

*Arnaldo Marcone*

## ROSTOVTZEFF AND ITALY: A LONG HISTORY\*

There is certainly one aspect that is clearly emerging from recent and ongoing research, and from the numerous and important contributions that have so systematically enriched our overall picture of Michail Rostovtzeff. We have all become much more aware, on the one hand, of the profound roots he had in early 20th-century European culture and, on the other, of the specifically Russian aspects of his personality as a scholar and, therefore, of what his mature historiography owes to the intertwining of these two components.<sup>1</sup>

There is no doubt that Rostovtzeff, before his departure for England in 1918 and later – in 1925 – for the United States, was closely indebted to German academia.<sup>2</sup> In Germany he had found his warmest admirers and supporters, and it was there that he regularly published writings he hoped might enjoy the kind of international circulation that the Russian language could not give them (“*Rossica sunt, non leguntur!*”, he complained).<sup>3</sup> This special relationship with the country then leading in the field of Classical Studies, must not lead us to underestimate other international relations Rostovtzeff established at the same time. Italy undoubtedly plays a major role which deserves consideration.<sup>4</sup>

We all know that Michail Rostovtzeff traveled a lot. It is not difficult to imagine what curiosity and thirst for knowledge must have driven him when, as a young man just over twenty, in 1892 he undertook a trip to visit Pompeii at his own expense.

---

\* I do still remember with emotion my visit to Moscow and St Petersburg at the occasion of a conference organized on Rostovtzeff by Gregory Bongard-Levin in September 1993 (see *VDI* 1994: 1, 229–232). Regretfully Bongard-Levin as many of the participants have passed away.

<sup>1</sup> On the remarkably important tradition of Classical studies in Russia, see Wes 1992 and now Cinnella 2018.

<sup>2</sup> See Fichtner 2020.

<sup>3</sup> See Andreau 1988 and Marcone 1992.

<sup>4</sup> See Marcone 1999.

This burning desire of Rostovtzeff's to learn about the Classical world, to see with his own eyes what beforehand he could only have guessed, is very characteristic of the personality of this scholar, who before and more than many others firmly believed in the value of archaeology for historical reconstruction. Rostovtzeff had dedicated to Pompeii his first university dissertation (*Pompeii in the Light of the New Excavations*) and it is therefore understandable that he wanted to visit the site he only knew through his readings.<sup>5</sup>

The article which he published on this subject in 1894 obviously benefited from this trip. But the great travel season in his life was to begin later, in 1895, when after three years of teaching at the imperial high school of Tsarskoye Selo, Rostovtzeff embarked on a grand tour of the Mediterranean and of leading European cultural institutions.

This was an official trip, as the young Rostovtzeff received a research grant from the Russian government. One remarkable feature of this journey is the alternation between winter stays in research centers and summer trips to visit excavations and archaeological sites. This earned him the esteem and the sympathy of scholars he was able to get in touch with.

It is precisely to the autumn of 1895 that we can date the first Italian season in Rostovtzeff's career. In that year he visited the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Rome, then located in Via Tarpea, on the Capitol. On Italian soil he also started establishing those contacts that were to prove so important for his future as a scholar with the academic world. One bond, in particular, proved particularly important. I am referring to the one he established with the archaeologist and epigraphist Christian Hülsen, a pupil of Mommsen's who was a specialist in the topography of ancient and medieval Rome. For over twenty years, from 1887 to 1908, Hülsen served as vice-secretary of the Institute, until a missed promotion led him to an early resignation.

The history of Rostovtzeff's relationship with the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut is largely the story of these personal relationships. The Russia we get to know through Rostovtzeff is of course a different one from that of aristocrats who, bored with provincial life, sell their properties and set off to spend a few years of leisure in the "land of the sun". In reality, until the Risorgimento, Italy's attractiveness for Russians was determined mostly by literary and aesthetic attitudes, sometimes even religious interests. After 1848 another Russia began to show itself in Italy and, in particular, in Piedmont, between Nice, Genoa and Turin. It was

---

<sup>5</sup> See also Rostovtzeff 1904.

a Russia made up of political *émigrés*, populists who anticipated the next wave of exiles, the one after 1905 – best known perhaps by association with Maksim Gorki and his stay on Capri (a sort of upper-class Crimea at the time).<sup>6</sup>

Rostovtzeff certainly had nothing to do with political emigration at this time. But we can easily understand how the presence of a well-established émigré network helped him find a place in a wider context than that of the German Institute.

It must be added that from 1860 to 1886 the chair of Italian literature in St Petersburg was held by Michelangelo Pinto, who was in touch with Alexander Herzen and Ivan Turgenev; through his marriage to Lidjia Adolfovna Voronec-Dmochovskaya, he gained access to St Petersburg high society. Pinto was among those who sympathized with the emigration of Russian populists to Piedmont.<sup>7</sup>

The environment of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome was particularly propitious as a springboard into the world of Italian culture at the end of the century: this is proven by the very peculiar story of another Russian scholar and poet, Vyačeslav Ivanov. Ivanov, who was slightly older than Rostovtzeff, arrived in Rome in 1892 from Berlin. Through the influence of Nietzsche – who was widely read in Russia at the time – the conditions were already emerging for Ivanov's transition from philology to poetry.<sup>8</sup> We must not forget that an important role with respect to Nietzsche's circulation in Russia was played by one of Rostovtzeff's teachers, the Pole Th. Zielinski.<sup>9</sup> Ivanov would never formally graduate: his thesis, *De societatibus vectigalium publicorum populi Romani*, was appreciated by Mommsen, and Rostovtzeff himself tried to have it published in St Petersburg in 1910, recommending the addition of an *instrumentum epigraphicum*.

Ivanov's own life, after he abandoned Classical Studies, became increasingly linked to Italy. In 1924 he settled there almost definitively: he first took up residence in Pavia and then, from 1934, in Rome. An ancient historian, Albino Garzetti, has shared his memories of Ivanov as a teacher at the Borromeo College in Pavia: an elderly gentleman with white hair and always dressed in black from head to toe.

As we have seen, Rostovtzeff's friendship with Hülsen proved decisive for his relationship with both German and Italian intellectual circles. His correspondence, preserved in the Archives of the Deutsches

---

<sup>6</sup> See Tamborra 1977 and Strada 1994

<sup>7</sup> See Morachioli 2015.

<sup>8</sup> See Glatzer Rosenthal 1986.

<sup>9</sup> See Plezia 1993.

Archäologisches Institut, illustrates the numerous relationships established by the Russian scholar.<sup>10</sup> What is certain is that after 1898, when bound by his teaching obligations and no longer able to take time off from St Petersburg, Rostovtzeff often turned to his friends in Rome for all kind of information and advice. This was the case, for example, when he was planning to attend the Second International Congress of Historical Sciences in April 1903, a congress that had a troubled background owing to an all-Italian dispute that led to the removal from the presidency of the Congress of the ancient historian Ettore Pais, accused of being too pro-German.<sup>11</sup> It was again the case when Rostovtzeff was considering of traveling to Italy in the summer of 1906, to work in Pompeii. The eruption of Vesuvius, which had taken place in April of that same year, made him doubtful as to whether he could find any facilities to carry out his work there; he also wanted to know about work opportunities in the Naples museum. For his Pompeian studies Rostovtzeff could also rely on the help of another scholar who was active in the German Archaeological Institute, August Mau, a man of a very different bent.

Rostovtzeff, however, certainly knew how to earn the esteem and trust of colleagues who had the opportunity to meet him and to work with him. I will only recall one case among many that could become even clearer through some patient archival research. I am referring to the close collaboration between him and Maurice Prou, with whom he published a series of studies on one of the subjects that he was most interested in in that period, the ancient leads.

It is very likely that if we could explore the correspondence of this illustrious paleographer, a friend of Jacques Pirenne's, which is stored in the Municipal Library of Sens, we would find valuable documentation concerning the cooperation between the then *attaché au Cabinet des Médailles* and the young Russian historian. To return to Italy, much the same can be said about the relationships Rostovtzeff established in his Roman years with Dante Vaglieri, the director of the Terme Museum: together with Vaglieri he published a paper on the new discoveries of leads and *tesserae* in "Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità".<sup>12</sup> Vaglieri is one of the scholars most warmly thanked in the introduction to the *Tesserarum Urbis Romae et Suburbi Plumbearum Sylloge*, which appeared in St Petersburg in 1903.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See Marcone 1988.

<sup>11</sup> See Erdmann 1987, 38–63; Hübinger–Ficht–Dabrowska 2010.

<sup>12</sup> 1900, 225–268.

<sup>13</sup> Reprinted in Bologna (Forni), 1979. The volume is dedicated to Zielinski, *magistro et amico*.

The volume complementary to this, *Römische Bleitesserae*, is significantly dedicated to the Roman friends of Rostovtzeff's who gravitated around the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut: H. Graeven, E. Kornemann, F. Muenzer, M. Siebourg, J. Sieveking, R. Wuensch.<sup>14</sup>

We can here appreciate the European dimension of Rostovtzeff's career as a scholar who always knew how to establish fruitful relationships. His acquaintance with Gaetano De Sanctis also dates back to this period. By a happy coincidence, according to what De Sanctis himself recounts in his memoirs, the two scholars – both born in 1870 – met in Athens in 1895. Rostovtzeff immediately earned the esteem and friendship of his young colleague, who was also in Greece to conduct some research: it is above all thanks to De Sanctis that his name immediately gained attention in Italy, establishing him as member of the select circle of scientific authorities on the ancient world in the country. Rostovtzeff's extensive use of papyrological sources, in addition to epigraphic ones, was particularly well regarded by the Italian scholar. As a pupil of Beloch De Sanctis knew better than anyone else how to combine as many heterogeneous sources as possible, and he was certainly capable of appreciating the innovative aspect of his Russian colleague's research.

We can find proof of this attitude in what De Sanctis wrote, together with his pupil Luigi Pareti, as a programmatic statement for the inauguration of the new series of publications *Studi Italici e Italoti* (Florence 1914):

Open to works of a predominantly philological and archaeological nature, our publications will also, and above all, welcome writings of a historical nature, always based, of course, on that the kind of minute and direct archaeological investigation without which the writing of history is a vain work.

In 1901 Rostovtzeff had published a short note in the first issue of the German journal *Klio*, which was as peremptory in its content as it was in its title. In a very concise form he supported the argument that the colonate, that is the bond of the small tenant to the land, had developed in customary form on large African estates, only subsequently receiving legal recognition.<sup>15</sup> The core of the colonate, however, was to be found in the management of landholdings in the East, whence transplanted in the West, with few modifications, by the Roman emperors. Rostovtzeff had come to the formulation of this thesis on the basis of an inscription, which

---

<sup>14</sup> Reprinted in Aalen 1979.

<sup>15</sup> Rostovtzeff 1901.

had just been published by B. Haussoullier, relating to the purchase, in 256 BC, of the village of Pannos and its territory by the wife of Antiochus II, Laodice. This inscription revealed the important fact that the object of the purchase was not only the land but also what was on it, including the peasants, the so-called *λαοὶ βασιλικοὶ* who resided there with all their assets. While not being slaves, these people were bound to the land and could not abandon it. The East, therefore, offered very precise evidence of the economic and administrative bond of peasants to the land. In this way, the colonate, which had never really disappeared, was revived. Five pages had been enough for Rostovtzeff to interpret an inscription with such confidence and develop such an important argument.

De Sanctis shared the hypothesis of the Hellenistic origin of the colonate. The Italian scholar followed Rostovtzeff in seeing the inscription as a decisive testimony in support of the thesis that, while the primary reasons for the development of the colonate were economic, its origin had to be found in the extension of regulations in force for some time on the land that the Roman state had inherited from the Seleucids to imperial estates in the West, and then from these to private ones. Particularly striking is what De Sanctis writes when reviewing a dissertation by H. Bolkenstein, *De colonatu romano eiusque origine*, published in the Italian Journal *Rivista Storica Italiana* in 1907. Although he recognizes the undeniable merits of this work, he reiterates in plain words how, in his opinion, the inscription about Laodice should be interpreted. He writes:

This opinion (i.e. that of the Hellenistic origin of the colonate) which Rostovtzeff and I support, based on a Milesian inscription recently discovered, would not appear to be undermined by the few sentences that the A. devotes to it on p. 160, n. 2, where he misreads the text of the inscription.<sup>16</sup>

De Sanctis did not react to Rostovtzeff's major publication on the colonate, the *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, which appeared in 1910 as the first supplement of the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* and that, in turn, stands as a testimony to the active collaboration and friendship between the Russian historian and a great German papyrologist, Ulrich Wilcken. This can be explained by the fact that the *Studien* were published in the only period in which, probably owing to the progress of his *Storia dei romani*, De Sanctis interrupted his tireless activity as a reviewer (the years 1910–1922).

---

<sup>16</sup> De Sanctis 1907.

In Italy the *Studien* received only one important review, by a specialist in Roman law, Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz, who discussed the book at length in the *Bullettino dell'Istituto di Diritto romano* of 1911. This is a very detailed account and the reviewer does not appear to be critical of the work in any way. It must be observed – and this strikes me as significant – that Arangio-Ruiz does not feel the need to introduce Rostovtzeff to the readers of the *Bullettino* (the review is included in a general discussion of legal papyrological studies) but limits himself to pointing out that the study contains many points of contact with the entry *Frumentum* in the Pauly–Wissowa.

Arangio-Ruiz even speaks of “a luminous and patient research developed on Egypt chiefly on the basis of papyri from the Ptolemaic and Roman ages”, of “a particularly original, new and insightful analysis of recently discovered epigraphic sources, and of a vigorous presentation of the agrarian evolution of the Empire, in this “most valuable book”.<sup>17</sup>

It is unsurprising, therefore, that in Italy, after the publication of many important writings,<sup>18</sup> Rostovtzeff's fame was really well-established. Let me take a step back, to consider an instance of Rostovtzeff's early significant involvement in an Italian initiative, which to this day remains the most important Italian collective enterprise in the field of Ancient History – although, unfortunately, it was never completed. I am referring, of course, to the *Epigraphic Dictionary of Roman Antiquities* which began to be published in 1886 on the initiative of Ettore De Ruggiero. De Ruggiero – I will briefly recall – had himself specialized under Mommsen in Berlin, where he had studied between 1861 and 1866. The first volume, including the letters A–B, had been brought to completion in 1895; the second, which is what we are interested in, including the letters from C to E, and appeared in three volumes within a few years. The first volume, which appeared in 1900, includes a contribution by Rostovtzeff on the *conductor*.<sup>19</sup>

The *Dizionario* was open to the collaboration of foreign scholars; it may be said that it was even more open to international collaboration than the Pauly–Wissowa.

De Ruggiero must have come across Rostovtzeff's name independently, given his relations with the German Institute and the economic-administrative history studies that the young Russian was publishing in

---

<sup>17</sup> I personally edited an Italian edition of this book in 1994 (Brescia). Cfr. Marcone 2001.

<sup>18</sup> I have published some of these papers in the volume: M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Scripta varia. Ellenismo e Impero romano* (Bari 1995).

<sup>19</sup> II, 1900, 578–597.



those years. And it is also likely that the entry was commissioned from Rostovtzeff during one of his winter stays in Rome.

I will limit myself to two general considerations: the first is that Rostovtzeff's collaboration with the *Dizionario Epigrafico* and Pauly–Wissowa took place in parallel and in relation to similar themes, yet through the drafting of different items: the entry *congiarium*, written by Rostovtzeff for the *Real-Encyklopädie* dates from 1901, while the same entry for the *Dizionario* is by Esperandieu.

A more important observation that I think can be made concerns the structure of the entry *conductor*. In his introduction, Rostovtzeff emphasizes legal issues, discussing the nature of the *locatio–conductio* contract, and whether its origin is to be traced back to the sphere of public or private law.

The presence of a very precise discussion of modern theories on the subject, which seems to exceed the editorial requirements, appears to be related to the general principles established by De Ruggiero and to the influence of the Mommsenian school, which probably reached Rostovtzeff through Hirschfeld. It is true that in the only other entry he wrote for the *Dizionario*, *fiscus*, in the volume published in 1922, the prose is more concise, more personal – in other words closer to the succinct style that we find in his major works.

Between Rostovtzeff and De Ruggiero there certainly was common ground in other respects as well. The Italian scholar was in fact in a condition to appreciate the openness to archaeology of his Russian colleague, as he had been Professor of Archaeology and Director of the Archaeological School of Pompeii. In 1874 he had been appointed director of the Museo Kircheriano in Rome, in which Rostovtzeff himself would later work: Rostovtzeff's fame in Italy was therefore rapidly consolidating at the beginning of the century, as various elements prove.

I here wish to consider what can be inferred from the testimony of an ancient historian who, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Italy was one of the leading authorities in the field, Ettore Pais.<sup>20</sup> In a paper on “Ancient history in the last fifty years with special reference to Italy”, which he gave at a meeting of the Italian Society for the Progress of Sciences in Rome, he cited Rostovtzeff as an example of those scholars who, through their preparatory work, were paving the way for a great synthesis on the Roman Empire.<sup>21</sup> Pais, of course, could not imagine at the time that, under completely different circumstances, this synthesis would be the work of Rostovtzeff himself. However, we must take account of the fact that Pais'

---

<sup>20</sup> See Nenci 1982.

<sup>21</sup> Pais 2011.



paper played a role in the controversy over the dependence of Italian philological and ancient historical studies on German research. It was obvious for Pais that Rostovtzeff's work was yet another expression of German scholarship outside Germany.<sup>22</sup>

In any case, even if with a delay, Italian Classical scholars – perhaps partly on account of the effort which was being made at the time to avoid any conditioning from German scholarship – also began to look at the researches of their Russian colleagues.

In this respect, Rostovtzeff must still have appeared too “German” and the path to an effective reconsideration of Russian Classical Studies passed above all through his teacher, the Nietzschean Zielinski, whose popular work, *Die Antike und Wir*, was translated in Florence in 1911. It must be said that this is not a translation from Russian but from German, the language in which the essay had already appeared in 1903. A few years later, in 1916, a short essay by T. Savcenko, *Outlines of Classical Studies in Russia*, appeared in the Florentine journal *Atene e Roma*. The most interesting fact is that this publication was inspired by a text read at Nicola Festa's seminar. However, it is worth noting that this was not a particularly valuable contribution. We need only consider the inaccuracies which the author incurs in the few sentences he devotes to Rostovtzeff.

Italian Classical scholars began to pay attention to Russia around the time in which it was becoming the Soviet Union.

Rostovtzeff's relationship with my home country now belongs to another dimension. Gaetano De Sanctis' review of *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* in 1926 represents the best-known and indisputable *trait-d'union* between the world of pre-war ties and the following one.<sup>23</sup>

To get an idea of Rostovtzeff's importance for De Sanctis and his pupils, we only need to leaf through some of the early writings by Momigliano, in which the name of the Russian historian frequently appears.

The aforementioned entry *fiscus* published in the *Dizionario Epigrafico* in 1922 may also be considered a sign of the desire to return to a common path.

To keep to a more personal level, Rostovtzeff tried to renew some of his old friendships: when traveling through Tuscany with his wife, he did not fail to pay a visit to Christian Hülsen, now a Florentine by adoption after the disillusion suffered at the German Archaeological Institute. Rostovtzeff was undoubtedly a loyal friend: we learn as much from his correspondence

---

<sup>22</sup> See Polverini 2002.

<sup>23</sup> De Sanctis 1926 = 1972.

with William Westermann.<sup>24</sup> I am referring to what Marinus Wes has published in *Historia* with reference to G. De Sanctis. Rostovtzeff wrote to Westermann from Lido di Camaiore in Versilia, during the Ferragosto holidays of 1932. He had arrived there after a visit to archaeological sites in southern Italy and a six-week work stay in Rome. Rostovtzeff, of course, was not in Versilia only to enjoy the beach, but also to revise the drafts of the Italian edition of his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* together with its publisher, Ernesto Codignola.<sup>25</sup>

I would like to stress that Rostovtzeff had planned to publish a new edition of this translation. In Trier, in the Gilliam collection (named after a pupil of Rostovtzeff's), acquired by Heinz Heinen and Günter Grimm, I found the Russian scholar's personal copy of the Italian edition of the *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, with his handwritten notes. These additions, of exceptional value, have been included in the new Italian edition of 2003. Chapter V, on Palmyra, is where Rostovtzeff sought to introduce the most important changes, as he had been deeply marked by the experience of the Dura-Europos excavations with Franz Cumont.<sup>26</sup>

Rostovtzeff lent support to De Sanctis, whom he had seen shortly before in Florence, where he had undergone an eye operation. In his letters to his American friends, he recalls that De Sanctis, one of the eleven Italian university professors to refuse to display any loyalty to Fascism, was living only on a meager pension. He did his best to get an invitation for De Sanctis from the Italian Casa della Cultura of Columbia University, which every year invited an Italian scholar to give a lecture.<sup>27</sup> In his opinion it would be better for Columbia to invite De Sanctis than worthless scholars, of the sort they had often hosted in the past, or renegades like Pais who had nothing more to say. This unfortunately never happened – because, according to Westermann, inviting De Sanctis would have created problems for the Director of the Casa, Prezzolini, who was not aligned with the regime and was trying to keep the cultural center free from overly pressing political interference.

I must also mention Rostovtzeff's significant involvement in an Italian cultural initiative which is undoubtedly the most important to have taken place under the Fascist regime, namely the *Enciclopedia Italiana*

---

<sup>24</sup> The correspondence between Rostovtzeff and Westermann reaches peaks of intensity that find few parallels in the former's very rich correspondence. The two scholars used to address each using graceful diminutives: Rosti / Vesti. See. Bongard-Levin–Litvinenko 1996 = Bongard-Levin 1997, 346–365.

<sup>25</sup> Wes 1993.

<sup>26</sup> In 2003 I published a new edition of the Italian translation with these additions (Milano). See Marcone 2001.

<sup>27</sup> Prezzolini was also a teacher at the same university.

*Treccani*. Two facts must be born in mind: the first is that the chief scholar responsible for Ancient History was Gaetano De Sanctis; the second is that this section was considered one of the “most Italian” in the *Enciclopedia*, as the entries about the ancient world were entrusted almost exclusively to Italian scholars.

The “almost” must be explained: the exception was represented precisely by some entries relating to the provinces of the Roman Empire, among which those on Thracian Chersonesus, Olbia, Panticapeous, Ponto and Dura-Europos stand out, which were entrusted to Rostovtzeff.

I would like to present a forthcoming publication. Among the links that Rostovtzeff established with many Italian colleagues is that with Evaristo Breccia, who before becoming professor of Ancient History in Pisa, had worked for a long time – starting in 1904 – as the director of the Graeco-Roman Museum of Alexandria, in Egypt, succeeding the founder of the museum himself, Giuseppe Botti, in this role. Rostovtzeff had been in touch with Breccia at least since 1905, as he had written his first letter to Breccia from St Petersburg on 19 June 1905.

We have 34 letters in total, which are now in the museum of Pisa University. Breccia taught ancient history there from 1930, also becoming president of the same university. The last letter was written by Rostovtzeff from Yale and is dated December 17, 1938. The publication of this correspondence is therefore of great importance. It was originally prepared by a pupil of Breccia himself, Donato Morelli and is now being edited by Rosario Pinaudi. Pinaudi will also publish an Italian translation of Rostovtzeff’s travel journal in Alexandria.

Traces of Rostovtzeff’s ties with Italian papyrologists are also preserved in the Laurenziana Library in Florence, where requests for information are found in the letters which Rostovtzeff addressed to Girolamo Vitelli, then professor of Papyrology in Florence and Director of the Papyrological Institute which, after his death, took his name.

Let me conclude by mentioning the important book published in 2019 by an Italian specialist on Rostovtzeff, the Milanese scholar Piergiuseppe Michelotto: *Da Pietroburgo a New Haven*.<sup>28</sup> Rostovtzeff indisputably remains a very important historian for scholars of Imperial Rome in present-day Italy.

Arnaldo Marcone  
Roma 3 University

arnaldo.marcone@uniroma3.it

---

<sup>28</sup> Michelotto 2021.

## Bibliography

- J. Andreau, *Introduction* to M. Rostovtzeff, *Histoire économique et sociale de l'Empire romain* (Paris 1988).
- V. Arangio-Ruiz, rev.: M. Rostowzew, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig 1910), *Bullettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano* 24 (1911) 251–256.
- C. Barocas, E. Breccia (eds.), *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 14 (Roma 1972).
- G. Bongard-Levin, Yu. Litvinenko, “M. I. Rostovcev i U. I. Vesterman: Dialog istorikov” [“M. I. Rostovtzeff and W. I. Westermann: A Dialogue between Historians”], *VDI* 1996: 3, 166–184.
- G. Bongard-Levin (ed.), *Skifskii Roman* (Moscow 1997).
- K. D. Erdmann, *Die Ökumene der Historiker. Geschichte der Internationalen Historikerkongresse und des Comité International des Sciences Historiques* (Göttingen 1987).
- E. Cinnella, *Lo zar e il latino. Gli studi classici in Russia tra Otto e Novecento* (Pisa 2018).
- G. De Sanctis, rev.: H. Bolkenstein, *De colonatu romano eiusque origine* (Amsterdam 1906), *RSI* 24 (1907) 417–418.
- G. De Sanctis, rev.: M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1926), *RFIC* 54 (1926) 537–554 = id., *Scritti Minori* VI, 1 (Roma 1972) 295–313.
- N. Fichtner, *Der Althistoriker Michail Rostovtzeff. Wissenschaft und Politik im vorrevolutionären und bolschewistischen Russland (1890–1918)* (Wiesbaden 2020).
- B. Glatzer Rosenthal (ed.), *Nietzsche in Russia* (Princeton, NJ 1986).
- G. Hübing, B. Ficht, E. Dabrowska, “Cultures historiques et politique scientifique. Les congrès internationaux des historiens avant la Première Guerre mondiale”, *Revue Germanique Internationale* 12 (2010) 175–191.
- A. Marcone, “Michele Rostovtzeff e l'Istituto Archeologico Germanico di Roma: la corrispondenza con Christian Hülsen (1894–1927)”, *Critica Storica* 25 (1988) 339–350.
- A. Marcone, “Peterburg–Rim–Berlin: vstreča M. I. Rostovzeva s nemezkim Antikovedeniem”, *VDI* 1992: 1, 213–224 = “Pietroburgo – Roma – Berlino: L'incontro di M. I. Rostovtzeff con l'Altertumswissenschaft tedesca”, *Historia* 41 (1992) 1–13.
- A. Marcone, “Rostovtzeff in Italia”, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* s. III, 24: 4 (1994) 923–938.
- A. Marcone (ed.), *Rostovtzeff e l'Italia* (Napoli 1999).
- A. Marcone, “La storia di una riedizione difficile: la ‘Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire’ di M. Rostovtzeff”, *Historia* 50 (2001) 357–373.
- P. G. Michelotto, *Da Pietroburgo a New Haven. Sei saggi su M. I. Rostovtzeff* (Milano 2019).
- S. Morachioli, M. Pinto (eds.), *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 83 (2015).

- G. Nenci, "Gli anni berlinesi di Ettore Pais nella corrispondenza con Girolamo Vitelli", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* 12: 2 (1982) 589–602.
- M. Plezia, "Tadeusz Stefan Zielinski", *Index* 21 (1993) 35–49.
- M. I. Rostovtzeff, "Proiskhozhdeniye kolonata", *Filologicheskoe Obozrenie* 19 (1900) 105–109 = "Der Ursprung des Colonats", *Klio* 1 (1901) 295–299.
- M. Rostovtzeff, "Pompeianische Landschaften und Römischen Villen", *JDAI* 19 (1904) 103–126.
- E. Pais, "La storia antica negli ultimi cinquant'anni con speciale riguardo all'Italia", *Rivista d'Italia* 14 (1911) 694–721.
- L. Polverini (ed.), *Aspetti della storiografia di Ettore Pais* (Napoli 2002).
- V. Strada, *L'altra rivoluzione* (Capri 1994).
- A. Tamborra, *Esuli russi in Italia dal 1905 al 1917* (Bari 1977).
- M. Wes, *Classics in Russia. Between two Horsemen* (Leiden 1992).
- M. Wes, "The Correspondence between Rostovtzeff and Westermann. A Note on Gaetano De Sanctis", *Historia* 42 (1993) 125–128.

In recent years, we have all become much more aware of Rostovtzeff's profound roots in early 20th-century European culture, of his specifically Russian traits as a scholar and, therefore, of what his mature historiography owes to the intertwining of these two components. Italy plays a major role in this context. To get an idea of the importance of Rostovtzeff for De Sanctis' school, we only need to glance at some of Momigliano's early writings, in which the name of the Russian historian frequently appears.

В последнее время нам стала понятней, с одной стороны, глубокая укорененность М. И. Ростовцева в европейской культуре начала XX в., а с другой – специфически русские черты его как ученого. Стало яснее, чем его зрелые исторические труды обязаны переплетению двух этих компонентов. Италия играет важную роль в этом процессе. Чтобы оценить важность Ростовцева для школы Де Санктиса, достаточно взглянуть на некоторые ранние работы Момильяно, где часто встречается имя российского историка.

## CONSPECTUS

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