofanis G. Stavrou, *Russian Interests in Palestine, 1882–1914: A Study of Religious and Educational Enterprise* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1963). Russian pilgrims always accounted for the highest number of Christian travelers to the Holy Land, dually characterized by their abundance of devotion and their financial poverty.

[76] To quote Antonin on his sense of mission, "We are not insulted to be called Asians. If we are Asians, then we have to think about and grieve for and take care of Asia, especially the historical *peredniaia* Asia, whose spirit we joined from the baptismal font, and about whose spirit Europe thinks so little" (*Ot Russkoi missii v Ierusalime: Otchet* [St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Ministerstva vnutrennikh del, 1875], 7).

[77] A. A. Dmitrievskii, *Imperatorskoe pravoslavnoe palestinskoe obshchestvo i ego deiatel´nost´ (1882–1907)* (St. Petersburg: V. F. Kirshbaum, 1907), 49. This was an extremely significant archaeological find. According to the New Testament, Christ had been crucified outside the city, but his Holy Sepulcher was inside the present wall. The discovery of a second, interior wall confirmed the biblical passage, because it meant that Christ would have been crucified outside this wall.

and culture, embassy and education, found a helpful ally in the archimandrite's society. Although founded to address the concerns of Russian pilgrims, with such aficionados as Antonin at the helm, it extended its reach whenever possible. In 1900, for example, the society provided Uspenskii with 5,000 rubles for an expedition to Syria, where he and his crew could explore the "intimate life of Christian society in the fifth and sixth centuries."[78] This was particularly important to the Christian East because "the spiritual development of Syria reveals many examples of its intensity and the heights to which it soared, in those years fatal for the West European world." Indeed, Syria lay at the center of early Christianity: "It is worth remembering how many Syrians participated in the working out of both minor and major dogmatic questions, and how multifaceted the literary production in the Syrian language of the fifth and sixth [centuries] was, and how widely the Syrian legal code was distributed in the East."[79] Enthusiastic about the as yet underexplored archaeological treasures in Syria, the archaeologists were disappointed because so much lay either in ruins or under layers of topsoil, difficult to access: "we had hoped that [the ruins of] Gauarin would serve as the prototype of the populous cities of this dead country, because at the beginning of the Christian era, these cities and villages teemed with life."[80] The nomadic Bedouin tribes, epitomes for primitivism in the 19th century, were now trampling the former Christian civilization.

The Byzantium excavated by scholars at RAIK was a vibrant society perfectly capable of discrediting the Gibbon-Hegel stance. B. A. Panchenko, a Vasilevskii student and secretary of the institute in 1901–14, argued that oppressive policies toward the peasantry came in from the West in the 11th century, disrupting the harmonious relations that had characterized Slavic peasants and their Byzantine rulers before this.[81] One of the institute's major successes began in 1898 in Bulgaria when Karel Škorpil, founder of the Varna Archaeological Museum and the "father of Bulgarian archaeology" worked with Uspenskii and Panchenko on the excavations of Aboba (681–893), the first Bulgarian capital and the only independent state in the Balkans recognized by the Byzantine government.[82] Another renowned Russian had somewhat surprising ties to the RAIK: Pavel Miliukov, best known as the

[78] F. I. Uspenskii, "Arkheologicheskie pamiatniki Sirii," *IRAIK* 7, 2–3 (1902): 94. Uspenskii's two brothers were also archaeologists, and his wife accompanied him on this expedition as the official photographer.
[79] Ibid., 238.
[80] Ibid., 112.
[81] B. A. Panchenko, "Krest´ianskaia sobstvennost´ v Vizantii: Zemledel´cheskii zakon i monastyrskie dokumenty," *IRAIK* 9, 1–2 (1904): 1–234.
[82] Published in *IRAIK* 10 (1905), with a supplementary album of photographs.

founder of the Western-oriented Constitutional Democratic (Kadet) Party during the 1905 revolution. Dabbling in archaeology as had his mentor Professor V. O. Kliuchevskii, Miliukov presented at the Eighth Archaeological Congress in Moscow in 1890 on a historiographically controversial Byzantine document.[83] A history professor at Moscow University from 1886, he was fired in 1895 for infusing his lectures with politics.[84] After lecturing briefly at Bulgaria's Sofia University in 1897, he spent the next two years studying Christian antiquities in western Macedonia, working with Kondakov for the tsarist government as well as with other members of RAIK.[85] As foreign minister of the Provisional Government following the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in 1917, Miliukov betrayed his own *translatio imperii* impulses when he insisted that the Russian army continue to fight the unpopular war because a victory would bring Constantinople and the Turkish Straits under Russian suzerainty. Crowd reactions against this cost him his political position.

What distinguished Russian archaeologists from their Western counterparts was the extent to which they blurred distinctions between Byzantium and the Christian East as separate spheres. To be sure, Western archaeologists and art historians at times used the terms almost interchangeably, but "Byzantium" also equated with a civilization whose value they judged rather harshly because their historiographical impetus was to juxtapose it to Renaissance Rome. In 1904, Kondakov published his *Archaeological Journey to Syria and Palestine*, based on a trip he had made in 1891–92, subsidized by the Palestinian Society.[86] This monograph included commentary on the past 25

[83] P. N. Miliukov, "Vremia i mesto deistviia zapiski grecheskogo toparkha," *Trudy 8-ogo arkheograficheskogo s"ezda v Moskve*, ed. P. S. Uvarova (Moscow: Mamontov, 1897), 278–89. In this paper he sided with Vasilevskii and Uspenskii with regards to locating the *toparchēs*, the Byzantine term for a semi-independent ruler, on the Danube rather than in Crimea. The document was part of the ongoing debate about Vladimir I's baptism.

[84] Melissa Stockdale, *Paul Miliukov and the Quest for a Liberal Russia, 1880–1918* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996), especially chap. 4. Exiled to provincial Riazan', P. N. Miliukov partnered with regional archaeologists and excavated provincial kurgans, presenting on them at the Tenth Archaeological Congress in Riga in 1896 ("Otchet o raskopkakh riazanskikh kurganov letom 1896," in *Trudy 10-ogo arkheograficheskogo s"ezda v Rige*, ed. P. S. Uvarova (Riga: E. Lessner and A. Gershel, 1899), 1:14–38.

[85] P. N. Miliukov, "Khristianskie drevnosti Zapadnoi Makedonii," *IRAIK* 4 (1899): 21–151. Miliukov was a member of the team charged by the government to, in Kondakov's words, "collect material for future historical-ethnographic research of the most important places in Macedonia: the goal was to establish historical-archaeological and philological bases, which it would be possible in the future to use when the critical political question is posed about the contemporary position of Macedonia in the Turkish Empire and its tribal composition in relation to the neighboring countries and nationalities of the Balkan Peninsula" (Kondakov, *Makedoniia*, 1).

[86] The expedition had been impeded by the cholera outbreak during those years in Syria; southern Russia also suffered terribly from a similar outbreak at the time.

years of scholarship on the entangled issues associated with early Christian art and archaeology and the continued divisions between Eastern and Western interpretations.[87] Significantly, he included the Caucasus, as Russian scholars were wont to do.[88] This is hardly to say that Westerners had overlooked this region, but they had made it less central to their Byzantine studies.[89] In this volume Kondakov drew attention to Austrian archaeologist-art historian Josef Strzygowski's *Orient or Rome* (1901), which had ignited an academic melee in the West because he credited the East with the greater contributions to early Christian art.[90] Kondakov downplayed Strzygowski's thesis by arguing that "the question is not about the predominance and superiority of the East or Rome," but rather one of methodology, and he pointed out that Strzygowski himself had recognized that he lacked the evidence to prove his case.[91] "The fundamental issue for the researcher," wrote Kondakov, "is not the argument about whether Rome or the East predominated, but the careful study of the typical forms, character, and degree to which the various countries participated in the creation of Christian art."[92]

Josef Strzygowski's theory merits a historiographical sidebar here because of the attention that the Austrian's works have received at the expense of Kondakov's originality. D. V. Ainalov, a student of Kondakov's, wrote a 16-page

[87] N. P. Kondakov, *Arkheologicheskoe puteshestvie po Sirii i Palestine* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel´stvo Imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1904). Kondakov visited the Russian hospice in Jaffa and studied the archaeological inscriptions that Archimandrite Antonin had collected (271).

[88] N. P. Kondakov and D. Z. Bakradze, *Opis´ pamiatnikov drevnosti v nekotorikh khramakh i monastyriakh Gruzii* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Ministerstva putei soobshcheniia, 1900). In 1904, the Kiev Spiritual Academy sent the Georgian graduate student K. S. Kekelidze to RAIK, a move embraced by the Georgian clergy, who favored participation in the broad objectives of cultural inclusion (Derzhavna arkhivna sluzhba Ukraïni f. 771, op. 3, d. 2805). On the support of the Georgian clergy for RAIK, see Lori Khatchadourian, "Making Nations from the Ground Up: Traditions of Classical Archaeology in the South Caucasus," *American Journal of Archaeology* 112, 2 (2008): 247–78.

[89] A sampling of articles in the first decade of the first major Western journal of Byzantine studies, Karl Krumbacher's *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1892–), reveals a paucity of interest in the countries of the Caucasus.

[90] Strzygowski's *The Orient or Rome: Contributions to the History of Late Antique and Early Christian Art* rocked Western academia with what Kondakov had long been saying: that religious artistic influence had moved from East to West. There is considerable scholarship on this Strzygowski, addressed most recently in a congress held in Brno (Foletti and Lovino, eds., *Orient oder Rom?*). Ivan Foletti has also written on Kondakov, but Strzygowski has, for multiple reasons, especially his Nazi past, garnered greater attention. See also Vladimir Goss, "Orient oder Rom? 115 Years Later," posted on Romanika.Net.

[91] Kondakov, *Arkheologicheskoe puteshestvie po Sirii i Palestine*, 10–12.

[92] Ibid.,12. Examining the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, "not only a major shrine, but the most important monument in Christianity immemorial" (144), Kondakov emphasized the need for extensive study of all the details that composed it, including Eastern influences.

review of *Orient or Rome* for Vasilevskii's *Vizantiiskii vremennik*. Comprehensive and complimentary, Ainalov nonetheless pointed out that "the scientific investigation of the sources of Christian and Byzantine art has already been defined and explained in the works of the Russian school, headed by Academician Kondakov."[93] Strzygowski had a complex relationship with the Russians. He and Kondakov maintained cordial relations, and he presented a paper at the 15th Archaeological Congress in Novgorod in 1911.[94] Perhaps the archaeologist Mikhail Rostovtsev hit closer to home in accusing Strzygowski of having "stolen Russian ideas."[95] Certainly language was an issue, as many more international scholars read German than Russian, but the centrality of the issue lay in the what Kondakov pointed to: methodology. Strzygowski's approach positioned his work within the humanistic, and nationalistic, European studies.[96] His argument for "eastern origins" provided more grist for an intramural contest among certain universities than for a reappraisal of Byzantium or even a debate about the Eastern Question in the West.[97]

The Christian East persisted as a sticking point for Russian archaeologists because of the extent to which Byzantium combined the cultural geography with the Orthodox religion. In Kondakov's theorizing, this meant that the form was inseparable from the content.[98] Shmit returned to the frescos and mosaics of Kakhrie-dzhami in 1911 to polish his explanation of differences between East and West. His argument rested on two points: first, that art reflects the psychology of the people who produce it; and second, that Christianity is an "Eastern" religion. How, though, to discern what he meant by using these geographical categories as cultural ones? He used "Hellenism" to characterize archaic Greek art, which as he saw it was "Eastern" because it

[93] D. V. Ainalov, "Orient oder Rome," *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 9 (1902): 139.

[94] Eight letters from Josef Strzygowski (1886–1913) lie in Kondakov's personal archive in the St. Petersburg filial of Arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii nauk (SPbF ARAN) f. 115, op. 4, d. 397. Strzygowski did not attend the congress, but Fanny Galle read his paper "On an Unknown Major Hellenistic Art Center in the Depths of Asia." Strzygowski had limited Russian, but more than most of his colleagues.

[95] Quoted in Suzanne Marchand, "Appreciating the Art of Others: Josef Strzygowski and the Austrian Origins of Non-Western Art History," in *Josef Strzygowski und die Kunstwissenschaften*, ed. Piotr Otto Scholz and Magdalena Anna Długosz (Vienna: Ibera, 2015), 270.

[96] Louise McReynolds, "Nikolai Marr: Reconstructing Ani as the Imperial Ideal," *Ab Imperio*, no. 1 (2016): 191–21.

[97] Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996) discusses the internal politics of German archaeology.

[98] To reiterate what Kondakov wrote about Christian archaeology: "it combined the form of the digs with the content of religious practice" ("Vizantiiskie tserkvi i pamiatniki," ii). Kyzlasova, *Istoriia izucheniia vizantiiskogo i drevnerusskogo iskusstva*, 177, also emphasizes this point as central to his theorizing.

intended to inspire emotions. When, in the fifth century BCE Greek philosophers had risen to challenge this emphasis on feelings, they had created a line of thought contradictory to these Eastern values. Alexander the Great then spread this Hellenism through all the lands that he conquered, but "the Hellenization of the East resulted in the orientalization of Hellenism." Christianity appeared as a solution to this contradiction, evident in its art, in the frescos and icons that celebrated spirituality rather than humanism, emotions over logic. As Shmit argued, Christian artists had not set out to create a new art, but they did so by virtue of the fact that they were responding to a different set of cultural needs in the rejection of cults in favor of monotheism. The key for Shmit lay in the separation of the secular from the religious in art, which he argued was also the situation in contemporaneous Russia. However, the destruction of Byzantium's secular culture had impeded an appreciation of it. Shmit saw the mosaics not as reflections of a culture in decline, but rather as an opportunity to look anew for how later Byzantine art might be trying to reconcile the intrusion of the secular. He concluded that Byzantine art was therefore paving the way for the Renaissance. Although his argument does not meet all the tests of even his own roundabout logic, it does make plain his desire to rehabilitate Byzantium as activist and influential.[99]

By 1910, RAIK enjoyed such a reputation that Uspenskii had to send a note to the curator of the Kiev Educational District, telling him to notify tourists and "private people" that they could not just drop by the institute when they wanted a tour of the antiquities in Constantinople.[100] The opening volleys of the Great War, though, closed RAIK, returning the men to Russia unclear about the future of the property left behind. Early Russian military successes along the Ottoman front, though, gave new opportunities to archaeological ambitions for *translatio imperii*. Kondakov was appointed to chair a committee to establish a postwar institute in Palestine, which would include Syria, the Sinai Peninsula, and Phoenicia.[101] The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, which addressed the issue of military destruction of national cultural monuments during wartime, had not anticipated the extent to which invading armies would claim numerous captured monuments as their own.[102] The Holy Lands suffered thus from a plethora of claimants. The familiar argument surfaced in Russia: "There is no people in the world

[99] F. I. Shmit, "Vostok i zapad v iskusstve," *IRAIK* 16 (1912): 362–65.

[100] Derzhavna arkhivna sluzhba Ukraïni f. 707, op. 294, d. 25, l. 237.

[101] SPbF ARAN f. 115, op. 3, d. 140, l. 3.

[102] "Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land," 29 July 1899, 32 Stat. 1803, T.S. no. 403, 26 Martens Nouveau Recueil (ser. 2) 949, reprinted in *American Journal of International Law* 1, 2 (1907): 129–59; and "Convention Respecting the Laws and Customs of Land Warfare," 18 October 1907, 36 Stat. 2277 (1907), T.S. no. 539, 3

connected by such an unbreakable bond with ancient Palestine as the Russian people."[103] In January 1917, when Western powers sat on the verge of dividing the Holy Lands among themselves, Kondakov continued to press for special Russian interests because of the country's connection to Byzantium.[104]

Russian army advances into eastern Anatolia in 1916 resurrected RAIK, with Uspenskii and Shmit following the military in the interests of archaeological preservation.[105] Although army commanders were less than excited, the usual suspects, from a grand duke to Praskovia Uvarova, pressed for funding and logistical support to get the archaeologists into the captured territories.[106] Undertaking a mission to Trabzon, which Uspenskii had visited when the institute first opened to examine the Christian churches from the 13th and 14th centuries, they were joined by five scholars from the Academy of Sciences.[107] Wartime considerations hampered research; their primary object of interest, the Orthodox Panagia Chrysokephalos Church, or the Fatih Mosque after 1461, was now a field hospital. Uspenskii's main purpose, though, seems to have been collecting everything portable and shipping it to the major imperial museum in the region: that is, to the Caucasus Museum in Tiflis (Tbilisi). His efforts were stymied by the army commander's refusal to requisition an automobile for transport, though he ultimately succeeded in amassing a valuable collection of manuscripts.[108] After the war, unlike Kondakov, Uspenskii did not emigrate, and he wrote the first history of the Trebizond Empire, one that emphasized its uniquely Eastern identity, flavored more by Georgia than by Greece.[109]

Back in the Christian East, the Russian scientists found a commonality with the Ottoman Turks: an aversion toward the local Greek population.[110]

Martens Nouveau Recueil (ser. 3) 461, reprinted in *American Journal of International Law* 2, 1–2 (1908): 90–117.

[103] SPbF ARAN f. 115, op. 3, d. 140, l. 14.

[104] Ibid., ll. 15–17.

[105] *IRAIK* 1 (1896): 30. See also Halit Akarca, "Imperial Formations in Occupied Lands: Russian Occupation of Ottoman Territories during the First World War" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014), especially chap. 4.

[106] RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 54, contains the communications about sending RAIK personnel to Trabzon; Russian archaeologists also traveled to other occupied territories, including Van and Galicia (N. Marr and I. Orbeli, *Arkheologicheskaia ekspeditsiia 1916 v Van* [Petrograd: Tipografiia Akademii nauk, 1922]). Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich had been assassinated in 1905; the new royal enthusiast, Georgii Mikhailovich, was friendly with Kondakov.

[107] RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 57, contains notes by the five academicians.

[108] Ibid., d. 55, ll. 11–12.

[109] F. I. Uspenskii, *Ocherki istorii trapezundskoi imperii* (St. Petersburg: Evraziia, 2003). This book was originally published posthumously by the Academy of Sciences in 1929.

[110] The reaction of this group to the native Greeks was mindful of imperial Russia's first encounter with them in Catherine the Great's Ottoman wars of the 1770s. Instead of mythic heroes, Catherine's navy found the locals to be lazy and greedy. She even persuaded Voltaire

Although Islamic rituals could no longer be held in buildings that had originally been Orthodox churches, worship in mosques was protected by Russian law, which Uspenskii and the others respected. Russian Orthodoxy had long competed with its Greek correspondent in the Ottoman Empire, and these repercussions were being felt here.[111] Moreover, in concert with the longtime Russian intellectual admiration for cosmopolitan Arabic, the academician and literary scholar A. E. Krymskii marveled at the library he found, especially the books on Arabic philosophy.[112] He disdained the Greeks moving into houses abandoned by Muslims "as though it were their property," noting that "when the Muslim population that has run away is able to return to Trabzon, our archive will be of great use to them."[113] Preference for Ottomans over local Orthodox Greeks revealed further vestiges of *translatio imperii*, a buffer to modern Greek nationalism.[114]

Russia's Byzantine heritage has for too long functioned as its historio-cultural cross to bear. In 1962, Georges Florovsky understood it as "the problem of old Russian culture," signaling a plea for further scholarship to erase the commonplace that medieval Russia was treated as "obsolete, sterile and stagnant, primitive and backward."[115] As late as 1990, former Librarian of Congress James H. Billington noted that denigrating Byzantium is "a fixture of all the mistaken conventional wisdom" about Russia and Eastern Europe.[116] And in

to disdain them. See Elena Smilianskaia, "Catherine's Liberation of the Greeks: High-Minded Discourse and Everyday Realities," in *Word and Image in Russian History: Essays in Honor of Gary Marker*, ed. Maria di Salvo, Daniel H. Kaiser, and Valerie A. Kivelson (Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2015), 71–89.

111 Gerd, *Russian Policy in the Orthodox East*, especially chap. 3, "Russia and the Patriarchate in Constantinople."

112 Vera Tolz, *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

113 RGIA f. 757, op. 1, d. 57, l. 12. Krymskii also complained that his white jacket had become "black with fleas" (l. 13).

114 The founder of Byzantine studies in the West, Karl Krumbacher, developed the discipline as a philological and cultural means to connect Byzantine literature with the modern Greek language. Hence he was more inspired by Romantic nationalism than by imperialism (Panagiotis Agapitos, "Karl Krumbacher and the History of Byzantine Literature," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 108, 1 (2015): 1–52.

115 Georges Florovsky, "The Problem of Old Russian Culture," *Slavic Review* 21, 1 (1962): 1–15. Florovsky includes Buslaev among those who preferred Petrine secular progress over Russia's Dark Ages, although this strikes me as a use of selective quotes prompted from a misreading of Buslaev's corpus.

116 James H. Billington, "Looking to the Past," *Washington Post*, 22 January 1990, A11. I thank Nicolai Petro for referring me to this article.

comparison to the histories of its closest relatives, Greece and Rome, Byzantium has long been relegated to a secondary status, although its fortunes have improved of late.[117] Does this study of how Russian archaeologists analyzed it in the 19th century overturn the Gibbon-Hegel paradigm in such a way as to rejuvenate Russia's past?[118]

We learn considerably more if we steer clear of the paradigm and focus instead on the methodology and direction that Kondakov and his colleagues were taking. No less free of subjectivity than their Western counterparts, they laid legitimate claim to taking a different approach, and one that presented an alternative vision of Byzantium. Preference for privileging Eastern over Western influences and the ways in which excavations in Ottoman territories harmonized with *translatio imperii* have made it too easy to essentialize scientific goals as political ones.[119] Without denying an overlap, it profits us more to return the Kondakov crowd to their cultural context, one in which Russians no longer sorted themselves according to a "Slavophile vs. Westernizer" binary and were simply comfortable as citizens of empire. Their constant references to a pluralism of artistic styles and an embrace of the multiple cultures of Byzantium provides more than an argument for *translatio imperii;* they reveal self-satisfaction with an identity at odds with the ethnic nationalism of the age. Did these scholars simply substitute an Orthodox Christianity, given that religion formed the basis of the material culture they studied? In part, yes, but rehabilitating their "barren" culture depended on a fresh approach to the religion that underlay it.[120] Neither proselytizers nor evangelicals, these men could still not rid their culture of negative value judgments with respect to Western Christianity. Their attention to Byzantine styles did not stem from a rejection of Renaissance aesthetics; Kondakov himself argued for Renaissance influence on Russia's most celebrated icon artist, Andrei Rublev, who

[117] The most recent work on Byzantium has shifted the attention to the Near East and seems to be following Kondakov's counsel: Paul Corby Finney, ed., *The Eerdmans Encyclopedia of Early Christian Art and Archaeology*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2017). An exhibit at New York's Metropolitan Museum focuses on Armenia from the 4th to the 17th centuries, especially the Byzantine era.

[118] The late Oxford don Sir Dimitri Obolensky partially succeeded in his sweeping *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453*, which was published first in 1971 by the Orthodox publisher St. Vladimir's Seminary Press and has been revised twice, last in 2000.

[119] Foletti—in an otherwise informative biography of Kondakov and his contributions to Byzantine studies, *From Byzantium to Holy Russia*—traps the archaeologist in the outdated binary of "Slavophile or Westernizer?" and connects his positions to a superficial reading of contemporaneous politics.

[120] Brian Croke pointed out that Mommsen ultimately became "acutely aware" of the paucity of attention to the "spiritual dimension of life" in the Roman world and "regretted not having taken theology seriously" ("Mommsen and Byzantium," 80).

painted at the turn of the 15th century.[121] Rather, they were seeking to create a methodology that accounted for cultural exchange in ways that could animate views on Byzantium. Instead of creating a hierarchy, they wanted to establish criteria that connected the function of art to the culture that produced it, as in Shmit's tangled argument about the synthetic nature of early Christian art.[122]

If we put Kondakov in conversation with two of his colleagues who were not Byzantologists, the literary critic A. N. Veselovskii and the archaeologist of the Caucasus N. Ia. Marr, we find a larger intellectual framework that connected Western humanism with nationalism, pivoted around the kind of Eurocentrism that had made Gibbon and Hegel so popular. Aesthetics aside, Kondakov critiqued Western religious art for having lost its function of stimulating spirituality, one aspect of a visceral rejection of stereotypes of Western selfishness and greed.[123] Veselovskii—whose influence would be felt much more strongly in the 20th century under his acolytes Viktor Shklovskii, Vladimir Propp, and Mikhail Bakhtin, to name a few—rejected the Eurocentric view of aesthetics that privileged Greco-Roman stylistics.[124] In its place he sought a universalism that was "an anti-individualistic, almost collective approach, a concern for literary evolution and its social causes."[125] Marr, in the decades before he destroyed Soviet linguistics with his crackpot "Japhetology," had devoted years to the excavation of the short-lived Armenian capital at Ani (961–1045). Like Kondakov, he eschewed the notion of a singular influence and celebrated instead that under Muslim rule in Ani, the city boasted an "international urban population, the native Armenian trading class living peacefully right alongside the Persian-Muslim traders."[126]

[121] V. G. Putsko, "Renessansnye skhemy russkikh ikon Bogomateri," in *Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov 1844–1925: Lichnost´, nauchnoe nasledie, arkhiv,* ed. E. N. Petrova (St. Petersburg: Palace Editions. 2001), 91–99. E. K. Redin soaked up all the art in Italy, especially thrilled with Giotto (*Italiia: Iz pisem k druziam* [Khar´kov: Tipografiia Gubernogo Pravleniia, 1903], 45–47).

[122] In another example, Kondakov criticized Western religious art for having lost its function of stimulating spirituality: "Modifications of the type ... [and] artistic improvements, disturb its conventional, traditional scheme and reduce it to an allegory and a personification, thus causing it to lose its sacred character" (quoted in Foletti, *From Byzantium to Holy Russia*, 222).

[123] Kondakov chastises the British merchants in Suez for exploiting the locals, with destructive effects on native cultures (*Puteshestvie na Sinai*, 3–5).

[124] Boris Maslov, "A. N. Veselovsky, 'On the Method and Tasks of Literary History as a Field of Scholarship' (1870)," https://lucian.uchicago.edu/blogs/historicalpoetics/files/2010/08/Veselovsky_1870.PMLA_Formatted.pdf.

[125] Quoted from René Wellek in Craig Brandist and Katya Chown, *Politics and the Theory of Language in the USSR, 1917–1938: The Birth of Sociological Linguistics* (London: Anthem Press, 2010), 194.

[126] McReynolds, ""Nikolai Marr," 114.

He also specifically challenged Western colleagues who dismissed Eastern influences; in addition to Schlumberger, Marr confronted Rudolph Virchow, himself an honored member of the Moscow Archaeological Society, who had categorically insisted that "we must put aside any thought that Germany and the West received their models from the Caucasus; at that time they were in a direct relationship with Italy."[127] Marr also concluded that "the true path of social progress lies in the cultural-intellectual movement away from humanism, which is based in the classical world."[128] These three were acquainted, and as personifications of the political point that scholars' cultural contexts will influence their interpretations, they represented a view of cultural exchange that liberated the East from its Hegelian subservience to the West.[129] European humanism translated into nationalism, and the converse held just as true: Russian universalism into imperialism.

The imperialist tendencies of Russian archaeologists are easily identifiable in postcolonial evaluations of their ideas relevant to *translatio imperii*.[130] Kondakov, for example, specifically referenced "Kievan Rus´ and other parts of Russia, namely Crimea and Georgia, [which] accepted Byzantine art as they did the religion."[131] He also willingly led an excursion into Macedonia that had politicized aims relevant to Russian influence in Ottoman lands.[132] Byzantium, though, can now return to play the positive role in Russia's history and culture that it has been denied. No longer stalled in time, frozen in form because it did not evolve into Renaissance humanism, Byzantium offered both its subjects and its potential heirs an alternative take on rebirth, which depended on cultural interaction and offered spirituality in return for adherence to its values. It lies not within the purview of this essay to choose sides in the contestation between Christian spirituality and secular humanism. However, it does emphasize the need to integrate Russian and other non-Western scholars into debates, precisely because it is no more possible for

[127] N. Ia. Marr's personal archive in SPbF ARAN f. 800, op. 1, ed. khr. 1147, l. 9.
[128] Ibid., ed. khr. 2216, l. 27.
[129] All three were elected to the Academy of Sciences; both Veselovskii and Kondakov had studied under Buslaev, and personal letters between Marr and Kondakov in the latter's archive indicate a close friendship (SPbF ARAN f. 115, op. 3, ed. khr. 140).
[130] In an essay about Strzygowski's antagonist Alois Reigl, Margaret Olin argues that his background in the Austrian Empire made him comfortable with imperial structures of rule. The same could hold just as easily for all members of the Kondakov crowd ("Alois Riegl: The Late Roman Empire in the Late Habsburg Empire," in *The Habsburg Legacy: National Identity in Historical Perspective*, ed. Ritchie Robertson and Edward Timms [Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994], 107–20).
[131] N. P. Kondakov, *Ikonografiia Bogomateri: Sviazi grecheskoi i russkoi ikonopisi s ital´ianskoi zhivopisi rannego Vozrozhdenii* (St. Petersburg: Golike i Vil´borg, 1911), 3.
[132] Kondakov, *Makedoniia*.

objectivity to maintain a superior position over subjectivity than it is for the West to dominate the East.[133] Except, that is, in the imperializing imaginations so characteristic of the 19th century.

Dept. of History
421 Pauli Murray Hall
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
102 Emerson Drive, CB #3195
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3195 USA
louisem@ad.unc.edu

[133] To quote Lorraine Daston and Peter Galson, "Objectivity fears subjectivity, the core self. … Subjectivity is not a weakness of the self to be corrected or controlled like bad eyesight or a florid imagination. It is the self" (*Objectivity* [New York: Zone Books, 2007], 373).