

L'ARCHEOLOGIE CLASSIQUE EN RUSSIE, DE PIERRE LE GRAND A LA PERESTROIKA

I. TIKHONOV (SAINT-PÉTERSBOURG)

Classical Archaeology at the St.Petersburg University from XIX century till the present time

A university statute of 1804 recorded that a department of Theory of Fine Art and Archaeology was established at the faculties of History and Philology. The original department remained concerned with classical art, but F. B. Grefe made an important contribution to Russian archaeology through his work on classical epigraphy and the antiquities of the north coast of the Black sea. Among Grefe's disciples was the famous Russian archaeologist Count A. S. Uvarov. The teaching activity of Professor M. S. Kutorga who interpreted artefacts as historical sources was also of great importance, and in 1867 his disciple F. F. Sokolov started lecturing on non-written sources in ancient Greek history. In the 1820s-1840s there were established the first university collections of artefacts: the Minz cabinet in 1822 and the Museum of Antiquities in 1841.

In 1887 N. P. Kondakov started teaching at the History of Art department delivering lectures on the history of ancient and medieval art, with a special focus on archaeological data. Kondakov's works turned out to be fundamental syntheses of the data in the field of Classical and Old Russian archaeology. Though his approach to archaeological material was mainly art-historical, the iconographic method of stylistic analysis and the dating sequences of ancient objects worked out by Kondakov had a considerable influence on the development of Russian archaeology. He formed the scientific interests of his followers: M. I. Rostovtsev, C. A. Zhebelev, Ya. I. Smirnov, D. V. Ainalov and many others who regarded archaeological data as an additional source for the reconstruction of ancient history. Their trips abroad in the mid 1890s, organised by the University in order to get them prepared for their teaching activities, made a significant impression to their archaeological background. During these trips they visited almost all the major archaeological excavations in the Mediterranean. The teaching activity of the new generation of scientists began a new stage in the development of archaeology at St Petersburg University and special courses of lectures, seminars and practical classes came into being. Rostovtsev in his general course of lectures on the history of the Ancient World and in a specialised course 'Introduction to the archaeology of the West' tried to examine the phenomenon of ancient civilisation in the context of pan-European prehistory. In 1905 B. V. Farmakovsky's course of lectures became the first in Russia to synthesise the new archaeological data on Minoan culture. Rostovtsev, Farmakovsky and Zhebelev debated the results of excavations in South Russia in their seminars and practical classes. The issues of chronology and ethnic identity of archaeological cultures and artefacts were raised, and ordinary (non-art) objects were studied. These seminars contributed to the formation of such famous researchers of classical and Scythian antiquities as G. I. Borovko, K. E. Grinevich, I. I. Tolstoy, B. L. Bogaevsky, L. A. Moiseev and others.

In 1889 professor of the Oriental faculty N. Veselovsky started digging burial mounds in the northern Black sea area and in Kuban - excavations that were to continue until 1917. In the summer of 1922 the Archaeological Institute was united with the University as a separate department preparing specialists in archaeology, archives, archaeography and history of art. More than 60 students attended general theoretical courses on archaeology during the first two years and in the third year they specialized in one of three areas of research: Russian and Byzantine archaeology, classical archaeology or prehistoric archaeology. But in the mid 1920s the development of Stalin's command and administration system was imposing a strongly negative influence on Soviet higher education. In early 1930 a lot of scientific schools were destroyed and many researchers were repressed due to the adaptation of Soviet

archaeology to the Marxist theory. In 1931 the faculties of humanities were excluded from the university structure to make a separate institute (LIFLI). This fact, as well as the tendency to substitute socio-political subjects for specialist courses and the growing disparagement of highly skilled researchers and teachers of the pre-revolutionary generation (in 1928 Spitsyn and Zhebelev were forced to retire from the University) played a negative role in the evolution of historical and especially archaeological education. The very term 'archaeology' was declared bourgeois and many archaeologists were subject to repression.

Only in 1935 archaeological teaching resumed at the Department of Pre-class Society of LIFLI. The Faculty of History was restored and returned to the University in 1934. For the first two years archaeology was taught as an optional subject, Ravdonikas headed the archaeological division organised in 1938. The division specialised in prehistoric, classical, Slavonic-Russian, Central Asian and Caucasian archaeology. Lectures on Scythian archaeology and art were read by prof. M.I. Artamonov who was the head of Archaeological Department in 1949-1972 and simultaneously he directed the State Hermitage in 1951-1964. Prof. V. F. Gaidukevich had delivered lectures on Classical archaeology since 1938 till 1966. The Bosphorian expedition headed by him excavated Ilurat, Myrmekion, Tiritaka and orders Greeks site on Bosphorus . Gaidukevich had a lot of disciples. After his death training in Classical archaeology was continued by A.V.Davydova and A.N.Scheglov. Now this subject is teach by A.M. Butyagin who works at the Department of culture and art of antiquity of the State Hermitage.

H.-C. MEYER (LONDRES)

The Scythian sacrament: Rostovtzeff's hermeneutics and the study of cultural interaction in the Bosporan kingdom

This paper looks at the modern historiography of cultural interaction in the Bosporan kingdom, with special focus on the evidence, individuals and ideas that shaped the dominant interpretative framework of northern Black Sea archaeology. I argue that religious interpretation of classical Greco-Scythian metalwork, offering ostensibly direct access to the political ideology of the Bosporan and Scythian elites, has prevented scholarship from seriously engaging with recent approaches to cultural identity as applied to archaeological evidence from other contact zones of the ancient world. The explanation of Greco-Scythian genre scenes in terms of local conceptions of divinity and monarchical power is traced to Michael Ivanovich Rostovtzeff's pioneering work of the pre-Revolutionary period. His understanding of scenes of ritual 'communion' in particular is analyzed in the contemporary context of European comparative religious history and its basic explanatory models of diffusion and syncretism. The aim of my enquiry is to reveal the opportunities Rostovtzeff's work offered to political self-perception among the intelligentsia of late tsarist Russia and the possibilities his hermeneutics may hold out for methodological re-orientation in current scholarship.

S. GORSHENINA (PARIS)

L'archéologie de l'Asie centrale dans le contexte colonial au XIXe et au début du XXe siècles: entre science et politique

La présente communication tentera d'esquisser les premières étapes de l'archéologie scientifique en Asie centrale russo-soviétique en portant l'accent sur une analyse des divers rapports qui, dans ce contexte colonial, se sont produits entre la science et la politique.

Avant d'aborder des réflexions purement archéologiques, l'exposé débutera par un bref aperçu historiographique qui mettra en évidence la complexité des discours sur la nature de la présence coloniale russe en Asie centrale. Lors de cette introduction, on remettra en question

les arguments encore naguère invoqués contre l'application des méthodes de l'analyse post-coloniale à l'histoire du Turkestan russe, ainsi que l'approche qui fait de cette aire culturelle une exception particulière. En revisitant l'évolution des discours scientifiques et politiques sur l'Asie centrale russe, on essaiera d'aborder l'histoire de l'archéologie au Turkestan russe dans l'esprit des études post-coloniales contemporaines, tout en soulignant l'actuel élargissement du cercle des questions abordables et des sources d'analyse.

Par la suite, on examinera le contexte des premières découvertes archéologiques au moment où l'archéologie commence à se distinguer du tourisme éclairé, ainsi que les méthodes qui ont été utilisées dans les premières fouilles archéologiques par les archéologues tant russes qu'occidentaux.

L'analyse de la structuration et de l'institutionnalisation de l'archéologie centre-asiatique consécutives à des premières découvertes spectaculaires, notamment à Samarcande, permettra de repenser dans quelle mesure on peut parler d'une « archéologie coloniale » au Turkestan russe. Certains aspects seront analysés de manière plus détaillée, comme le traitement du mythe aryen qui a joué un rôle déterminant dans les discours de légitimation de la colonisation russe du Turkestan. Ces discours se sont politisés au fur et à mesure de l'installation du pouvoir russe au Turkestan et ont joué un rôle important dans certaines institutions locales basées à Tachkent, notamment dans le *Cercle d'amateurs d'archéologie du Turkestan*. En effet, l'idée parmi d'autres que le berceau aryen se trouvait en Asie centrale a permis aux milieux intellectuels russes imprégnés de slavophilisme de mener une réflexion qui voulait que l'expansion russe n'a pas été de nature coloniale, mais un simple retour des Aryens dans leur patrie.

Finalement, on dressera quelques traits communs de l'archéologie de l'époque tsariste et de l'archéologie soviétique, soulignant que ces étapes initiales n'ont été que des étapes des archéologies nationales.