Procopius in Russian.

Ekaterina Nechaeva

Histos Supplement 9 (2019 [2024]) 5.1–38

5

PROCOPIUS IN RUSSIAN*

Ekaterina Nechaeva

This article focuses on the history of editions and translations of Procopius in Russian scholarship, as well as on the circumstances in which they appeared, and on some major studies of his works in Russian.

Attention to Procopius in Russian historiography has always been twofold. Alongside the general academic interest in his works, it was the mentions and descriptions of the *Sklaveni* and *Antes* that attracted the particular interest of historians in the Tsarist, as well as Soviet, periods.

In the 1750s, the Russian polymath Mikhail Lomonosov wrote his *Old Russian History*, tracing the history of the Slavs back to the most ancient times. Along with Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny, Lomonosov extensively used and quoted passages from Procopius.[1] More generally, the Academy of Sciences of the Russian Empire (established by Peter the Great in 1724) promoted historical studies. Russian history, which was at the centre of the first research projects of the Academy, was understood globally, and included the early history of the territories belonging and adjacent to the Russian empire.

* This article is a part of research carried out in the framework of the EX-PATRIA Project at the University of Lille, UMR 8164–HALMA–Histoire Archéologie Littérature des Mondes Anciens.

[1] Ломоносов (1766) 9, 15, 17, 26–7, 30–1, 52 (also, on the Avars in Dagestan: 39–40).

In the 1770s, the Academy of Sciences undertook its Byzantine 'Excerpta Project': the extraction from Greek sources of data on peoples 'closely related to Russian history, as well as on the other, migrating, and other not well known peoples … who lived in the neighbourhood of Russia'.[2] The project was conceptualised by A. Schlözer, who commissioned Johann Gotthelf Stritter, a Russian historian of German origin, to undertake this element. Stritter prepared and published four volumes of excerpts that mentioned or described peoples living along the Danube, the Black Sea, the Sea of Azov, the Caspian Sea, and the Caucasus, as well as 'the inhabitants of the North'.[3] The volumes were based on Latin translations of the Parisian *Byzantinae Historiae Scriptores* corpus, and were organised according to ethnographic principles, by peoples. Except for volume 3, which focuses on the Turkic peoples, Stritter in all the other volumes extensively uses Procopius' works, relying on Maltret's edition of 1662/1663.[4] In accordance with the Academy's project, Stritter also prepared an abridged version of the compendium for the Russian language edition. Translated by V. Svetov, the four Russian volumes are more focused on later events, which are more closely connected to Russian history, than the Latin edition, providing a brief account of the earlier events.[5] However, the first volume, which focuses on the early history of the Slavs,[6] and the second volume—on the Goths, Vandals, Gepids, Heruls, Huns, and Avars[7]—are largely based on Procopius. Stritter's *excerpta* remained an important instrument for several generations of scholars.[8]

Ample work on translations of ancient Greek and Latin authors (which was particularly intense in St Petersburg and

[2] Стреттер-Светов (1770), Preface. .

[3] Stritter (1771–9).

[4] Maltret (1662–3).

[5] Стреттер-Светов (1770–5).

[6] Стреттер-Светов (1771).

[7] Стреттер-Светов (1770–5).

[8] Цамутали (1991) 5; Медведев (2006) 10–12.

in Moscow in the second half of the 18th century)[9] and the continuation of studies of early Russian, as well as Slavic and Balkanic, history[10] prompted a growth of interest in Byzantine history.

A monumental new endeavour in the field of Byzantine studies was planned by the Russian Academy. Established in 1783 in St Petersburg by Catherine II, this Academy (not to be confused with the Academy of Sciences) was envisaged—and initially directed—by princess Ekaterina Dashkova as a research centre for the Russian language and for Russian literature.[11] In 1837 its president, Alexander Shishkov, started to realise his ambitious 'Byzantine project', which envisaged the preparation of translations of Byzantine historians (based on the Bonn *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*) into Russian.[12]

The Academy invited **Spiridon Destunis** (1782–1848) to translate the works of Procopius. A career diplomat (the Russian consul general in Izmir/Smyrna from 1818 to 1826) and an expert in the Greek language (he was born in Greece, moved to Russia as a boy, and studied in the Moscow University gymnasium), S. Destunis became one of the first renowned Hellenists in Russia.[13] In four years, S. Destunis translated the 'fragmentary' early Byzantine historians,[14] Agathias, and the *Wars* and the *Anecdota* of Procopius.

As a result of the merger of the Russian Academy with the Imperial Academy of Sciences in 1841, work on the project was abandoned and most of the translations were never

[9] Фролов (2006) 86–111.

[10] Курбатов (1970) 179.

[11] Modelled on the French Academy, it started its work with the creation of the *Dictionary of the Russian Academy*: Ольденбург (1926). For the history of the Academy: Сухомлинов (1874–87).

[12] Файнштейн (1999) 521–3; Медведев (2006) 16–17; Белоброва (1995) 26.

[13] For information about him, see Prousis (1989) 396–404 (in the section 'Biographical and Bibliographical Information').

[14] From the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* edition: Bekker–Niebuhr–de Valois (1829).

published, while some were entirely lost.[15] Gavriil (Gabriel) Destunis (1818–95), Spiridon's son, prepared and published some of his fathers' translations, adding his commentaries: this included the two books of the *Persian Wars*[16] and the first book of the *Vandal Wars*.[17] Gavriil Destunis remarked in 1876, in the preface to the first book of the *Persian Wars*, that he revised his father's translation twice, before the edition of 1861 and before that of 1876. He also explained that his commentaries were more historical than textological, as he mostly used the already existing editions.[18] The commentary to all three published books (*B.P.* I–II and *B.V.* I) is thorough and very extensive. It makes numerous references to parallel sources and gives a very detailed, often line-by-line, analysis of the text. All three books contain Appendices with additional commentaries or translations of parallel traditions. The *Persian Wars* contains the following indexes: (1) an index of personal, ethnic, and geographical names; (2) a subject index; and (3) an index of Greek terms discussed in the commentary to the text and an index of manuscript variations discussed in the commentary to the text.

G. Greatrex has remarked about Gavriil Destunis' commentary on the *Persian Wars*: 'it has left little trace in subsequent scholarship'.[19] The same is regrettably true in regard to the commentary on the first book of the *Vandal Wars*, and in regard to the overall impact of Spiridon Destunis' translations. A. Chekalova, who at the end of the 20th century published her translations and commentaries of both the *Persian* and the *Vandal Wars*, does not mention the work of S. and G. Destunis at all (see further below).

While the second book of the *Vandal Wars*, and the *Gothic Wars* and the *Anecdota*, were also translated,[20] they remained

[15] Медведев (2006) 17; Файнштейн (1999) 532.

[16] Дестунис–Дестунис (1862[1]; 1976[2]); Дестунис–Дестунис (1880).

[17] Дестунис–Дестунис (1891).

[18] Дестунис–Дестунис (1976) ii.

[19] Greatrex (2022) xii.

[20] Translations of the *Gothic Wars* and of the *Vandal Wars* are mentioned in a review of these translations that was made in 1838 by a

unpublished. Gavriil was seriously ill during the last years of his life and was obliged to abandon his scholarly work.[21] Archival documents preserve a letter from S. Destunis to Dmitri Iazykov, the Secretary of the Academy, regarding the revision of notes for his translations. In this letter, S. Destunis expresses his eagerness also to prepare a biographical note on Procopius (as he had done for Agathias) and a lexicon of the Greek words used by Procopius and translated into Modern Greek, which he suggested could be added to the fourth volume.[22] A report of the members of the reviewing committee on Destunis' translations praised the quality of his work, noting that the translation was accompanied by many explanatory comments.[23] Recommending the work for publication, the committee report mentions several passages in Procopius to demonstrate the particular interest of his works. This list is quite notable. Among the passages considered to be of particular interest are the following: 'the capture of Petra [*B.P.* 2.17.18–28; *B.G.* 4.11.11–62]; the heroic

member of the Russian Academy Alexander Vostokov (Файнштейн (1999) 528–9). A list of the accomplished translations, prepared in 1841 when the project was abandoned, mentions Destunis' translation of the two parts of Procopius' *Wars* as finished and submitted to the Academy and the *Anecdota* as finished but not submitted (*ibid*). The two parts of the *Wars* must refer to the Bonn Corpus edition (Dindorf (1833)). The manuscript of the second book of the *Vandal Wars*, prepared by Gavrill Desunis for publication, is preserved in the Archive of the Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch, Manuscript Group (Fond) 733, Inventory (Opis') 1, Number 76 (The same reference in Russian: Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петергбургский филиал. Фонд 733, Опись 1, номер ед. хранения 76.) Other manuscripts of the translations of the *Wars* and of the *Anecdota* are preserved in the Research Library of the St Petersburg State University (Отдел редких книг Научной библиотеки Санкт-Петергбургского университета ('История готской войны': НБУ 439, 440, 442, 443; 'История войн римлян с персами, вандилами и готфами: НБУ 441'; 'История неизданная, то есть "Тайная история"': НБУ 439. One part of the manuscript of the *Gothic Wars* translation was lost in a fire: НБУ 442): Белоброва (1995) 26–7.

[21] Ред. (1895) 'Гавріилъ Спиридоновичъ Дестунисъ†'.

[22] Published by Файнштейн (1999) 535–6.

[23] Published by Файнштейн (1999) 532–3, 534–5.

deeds of Bessas [probably the siege of Petra: *B.G.* 4.11.11–62], Paul [probably *B.G.* 2.21.3–11], and Theia [probably *B.G.* 4.26.21–4]; the courage of Koutilas and Arzes [*B.G.* 2.14–18]; Belisarius' popularity among his soldiers [*B.G.* 3.1.18–19] and his defence of Rome [*B.G.* 3.13–19]; the description of Aeneas' ship [*B.G.* 4.22.7–16] and the "Lemnian monument", still seen by Procopius [probably *Athena Lemnia* is meant and the corresponding mention must be *B.G.* 4.21.13]; his remarks about the robustness of the Appian Way [*B.G.* 1.14.6–22], about the luxurious life of the Vandals [*B.V.* 2.6.5–9], and about some natural phenomena, for example, the ash of Vesuvius [*B.G.* 2.4.25–7], the winds of Benevento [*B.G.* 1.15.7], the sea stream and the swiftness of the Boas river [*B.G.*4.2.6–9]; stories about the fiancé of Radigis [*B.G.* 4.20.22ff.]; the execution of Aetius [*B.V.* 1.4.27], Gelimer's meeting with Tzazo [*B.V.* 1.25.24] and with Belisarius [*B.V.* 2.8.14]; the miracle of True Cross in Apamea (*B.P.* 2.1.14–23), and so on, as well as the speeches of Belisarius …'.[24]

While the translations of Byzantine historians prepared by Spiridon Destunis were published only after his death,[25] his essay on these historians and on their translation into Russian appeared in 1841.[26] In this work, Destunis provides a general introduction to the envisaged edition, giving an outline of the existing foreign editions and highlighting the importance of Byzantine history and its authors, which he argues had been long neglected and overlooked. Demonstrating the necessity of a Russian translation, he not only mentions the limited number of people in Russia who know the Greek language, but also remarks that this edition will be much more affordable than the Bonn Corpus, costing half the price.[27] Destunis characterises Procopius as 'undoubtedly the most

[24] Файнштейн (1999) 535.

[25] Except of a fragment from Priscus of Panion describing the famous embassy to Attila: Дестунис (1842).

[26] Дестунис (1841).

[27] The Russian edition, by his estimation, would cost not more than 50 silver roubles, while the Bonn one cost 160 silver roubles: Дестунис (1841) 85.

important of Byzantine historians', emphasising his intelligence, brilliance, experience, and writing skills, and the clarity of his language.[28] The translator also emphasises the broad scope of the geographical coverage of Procopius' works and remarks that those who are curious about the contemporary situation in the Caucasus and in Algeria will be interested to read Procopius to find out about the wars fought in his times in these territories.[29]

Throughout the 18th century and the first part of the 19th century the study of Slavic and Russian history remained a vehicle for the development of Byzantine studies in Russia. In this context, in 1861 the need to prepare a new critical collection of sources on the early Slavs was again underlined by a Slavist, V. Makushev, who published a list of texts that he recommended for such an edition.[30] The first part of the work, characterising the sources, contains a concise account of Procopius and his works, and briefly presents the state of modern scholarship.[31] In the second part, which is divided into thematic blocks, evidence by Procopius is quoted and analysed where relevant.[32]

The development of studies of classical philology and the ancient history in Russia at first centred around the Academy of Sciences, where in the early 19th century a Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities was established.[33] University departments of Greek or Classical philology gained greater importance throughout the first half of the 19th century (in particular in St Petersburg, in Derpt (modern Tartu, Estonia), and in Moscow).[34] The University of St Petersburg

[28] Дестунис (1841) 85.

[29] Дестунис (1841) 85–6.

[30] Макушев (1861). This work was prepared as a student dissertation at the Historical-Philological Faculty of the Imperial St Petersburg University (p. iv). Unsurprisingly, Procopius' sections on the Slavs were also the focus of work in other Slavic countries: cf., e.g., below, ch. 6.

[31] Макушев (1861) 3–9.

[32] Макушев (1861), e.g., 108, in the chapter 'Way of Life'.

[33] Фролов (2006) 168–72.

[34] Фролов (2006) 172–204.

was to become one of the most important centres of ancient/classical, but also of Byzantine studies.

The last quarter of the 19th century and the early 20th century saw a flourishing of Byzantine studies in St Petersburg. Usually considered to have been founded by B. Vasilievsky,[35] this 'school of Byzantinology' was centred around the Historical-Philological Department of the University of St Petersburg. It included Vasilievsky's students, who specialised in different areas of Byzantine history, as well as a group of classicists who eventually switched their studies from Ancient to Byzantine subjects.[36]

Mikhail Krasheninnikov, who undertook the most thorough textological study of Procopius' works in Russian historiography, was a graduate (1887) of the University of St Petersburg, specialising in classical philology and history.

His *Magister* dissertation[37] on the Roman municipal priests and priestesses (1891)[38] and his doctoral thesis on the *Augustales* (1895)[39] were both largely based on epigraphic sources. During the years in which he was preparing his doctoral dissertation (1891–5) Krasheninnikov lived in Italy,[40] studying[41] epigraphy, Greek and Latin palaeography, and museum collections.[42] Following the defence of his doctoral

[35] Медведев (2006) 107, 111, 176; Герд (1999); Цамутали (1991) 8–14.

[36] Медведев (2006) 107.

[37] In the late 19th century Russian Academic system there existed two degrees: *Magister* and *Doctor*.

[38] Крашенинников (1891).

[39] Крашенинников (1895a).

[40] The practice of sending future Professors of the University of St Petersburg on training and research trips abroad was established and developed by two scholars: Fedor Sokolov (1841–1909), one of the most influential scholars of Antiquity in late 19th-century Russia (see Фролов (2006) 205–27); and Vasilii Vasilievsky (1838–99), a prominent Hellenist and a founder of the Russian school of Byzantine studies (see Медведев (2006) 111, 176; Герд (1999), 52–66; Фролов (2006) 235–6).

[41] On his own, with no supervision, and not attending any lectures, since he considered the training he received at the St Petersburg University to be excellent and sufficient (Анфертьева (1999) 380).

[42] Анфертьева (1999) 380–1.

work, he was appointed first Extraordinary (1896) and then Ordinary Professor (1898) at the Department of Ancient Greek Philology and History of Literature at the University of Yuryev/Derpt (now Tartu).

It was during his first palaeographic studies in Italian libraries that Krasheninnikov became interested in Procopius and the manuscript tradition of his works. In a letter of 1893 to his teacher, the prominent Russian classicist I. Pomjalovskij, Krasheninnikov mentioned finding out about J. Haury's preparation of an edition of Procopius. At that time Krasheninnikov must have already started his own work on the *Anecdota*, since he wrote about his intention to start the collation of *other* manuscripts (apart from those of the *Anecdota*), given that he did not expect Haury's edition to appear soon, and the fact that he welcomed some competition.[43] Krasheninnikov continued to work on the collation of the manuscripts of the *Anecdota*. The following year (1894) he was in Milan working with the codices of the Ambrosian library which, in his letters to Pomjalovskij, written in August and September of 1894, he enthusiastically described as independent of the Vatican tradition (except A 182).[44] In Milan, Krasheninnikov met J. Haury, and in the next year, in Florence, he met Domenico Comparetti.[45]

Comparetti mentions in the Preface to his edition of the *Anecdota* his meeting with Krasheninnikov in Florence in 1895, where the young professor of Derpt University came to examine the Laurentian codices for his future critical edition of the *Wars*. The Italian scholar, who at the time was working on the same manuscripts for his own forthcoming edition and translation of the *Gothic Wars*, interrupted his work to allow his colleague to study the documents.[46]

[43] Анфертьева (1999) 403 with n. 158 (containing the reference to the archival materials).

[44] Анфертьева (1999) 403 with nn. 160–1.

[45] Анфертьева (1999) 403 with n. 162.

[46] Comparetti (1928) lxxiii–lxxiv.

It was also in 1895 that Krasheninnikov published a review of Comparetti's *La Guerra Gotica*.[47] In the review, Krasheninnikov starts by quoting Krumbacher on the strong need for a critical edition of Procopius[48] and expressing satisfaction that this desideratum was close to being accomplished.[49] Along with Comparetti's preparation of the other books of the *Wars*, he mentions Haury's work for the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* and his own preparation for publication of the edition of the *Anecdota*.[50] Indeed, in the same year, Krasheninnikov published his first article on Procopius, a 'preliminary report' on the manuscript tradition of the *Anecdota*.[51] He also submitted his project of publishing an edition of the *Anecdota*, based on his own collations of the Vatican and the Milan manuscripts,[52] to the University of St Petersburg, where at that moment he was a *Privatdozent*. During his trips to Rome, Florence, Milan, Venice and Vienna in 1896–8 Krasheninnikov continued his work on the manuscripts.

Krasheninnikov's *Anecdota* was published in 1899 by the University of Yuryev.[53] The first title page presents the edition as the fifth volume of *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia*, revealing an ambition to publish also the *Wars*. J. Haury published a review of this edition[54] that Krasheninnikov described as 'bittersweet'.[55] The main disagreement between the two editors was in their evaluation of the MS W (Cod. Vat. 16, 15th century). Krasheninnikov considered it to be of primary importance,[56] while Haury saw it as secondary, since

[47] Крашенинников (1895b).

[48] Krumbacher (1891) 45.

[49] Крашенинников (1895b) 123.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Крашенинников (1895c).

[52] Анфертьева (1999) 403 with n. 163.

[53] Krasheninnikov (1899).

[54] Haury (1900).

[55] Анфертьева (1999) 404 with n. 168.

[56] Krasheninnikov (1899) x–xi; Анфертьева (1999) 404 with n. 168.

in his view it was copied partly from G (Cod. Ambr. G 14) and partly from V (Cod. Vat. 1001), and thus 'worthless'.[57] Krasheninnikov was preparing a second edition of the *Anecdota* which, according to his own words (in a letter to his teacher Victor Jernstedt,[58] written in 1902), was supposed to include the variants from a Parisian manuscript, which, Krasheninnikov claimed, remained unknown to Haury. In this new edition Krasheninnikov also intended to criticise Haury's interpretation of the MS W.[59] While Krasheninnikov's second edition of the *Anecdota* was never published, Haury's edition, which appeared in 1906, introduced a new Parisian manuscript (cod. Paris. suppl. grec. 1185).[60] There is evidence that Krasheninnikov continued to work on the second edition until at least 1912.[61]

Krasheninnikov's ambition to publish the first four volumes, containing the eight books of Procopius' *Wars*, was unfortunately never realised, despite the enormous efforts spent on the project. He was also preparing an edition of the *Buildings*. His many publications, as well as his correspondence and the proofreading materials that were discovered in the archives at the end of the 20th century (partly already published), reveal the amount of work he

[57] Haury (1900) 673; Анфертьева (1999) 404, with n. 168; Иванов–Гиндин–Цымбурский (1994) 173–4.

[58] Viktor Jernsted (Виктор Ернштедт) (1854–1902), Professor at St Petersburg University, specialist in classical philology and history, a prominent paleographist: see Фролов (2006) 249–53.

[59] Анфертьева (1999) 405, with n. 169.

[60] It is not entirely certain if the same Parisian manuscript was mentioned by Krasheninnikov (Анфертьева (1999) 405).

[61] A copy of the first edition, containing numerous additions made by the hand of Krasheninnikov, has survived: Анфертьева (1999) 405, with nn. 170–1). S. Ivanov, in his article introducing the commented excerpts from Procopius' works, publishes the stemma of the *Anecdota* in which Krasheninnikov added corrections that take into account manuscript P (*Cod. Paris. Suppl. Grec.* 1185): Иванов–Гиндин–Цымбурский (1994) 174; the Introductory article is by S. Ivanov.

undertook while preparing those editions and allow us to reconstruct the course of this work.[62]

Already in 1898 Krasheninnikov had considered the *Gothic Wars* to be almost ready for publication. By the end of 1900 materials for two volumes had been printed as proofs by the press of the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences.[63] In 1904 proofs of the first volume, containing the *Persian Wars*, were ongoing.[64] However, for years the proofs were in a constant state of revision and updating, as Krasheninnikov explored new manuscripts and made new collations.[65]

The work on the edition was slowed down by many factors. Throughout all of these years Krasheninnikov was intensively engaged in teaching.[66] Furthermore, the library of the University of Yuryev was not well supplied. The printing of the proofs and shipping them between Yuryev and St Petersburg was also time-consuming.[67] Lastly, Krasheninnikov's research trip abroad took place in 1897–8,[68] and during this time he had to rely on correspondence with colleagues to obtain new materials.[69] Furthermore, the Procopius edition was far from being the only research work Krasheninnikov was doing.[70] It is also important to note that Krasheninnikov did not have a team of either research or

[62] Анфертьева (1999), which includes the list of Krasheninnikov's publications (415–9); Старостин (2008).

[63] Volumes III, containing Books 5–7 (i.e., Books 1–3 of the *Gothic Wars*) and IV, containing the eight Book of the *Wars* (i.e., Book 4 of the *Gothic Wars*), *Appendix Critica*, and *Prologomena* (on the manuscripts of Books 5–8): Анфертьева (1999) 406.

[64] Анфертьева (1999) 407.

[65] Ibid.

[66] In some years his teaching commitments reached 11–13 hours per week (the normal professorial commitment was between four and six hours). Such a high commitment was probably due to financial pressure: Анфертьева (1999) 390–1.

[67] Анфертьева (1999) 387, 406.

[68] Анфертьева (1999) 386.

[69] Анфертьева (1999) 407; Старостин (2008) 18.

[70] See the list of his publications in Анфертьева (1999) 415–19.

technical collaborators: for all of his numerous projects he worked alone.[71] After the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, with the evacuation in 1918 of the University of Yuryev to Voronezh, and rising political and ideological tensions, Krasheninnikov's working conditions became increasingly difficult.[72]

While the full edition of Procopius never appeared, in the course of his work Krasheninnikov published several articles and remarks, mostly of a codicological and textological character. A short notice on the manuscript tradition of the *Wars* by Procopius that appeared in 1897 was a response to Haury's article on the subject, published in 1895.[73] Mentioning ten new manuscripts[74] not used by Haury or by Comparetti, Krasheninnikov criticised Haury for relying on the Florentine-Parisian manuscript tradition and not on the Vatican one. In Krasheninnikov's opinion, the Florentine manuscript (L: *Laurent.* 69,8) is heavily interpolated.[75] In 1898 and in 1899 Krasheninnikov published two articles setting out his conjectures on Books 1–3 of the *Gothic Wars*.[76] In these two publications he makes references to Comparetti's editions,[77] and puts forward his own conjectures with comments.

In 1898 Krasheninnikov published in *Vizantijskij Vremennik* an article more than 40 pages long on the manuscripts and textual criticism of the second tetrad of the *Wars*, i.e. the

[71] Старостин (2008) 18.

[72] Акиньшин (2013) 191.

[73] Haury (1895).

[74] *Vaticanus Gr.* 73; *Ambrosianus N* 135 Sup.; *Angelicus* 25; *Bruxellenses* 11301-16 and 11317-21; *Monacenses* 267 and 185; *Vaticanus Gr.* 1353; *Vaticanus Ottobonianus* 192; *Parisinus Suppl. Gr.* 607 A (s. X): Крашенинников (1897) 191.

[75] Крашенинников (1897).

[76] Крашенинников (1898a); id. (1899a). In his correspondence with Victor Jernstedt in March 1898 Krasheninnikov mentioned his intention to publish the conjectures that he was preparing, in order to 'ensure his priority': Анфертьева (1999) 409 with n. 206.

[77] Comparetti (1895–8).

Gothic Wars.[78] The article provides an account of 57 manuscripts (more than half of which were not mentioned by Comparetti)[79] or Haury, which Krasheninnikov marked with an asterisk);[80] 49 of them were used for the stemma.[81] One of the major points of Krasheninnikov's disagreement with Haury was in regard to establishing the relationship of the Parisian-Vatican manuscript tradition of **P/P^{I}** (*Cod. Parisinus Gr.* 1702),[82] **O** (*Cod. Ottobonianus* Gr. 1702), and **V^{I}/U^{I}** (*Cod. Vaticanus* 152 *Gr. prior pars*)[83] to the **K/V** (*Cod. Vaticanus Gr.* 1690),[84] on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to the **L** (Florentine *Cod. Laurentianus* 69,8). For Haury, **P/P^{I}**, **L**, and **O** descended from one archetype (y) and **V^{I}/U^{I}** and **K/V** from another archetype (z). Krasheninnikov criticised this approach, insisting on the same archetype for **P/P^{I}**, **O**, **V^{I}/U^{I}**, and **K/V**, and on a different one for **L**.[85] Another point of disagreement—specifically concerning the second four Books of the *Wars*—consisted in the overall evaluation of the two major manuscript traditions: **K/V** and **L**. Krasheninnikov—contrary to Haury—insisted on the 'immeasurable superiority' of the Vatican tradition over the Florentine one.[86] The second part of the article also contains a commented stemma of the manuscript tradition of the Constantinian Excerpta *περὶ πρεσβέων*.[87] In his edition, which appeared in 1905[88] in the *Prolegomena*, Haury gives two

[78] Крашенинников (1898b); reviewed briefly by Eduard Kurtz in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*: Kurtz (1899).

[79] Comparetti (1895–8).

[80] Haury (1895).

[81] Крашенинников (1898b) 471–2. The other manuscripts from the list are omitted in the stemma since 'the information about them is too scarce' (460).

[82] P in Haury; P^{I} in Krasheninnikov.

[83] V^{I} in Haury; U^{I} in Krasheninnikov.

[84] K in Haury; V in Krasheninnikov.

[85] Крашенинников (1898b) 474–5, 449–51.

[86] Крашенинников (1898b) 475.

[87] Крашенинников (1898b) 476–82.

[88] Haury (1905).

stemmata, for the first[89] and for the second[90] tetrads, making a note that the latter was described by Krasheninnikov in his 1898 *Vizantijskij Vremennik* article.[91] However, Krasheninnikov's view does not seem to have influenced Haury's position regarding the relation between the manuscripts and their interpretation.

For Krasheninnikov, the work on Procopius continued. In 1899 he published a short addition to the 1898 article, after he was able to study manuscript **E** (*Cod. Parisinus* 1038), which contains fragmentary excerpts from Procopius.[92] In the article, Krasheninnikov suggests some amendments to the stemma of the second tetrad of the *Wars* that he had proposed in 1898. He later added collations of this manuscript into the proofs (in 1900),[93] as well as collations from other manuscripts as he gained access to them over the years.[94] The final publication of the edition was constantly postponed. In 1898, 1902, and then in 1916, Krasheninnikov published a series of short articles with his textological commentaries to different parts of the *Anecdota*, the *Wars*, and the *Buildings*.[95]

As already mentioned, archival materials preserve an important part of the working materials of Krasheninnikov's preparation of the edition of the *Wars*. In 1996 I. Tunkina discovered in the archive of materials belonging to Vasilij Latyshev (1855–1921)[96] fragments of the printed proof-sheets of the first Book of the *Persian Wars* (*B.P.* 1.1–13), printed in 1904, and the full second tetrad (*B.G.* 1–4)[97]. Another group

[89] Haury (1905) xxviii.

[90] Haury (1905) xli.

[91] Haury (1905) xl, n. 1.

[92] Крашенинников (1899b).

[93] Анфертьева (1999) 407 with n. 186.

[94] Анфертьева (1999) 407.

[95] Крашенинников (1898c), (1902), and (1916).

[96] Анфертьева (1999) 408.

[97] The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch Manuscript Group (Fond) 110, Inventory (Opis') 1, Folder 115, Folios 173–512 (The same reference in Russian: Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петергбургский филиал, Фонд 110, Опись 1,

of materials (the so-called 'Krasheninnikov's archive') contains the following: fragments of the second round of the printed proof-sheets of the first Book of the *Persian Wars* (*B.P.* 1.1–11), also printed in 1904; fragments of the second and of the third round of the printed proof-sheets of the eighth book of the *Wars* (*B.G.* 4);[98] handwritten conjectures for the whole text of the *Wars*, probably in the version of 1898[99] and a part of the *Appendix Critica* for the *Wars* (also handwritten: 484 pages), probably in the version of 1898;[100] handwritten fragments of the text and collations of the *Buildings* (the following Books: from three to the beginning of Book five);[101] and the first volume of Haury's edition of Procopius[102] with numerous notes and corrections made by Krasheninnikov's hand.[103]

It was the work on Procopius' manuscripts that led

Дело 115, Листы 173–512) Анфертьева (1999) 409 nn. 201–2; Старостин (2008) 7.

[98] The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch, Manuscript Group (Fond) 1117, Inventory (Opis') 1, Folder 8, Folios 1–159 (The same reference in Russian: ПФА РАН (Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петербургский филиал), Фонд 1117, Опись 1, Дело 8, Листы 1–159); see also Старостин (2008) 7–8 n. 16.

[99] The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch, Manuscript Group (Fond) 1117, Inventory (Opis') 1, Folder 5 (The same reference in Russian: ПФА РАН (Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петербургский филиал), Фонд 1117, Опись 1, Дело 5); see also Старостин (2008) 7–8 n. 16.

[100] The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch, Manuscript Group (Fond) 1117, Inventory (Opis') 1, Folder 6 (The same reference in Russian: ПФА РАН (Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петербургский филиал), Фонд 1117, Опись 1, Дело 6); see also Старостин (2008) 7–8 n. 16.

[101] The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch, Manuscript Group (Fond) 1117, Inventory (Opis') 1, Folder 7 (The same reference in Russian: ПФА РАН (Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петербургский филиал), Фонд 1117, Опись 1, Дело 7).

[102] Haury (1905).

[103] The Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg Branch, Manuscript Group (Fond) 1117, Inventory (Opis') 1, Folder 9 (The same reference in Russian: ПФА РАН (Архив Российской Академии Наук, Санкт-Петербургский филиал), Фонд 1117, Опись 1, Дело 9).

Krasheninnikov to the study of the Constantinian *Excerpta*, which was eventually to form the central part of his research and publications.[104]

In 1918, during the First World War, following Estonia's declaration of independence and the German occupation, the University of Yuryev was partly evacuated to Voronezh. Krasheninnikov was among those who relocated. He continued his teaching and academic studies in Voronezh.[105] The political and ideological conditions of early Soviet Russia were becoming ever more repressive. In 1924 or 1925 Krasheninnikov received an invitation from the director of the Vatican Library, Giovanni Mercati, to join the Library in the event of his emigration from Russia. While Krasheninnikov did not (and likely could not) respond to the invitation, the very fact of its existence was later used to compromise him.[106] In 1929, during a campaign of political cleansings, Krasheninnikov was sacked by the University.[107] In 1930 he was arrested on trumped up charges of counter-revolutionary activity and preparations to overthrow the Soviet government.[108] Krasheninnikov was sentenced to a five-year exile in northern Kazakhstan. He died on 21 January 1932 in the Semipalatinsk camp and was rehabilitated as a victim of political repression in 1978.[109]

In Russia, as in Western scholarship, of all the works by Procopius, the *Anecdota* has received the most scholarly attention.

[104] See the list of his publications in Анфертьева (1999) 416–9; see also Анфертьева (1999) 410–12; Старостин (2008) 8–14, 16–17.

[105] Анфертьева (1999) 395–8; Старостин (2008) 3; Акиньшин–Немировский (2003) 41.

[106] Акиньшин–Немировский (2003) 41.

[107] Анфертьева (1999) 399–402; Акиньшин–Немировский (2003) 42.

[108] Анфертьева (1999) 402; Акиньшин–Немировский (2003) 42–5; Попов (2001) 178–9; Акиньшин (2013) 191.

[109] Попов (2001) 178–9; Акиньшин–Немировский (2003) 45.

Fedor Kurganov,[110] in his dissertation (1880) on the *Relations between the Church and Civil Power in the Byzantine Empire* in the fourth to the sixth centuries,[111] dedicates some one hundred pages to Procopius.[112] He focuses on the *Anecdota* and analyses interpretations of its authenticity, authorship, and significance in different historiographical traditions, starting from the 17th century. The historiography is analysed in its religious/theological, as well as social and historical, context. Kurganov himself, however, remains reluctant to provide his own answer to the question of the authorship of the *Anecdota*.[113]

In 1895–7 **Boris Panchenko** (1872–1920)[114] published his investigation of the *Anecdota*.[115] Already as a student he had become interested in this text and in its author. V. Vasilievsky, a promoter of Byzantine studies at the University of St Petersburg, encouraged his students to undertake work on studying sources. One of the topics proposed for such textual analysis—'Procopius and his *Anecdota*: Authenticity and Reliability'[116]—was chosen by B. Panchenko.

Considering the question of the text's authenticity solved, at least after Dahn's publication,[117] in his investigation of the *Anecdota*, Panchenko nevertheless insists on the necessity of a detailed study of the text and of the author in the historical context of the epoch,[118] in order to confirm once again the authorship of Procopius and the authenticity of his text. Speaking about the numerous 'exaggerations, accusations,

[110] Kurganov (1844–1920) was a church historian and theologian, and a Professor at the Kazan Theological Academy and at the University of Kazan: Соколов (1926).

[111] Курганов (1880).

[112] Курганов (1880) 341–440.

[113] Курганов (1880) 336.

[114] For information about him, see Сюзюмов (1964).

[115] Панченко (1895); (1896); (1897). It also exists as an offprint: Панченко (1895–7).

[116] Medvedev (2006) 110.

[117] Dahn (1865).

[118] Панченко (1895–7) 2.

and passionate expressions of hatred' that are characteristic of the text, Panchenko makes an important methodological, positivist statement: 'Not a single line of the author, a contemporary of the epoch, can be neglected: his very passion is a valuable historical fact. Any incredible testimony should be explained as the product of a certain mood and may perhaps indicate from which circles of society it emanates or could emanate'.[119] Panchenko also emphasises the importance of parallel contemporary sources for the study of the *Anecdota*, relying on the progress made in the field and on the new editions.[120] In the preface to the investigation he mentions that he had not consulted the manuscripts in the Italian and Parisian libraries. Panchenko adds that he does not consider it necessary to do the work that 'others are rumoured to be doing',[121] an obvious allusion to the work of Krasheninnikov.

The monograph consists of a preface, three chapters, and very brief conclusions. The first chapter, on the 'Attribution of the *Anecdota* to Procopius', examines the historiography of the question of the authenticity of the work. Providing an analytical historiographical account of arguments in favour of its authenticity, Panchenko adds his own considerations regarding the structure of the *Anecdota.*[122] He also seeks to reconstruct the political, social, and economic views of Procopius, analysing the language and terminology used by the author.[123] The second and the third chapters of the investigation focus on the analysis of the content of the *Anecdota*. Panchenko thoroughly analyses information provided by the *Anecdota* on events of political history (Chapter

[119] Ibid.

[120] Панченко (1895–7) 3.

[121] Панченко (1895–7) 3–4.

[122] Chapters after Chapter 18 have been added to the initial text of the *Anecdota*; both the main text and the addition were made by Procopius himself and at the same time; the text lacks the final editing and finishing: Панченко (1895–7) 38–41.

[123] Панченко (1895–7) 44–65.

II),[124] and the problems of finances, the law, and administration (Chapter III).[125] He discusses every issue by comparing the data in the *Anecdota* with other works of Procopius, as well as with other sources (in particular the *Novels*; the *De magistratibus* of John Lydus; and John of Ephesus).

Several Procopius-related projects in Russian scholarship have remained unrealised or only partially realised. As a result of administrative changes at the Russian Academy, only some of the translations prepared by S. Destunis were published (the *Persian Wars* and the first book of the *Vandal Wars*).[126] Challenges in carrying out the research work alone, without adequate institutional support and access to European libraries, followed by the hardships of academic work and life in post-revolutionary Russia, impeded M. Krasheninnikov's efforts to finalise his ambitious project of publishing a full edition of Procopius, and only the *Anecdota* saw the light of day.

Another project—that of publication in the 1930s of a Russian translation of the *Anecdota*, together with a commentary—was never realised owing to the turbulent and tragic circumstances of the period of Stalin. The story of this unrealised project is important not only for the history of Russian/Soviet Byzantine scholarship, but also as evidence for this period. **Vladimir Beneshevich** (1874–1938),[127] a renowned scholar of Byzantine law and canon law—and one of the most tragic figures of early Soviet Byzantine studies—was at the origin of this project. Most likely at the beginning of 1934, soon after his release from the Solovki camp (where he was sentenced to forced labour on false charges of

[124] Панченко (1895–7) 65–102.

[125] Панченко (1895–7) 103–217.

[126] Дестунис– Дестунис (1862[1]; 1976[2]); Дестунис–Дестунис (1880).

[127] For information about him, see Герд–Щапов (2002); Ананьев–Бухарин (2019); Медведев (2006) 215–312.

espionage)[128] and his return to Leningrad, Beneshevich found out about Maxim Gorky's initiative to publish a book on the status of women in Byzantium. Gorky was at the time the head of the editorial council of the publishing house *Academia*, which was preparing a series on the status of women in different periods.[129]. Beneshevich wrote to Gorky, suggesting that Byzantine material would prove extremely interesting for the topic[130] and proposing to publish the translation of the *Anecdota* 'as an illustration'.[131]

Gorky passed this proposal to Lev Kamenev, a Bolshevik revolutionary, Soviet politician, and, at the time, the head of the *Academia* publishing house, who expressed his great interest in and support for the project.[132] Correspondence between Beneshevich and Kamenev on the details and preparations of the planned edition lasted from February to May 1934, and correspondence continued with the editorial board of the publishing house until January 1935. In the early letters, Beneshevich provides Kamenev with a list of different foreign translations of the *Anecdota* so that he can get a better idea of the nature of the work. Beneshevich makes reference to Panchenko's monograph, but does not mention the translation made by S. Destunis, which, though it had not been published, must have been available as a manuscript in the library of St Petersburg University.[133] The planned volume was supposed to be based on Krasheninnikov's edition and to contain the following: an introduction (planned to run to at least 80,000 characters, with short

[128] On his arrest and imprisonment in the Solovki camps, see Ананьев–Бухарин (2019) 317.

[129] Медведев (2006) 251; Крылов–Кичатов (2004) 80–1.

[130] He remarks that an Institute of Byzantine Studies should be created; at this time, Beneshevich was actively trying to influence the restoration of Russian Byzantinology, encouraging the creation of groups of studies with the Academy of Sciences and restoration of the Византийский Временник: see Ананьев–Бухарин (2019) 317, 321.

[131] Медведев (2006) 252.

[132] Медведев (2006) 253.

[133] Medvedev supposes that, for some reason, Beneshevich was not aware of this translation: Медведев (2006) 254.

footnotes); a more detailed commentary in the endnotes; illustrations; a map of the Eastern Roman Empire; a plan of Constantinople in the sixth century; and indices.[134] Beneshevich was reluctant to undertake the work of preparing the translation alone, primarily because of the impossible working conditions.[135] He probably therefore agreed to act as an editor of the project.[136] Two excellent classicists, Maria Sergeenko (1891–1987)[137] and Alexander Boldyrev (1895–1941),[138] were enrolled as translators.[139] On 15 January 1935 the contract for the preparation of the translation was signed, on the condition that the translators would receive the two recent translations of the *Anecdota* from abroad, those of the Dewing and Comparetti.[140]

All of the details about this project are known from archival materials, containing the correspondence between Beneshevich and the publishing house, which were published and studied by Igor Medvedev.[141] The project was never realised (and perhaps never really started). Kamenev was arrested on 16 January 1935, the day after the contract for the *Anecdota* translation was signed, and sentenced to five years of prison. In the summer of 1935, his term was changed to ten years, and in August 1936 Kamenev was executed together with Zinovjev and fourteen other old Bolsheviks accused of

[134] Медведев (2006) 254.

[135] After his return from the camp Beneshevich's family's living conditions were extremely harsh. He also did not have access to his library and research materials: Медведев (2006) 255 with n. 19; Ананьев–Бухарин (2019) 324.

[136] In a letter of 6 March 1934 he explicitly declined to act as an editor (Медведев (2006) 256–7); however, the later correspondence seems to suggest that he agreed to some supervising role: Медведев (2006) 257–63.

[137] For more on her see Гаврилов–Казанский (1993).

[138] Медведев (2006) 251.

[139] Медведев (2006) 261.

[140] Медведев (2006) 261–3.

[141] Медведев (2006) 250–63.

terrorism at what was the beginning of Stalin's Great Purges.[142]

The fate of Beneshevich was also tragic. After the Bavarian Academy published his critical edition of John Scholasticus' collection of canons in 1937,[143] Beneshevich was fired from Leningrad State University. A publication in Nazi Germany was seen as a 'politically damaging act, hostile to the interests of the Soviet people and Soviet scholarship'.[144] Beneshevich was once again arrested and charged with espionage. He was executed on 27 January 1938.[145]

Another Russian translation of the *Anecdota* did appear at the end of the 1930s. **Sergei Kondrat'ev**, a classical philologist and a graduate of Moscow University (1906),[146] prepared and published translations of the *Anecdota*[147] and of the *Buildings*[148]—their first publication in Russian historiography. Both translations were published as supplements in the newly established (1937) *Journal of Ancient History* (*Вестник древней истории*: *ВДИ*). Kondrat'ev's translation of the *Gothic Wars*, published in 1950, completed his work on Procopius.[149]

Kondrat'ev's translation of the *Anecdota* begins with a short *Introduction* (two pages) that mentions the main editions and translations, and very briefly characterises the history of the study of the text, making special reference to the work of B.

[142] Крылов–Кичатов (2004) 104–12.

[143] The work on which had started in the early 1900s: Beneshevich (1937).

[144] Медведев (2006) 302–12 .

[145] His two sons and his brother were also executed: Медведев (2006) 293. In 1958 Ljudmila (Amata) Beneshevich, the wife of V. Beneshevich (daughter of F. Zelinskij) obtained a decree of rehabilitation of her family: Вольфцун (1999) 103).

[146] For biographical details, see a note about him published in the journal *Вестник Древней Истории* to celebrate his 75th birthday: Ред. (1947) 'К 75-летию со дня рождения', 220.

[147] Кондратьев (1938).

[148] Кондратьев (1939).

[149] Кондратьев (1950).

Panchenko. Rather courageously, Kondrat'ev writes about Krasheninnikov's edition, calling it a 'a major event in the work on the *Anecdota*'.[150] This reference could have been dangerous for the writer, considering that Krasheninnikov had died in a prison camp after being charged with 'counterrevolutionary activity and preparations to overthrow the Soviet government'.[151] Probably because he was unaware of the unpublished work of S. Destunis, Kondrat'ev emphasises that the *Anecdota* had never before been translated into Russian. The translation was made from Haury's edition.[152] During his work, Kondrat'ev did not have access to Dewing's translations. A commentary is given in the footnotes, which provides occasional explanations about personalities and historical circumstances, and references to other works of Procopius, to some other sources and to contemporary literature.[153] The footnotes also occasionally provide translated conjectures from Haury's and other editions. An index of names, places, and certain terms is provided at the end of the publication.[154]

The translation of the *Buildings* starts with an even shorter introduction than the *Anecdota*, which seeks to explain the historical value of the text.[155] Even compared to the not very extensive commentary to the *Anecdota*, the commentary on the *Buildings* is remarkably brief: it gives very few explanations, provides occasional references to other works of Procopius and other sources,[156] and gives some translated conjectures taken from Haury's edition. The translation is

[150] Кондратьев (1938) 274.

[151] Анфертьева (1999) 402; Акиньшин–Немировский (2003) 42–5; Попов (2001) 178–9; Акиньшин (2013) 191.

[152] Haury (1906).

[153] A very short list of those sources and modern works is provided at the end: Кондратьев (1938) 255–6.

[154] Кондратьев (1938) 357–60.

[155] Кондратьев (1939) 203–4.

[156] The reader is referred to the same list of sources and modern literature that is given in the *Anecdota*: Кондратьев (1938) 255–6.

followed by an index of names, places, and some themes.[157] Kondrat'ev's translations—without any mention of the translator's name—were used by A. Mishulin in the excerpts on the 'Ancient Slavs in the Fragments of Greco-Roman and Byzantine Writers up to the Seventh Century AD'.[158]

The *Gothic Wars*, translated by Kondrat'ev, appeared in 1950 as a book published by the Academy of Sciences.[159] The text is preceded by an introductory article by Z. V. Udal'tsova.[160] A testament of the period, the article is imbued with Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist ideology. The article stresses the value of Procopius' works for Marxist historians in the context of the debunking of the idealisation of Justinian by 'bourgeois historiography' (Ch. Diehl is particularly criticised).[161] Procopius is characterised as an ideologue of a slave system;[162] he is, however, considered an important source in revealing the decay of the Eastern Roman ruling class.[163] The article attempts to reconstruct Procopius' political view with a focus on his criticism of Justinian. The war in Italy is described as an aggression by the reactionary Byzantine government and slave-owning nobility against the achievements of the slave revolution of the fifth century.[164] The second phase of the war, starting in 541, is described as a people's war of liberation against the restorers of the slaveholding order:[165] the Gothic leadership (Totila) sought to side with a broad movement consisting of the peasantry and masses of free barbarians;[166] Teia's struggle against the Eastern Romans belongs to the most heroic pages of the

[157] Кондратьев (1939) 284–98.

[158] Мишулин (1941).

[159] Кондратьев (1950).

[160] Удальцова (1950).

[161] Удальцова (1950) 6.

[162] Удальцова (1950) 12.

[163] Удальцова (1950) 15.

[164] Удальцова (1950) 20–1.

[165] Удальцова (1950) 31.

[166] Удальцова (1950) 33–42.

people's liberation war in Italy.[167] The main conclusion of this analysis is that Justinian's wars in Italy—as well as in North Africa and Spain—were the last attempts of the slave-owners to save the slave system. According to the analysis, this reactionary policy sparked a new wave of slave revolutions, in alliance with the barbarians (the Lombards).[168] The *Gothic Wars* are further described as a valuable source on different barbarians: the geography of their settlements, their way of life, and their social structure.[169] As is typical for Russian and Soviet historiography on Procopius, Udal'tsova particularly focuses on the Slavs as described by Procopius.[170] The Soviet scholar finds Procopius to be particularly biased against the early Slavic peoples.[171] The final part of the article briefly analyses the *Buildings*—as a complementary source on the invasions of the Slavs and other peoples, and as a testimony of the weakness of the Eastern Roman state, defending itself from both external enemies (barbarians) and internal enemies (rebelling slaves and *coloni*, allied with the barbarians).[172]

There is no other preface in the volume, nor are there references to editions, translations, or scholarship.[173] The translation itself is considered correct, though not without some stylistic flaws.[174] Notes and comments are extremely scarce (three pages of comments for all of the Books) and are mostly references to other works of Procopius taken from Haury's edition (without referencing Haury). The index is

[167] Удальцова (1950) 42.

[168] Удальцова (1950) 44.

[169] Удальцова (1950) 44–50.

[170] Удальцова (1950) 46–50.

[171] Удальцова (1950) 47.

[172] Удальцова (1950) 57.

[173] One can only guess whether the authors of the translation of the introduction were thus avoiding ideologically questionable, and therefore potentially dangerous, references to 'bourgeois historiography' in the midst of the Stalinist era.

[174] See the review of Феленковская (1950).

also taken from Haury's edition (this time with a mention of the author), with some transliteration mistakes.

In 1996 the publishing house 'Арктос' reprinted the *Gothic Wars* and the *Buildings* in Kondrat'ev's translation.[175] Udal'tsova's introductory article—no longer ideologically relevant—was excluded from the edition. This reprint does not contain any prefaces or introductions: not a word on Procopius, nor on the translations (it mentions only that the translation is by Kondrat'ev).

Two other important and original projects were published in the early 1990s. The first was the ***Corpus Testimoniorum Vetustissimorum ad Historiam Slavicam Pertinentium***.[176] Continuing the old tradition of publishing excerpts on the early Slavic peoples (see above), this edition, under the leadership of **L. Gindin**, **S. Ivanov**, and **G. Litavrin**, was carried out at a high academic level. The corpus presents texts in Ancient Greek, Latin, and Syriac, with parallel translations into Russian that were prepared specially for the edition; the texts are provided with a rich commentary. Each source is preceded by an introduction containing information about the author, the peculiarities of the source, and the manuscript tradition. Sergej Ivanov authored the introduction to the entry on Procopius[177] and most of the extended commentaries.[178] There are analyses of the manuscript tradition for the *Gothic Wars*, the *Anecdota*, and the *Buildings*—the works containing passages on the Slavs. For the *Gothic Wars* and the *Buildings*, the authors mostly follow the Haury–Wirth edition, referring to other editions when their conjectures are preferred. For the *Anecdota*, the text follows Krasheninnikov and Haury, referring to other editions when their conjectures are preferred. Translations of

[175] Кондратьев (1996).

[176] Гиндин–Иванов–Литаврин (1994).

[177] Иванов–Гиндин–Цымбурский (1994) 170–5.

[178] Иванов–Гиндин–Цымбурский (1994) 208–50.

the excerpts are prepared by S. Ivanov and by L. Gindin, together with V. Tsymburskij.[179]

Finally, the publication in 1993 of a commented translation of the *Persians Wars*, the *Vandal Wars*, and the *Anecdota* by **Alexandra Chekalova**[180] brought to a close the history of 20th-century Russian translations of Procopius. This was probably meant to complement Kondrat'ev's translation and thus does not include the *Gothic Wars* and the *Buildings*. Aleksandra Chekalova, a student of Z. Udal'tsova,[181] mostly worked on early Byzantine history, primarily the period of Justinian. Her translations are made from the Haury–Wirth edition. An account of the life and works of Procopius concludes the first edition[182] and forms the introduction in the second edition.[183] The comments (not extensive, but considerably more thorough than those in Kondrat'ev's translations) contain references to parallel traditions, other translations, and scholarship in European languages. The author mentions her stay at the Dumbarton Oaks research centre in 1992, which allowed her to 'get acquainted with the literature and editions of the works of Procopius of Caesarea missing in Russia'.[184]

Oddly, references to Russian scholarship on Procopius in her comments are extremely scarce. The translation of the *Anecdota* by Kondrat'ev is mentioned in the bibliography and is occasionally referred to in comments with regard to differences in translation.[185] Discussing the problem of the authorship of the *Anecdota*, Chekalova also refers to the works of B. Panchenko.[186] There are no references to the trans-

[179] Иванов–Гиндин–Цымбурский (1994) 175 n. 3 names the authors of the translations of all passages.

[180] Чекалова (1993).

[181] Ред. (2017) 'Памяти А. А. Чекаловой'.

[182] Чекалова (1993) 421–56.

[183] Чекалова (2013) 345–73.

[184] Чекалова (1993) 456; (2013) 5.

[185] Three times, to be precise: commentary to the *Anecdota*, nn. 220, 253, 265.

[186] Чекалова (1993) 425 n. 23; 446 n. 111.

lations and commentaries of the *Persian Wars* and of the first Book of the *Vandal Wars* by Gavriil Destunis and Spiridon Destunis, or to any of the extensive scholarship by Krasheninnikov.[187] Chekalova was undoubtedly aware of the two volumes of S. Destunis' translations and G. Destunis' commentaries: in her book, *Constantinople in the Sixth Century and the Nika Riot*,[188] she not only mentions these two published volumes in the bibliography (under *Sources*), but also quotes G. Destunis' commentary to *B.P.* 2.21.27 about John, the son of Basil who was given to the Persians as a hostage.[189] Here Chekalova refers to G. Destunis, who follows Alemanni's identification of John's father as Basil (given to the Persians as a hostage by Anastasius).[190] Surprisingly, in her own commentary on the same passage, in the translation that was published several years after the publication of the monograph on Constantinople in the sixth century, Chekalova repeats this identification of John the son of Basil. However, she provides no references, neither to Alemanni, nor to Destunis, only to primary sources (*Josh. Styl.* Ch. 80 and *Theoph.* A.M. 5998).[191]

To sum up, Russian scholarship has shown considerable interest in Procopius. Throughout the centuries, an important vehicle for this interest remained the focus on early Slavic history, and thus editions, translations, and commentaries were produced only on the relevant passages. However, despite the failure of several major translating and editing projects, by the end of the 20th century all of Procopius' works had been published in Russian. A table will help to summarise this work.

[187] Which, in 1993, would not have been politically compromising or dangerous.

[188] Чекалова (1986[1]); (1997[2]).

[189] *PLRE* III, Ioannes 30.

[190] *PLRE* III, Basilius 1. See Дестунис (1862[1]) 150–2 n. 20; cf. Чекалова (1986) Ch. 2, n. 1; (1997) 69 n. 1.

[191] Чекалова (1993) 495 n. 30.

- The *Persian Wars* was translated and published twice: by G. Destunis and S. Destunis in 1862/1976 and by A. Chekalova.
- The *Vandal Wars*: Book 1 was translated by S. Destunis and commented upon by G. Destunis in 1891; both books 1 and 2 were translated and commented upon by Chekalova.
- The *Gothic Wars* was translated by Kondrat'ev in 1950.
- The *Anecdota* was translated by Kondrat'ev in 1938, and by Chekalova in 1993.
- The *Buildings* was translated by Kondrat'ev in 1939.

The only published critical edition (apart from the excerpts) of the *Anecdota* is that prepared by M. Krasheninnikov in 1899.[192] Boris Panchenko's investigation of the *Anecdota* significantly contributed to the recognition of the work's authenticity and Procopius' authorship. [193]

Probably as a result of the tumultuous and cataclysmic history of 20th-century Russia, a considerable part of the important and rich 19th-century scholarship on Procopius remained either ignored or scarcely used in 20th-century translations. At the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, Igor Medvedev prepared and edited a series of publications on the Russian Byzantinists, based on archival materials.[194] This work greatly advances the historical knowledge of the heritage of Russian classicists and Byzantinists, particularly given that a huge part of this heritage has remained unpublished.

[192] Krasheninnikov (1899).

[193] Панченко (1895–7).

[194] Медведев (1995); (1999); (2004); (2006).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: *PLRE* III = Martindale (1992).

Primary Sources

Bekker, I., B. G. Niebuhr, and H. de Valois (1829) *Dexippi, Eunapii, Petri Patricii, Prisci, Malchi, Menandri Historiarum quae supersunt* (Bonn).

Beneshevich, V. N. (1937) *Ioannis Scholastici Synagoga L titulorum ceteraque eiusdem opera iuridica: iussu ac mandato Academiae Scientiarum Bavaricae* (Munich).

Comparetti, D. (1895–8) *La guerra gotica di Procopio di Cesarea: testo greco, emendato sui manoscritti con traduzione italiana* 1–2 (Rome).

Dindorf, W. (1833) *Procopius, ex recensione Guilielmi Dindorfii* (*Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae*; Bonn), vols. 1–2.

Greatrex, G. (2022) *Procopius of Caesarea: the* Persian Wars*: A Historical Commentary* (Cambridge).

Haury, J. (1905) *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia* vols 1–2 (*Bella*) (Leipzig).

—— (1906) *Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia* vol. 3.1 (*Historia Arcana*) (Leipzig).

Krasheninnikov, M. (1899) 'Procopii Caesariensis: Anecdota quae dicuntur' (Jurievi) (*Ученые записки Императорского Юрьевского университета* 2, I–IV, 1–160; 2, VII–LXXIV, 161–205. *Отдельный Оттиск* LXXIV).

Maltret, C. (1662–3) *Procopii Caesarienss Historiarum sui temporis libre VIII. Et Procopii Caesariensis Arcana historia qui est liber nonus Historiarum*, 2 vols (*Coll. des historiens byzantins*, Paris).

Дестунис, С., transl., Г. Дестунис, comm. (1862[1]; 1976[2]) *Прокопий Кесарийский. История войн римлян с персами, вандилами и готфами. История войн римлян с персами. Книга первая* (St Petersburg).

—— (1880) *Прокопий Кесарийский. История войн римлян с персами, вандилами и готфами. История войн римлян с персами. Книга вторая* (St Petersburg).

—— (1891) *Прокопий Кесарийский. История войн римлян с персами, вандилами и готфами. История войн римлян с вандилами. Книга первая* (St Petersburg).

Кондратьев, С. П., transl. (1938) 'Прокопий. Тайная история', *Вестник Древней Истории* 4: 273–360.

—— (1939) 'Прокопий. О постройках', *Вестник Древней Истории* 4: 203–83.

—— (1950) *Прокопий Кесарийский. Война с готами* (Moscow).

—— (1996) *Прокопий Кесарийский. Война с готами. О постройках* т. 1–2 (Moscow).

Чекалова, А. А., transl., comm. (1993) *Прокопий Кесарийский. Война с персами; Война с вандалами; Тайная история* (Moscow).

—— (2013) *Прокопий Кесарийский. Война с персами; Война с вандалами; Тайная история*[2] (St Petersburg).

Excerpts

von Stritter, J. G. (1771–9) *Memoriae populorum, olim, ad Danubium, Pontium Euxinum, Paludem Maeotidem, Caucasum, Mare Caspium, et inde magis ad septemtriones incolentium* (Impensis Academiae Scientiarum).

Стриттер, И. М. and В. П. Светов, trans. (1770–5) *Известия византийских историков: объясняющия российскую историю древних времен и преселения народов* (Imperial Academy of Sciences).

—— (1770) *Известия византийских историков: объясняющия российскую историю древних времен и преселения народов,* Часть 1: О славянах (Imperial Academy of Sciences).

—— (1770) *Известия византийских историков: объясняющия российскую историю древних времен и преселения народов,* Часть 2: О готфах, вандалах, гепидах, ерулах, уннах и о аварах (Imperial Academy of Sciences).

Гиндин, Л. А., С. А. Иванов, and Г. Г. Литаврин, edd. (1994) *Свод древнейших письменных известий о славянах = Corpus Testimoniorum Vetustissimorum ad Historiam Slavicam Pertinentium* (Moscow).

Дестунис, С. (1842) 'Римское посольство к Аттиле. Отрывок из сочинений Приска, писателя V века', *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 33, Отделение 2, Словестность, Науки и Художества: 65–116.

Мишулин А. (1941) 'Древние славяне в отрывках греко-римских и византийских писателей по VII в. н.э.', *Вестник Древней Истории* 1 (14): 233–45.

Secondary Sources (Russian)

Акиньшин, А. Н. and А. И. Немировский (2003) 'Михаил Никитич Крашенинников—историк литературы и педагог', *Вестник ВГУ. Серия Гуманитарные науки* 1: 33–47.

Акиньшин, А. (2013) 'Историки в Воронежском университете в 1918–1941 гг.', *Вестник Воронежского государственного университета, Серия: Проблемы высшего образования* 2: 190–4.

Ананьев, В. and М. Бухарин (2019) '"Все горе в звериной ненависти к византиноведению …" В. Н. Бенешевич и Академия Наук СССР в 1933–1937 гг.', *Византийский Временник* 103: 314–38.

Анфертьева, А. Н. (1999) 'М. Н. Крашенинников: к портрету ученого и человека', in Медведев (1999) 375–419.

Белоброва О. А. (1995) 'С. Ю. и Г. С. Дестунисы: рукописное наследие', in Медведев (1995) 22–33.

Вольфцун, Л. Б. (1999) 'Бенешевич Людмила (Амата) Фаддеевна', in Шилов (1999) 100–3; electronic version: http://nlr.ru/nlr_history/persons/info.php?id=508.

Гаврилов, А. К. and Н. Н. Казанский (1993) 'К 100-летию М.Е. Сергеенко', *Вестник Древней Истории* 24: 316–28.

Герд, Л. А. (1999) ‘В. Г. Васильевский: портрет ученого в свете его неизданной переписки’, in Медведев (1999) 52–66.

Герд, Л. and Я. Щапов (2002) ‘Бенешевич Владимир Николаевич’, *Православная энциклопедия* IV: 619–21 (https://www.pravenc.ru/text/78078.html).

Дестунис, С. (1841) ‘Нечто о византийских историках и о переводе их на русский язык’, *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 32: 69–90.

Иванов, С. А., Л. А. Гиндин, and В. Л. Цымбурский (1994) ‘Прокопий Кесарийский’, in Гиндин–Иванов–Литаврин (1994) 170–250.

Крашенинников, М. (1891) *Римские муниципальные жрецы и жрицы. Эпиграфическое исследование* (St Petersburg).

—— (1895a) ‘Августалы и сакральное магистерство. Исследование в области римского муниципального права и древностей’, *Записки Историко-филологичкскаго факультета Императорскаго Санкт-Петербуреского Университета* (St Petersburg).

—— (1895b) ‘Review of Comparetti (1895–8) vol. I’, Журнал *Министерства Народного Просвещения* 302, November, Отдел критики и библиографии, 123–58.

—— (1895c) ‘О рукописном предании “Тайной Истории” Прокопия (Предварительное сообщение)’, *Византийский Временник* 2: 416–25.

—— (1897) ‘К рукописному преданию “Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων” Прокопия Кесарийского’, in *Commentationes philologicae: Сборник статей в честь проф. И.В. Помяловского* (St Petersburg) 191–4.

—— (1898a) ‘Procopiana I: К критике текста V книги “Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων” Прокопия Кесарийского’ *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 317, май-июнь, Отделение классической филологии: 121–48.

—— (1898b) ‘К критике текста второй тетрады “Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων” Прокопия Кесарийского. Введение. Краткий

обзор рукописного предания и стемма рукописей', *Византийский Временник* 5: 439–82.

—— (1898c) 'Varia XXV Procop. *Anecd.* P. 10, 1 ed. Bonn' *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 317, май-июнь, Отделение классической филологии: 105.

—— (1899a) 'Procopiana II: К критике текста VI книги "Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων" Прокопия Кесарийского', *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 325, сентябрь, Отделение классической филилогии: 127–44; октябрь: 1–18.

—— (1899b) 'Дополнительная заметка по вопросу о рукописном предании второй тетрады "Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων" Прокопия Кесарийского', *Византийский Временник* 6: 288–91.

—— (1902) 'Varia: XXXI Procop. De bellis V 14 p. 21, 18 ed. Bonn (p. 14, 14 Kr.); XXXII Procop. De bellis V 7 p. 37, 18 Bonn (p. 29, 13 Kr.); XXXIII Procop. De bellis V 7 p. 37, 19 Bonn (p. 29, 14 Kr.)', *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 343 октябрь. Отделение классической филологии: 468–92.

—— (1916) 'Varia, LVI Procopius, *De bellis* VIII, 12, p. 521, 1 (Bonn) (p. 55, 3 Kr.); LXII Procopius, *De aedif.* IV, 6, 20 p. 129, I and IV, 4 p. 124, 27 ed. Haury; Procopius *De aedif.* IV, 4 p. 120, 15 and IV, 11 p. 148, 24 ed. Haury; LXIV Procopius, *De aedif.* IV, 11, p. 147, 14. 15. 19. 20. And I. 11. 16 p. 43, 26 ed. Haury; LXV Procopius, *De aedif.* IV, 11 p. 147, 32. 33. 34. 36. 37 and p. 146, 44, ed. Haury', *Журнал Министерства народного просвещения* 66 декабрь. Отделение классической филологии: 433–82.

Крылов, В. and Е. Кичатов (2004) *Издательство Academia. Книга и люди* (Moscow).

Курбатов, Г. Л. (1970) 'Из истории возникновения отечественной школы научного византиноведения (Г. С. Дестунис)', *(Православный) Палестинский сборник* 23 (86): 179–91.

Курганов, Ф. (1880) *Отношенія между церковною и гражданскою властію в Византийской имперіи. Обзор*

эпохи образованія и окончательного установленія характера взаимоотношеній между церковною и гражданскою властію в Византіи (325–565) (Kazan).

Ломоносов, М. В. (1766) *Древняя российская история от начала российского народа до кончины великого князя Ярослава Первого или до 1054 года* (Imperial Academy of Sciences).

Макушев, В. В. (1861) *Сказания иностранцев о быте и нравах славян* (St Petersburg).

Медведев, И. П. (2006) *Петербургское византиноведение: страницы истории* (St Petersburg).

——, ed. (1995) *Архивы русских византинистов в Санкт-Петербурге* (St Petersburg).

—— (1999) *Рукописное наследие русских византинистов в архивах Санкт-Петербурга* (St Petersburg).

—— (2004) *Мир русской византинистики. Материалы архивов Санкт-Петербурга* (St Petersburg).

Ольденбург, С. (1926) 'Академия Российская', *Большая советская энциклопедия* 1: 791.

Панченко, Б. (1895–7) *О Тайной Истории Прокопия* (St Petersburg).

—— (1895) 'О Тайной Истории Прокопия', *Византийский Временник* 2: 24–7, 340–71.

—— (1896) 'О Тайной Истории Прокопия', *Византийский Временник* 3: 96–117, 300–16, 461–527.

—— (1897) 'О Тайной Истории Прокопия', *Византийский Временник* 4: 402–51.

Попов, С. А. (2001) 'Профессор М. Н. Крашенинников (1865–1932). Материалы к биографии', *Филологические записки. Вестник литературоведения и языкознания* (Voronezh) 16: 171–9.

Ред. (1895) 'Гавріилъ Спиридоновичъ Дестунисъ†' *Византийский Временник* 2.1: 316–26.

Ред. (1947) 'К 75-летию со дня рождения и 50-летию педагогической деятельности С. П. Кондратьева', *Вестник Древней Истории* 1: 220.

Ред. (2017) 'Памяти А. А. Чекаловой' *Византийский Временник* 10: 348–9.

Соколов, И. (1926) 'Ф. А. Курганов (†1920)', *Византийский Временник* 24: 103–4.

Старостин, Д. Н. (2008) 'Рукописное наследие М. Н. Крашенинникова и практика издания византийских текстов в дореволюционной России', *Byzantinoslavica* 1–2: 21–38.

Сухомлинов, М. И. (1874–87) *История Российской академии*, vols. 1–8 (St Petersburg).

Сюзюмов, М. Я. (1964) 'Научное наследение Б. А. Панченко', *Византийский Временник* 25: 32–52.

Удальцова З. (1950) 'Прокопий Кесарийский и его "История войн с готами"', in Кондратьев (1950) 3–60.

Файнштейн, М. Ш. (1999) 'Из истории отечественной византинистки: забытый проект Российской Академии', in Медведев (1999) 521–36.

Феленковская, И. В. (1950) 'Review of М. Кондратьева, *Прокопий из Кесарии. Война с готами,* Пер. С. П. Сгреческого (1950)', *Вестник Древней Истории* 4 (38): 148–55.

Фролов, Э. Д. (2006) *Русская наука об античности* (St Petersburg).

Цамутали, А. Н. (1991) 'Петербургская школа византиноведения', *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины* 23: 5–19.

Чекалова, А. А. (1986) *Константинополь в VI веке. Восстание Ника* (Moscow).

——— (1997) *Константинополь в VI веке. Восстание Ника*[2] (St Petersburg).

Шилов, Л. А., ed. (1999) *Сотрудники Российской национальной библиотеки—деятели науки и культуры: Биографический словарь*, том 2 (St Petersburg).

Secondary Sources (Other)

Comparetti, D. (1928) *Le Inedite: libro nono delle Istorie di Procopio di Cesarea* (Rome).

Dahn, F. (1865) *Prokopius von Cäsarea* (Berlin).

Haury, J. (1895) 'Über Procophandschriften', *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Philologischen und Historischen Classe der K. B. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* 1: 125–76.

—— (1900) 'Review of M. Krascheninnikov, ed., *Procopii Caesariensis Anecdota quae dicuntur*', *BZ* 9: 672–4.

Krumbacher, K. (1891) *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)* (Munich).

Kurtz, E. (1899) 'Review of M. Kraseninuikov, *Zur Kritik des Textes der zweiten Tetradeder Schrift des Prokopios von Kaisareia* "Ὑπὲρ τῶν πολέμων"', *BZ* 8: 211.

Martindale J. R., ed. (1992) *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, Vol. III, A.D. 527–641* (Cambridge).

Prousis, T. C. (1989) 'The Destunis Collection in the Manuscript Section of the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in Leningrad', *History Faculty Research and Scholarship* 18. Online publication: (https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/ahis_facpub/18)