
AN IMPERIAL EYE TO THE PAST: BYZANTINE EXHIBITIONS IN THE STATE HERMITAGE MUSEUM, 1861-2006

Yuri Pyatnitsky

The Communist regime and the mental construct of its ideology have been crushed in Russia, as we all know, but the *dictum* by Vladimir Lenin, the communist leader and idol, that “*an individual cannot live in society and be free from society*” remains absolutely valid. The idea that “art is for art’s sake” and that “Museums exist only for pure art” is only a romantic dream of some individuals, not a reality. Admittedly, society’s readiness to respond to artistic traditions, the State and its political aspirations, as well as individual ambitions, each have profound influences on a museum’s life, especially so on its exhibiting activity. Meanwhile, the success of an exhibition gives an impulse for new acquisitions, for new study and, usually, renders the subject matter of the exhibits more popular and fashionable.

The best example to illustrate this point is the influence exerted by the very successful recent exhibitions held in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, namely, “The Glory of Byzantium” in 1997, and “Byzantium: Faith and Power” in 2004. And these are not the only cases. The same situation can be attested to in the history of the Byzantine exhibitions in the State Hermitage museum, St. Petersburg, which spans a period from the middle of the 19th to the beginning of the 21st century, and in which the Imperial ambitions of Russia were also added to other motivations underlying all of these enterprises¹.

The first Byzantine exhibition in the Hermitage, 1861

The earliest Byzantine exhibitions in Russia are connected to the name of Piotr Sevastianov. Piotr Ivanovich Sevastianov (1811-1867) was the son of a rich merchant from Penza, who received a good education in law at the University of Moscow and held a number of high administrative offices in the Caucasus, Perm’ and Saint-Petersburg. After



Fig. 1. Piotr Ivanovich Sevastianov (1811-1867).
Lithography by 1859. The State Hermitage museum.

twenty years of impeccable service he resigned in 1851 and devoted his efforts entirely to studying and collecting ancient Christian mementoes. His regular journeys across Europe and the Orthodox East brought him a reputation as an intrepid traveller. He first visited the monasteries of the Mount Athos, or Holy Mountain, in 1851, did so again in the summer of 1852 and then, after the Turkish-Russian war in 1857 and 1858, and finally in 1859-1860, when he spent more than 14 months there.

Sevastianov was far more than an amateur of fine art and an enthusiastic traveler during his Mount Athos visits. Being one of the first people to realize the scholarly potential that lay in photography, he had traveled to Paris to study this newly discovered art. As he wrote, “*in early 1857 I was struck by the diversity of application of photography and efficiency of its results. Preparing to spend the next summer on Mount Athos I decided*

¹The article was preparing in winter and spring of 2008 in Dumbarton Oaks in Washington.

to study photography, in order to use it for copying the manuscripts, archives, icons, and three-dimensional objects kept in the Mount Athos monasteries. For this I contacted the famous Professor Belloc², and with his easy and rational method, 10 lessons were enough to introduce to me the secrets of collodium³. Sevastianov invited as companions and assistants in his trip the German painter Janson (in 1857), and, in 1859, the French professional artist E. Vaudin. Both artists were to make drawings and original-scale tracings of Athonite frescoes and icons.

Sevastianov proposed to organize a special photo-archive in each of the great libraries and museums in the world. Each archive would make a full copy of the more important manuscripts and objects of art and exchange it with all the others. As a result of this proposed enterprise, these materials would be preserved and would become more accessible to scholars.

In February 8 of 1858 Piotr Sevastianov delivered the lecture "Sur le Mont Athos, ses monastères et les manuscrits de leurs bibliothèques" (On Mount Athos, its Monasteries, and the Manuscripts in their Libraries) at the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* in Paris, in which he presented his recent research on the Mount Athos monasteries (Севастьянов 1859, столбцы 257-261; Sevastianoff 1859, 25-28). He gave the general overview of the Mount Athos and its 20 monasteries, described the main characteristics of the monastic life and administrative management. Sevastianov specifically mentioned his studies in the monastic libraries and photographing individual pages and even entire manuscripts. His lecture was accompanied by an exhibition of drawings, photographs, and original objects from Mount Athos. The French press wrote enthusiastically about Sevastianov's activities, and the great success of the lecture, as well as the absolute admiration of the Parisian society for this Russian scholar's mission, resulted in Sevastianov's presenting the same

lecture-series and exhibitions in Moscow and St. Petersburg in 1859. As every serious reader of the Russian Classics knows, Russia always adhered to the opinion of Europe, where Paris was the irrefutable arbiter. Which is to say that Sevastianov's success in Paris was an *a priori* guarantee for his favorable welcome by the Russian high society.

Indeed, in 1859, Sevastianov demonstrated the drawings and photographs that he made, on a special exhibition held firstly in the Moscow University and later in the building of the Holy Orthodox Synod at Saint-Petersburg. In the Synod buildings Sevastianov's drawings and photographs were arranged on the tables in the centre of the halls, and the monumental, original-scale tracings of the Mount Athos frescoes were exhibited on the walls. As it was expected, this presentation of the outcome of his Athonite mission enjoyed a tremendous success in Russia, too, and the Russians in Moscow and Saint-Petersburg, taking after the Parisians, were delighted by the self-sacrificing and the unselfish devotion of their compatriot. What is more, his daring idea of making the archives of the photographic copies of the manuscripts and art objects was greatly supported by Russian scholars. The academic Ivan Sreznevsky wrote in 1858 that Sevastianov was the first who realized the usefulness of photography for scholarly studies and utilized it in locations where scholars could rarely enter, namely, in the libraries of the Mount Athos monasteries (Срезневский 1858, 367-370). Another scholar, Sergei Shevyrev, in 1859, pointed out that "from now on there is no need to cut pages, damage, and deform the manuscripts as it was practiced in the past. Photography, being such an honorable art, saves these treasures and satisfies the egoism of seekers of all kinds of rarities" (Шевырев 1859, 3). In the same year, one of the most popular journals of that time, *Russkii Khudozhestvennyi Listok*, wrote that "Mr. Sevastianov was the first who reached excellent results in applying photography for reproducing ancient monuments" (Русский 1859, 8). Sevastianov had found support of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, where he held professional presentations and where his article on the role of photography for the humanities was published⁴ (Севастьянов 1859, столбцы 257-

² Belloc Joseph August (c. 1800-c. 1868) – French photographer, member the Société française de photographie from 1854. From the very beginning, he was implied in the photographic democratization, gave photographic lessons and wrote about ten treatises concerning the photographic processes, the way to use them, and some of practical advice. Practicing daguerreotype, he became involved in wet collodion development and improved the wax coating process, helping the pictures to keep their wet-like luster (Encyclopedia 2008, 146).

³ Государственная Российская библиотека. Отдел рукописей. Ф. 269, д. 2347, л. 1.

⁴ Архив Института Археологии РАН в Санкт Петербурге. Ф. 3, д. 408, л. 107-109.



Fig. 2. The exhibition of Sevastianov's materials in Saint Synod in St. Petersburg. Lithography by 1859. The State Hermitage museum.

261). On February 24 1859 the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts elected him as *membre honoraire libre*⁵. One note of interest in connection to Sevastianov's exhibitions in Moscow and Saint-Petersburg was that they were visited by people from different levels of the Russian social hierarchy. It is interesting to mention in this context that, in a drawing made during the exhibition in the Holy Synod building, one discerns the high-society ladies, along with scholars, church hierarchs, merchants, and even peasants. The greater part of the two latter categories was comprised by the so-called "Old Russian Believers".

As an interesting result of Sevastianov's enormous success, a special, art-historically focused expedition to Mount Athos was organized again in 1859-1860 (Didron 1861, 173-183; Пятницкий 1988, 126-131; Пятницкий 1992, 17-22; Пятницкий 1995, 42-44; Довгалло 1995, 242-256; Papoulidis 2000, 87-104; Etingof 2000, 211-220; Piatnitsky 2001, 423-424; Piatnitsky 2004, 201-207; Pyatnitsky 2006, 24-29). This second expedition was funded by the Imperial Couple itself, as well as by

the Academy of Fine Arts and the Holy Orthodox Synod. The official budget of the expedition was 16.000 rubles (7.000 rubles donated by the Emperor and Empress, and 9.000 rubles donated by the Holy Orthodox Synod). In addition, the Grand Princes Maria, president of the Academy of Fine Arts, donated another 3.000 rubles. Regardless of these donations, and according to the documents of the expedition (Довгалло 1995, прим. 30), Piotr Sevastianov added up the sum of approximately 15,000 rubles from his own money. Thus his private initiative led to an official commission from the government itself. He thus accepted this new government position and set off for Mount Athos in 1859, this time as leader of a special art-historical expedition consisting of a group of ten individuals. Amongst them were the painters Mikhail Granovsky, Christo Christoforov, E. Vaudin, the architect Feodor Klagest, and the topographers Konstantin Zuru and Antuan Leborgne.

The success of any project, and especially of an expedition aiming to study a monastic community, depends greatly on the personal qualities of its leader, his character and discretion. Sevastianov

⁵ Российский исторический Архив в Санкт Петербурге. Ф. 789, о. 2 (1859 г.), д. 107, л. 2, 10, 11.

was a charming man and without doubt a talented diplomat. Throughout the fourteen months that the expedition lasted, the ten participating members worked in the Athonite monasteries, under difficult conditions, in which the usual working day lasted eleven-to-twelve hours. The main goal of the expedition was to make authentic copies of the Byzantine paintings, which would assist the revival of the old tradition of icon-painting in nineteenth-century Russia. Sevastianov's crew took over five thousand photographs⁶ and made many hundreds of tracings, drawings, sketches of icons, frescoes, mosaics, manuscripts, and other objects. It was only recently that the once famous *oeuvre* of the *Athos Expedition*, kept in different museums and libraries of Moscow and Saint-Petersburg (and, alas, partially lost during the Soviet times), started to attract the attention of contemporary scholars.

The team returned to Russia in December of 1860, whereupon it was decided to organize a special exhibition for the Emperor's family, so that the amazing outcome of this enterprise would be demonstrated in the full. Indeed, the exhibition opened on 16 March 1861, in the White Hall of the Winter Palace, and it was the first exhibition of Byzantine art that took place in the Hermitage.

Significantly enough, to the bulk of the expedition's materials under display, Sevastianov added the 135 best icons, as well as several fragments of frescoes, and several items of liturgical objects from his personal collection. According to the Kamer-furier's journal, Piotr Sevastianov personally delivered a speech-commentary of the exhibition, which lasted over two hours. Emperor Alexander II, along with his family and the Court, were overwhelmed both in seeing the photographs, drawings, scale models, original icons and church objects, and in listening to the captivating story told by P.I. Sevastianov. The Emperor was so vastly impressed, that he expressed the wish to introduce these fascinating artifacts to the general public. So one month after that event the exhibi-

tion was transferred to the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts in Saint-Petersburg and it was opened to the public in April 1861.

Today it is hard for us to understand the criteria by which Piotr Sevastianov chose the icons for presenting them to the Tsar's family (in the Winter palace) and to the general public (in the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts). At that time, the information that presently helps art historians in establishing the date and place of origin of Byzantine icons was not known; besides, the voluminous albums and catalogues that could provide the (so necessary) comparative illustrative material did not exist. It should also be mentioned that some of those icons were over-painted two or three times, as, for example, the well-known icon of Saint Gregory the Miracle-Maker dated to the 12th century. What is more, those icons were neither restored nor cleaned from the grimy, centuries-old soot or the blackened varnish. Thus, though the motives underlying Sevastianov's choice of icons for the exhibition will never be disclosed, it is an undeniable fact that from his personal collection he selected the best and oldest Byzantine icons. And it is only thanks to this particular selection of his that the Hermitage is now in possession of a first-class collection of icons dating from the 11th through the 15th century, and also of a very interesting collection of post-Byzantine icons dating from the 16th to the 17th centuries. It is only very few Palaiologan icons of the 14th-15th centuries from the items he owned that were not included in the 1861 exhibitions; they eventually found their way to the Moscow museums and are now kept in the Tretyakov gallery, the A.S. Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, and the State Historical Museum (Византия, Балканы, Русь 1991, №№ 2, 13, 19, 26, 53, 95, 99, 110, 112). All the best and oldest icons that Sevastianov had shown in 1861 at the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts later came to the Hermitage.

None the less, on his road to success and beneficence man is awaited by the evils of envy and treachery. Such was the case with Petr Sevastianov. Rumors started to spread that the artifacts he found had no scholarly value and that he himself was a *dilettante* who possessed no knowledge of Byzantine culture whatsoever. In addition to all this, the dating and the value of the icons from his collection were questioned. The reasons for this negative assessment were at the

⁶ It was indeed thanks to Sevastianov that the inhabitants of Mount Athos were introduced to photography, and it was not long before the Monastery of St. Panteleimon was indulging in it. The early photographs taken by the fathers Leonti and Genadi are now among the star exhibits on the cultural heritage of the Holy Mountain. The excellent quality of their work can be admired in the album that now belongs to the Hermitage Collection and was on display in the Athos exhibition in Helsinki in 2006-2007 (*Athos 2006*, 277-278, no 2.16).

same time general and personal. The former can be explained by the lack of knowledge about Byzantine art at the time – in other words, the “official scholars” were not ready to fully appreciate and comprehend the results of the expedition⁷. On a personal level, Sevastianov was too notable and too independent a figure to not provoke jealousy and intrigue among his contemporaries, the “authorities” in the field he chose to explore. But who remembers his accusers today? Who heeds into the various and, at times, vicious plots of intrigue that attempted to mar the brilliance of his conceptions? Indeed, in our days we profer the name of Petr Ivanovich Sevastianov with honor and respect, and that is how he will stay in our memory now and forever.

Being heavily insulted by the intrigues, Sevastianov left for Moscow in 1862, where he began to collaborate with the Rumiantsevsky Public Museum. In spite of this, the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts kept all the items exhibited there in 1861 and transferred them to its Museum of the Old Russian Art, where they were placed in a special “Mount Athos Room”. Today the majority of these items are kept in the Hermitage museum, while a small number of them is kept in the State Russian Museum of St. Petersburg⁸.

A further outcome of Sevastianov’s fervent and pioneering activity is that the concept of a “Byzantine heritage”, invested with an official aura, played a crucial role in the development of nineteenth-century Russian culture (Pyatnitsky in print). It is due to Piotr Sevastianov that in 1859-1861 – and for the first time, in Russia, at that – special “Byzantine exhibitions” were organized, and the public could see artifacts of Byzantine art, either in the originals, or through photographs, drawings, and copies. It is interesting to note that Piotr Sevastianov was the first who came up with an idea to put on display, beside the originals, the exact replicas (on paper) of Byzantine mosaics and murals. This practice was repeated many times in the decades to follow by organizers of large Byzantine shows, as for example, “Exposition d’Art Byzantin” (1931) at the museum of

Decorative Art in Paris, “Byzantine Art in USSR Collections” (1975-1976) at the Hermitage, St. Petersburg, “Glory of Byzantium” (1997) at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, as well as in the renovated permanent exhibitions of the Benaki Museum and the Byzantine Museum in Athens, which opened during the 2000s.

The Medieval department in the Imperial Hermitage, 1888

It was in the same period, in the second half of the nineteenth century, that the World Industrial Exhibitions became extremely popular. As a result, many collectors started to exclusively gather objects of the applied arts, which, as they used to say, could demonstrate the development of man’s industry through the centuries. One of the most famous collections was that of Aleksandr Petrovich Basilevski (1829-1899), a Russian aristocrat who lived in Paris, on Rue Blanche (Kryzhanovskaya 2006, 62-71; Kryzhanovskaya 1990, 143-155). As Basilevski himself declared in the preface to the catalog of his collection, his goal was “*to form a collection of objects in their continuous succession from the first experiments of the Christian catacomb art up to its last appearance during the Renaissance*” (Darsel, Basilevsky 1874, 10). Throughout his life, Aleksandr Basilevski was devoted to art and art collecting and it is so telling in this context that for his coat of arms he chose the motto “OMNIA PRO ARTE”. We are not sure as to when Basilevski started collecting antiquities, but from 1860 he was active in purchasing Medieval and Renaissance works of art at various auctions. His purchases were by no means kept secret for he actively lent them to exhibitions and permitted their study for scholarly publications⁹.

In order to house his collection, Basilevski built an extension to his mansion on Rue Blanche, a special gallery topped by skylights. The interior of this gallery can be seen in a watercolor by Vasily Vereshchagin and another one by Andrei Lavezari made in 1870 now kept in the Hermitage. The gallery was open on Fridays for all interested visitors, and on Mondays there were gatherings for the elite collectors and appreciators of fine arts. In 1875, the art historian L. Clement de Ris, in his review of the two-volume catalogue of the collection (Darsel, Basilevsky 1874) published in

⁷ As a matter of fact, Sevastianov was ahead of his time, and his understanding of icon-painting, along with his intuitive faculty as a collector and an *amatuer des Arts* were more keen than that of the majority of the established scholars.

⁸ The Russian museum objects were published in: Athos 2006, 167, no. 1.6, 169 no. 1.8, 172, no. 1.11, 177-178, no. 1.17, 197-198, no. 1.29, 259, no. 1.91, 262-263, no. 1.95.

⁹ For example, A. Basilevsky was participated in the World Industrial Exhibitions held in Paris in 1865, 1867, and 1878.

1874 by Basilevski together with Alfred Darsel, noticed in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* “*Il n’est personne a Paris se piquant de gout ou s’interessant aux etudes d’art qui n’ait visite au moins une fois cette collection, qui n’ait rendu justice au soin qui a preside a sa formation, qui n’ait garde un sympathique souvenir de l’acceuil et de la courtoisie du proprietaire*” (*There is no one in Paris having any taste or interested in the study of art who has not made at least one visit to this collection, who has not done justice to the needs which determine his education, who does not have a warm (sympathetic) memory of the welcome and the courteousness of the owner*) (de Ris L. 1875, 103-104).

Notwithstanding the publication of this catalogue, Basilevski continued to enrich his collection with new purchases. He continued to add up the notes about new acquisitions on extra leaves inserted in his personal copy of the published catalogue. Later, this copy would serve as an official inventory book of the Basilevski collection during its purchase by the Hermitage in December of 1884. Today this copy is stored in the Museum archives. At the end of the 1870s Basilevski began to face health problems and slowed his activity in expanding his collection. In 1883 he decided to auction it off. In the end, however, he chose not to disperse it into various places, and agreed to sell it as a whole to the Russian Tsar Alexander III for the Imperial Hermitage museum. The transaction was completed in December of 1884 and in January of 1885 the boxes containing the objects arrived to Saint-Petersburg (Крыжановская 1986; Kryzhanovskaya 2006, 62-71). Many of the masterpieces of Byzantine art in this collection became a major part of the new Medieval and Renaissance Department in the Tsar’s Hermitage, which opened in 1888, after three years of preparation. The particular status of the Hermitage as the grand museum of Russia was an inspiration in forming the new Department, for the Tsars wanted the Hermitage to be on the same level as European Imperial museums, such as the Louvre, the British, the Berlin, and the Vienna ones. As a result, the new Medieval and Renaissance Department was founded as a part of this program.

It is through this new Department that objects of the Byzantine applied arts came to the Hermitage. And in its inception, the society’s influence, its interest to the history of man’s industry, and

the imperial ambitions of the Russian Tsar, were all combined as the forming parameters. The outcome was perfectly splendid. The new Department was housed in the ravishing double enfilade of the first floor, with the objects of art spanning over 20 rooms. Besides the Basilevski collection, the new Department received objects from the Arsenal in Tsarskoe Selo, where in addition to the arms of different peoples and from different periods, rarities such as gifts to the Russian Emperors, including ambassadorial ones, were also kept. A collection of Russian medieval objects, previously in the Numismatic Department, and the objects of Medieval and Renaissance art were transferred from several departments within the Hermitage. As a result, according to the guide written by Nikodim Kondakov, a prominent Russian Byzantinist and then-Senior Curator in the Hermitage, “*the new Department of the Imperial Hermitage grew to the same level as the Museum collections of the Louvre, Berlin, and Kensington (today the Victoria and Albert Museum - Yu.P.), while the other European collections of medieval art bear the cultural-historical and domestic or specifically local nature but not an artistic one*” (Кондаков 1891, 5). The new department possessed several thousand artifacts, and many showcases were overcrowded with the objects. This was especially true for jewelry and items that came from archaeological hoards. Weaponry, though solely exhibited for decorative purposes, obviously prevailed: even when the rooms were devoted to specific historical periods and countries, (as, for example, “Room of Italian Renaissance”, “Medieval Russia”, or “Oriental Room”), the weapons was always put on display. Several rooms exhibited objects of the same type of material or technique, for example, “The Room of Wood-Carving”, “The Room of Ivory Carving”, “The Room of Majolica”, or “The Room of Enamels”. In other rooms the exhibits had a common geographical origin, such as “Antiquities from the Caucasus”, “Antiquities from the ruins of Sarai, the capital of Golden Horde”, “Russian antiquities before the Mongolian invasion”. And only Room 13, “The Room of Christian antiquities of the first eight centuries of Common Era” was designed with a clearly expressed historical tendency. It should be noted though that the chronological principle here was not strictly kept up in Room 13, and the exposition included the Byzantine objects of the 10th-15th centuries and Russian hoards with cloisonné



Fig. 3. Vasilij Vereschagin. View of Basilevsky's gallery in Paris. Watercolor 1870. The State Hermitage museum.

enamels of the 10th-12th centuries. On the other hand, many objects of purely Byzantine art were displayed in the rooms of “Ivory carving”, “Wood carving”, and “Enamels”. Despite the lack of clear principles in designing the exposition, it's being overcrowded with objects, and the decorative concept underlying in their arrangement, which often was inconvenient for studying, the new department of the Hermitage made a strong impression on the public and on professionals due to the richness, the variety, and the high quality of the collections.

As we wrote, the new Department was housed in the ravishing double enfilade of the first floor, where the administrative offices of the Hermitage museum are currently located. As a parenthetical note in this context, it is relevant to remind the reader how a visitor to the Director's offices – or even to one of his deputies – becomes aware of a Byzantine aura of intrigue haunting these rooms, and recalls the time when the paragons of Byzantine art were exhibited in these spacious and elegant halls.



Fig. 4. View of the Hermitage gallery of Medieval and Renaissance art. Photo end of 19th c. The State Hermitage museum.

The Byzantine display and exhibitions in the Soviet Hermitage, 1917-1941

After the Russian Revolution of 1917 it was inevitable that many scholars and art historians sincerely adhered to the official propaganda and to such proclamations, as “Liberty, Parity, Friendship” and “We will create a new world”. Hence they attempted to realize their ideas and the “novel ideals” in new museums, exhibitions, and in reconstructions of former installations. These men thought that in Soviet Russia it would be possible to establish creative liberty and independence. Thus, when in 1922 the Hermitage collection was returned from its war-time location in Moscow, a special Byzantine department was organized and a large exhibition space was created for it.

In 1927 a special exhibition, entitled “*The Art of Byzantium and the Migration Period*,” was opened in eight rooms on the third floor (Мацулевич 1929), exactly above the enfilade, where, prior to the Revolution, the Medieval Department was located. This exhibition adhered to what we may call an “archeological” overtone, because most of the objects were part of hoards, or were found during excavations. One should bear in mind that, at that time, the Byzantine icons were not yet kept in the Hermitage. In spite of this, the exhibition was interesting and its ambient differed from the respective “Byzantine rooms” in the European museums, as well as from the Tsar’s Hermitage. One of the important results of this reconstruction was the publication of the famous book *Byzantinische Antike* by Leonid Matzulevich in 1929 (Matzulevich 1929).

Being a disciple of the greatest Russian Byzantinists Dmitry Ainalov and Nikodim Kondakov, Leonid Matzulevich (1886-1959) played the leading role in organizing the Byzantine department. He invested much energy in searching for objects of Byzantine and Old Russian art which he delivered to the Hermitage. Thanks to his active role, the Museum acquired ivories and other Byzantine items from Mikhail Botkin’s former collection (Мацулевич 1923, 35-49). Matzulevich also found fragments of Georgian silver and some cloisonné enamels that belonged to the mentioned collection (Maculevič 1925, 77-108). It should be mentioned in this context that, by preventing a great number of the Russian religious silver from being melted or sold abroad, Matzulevich surely saved it (Мацулевич 1922).



Fig. 5. Leonid Antonovich Matzulevich (1886-1959). Drawing by Ernest Lipgart 1919. The State Hermitage museum.

Unfortunately, not long after, Matzulevich’s work in the field of Byzantine art was cut short. There were several reasons for this. Firstly, Matzulevich, as a former officer of the Tsar’s army, was put on the list of the “elements alien toward the Soviets” and was even fired out from the Hermitage in 1930, though later he was re-hired. Secondly, Vladislav Ravdonikas, his colleague-archaeologist, wrote a letter to GPU-NKVD (the predecessor of KGB) where it was stated that Matzulevich promotes clerical views and studies religious art, which is harmful and needles for the Soviet society. It was a miracle that Matzulevich escaped repressions, but his students remember that until his last days, he kept a suitcase with all his essential belongings in the anteroom closet, ready to face arrest. It is interesting to note that Ravdonikas, who, like all scholars at the time, was afraid of being arrested, and solicitously kept a copy of his letter to the GPU-NKVD among the other documents of his personal archive. After his death, his archive was acquired by the Archives of the Academy of Science in Leningrad. During the 1980s, I worked in the Archives and as a staff member had the opportunity to read this defamatory letter. It may be assumed that Vladislav Ravdonikas was hoping that in a case of arrest, the letter and other similar documents would help him to demonstrate his loyalty to the Soviet regime. Indeed,

Ravdonikas's letter had its consequences: from the beginning of 1930s, Leonid Matzulevich, who began his career as a scholar by researching the Byzantine and Old Russian frescos, for many years almost completely withdrew himself from the study of the Byzantine monuments, especially those with a religious meaning¹⁰.

Yet there was also another serious reason that ended the work of Leonid Matzulevich as a Byzantinist. The Hermitage had a section designated to the "Muslim Orient", which was established in 1920, but was gradually broadened and reorganized until it grew in the huge Oriental Department. If in 1921 the Oriental collection consisted of seven thousand objects, in 1933 the department possessed 84 thousand of them, and in 1939 the collection numbered over 100 thousand items with an exposition occupying more than 80 rooms (Варшавский, Рест 1940, 219). Besides the objective grounds for establishing the Oriental department (i.e., the presence of Oriental regions in the structure of the USSR and international politics of the USSR), its richness played a major role in the tireless activity and international prestige of Josef Orbelli (1887-1961), an Orientalist, who was put in charge of the Oriental department and later, in 1934, became Director of the Hermitage. Using his prestige and authority, Josef Orbelli initiated the reorganization of the Hermitage structure in 1930, whereby the Byzantine Department was turned into a sub-section of the Oriental Department. As a consequence of these changes, there was no place for Leonid Matzulevich, the leading and most famous Byzantine expert in the Hermitage at the time. Matzulevich was on bad terms with Orbelli. It is a widely-known fact that the latter disliked well-mannered and elegant persons; they often were in his disfavor without any reason (Косинский 1995, 198). And Leonid Matzulevich was, in fact, a well-mannered and elegant man who dressed nattily. Besides that, Josef Orbelli could not forget that during his struggle with the former administration of the Hermitage, Matzulevich remained neutral. Matzulevich's removal from the Byzantine collections was simply a matter of personal vendetta.

In February 8, 1931 Alice Vladimirovna Bank (1906-1984), a pupil of the prominent Byzan-

tinist Vladimir Beneshevich, came to the Hermitage, and Josef Orbelli put her in charge of the Byzantine collection. Kurt Weitzmann, who visited the Hermitage in October 1932 wrote in his memoirs: *"The Byzantine Department had been dissolved, but all the objects were stored and well cared for. A young assistant, Alice Bank, got every ivory I asked for out of the storeroom except one, which was considered a forgery because it had come from the ill-famed Botkine collection. I insisted on seeing it and found that this ivory was as good as gold — a verdict she accepted. I developed a friendship with Alice Bank that survived the Nazi period and was revived after the war. I was lucky not only to see all the Greek manuscripts in the Public Library, but to be able to take my own photographs. The kind and helpful curator in charge there was Alice Bank's father"* (Weitzmann 1994, 74)¹¹.



Fig. 6. Alice Bank (1906-1984). Photo 1970-ies. The State Hermitage museum.

During the transfer process from the former Byzantine department to the new Oriental department, many Byzantine collections and archaeological assemblages, even the famous Pereshchepina treasury, were split between the

¹⁰ See the list of his article and books in: Банк 1960а, 373-378.

¹¹ See the list of his article and books in: Банк 1960а, 373-378.

two departments. According to Alice Bank, the Byzantine silver plates about which Matzulevich published a book in 1929, were taken by force from him by Josef Orbelli and brought to the Oriental department. Josef Orbelli was a remarkable person with an extremely dynamic temperament and a difficult "Oriental" personality. There are many negative stories regarding his activities in the Hermitage, but looking back at him today, we have to objectively admit that it is due to this man that the Hermitage and its collections have been preserved for us and the future generations. Thus the story of the Byzantine collection, a collection that only Orbelli was able to rescue from its selling at the auctions in the beginning of 1930s (when other masterpieces were dispersed by the four winds), is very telling.

The Second International Congress on Persian art took place in London in 1931 (from January 7th to February 28 of 1931). For the exhibition that accompanied the Congress (held in the Royal Academy of Art at Burlington House), art objects from the Soviet Union, including the famous masterpieces from the Hermitage museum, were sent for the first time. It is quite interesting that the catalogue lacked information on the museums' provenance of the exhibits, providing only the vague phrase "*Lent by the Soviet Union Government*". Among the items included in the catalogue were the gold Sasanian vessels from Pereshchepina, precious Indian items from the mission of Nadir Shah, the sword of Fath Ali Shah, two manuscripts, rare textiles and carpets, and ceramics (Catalogue 1931, 48, 54, 70, 85, 178, 192, 206, 229, 232, 296, 298). Beginning in the 1920s, the issue of selling of treasures from the Russian museums by the Bolsheviks was frequently discussed in the Western media, and the created impression was that nothing valuable was left in Russia. Hence the exhibited masterpieces from the Hermitage (for many objects in the 1931 exhibition were from the Hermitage collection) were a rather pleasant surprise to the Western audience. As a consequence, many newspapers reviews suggested that rumors about the sales were exaggerated. None the less, the Bolshevik officials accompanying the exhibits reacted differently to the interest presented in London with regard to Russian exhibits: they presented a great desire to organize the sale of the objects. As eye-witnesses recollect, the Bolshevik representatives often came to the visitors and right on the spot

offered them to buy the exhibited articles, and thus an idea of a sale organized in the premises of the Russian embassy emerged soon after the closing of the exhibition. All these actions produced a negative reaction in London, though some collectors, and even museums, would be interested in such a sale. These actions also caused enormous anxiety to Josef Orbelli, who used all his political and social connections, all his Oriental diplomacy, and even his famous stubbornness and no less famous reckless personality, in order to prevent sale and bring the objects back to Russia. Eventually, he was able to do so, but he soon understood that it was only a matter of time: if Western antiquarians became interested in the Hermitage oriental masterpieces, sooner or later the dealers would come for them in the Hermitage rooms.

Another international exhibition, devoted specifically to Byzantine art, took place in another capital city, Paris, from May 28 to July 9, 1931. This was the second Byzantine exhibition in the world (the first one was held in 1905 in Grottaferrata, Italy). Over 700 original items from the museums and church collections of France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Spain, Greece, Great Britain, Hungary, Holland, Italy, and the USA were brought together for this exhibition (Exposition 1931). It should be noted that the active role in organizing the exhibition was played by Georges Duthuit, Hayford Peirce and Royall Tyler, who contacted many private collectors and dealers for lending the objects. Hayford Peirce and Royall Tyler were friends and advisors of Robert and Mildred Woods Bliss, the prominent American collectors and founders of Dumbarton Oaks, the widely-known scholarly center in Washington. The Bliss's were members of the Honorable Committee of the Paris exhibition and, as it was noted in the catalogue, contributed both morally and financially to the project. Specifically, they donated \$1,000 for the organizational needs of the exhibition (Nelson 2005, 48). Mrs. Bliss also provided fifteen objects from her personal collection, including such masterpieces as a silver paten, an Egyptian wool tapestry, an ivory with Crucifixion, several necklaces (one with a Venus pendant among them), and part of a hoard found in 1910 at Piazza della Consolazione, Rome (Exposition 1931, nos. 90, 190 bis, 273, 339, 347, 367-369, 371-374, 410, 439, 562). The exhibition, besides being a great success that stimulated the antiquities market, caused an interest in American collectors of Byz-

antine art. Several of the outstanding objects exhibited in Paris were previously kept in different private collections and later became a part of Mr. and Mrs. Bliss' collection in Washington, which is now kept in Dumbarton Oaks¹².

The sensational success of the Paris Byzantine exhibition, and the activity on the antiquities market, made the Parisian dealers focus on the Byzantine collection in the Hermitage. Mention can be made that in Paris there were important cloisonné enamels exhibited from the former private Russian collections of Mikhail Botkin and Ivan Balashov, nationalized by the Bolsheviks after the revolution and in 1920s sold through German antiquarians (Exposition 1931, nos. 497, 504, 508, 512, 516-518). Thus, negotiations about the purchase of Byzantine objects from the Hermitage began between French dealers and the Russian firm "Antikvariat". An ironic fact in this context is that the French dealers were informed about the Byzantine antiquities from the deluxe, pre-revolutionary, multi-volume journal "Khudozhestvennye sokrovishcha Rossii" ("Art treasures of Russia"), which contained detailed descriptions of the best private and museum collections in Russia. Could the publishers of this journal, who created it "for the glory of Russia", think that their work would serve for the looting of art treasures of Russia? Could Aleksandr Basilevski foresee that, based on his catalogue published in 1874, the dealers of 1930s would select the best objects, and thus destroy the integrity of his collection? Thus, owing, in some degree, to two great international exhibitions of 1931, the Hermitage was in real jeopardy of losing its famous collections of Persian, Byzantine, and Western Medieval art. In this dangerous situation Josef Orbelli decided to appeal directly to Josef Stalin. He wrote him a letter explaining that the Hermitage already lost many masterpieces and that without the collections of Sasanian and Byzantine silver it cannot be considered as a world-class museum and a fact that would mean the end of the Hermitage. According to archival documents, only from 10 March 1928 to 10 October 1933, the Hermitage provided the

"Antikvariat" for overseas auctions the following numbers of art objects: 2.880 paintings, 16.489 items of Western European decorative art, 415 ancient gold ornaments, 3.763 drawings and etchings, 689 items of Chinese and Japanese porcelain and bronzes (Соломаха 2004, 178).

One should be reminded here that Stalin, by being a Georgian, was protective of Oriental culture. Thus, when Orbelli directed Stalin's attention to the improper auctions of the Hermitage masterpieces, the leader answered in a short letter: "*I order not to touch the objects from the Oriental department of the Hermitage*" (ЖУКОВ 2005, 126-127). As the reader understands, it was at that very moment that many items of different cultures and dates "became very important for the Oriental Department" and were moved there. In this situation, the liquidation of the separate Byzantine Department its becoming a part of the Oriental Department can be considered as a wise move, because it gave hope for the preservation of its collections from sales. Nevertheless, even the note from Stalin could not serve as a guarantee.

The French dealers' first attempt toward the disrobing of the Hermitage Byzantine treasures was targeted on the ivory triptych with the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia. This very choice on their part set the momentum and established a happy chance for the fortune of the Hermitage Byzantine collection. As was to be expected of Josef Orbelli, he declared that the triptych belongs to the Oriental culture, and, as was expected of the dealers, they didn't trust his opinion. After an active struggle between the Hermitage and the Soviet Antiquaries Authority, a special Commission of the Academy of Science was summoned to decide about the fortune of the triptych. Everybody at that moment understood that it was not just the fortune of this specific triptych, but that of the entire Byzantine Collection of the Hermitage that was at stake. The ensuing verdict of the Commission was firm and indisputable – "the triptych is connected with Oriental culture", – a fact that disgraced the dealers and discouraged them from repeating their attempts. But why did the scholars of the Commission come up with this verdict? As a matter of fact, the Byzantine ivory triptych with the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia, dated now to the late 10th-early 11th century, bears one interesting detail: the motifs decorating the shields of Sts Demetrios and Prokopios, as well as the sword of St Theodore

¹² Among these are: an enamel cross-reliquary from the former collection of Piotr Sevastianov, an ivory pyxis with musicians from the former Stroganoff collection, an Egyptian textile from the Sangiorgi, Rome, a sapphire cameo with a bust of Christ, an ivory with the Incredulity of Thomas from the Spitzer collection, and a silver and enamel icon frame from the Alphonse Kann collection (Ross 1962, 99-100; Ross 2005, 105-106, 109-110; Weitzmann 1972, 43-48, 77-82).

Stratelates, imitate Arabic Kufic script, hence the indisputable argument by the Commission of the Academy. So this minor detail, which we can consider as a secular realistic feature that crept into the religious icon-triptych, played a decisive role in the fate of the Byzantine collection of the Hermitage (Пятницкий 2003, 56-62).

Thus, as a result of reorganizing the curatorial departments of the Hermitage in 1930 and 1931, the main part of the Byzantine collection came into the Oriental Department. At that time, in 1930 and in 1934, the Byzantine and Greek icons from the State Russian Museum in Leningrad were transferred to the Hermitage, and were enlisted into the acquisitions of the Oriental Department. In 1931, Turkey handed the library and part of the museum's possessions of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople to Soviet Russia (as they had been requisitioned in 1914, after the First World War broke out). Thus, in the 1930s the Hermitage possessed a Byzantine collection, which was: a) absolutely unique, and b) the largest Byzantine collection in the world which comprised nearly all genres of Byzantine art. This fact would have been a good chance to introduce Byzantine art in all of its aspects, but it was not possible for political reasons, as well as for the religious content of the items. One should be reminded here that, while in Moscow and other places, Byzantine objects were removed from the museum displays and kept in storage, at least, the visitors to the Hermitage could see the Byzantine objects in the Oriental rooms. By using the political Imperial ambitions of the Soviet Union, the Hermitage scholars studied Byzantine art, although they had to stress its "Oriental look". This compulsory measure opened a new research direction, in which Soviet scholarship was a leader for many years. And it is this aspect that now is so popular in world scholarship.

It was precisely the Oriental Department of the Hermitage that in the 1930s led a most dynamic life, both scholarly and personal. It enjoyed a special privileged status, especially from 1934, when Joseph Orbelli became the Director of the Hermitage. In 1935, an exhibition organized in connection to the 3rd International Congress on Iranian art, became significant for the growth of the Department. It was at that time when the Oriental Department was expanded to eighty-four rooms. The majority of the items taken by Orbelli

from other museums for that temporary exhibition were not returned. They became part of the Hermitage's Oriental Department, and after the Iranian Congress, the "Oriental exhibition" (with little changes) became the permanent exhibition of the Hermitage. It occupied numerous rooms on the first, second and third floors of the Winter Palace. It should be emphasized here that, beginning in the 1930s, the Coptic collection of the Hermitage has always being a separate one from the Byzantine collection, as it forms part of the Egyptian collection. In 1940, before the World War II, four rooms devoted to "Byzantine Egypt" were situated on the first floor while the specific Byzantine rooms were located on the second floor. Here, the notion of "Byzantine" was neither presented as a reference to the whole empire, nor as a pointer to a great culture, and even the objects were not arranged in chronological sequence. The Byzantine objects dating to the 5th-7th centuries, mainly silver and ivories, were exhibited in a separate room, in the "Iran and Caucasus, from 6th century BC - to 8th century A.D." section. This section was followed by the "Near Asia from the Arab Conquests to the 15th century" display that included two small Byzantine rooms: "Culture and art of Byzantium in the 10th-15th centuries" and "Culture and art of Chersonese and Balkan countries in the 10th-15th centuries". Of course, emphasis was placed on the "Oriental aspect" of Byzantine art. Despite the magnificent collection of icons, only few of them were put on display: the two famous miniature-mosaics from the beginning of the 14th century, the icons of *Saint Gregory the Miracle Maker* and of an epistyle fragment with *St Philip, saints Theodore and Demetrius* (12th century), and also the famous *Christ Pantocrator with a Figure of the Donor* on the raised border (ca 1363). The term "culture of Balkan countries" referred to Bulgaria and Serbia, the art of which was opposed to proper Byzantine art. Chersonese was presented as an archaeological complex, and in order to arrange the "farming and fishing tools" in context, even "real soil" from the excavations was brought (Путеводитель 1940, 100-104; Путеводитель 1939, 135-142).

War and reinstallation of the Byzantine gallery in the Hermitage, 1941-1975

During World War II, from 1941 to 1945, the Byzantine collections were evacuated to Sverdlovks, in the Urals, and after their return to the Hermitage

it took several years for the sorting out and cataloguing of the items included in them. All the burdens of evacuating the objects, their safe return, and a new cataloguing fell on the shoulders of the curator of the Byzantine collection, Alice Bank. In Sverdlovsk, the boxes remained sealed and only sometimes were several of them opened selectively for the examination of the objects condition. It should be mentioned that despite the wartime hardships, the proper climate conditions were maintained in the storage room with the museum collections, as is evinced by the preserved daily charts. But the work conditions that prevailed upon the return of the collections to the Hermitage were not the most suitable. In this context, it suffices to mention that, for several years, while the special depository for the Byzantine icons was in the process of preparation, the icons were stored horizontally in former cabinets for linens, in the private apartments of the last Russian Emperor, Nicholas II, in the Winter Palace.

Finally, in 23 March 1956 the Byzantine Collection was opened to the public. Unfortunately, it occupied only two medium-size rooms and one small corridor on the third floor of the Winter Palace. As Alice Bank wrote in 1956, the Hermitage scholars “came to the conclusion that it is more appropriate to present the Byzantine materials independently, separately from the rooms designated for demonstration of cultures of the peoples of the Near and Middle East” (Банк 1956, 340). It has to be stressed that the renewed Byzantine exhibition of 1956 was placed in two rooms and the aisle was considered as a temporary installation. In an article about this exhibition Alice Bank wrote: “in the future, after the redesigning of certain rooms, according to the general plan of the Hermitage expositions, the Byzantine gallery will be placed in closest proximity to the Greek and Roman Classical Department, medieval Western European, Old Russian, and Italian art exhibitions” (Банк 1956, 340, прим. 1). Unfortunately, these plans have remained only “good intentions” and until today the Byzantine exposition continues to huddle in the same two rooms and corridor. In the installation of 1956, the corridor was designated for the fragments of sculpture and capitals. In the two following rooms, the exhibition was divided into three parts that corresponded with important chronological periods in Byzantine history. The first room was completely devoted to culture of

the 5th-7th centuries; the second room was divided into two parts, with objects of the 9th-12th centuries in one half and objects of the 13th-15th centuries in second. For all that, in both rooms materials were grouped according to certain “social” themes important for the understanding of Byzantine culture. This kind of arrangement of materials was an obligatory “contribution” to the “sociological” approach that dominated Soviet scholarship, including art history. Again, the exhibits’ Oriental aspect was the main consideration, although at that time such an emphasis was no longer necessary. Coptic items in these two rooms were presented only in one showcase, as Egypt was one of the eastern provinces of Byzantium. At the same time with the Byzantine rooms on the third floor, in another part of the Winter Palace, on the first floor, the special exhibition “Coptic Egypt”, a logical continuation of the Ancient and Greek and Roman period in Egypt, was opened (Матъе 1956, 348-351). It should be noted that Alice Bank constantly and persistently stressed the artistic and esthetic significance of the Byzantine collection, noted its high artistic quality and emphasized that the Hermitage “collections of early silver (6th-7th centuries) and icons are the best in the world”. In talking about the displaying of the “Byzantine culture” in the Hermitage, she repeated again and again that it should reveal “mainly the artistic culture”. Especially in those years, when the war and all its nightmares were left behind, Soviet scholars were full of optimism. Alice Bank was hoping that plans developed for the organization of the new enlarged and special Byzantine exhibition, as well as the creating of a separate Byzantine Department, would be materialized.

Yet, though this never happened, another important event occurred in 1958, when the international exhibition “*Masterpieces of Byzantine Art*” was organized in Great Britain. The exhibition was firstly held in Edinburgh, in connection with its International Festival, and later traveled to London. According to the exhibition catalogue, 247 objects from fourteen countries were lent for the show. The director of the Edinburgh Festival, Robert Ronsonby, noted in the preface to the catalogue that not all objects that the organizers of the exhibition would like to see on this show were possible to get: “some were too fragile, some too sacred, and in a few cases, notably with regard to Vienna,

local exhibitions or Festivals had take precedence. Nor, for reasons of cost, was it possible to borrow objects from the United States, where there are many important collections. But much has been assembled, and in some cases the objects are of exceptional interest, for they have never before been seen by any but those who have visited far distant collections, often not very easy to access; this is especially the case with the loans so generously sanctioned by Turkey, USSR and Yugoslavia" (Masterpieces 1958, 5). And though the works from the Turkish museums were never lent and exhibited, all objects promised by the Hermitage, including such fragile ones as the famous *Bishop Paternus* silver paten (491-518), painted icons of the 12th century, and a miniature mosaic icon of the beginning of the 14th century, were delivered. Thus in 1958, Byzantine artworks left the Hermitage and were shown for the first time in a big international exhibition devoted exclusively to Byzantium. This became possible, in the first place, due to friendly personal contacts between Professor David Talbot Rice and his Russian colleagues, Viktor Lazarev and Alice Bank in particular. It would not be an exaggeration to say that it is precisely the Edinburgh exhibition that initiated the numerous spectacular Byzantine "blockbusters" that continue to be active until the present day. The catalogue published in connection with the 1958 exhibition was not spectacular in the least, but the exhibition itself, unlike the many ones that followed, was an important landmark in the history of the study of Byzantine art throughout the world. It not only stimulated the public's interest in Byzantium, but also initiated numerous studies, on both general and specific areas of Byzantine art. It also stimulated a whole number of publications devoted to Byzantine art in general, and Byzantine and Russian icons in particular. After the Edinburgh exhibition icons became an essential part of all Byzantine exhibitions and a focus for research. They, to some degree, even arose as a distinct symbol of Byzantine art.

But how exactly the Edinburgh exhibition did influence the Hermitage? As early as two years after the exhibition, in 1960, Alice Bank published the album "Byzantine art in the Hermitage collection" (Банк 1960). At the same time she began to work on her biggest project, the album-catalogue "Byzantine Art in the Collections of the Soviet Union". The latter was published in 1966 in Russian, and during the 1970s-1980s was translated into many



Fig. 7. Exhibition "The Byzantine Art in the SSSR collections" in the Hermitage. Photo 1975. The State Hermitage museum.

languages and reprinted several times (Банк 1966; Банк 1978; Банк 1985). Also, after visiting the Edinburgh and London exhibitions in 1958, Alice Bank decided to make an exhibition of the Byzantine artifacts kept in the museums, libraries, and archives of the USSR. Seventeen years later her dream, the central and most cherished project of her life, took a material form.

Byzantine exhibition in Leningrad and Moscow, 1975-1977

The pivotal exhibition "Byzantine art in the USSR Collections", organized in 1975-1977 by Alice Bank, curator of Byzantine collection of the Hermitage and Professor of the present writer, played a very important role in the perception of Byzantine art in the Soviet Union. Though it was held in two cities (under the same title), Leningrad (Saint-Petersburg) and Moscow, it presented some differences in both its content and its organizing principles.

The Hermitage phase of the exhibition took place from 26 September 1975 to 8 February 1976. It gathered together 1400 items from different museums and libraries of the Soviet Union, as well as three objects lent by an East Berlin museum. It should be mentioned here that the Kiev museum did not send to Leningrad all the promised encaustic icons of the 6th-7th centuries, and museums in Georgia refused to take part in the exhibition at all. For this reason the famous Byzantine enamels were represented only by a few items coming from the Russian museums. The exhibition was based merely on the magnificent Byzantine collections of the Hermitage and on the manuscript collec-

tion of the State National Library (former Public Library) in St. Petersburg. The vast goal initially established by the organizers was almost impossible to achieve: “*firstly to show, as completely as possible, the development of Byzantine art in all its forms, during the entire time span of its existence, by comparing the contemporary works of painting (both icons and miniatures), plastic art, and all other types of decorative art, and at the same time revealing the diverse sources of Byzantine art, its connections with the countries of West and East*” (Банк, Шандровская 1979, 242). Despite this declaration, the Hermitage exhibition was not purely artistic in spirit, but it rather had a dual character. Numerous masterpieces of Byzantine art from the Russian museums and libraries, of course, set the tone of the show. But at the same time, a great number of items connected to the so-called “auxiliary branches of history”, i.e. epigraphs, weights, coins, and especially seals, farming tools, and all that usually goes under the definition of “every-day” articles, dominated and, quite frankly, interfered with the perception of the high style of Byzantine art. The years of Soviet power and Soviet scholarly style transpired clearly through the showcases of this exhibition, reflected in themes such as “the development of writing”, “symbolism and relics of the pagan cults”, “the monetary system”, and “the administrative structure of the Empire according to sigillographie”. All these vividly recall the propagandistic exhibitions of the 1930s. Alice Bank was the main organizer of this exhibition, but not the only one. She had to take into consideration the opinions of her colleagues, and sometimes, under pressure and against her will, she even had to concede to their whims. For instance, Byzantine seals were presented in a manner that was disproportionately excessive. Also, the curator of sigillographie declared that all lead seals should be treated as works of high art (Банк, Шандровская 1979, 242). Despite the above mentioned “special themes”, the main exhibition plan was made according to a chronological principle. It thus gave the possibility to define the three main stages in the development of Byzantine art¹³. Each period was represented by the most spectacular objects

¹³ The same principle of the three main periods in the development of Byzantine art lied in the basis of the remarkable exhibitions of the Metropolitan Museum of Art: “Age of Spirituality” 1966, “Glory of Byzantium” 1997, “Byzantium: Faith and Power” 2004.

that reflected the essence of that epoch. Hence, for the early period of the 4th-7th centuries it was Byzantine silver and ivory that set the tone. The mediaeval period of the 10th-12th centuries being the most multifaceted one, was represented by illuminated manuscripts, ivory, painted icons, silver, enamels, and sculpture, which were aligned together and supplemented each other. Most of the objects on display were of a very high quality. Of course, in the Palaiologan section (end of the 13th - middle of the 15th century) the icons set the tone. An entire gallery was devoted to these icons, and on its white walls, shining with bright colors and gold, they looked like real gems. This is due to Viktor Pavlov, Head Designer of the exhibition, whose display had been constructed very beautifully and logically. This was not an easy task to achieve, as the spaces designated for the exhibition were the Throne Hall and the adjoining narrow gallery of the Winter Palace. However, the ceremonial solemnity of the decoration of these rooms emphasized the imperial character of Byzantine art. It goes without saying that the organizers had no intention to compare the two empires, the Byzantine and the Russian, for these rooms usually were assigned to the large exhibitions during the 1970s, but this comparison occurred anyway.

Notwithstanding the methodological shortcomings, this Hermitage exhibition made a great impression on both the general public and the professionals. For the first time, the Soviet people were able to realize what the Byzantine Empire truly was, as the textbooks and encyclopedias usually devoted few pages to the issue, which were laden with the required quotes from Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The general public actually discovered Byzantium for itself, and specialists got an opportunity to compare works kept in various museums and cities. This exhibition also made a big impression on the present writer, a student of Leningrad University at the time, and the lectures that Alice Bank gave directly at the exhibition strengthened his desire to study Byzantine art.

In 1977 the exhibition was transferred to Moscow, in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts. It was held from April 26th to June 5th, that is, for a shorter period than in the Hermitage. However, in this phase, major changes had been made in its composition and structure. The section of illuminated manuscripts was greatly increased due to the con-

tributing libraries of Moscow and Kiev, whilst not all the manuscripts from the Leningrad libraries were included. The Kiev Art museum lent all of its four encaustic icons, in contrast to the only two given for the Hermitage show. Icons from the Trinity Sergius Lavra, and several others from the Moscow museums that had not been displayed in the Hermitage gave the opportunity to increase the icons' section as well. Coptic art was represented exclusively by the items from the rich collections of the Moscow museums. What is more, serious changes were made in the conception of the exhibition. As Alice Bank and Valentine Shandrovskaja wrote in their article, in Moscow *"the amount of archaeological materials decreased significantly, as well as the seals; coinage was not represented at all [...], the majority of historical and historically cultural themes were also excluded from the exposition. [...] In some sections, the esthetic aspect prevailed over the historical one: it was reflected, for example, in the display of works of applied art where the chronological principle was not maintained"* (Банк, Шандровская 1979, 248). Meanwhile, they had to admit that in Moscow *"the painting exposition won significantly. Manuscripts with miniatures and decoration, gathered with an exclusive fullness, gave the opportunity to show not only the development of this type of art in this chronological span but also to present various stylistic directions as well[...] To some degree, the different stylistic groups became appreciable as well in the icon-painting"* (Банк, Шандровская 1979, 248).

In the context of what is said above, it is interesting to note the differences in the methodological approach of studying Byzantine and Russian art between the St. Petersburg and the Moscow schools, the existence of which can be traced as far back as the 19th century. The St. Petersburg school has always been more rational, i.e. academic, while the Moscow school preferred the aesthetical, and often aesthetic (i.e. the more literary, verging even to the journalistic) approach. These two trends continue to persist even today, and it is precisely these tendencies that are reflected in the manner of presenting Byzantine art in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg, on the one hand, and the museums of Moscow, on the other. Of course, in par with these broader, historical foundations, there exist narrower reasons, which

are personal. Olga Popova, for instance, a Professor of Moscow University, took an active part in the 1977 Moscow exhibition. As a specialist in the history of Byzantine painting, she was more interested in illuminated manuscripts and icons. This is why manuscripts and icons dominated the Moscow show. In Saint-Petersburg, Alice Bank, a specialist in Byzantine applied art, was in charge of the show, and thus applied art was more accentuated in the Hermitage exhibition. Besides that, all burden of the Hermitage tradition of "historical", "economic", and "sociological" presentation of Byzantine objects that we mentioned above, played its own leading role. To this effect should also be added the abnormal ambitions of the Hermitage curators of coinage, and especially so of the sigillographic collections.

It is quite an inopportune fact that press reviews were scarce for this so important exhibition, due to the religious aspect of Byzantine art (a fact that, for obvious reasons, rendered the State uncomfortable). In addition, the exhibition catalogue, published on low-quality paper, included poor black-and-white illustrations and a limited entries text in Russian (Искусство Византии 1977). But the fact that this exhibition marked an important phase in the development of Byzantine studies in Russia should not be underestimated. In particular, the Institute of the Academy of Science, along with reputable journals and publishing houses, began to pay more attention to Byzantine art. What is more, this exhibition influenced the European "exhibition politics" as well. Indeed, the organizers' goal in this fundamental exhibition was to present the Byzantine collections in the Soviet Union to their maximum extent. It is therefore hard to refute that this exhibition became a blueprint and a catalyst for several, and fundamental ones at that that followed in Europe, such as "Splendori di Bisanzio. Testimoniazze e riflessi d'arte e cultura Bizantina nelle chiese d'Italia" (Ravenna, 1990), "Byzance. L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques francaises" (Paris, 1992), "Byzantium. Treasures of Byzantine Art and culture from British Collections" (London, 1994), "Byzantium. Late Antique and Byzantine art in Scandinavian collections" (Copenhagen, 1996).

Kurt Weitzmann, who was invited to the Byzantine conference in the Hermitage in 1975 and visited the Hermitage exhibition, wrote: *"The*

exhibition included, in addition to the vast holdings of Byzantine art owned by the Hermitage proper, practically every important Byzantine monument in other Russian museums. In addition to the famous gold and silver treasures of the Hermitage, it was especially rich in illustrated manuscripts and icons" (Weitzmann 1994, 475). The same great scholar, in his book about the St Peter icon in Dumbarton Oaks, also mentioned the Russian exhibitions in 1975-77: "After Athens [exhibition of 1964 - P.Yu.], no major exhibition of Byzantine art could be mounted without giving icon painting its proper place; this became clear in the exhibition held in Leningrad and Moscow from 1975 to 1977. Here, most sensibly; their large selection of icons was not exhibited and discussed as a separate section but was integrated into the development of Byzantine art as a whole, thereby making the icon's impact felt all the more" (Weitzmann 1983, 6).

The great success that this exhibition had in Leningrad and Moscow in 1975-1977 opened the door for publications on Byzantine subjects, as well as for the display of Byzantine religious objects in the Russian museum rooms. As a result, the Byzantine exposition in the Hermitage was fully renovated, and 25 icons were included in it. The objects were to be displayed in chronological order and arranged by regions, but unfortunately, no new rooms were added to accommodate the augmented exhibits.

Byzantine exhibitions in the Hermitage museum in 1990-ies

Besides the Leningrad and Moscow exhibition, the outstanding success of the Metropolitan Museum show *The Glory of Byzantium* in 1997 (curators Helen Evans and William Wixom) inspired Byzantine exhibitions in different countries, and made the "Byzantium" theme popular. It also had an influence on the Hermitage, which also had exhibitions and publications with regard to Byzantine studies since the end of the 1980s. Hermitage exhibitions had some impact, but they did not have the resonance of the one organized by the Metropolitan Museum.

For example, in 1991, the Hermitage, in connection with the Moscow Byzantine Congress, organized the exhibition "*Byzantium and Byzantine traditions*", in which, for the first time, emphasis was given on the art of the different regions of the

Orthodox East during the Byzantine and post-Byzantine periods (Византия 1991). Subsequently, this theme was developed on the very important exhibition "*Christians in the Holy Land: The Art of the Melchites and Other Denominations of the Orthodox Church*", 1998. As Mikhail Piotrovsky, the director of the Hermitage, said in his article for the catalogue, "*The exhibition displays works from the communities of the Melchites, Monophysites and Nestorians thus making a valuable contribution to our new cultural reality as fewer members of the public than should be the case are aware of these communities. The attempt to arrange exhibits from the Christian medieval culture according to the principle of their associations with different currents of Christianity may arouse a manifold protest, not only in principle, but in relation to many particular cases. The task is very complicated, often an impossible one, but such a classification helps us not only to see different facets of the Christian culture of the East. It also helps us to perceive the material incarnation of abstract theological disputes, which, notwithstanding their abstruseness, remain close to the hearts of thousands of people. The exhibition therefore is not an exercise in didacticism, but comprises historical and cultural research. The public is presented with the problem, various solutions are put forth, and the spectator is invited to participate in the discussion*" (Christian 1998, 11). Consequent with the above mentioned exhibition was the one entitled "Pilgrim Treasures from the Hermitage. Byzantium-Jerusalem," (Amsterdam, October 1, 2005 to March 26, 2006), which was weaved on the subject of Pilgrimage Art, an essential aspect of the art of the Holy Land (Pilgrim treasures 2005).

Athos subject exhibitions, 1992-2006

In 1992 the Hermitage exhibited for the first time its excellent icons from Mount Athos, which had been kept in storage for many decades. Thus, thanks to this extraordinary collection, many of the general aspects pertaining to the art of the Holy Mountain through several centuries were demonstrated (Афонские древности 1992). Admittedly, this exhibition was ahead of its time and some Russian scholars were not ready to fully embrace the material and the issues raised by the arts of Mount Athos. However, the acceptance of this enterprise outside Russia was quite different, especially in Greece, where the modest Hermit-

age catalogue has been systematically cited in scholarly texts¹⁴.

In August 17, 2006 a large exhibition devoted to the art of Mount Athos was opened in Helsinki, Finland (Athos 2006). It was initially inspired by the Mount Athos exhibition which was held in Thessalonica, in 1997 (Treasures 1997)¹⁵. To be sure, the idea of organizing an exhibition devoted to the Orthodox monasteries of Mount Athos by the Helsinki City Art Museum, where the participants were the Mount Athos monasteries and the most important museums of Europe, seemed quite adventurous¹⁶. Moreover, the objects from the Athonite monasteries had been lent only on rare occasions, even to world-class museums. Thanks to the Greek scholars, the organizers of the Finnish exhibition learned about the 1992 Hermitage exhibition. The main organizer of the Helsinki exhibition, Dr. Berndt Arell (Director of the Helsinki City Art Museum at that time) was very successful in persuading both the Athonite monasteries and foreign museums to lend objects for the exhibition. And it was due to his efforts that the Hermitage lent its rare Athonite icons.

Eventually, the Hermitage decided to seize the opportunity to display icons that are usually kept in storage in an international exhibition and to include them in the high-quality catalogue that was published on the occasion. This leaving the permanent display intact, except for two masterpieces sent out to this momentous exhibition. Other important reasons that led to this decision were the appealing, honest enthusiasm of the Finnish colleagues, Helsinki's proximity to St. Petersburg (which assured a safe transportation of the objects), the similar climate and the non-commercial nature of the enterprise.

¹⁴ Twelve years later, in 2004, the Moscow museums with the Greek Embassy's financial support, emulating the Hermitage's experience, organized a similar exhibition devoted to Mount Athos. I regret to say that the icons exhibited, with a few exceptions, were of a poor quality in general, and the manner of presentation was less informative with relation to the history of art (Древности 2004).

¹⁵ Thanks to the Greek scholars, the organizers of the Finnish exhibition learned about the 1992 Hermitage exhibition and put all their effort into making the Hermitage participate and lend its masterful Athonite icons.

¹⁶ The Orthodox population of Finland comprises only 1.2% (ca 60.000) of the populace. Besides, neither Dr. Arell (the exhibition's curator), nor his assistant Mikko Oranen (the exhibition's coordinator) were specialists in Byzantine art and culture.

Altogether, the Hermitage provided forty icons and frescoes from different periods, and one photographic album of the 19th century; among the icons there were several unique ones dating to the 12th-15th centuries that many world's great museums would be happy to have in their collections. In return, the Finnish colleagues offered us the opportunity to include in the catalogue extensive descriptions of the Hermitage items, many of which were being introduced to the scholarly community for the first time. Furthermore, the Hermitage objects were allocated to a privileged space, thus forming a self-contained, core exhibition within the broader one.

In the Helsinki exhibition approximately 5.000 objects of different nature and periods were displayed. Among them were many rare and unique artifacts, and even acknowledged masterpieces¹⁷. The exhibition lasted from August 18 2006 to January 21 2007, and had 100,000 visitors¹⁸. And though specialists in Byzantine art and strict critics may have found certain shortcomings in both the exhibition and its accompanying catalogue, these are all mitigated when one bears in mind the hugely positive and sincere interest in the monastic life of Mount Athos which was coaxed out by this particular event. In addition to this, one should not underestimate the exhibition's huge educational significance for the cultural and religious life of not only Finland, but of the neighboring Scandinavian and Russian countries as well – suffice it to mention in this context that numerous groups of tourists from the mentioned regions visited Helsinki to see specifically this exhibition.

***Sinai, Byzantium and Russia* exhibition in the Hermitage, 2000**

When the Jubilee of Christianity was celebrated in the year 2000, the Hermitage organized the grand show *Sinai, Byzantium and Russia* with more than 790 Byzantine, Post-Byzantine, Georgian and Old Russian beautiful objects, including ten unique icons from the Sinai monastery. The concept underlying this exhibition was multi-faceted, with the main focus being on the Great Empires – Byzantium and Russia. While this project was a new concept for much of the Hermitage's

¹⁷ The exhibition occupied two floors of the vast Tennis Palace located in the center of the Helsinki.

¹⁸ The fact is remarkable, considering that the whole population of Finland consists of 5 million people and half a million live in Helsinki.



Fig. 8. Exhibition "Sinai, Byzantium and Russia" in the Hermitage. Photo 2000. The State Hermitage museum.

staff, and thus required an immense effort, the exhibition was a great success, with more than 548,000 people visiting the show over its three-month run.

It was an idea of Michael Piotrovsky, Director of the Hermitage and member of the Saint Catherine Foundation, London¹⁹, to organize an exhibition devoted to the Sinai Monastery. Notwithstanding the fact that the Hermitage does not possess objects originating from Sinai, and it has only a few items that could be connected to the history of Sinai and the Saint Catherine Monastery, the present author offered to make the *imperial patronage to the St. Catherine Monastery* as the principal idea for the future exhibition: the Monastery was founded in the 6th century by the Byzantine Emperor Justinian and continued to be

supported by successive Byzantine emperors and Russian tsars. This approach gave the possibility to show the extensive collections of Byzantine and Russian religious art kept in the Hermitage. Thus the main direction and title of the exhibition were defined as "*Sinai, Byzantium and Russia: Orthodox Art from the Sixth to the Twentieth century*". During its preparation, the initial plan went through some changes. More specifically, by request from the Synaxis of the Sinai Monastery, the objects taken (allegedly stolen) from the Monastery by Bishop Porfiry Uspensky in the 19th century were excluded from the project. These are encaustic icons that are now kept in Kiev and the fragments of Sinai manuscripts from the National Library in Saint-Petersburg. In return, the Monastery agreed to lend for the exhibition ten unique icons and the *Chrysobull* (edict with a golden hanging seal) of the Russian tsar Michael Romanov. It was exactly these Sinai items which served as a bridge between the Byzantine and Russian sections of the exhibition. In this exhibition, practically all Hermitage departments participated and forty-five curators gave objects from the collections under their charge. "Imperial regime of patronage" dictated the selection of objects: they had to be of a high artistic quality

¹⁹ The Saint Catherine Foundation is a UK-registered charity established in 1996 under the royal patronage of HRH The Prince of Wales as Royal Patron. The foundation supports conservation work at Saint Catherine's monastery, Mount Sinai, Egypt. The monastery's Library is the present focus of conservation activities. The monastery's immediate conservation needs have been defined in conjunction both with the monks and with conservation experts in Egypt, Greece and at the London Institute's Camberwell College of Arts. The Foundation is presently raising funds for the conservation of the manuscript collection, comprising some 4.500 early books and scrolls.



Fig. 9. Opening of the exhibition "Sinai, Byzantium and Russia" in the Hermitage: Damianos, archbishop of Sinai; Vladimir archbishop of St. Petersburg; Yuri Pyatnitsky, curator of this exhibition. Photo 2000. The State Hermitage museum.

and connected to the tsar's family. Included were all best objects from the Byzantine collection of the Hermitage. Besides the famous masterpieces, well known from the publications by Alice Bank and the catalogue of 1975-1977 exhibition, a number of the Byzantine objects from storage-rooms were displayed and properly published for the first time. Such were, for example, gold crosses, earrings and colts of the 6th century, silver buckles of the 6th century, a gold medallion with Virgin and child in bust made by niello of the 7th century, a cameo with Virgin *Platytera* of the 12th century, a silver Eucharist bowl, ca. 1200 (it was purchased especially for the exhibition), gold chrysobulls of the 9th-14th centuries, and several dozens of Greek icons of the 6th-17th centuries.

A separate section of the exhibition was devoted to art of medieval Georgia, the tsars of which, as is well known, were also benefactors of the Sinai Monastery. The Hermitage has a small collection of Georgian art, of which the scholars are most familiar with the illuminated manuscripts. It was known that the collection also includes silver fragments of icons and crosses but no one assumed that they happened to be the fragments of such

masterpieces of Georgian art as the 11th-century icon of Virgin *Eleousa* from Zarzma, the frame of the famous 12th-century Transfiguration icon, or the Archangel icons from Dzumati dating to the 12th and 14th (?) centuries. As one of the prominent Hermitage scholars, the late Boris Marshak, noted, thanks to this exhibition the Georgian collection of the Hermitage finally gained its real significance. And this is true. As one of the positive outcomes of the rediscovery of the Georgian collection we should mention in this context the new permanent installation devoted to the art of Georgia and Armenia, which opened to the public in 2006, as well as the complete catalogue of the collections by their curator Alvida Mirzoian.

Similar "rediscoveries" of objects that had never been exhibited before, rarely published, or little known even to the specialists, took place in the "Russian section" of the exhibition as well. To mold this section was both an easy and a difficult task. It was easy because many items belonged to Russian tsars and amply manifested the idea of the imperial patronage to Christian Orthodoxy. On the other hand, it was difficult because firstly their number is immense, and secondly, because



Fig. 10. Exhibition “Sinai, Byzantium and Russia” in the Hermitage. Photo 2000. The State Hermitage museum.

while we intended to show the style of the epoch fairly, in the 19th - beginning of the 20th century the taste of Russian tsars and the overall level of religious art quite often fell short of being great.

The accompanying catalogue included all the exhibits, many of them published for the first time, and, admittedly, it was one of the first Hermitage catalogues compiled and published on such a high level, both scholarly and typographic, and issued in two languages, Russian and English (Pyatnitsky and al. 2000). This was made possible by the support and the participation of the St. Catherine Foundation of London. Working on the exhibition, I was concerned about the negative reactions of the future visitors, since many items of Russian religious art came to the museum from closed and ravaged churches. However, the exhibition's design, the space of the Great Cathedral of the Winter Palace, where it was displayed, and its conception and careful selection of the objects, created an extraordinarily harmonious atmosphere, characterized by a high artistic, aesthetic, and spiritual level. There is no doubt that the icons brought from the *most ancient* – in terms of its *uninterrupted* liturgical practice – Monastery of St Catherine at Mount Sinai, played an important role in contributing to this effect. As a result, all

reviews were highly appreciative (Cutler 2001, 163-164; Weyl Carr 2002; Walter 2004, 174-175), and the exhibition received an up-to-now, unheard-off positive response from all levels of the Russian society (Galich 2006, 200-204).

The mentioned exhibition and its catalogue made a significant influence on Russian scholars. However, I regret to point out that many Muscovite colleagues did not want to acknowledge this fact. As a paradigm of this biased attitude, I refer to Olga Etinghof's book on Byzantine icons of the 6th-13th centuries in Russia (ЭТИНГОФ 2005), where the catalogue of the Hermitage exhibition is not only cited on almost every page, but there are also many instances of direct and blatant plagiarism of the original text written by the Hermitage scholars.

One further positive result of the exhibition *Sinai, Byzantium and Russia* was that the administration of the Hermitage fully understood – at long last! – how unique the Byzantine collection is in our museum, so that now the Collection is considered of the same importance as the Scythian gold, the collection of Rembrandts, and of the Impressionists. As a concomitance, recently, the Byzantine Icon Room was fully renovated, and



Fig. 11. Exhibition “Sinai, Byzantium and Russia” in the Hermitage. Photo 2000. The State Hermitage museum.

it is scheduled that in the near future the rest of the rooms devoted to the Byzantine artifacts will follow suit (Галич 2004, 99; ПЯТНИЦКИЙ 2005, 126-129). What is more, one additional room – at least – will be created in order to include the art of the Palaiologan period.

Conclusion

Indisputably, due to the successful Byzantine exhibition policy of the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg, to the great success of the two recent Metropolitan Museum exhibitions (“The Glory of Byzantium” and “Byzantium: Faith and Power”), and to the shows that these inspired in other museums throughout the world, a new, attractive and multifaceted image of the arts of the “Lost Byzantine Empire” is being created.

It would be appropriate to end this article on such an optimistic note. However, we are obliged to be objective and to mention negative aspects accompanying the successful museum exhibitions. Although each successful exhibition enterprise attracts a business interest, there is nothing wrong with museum exhibitions, when, besides their noble educational and scholarly goals, they also bring in a financial profit for the

organizing museum. On the other hand, seriously negative events occur when an exhibition is driven primarily by business objectives. There seems to be the opinion that it is very easy to make a successful exhibition: get as many masterpieces as possible, create a flamboyant, showy design, and, as one of the attributes of success, publish a thick, large-format catalogue with color illustrations. Those who think in such a way forget about the hard work of curators and other museum personnel who normally spend several years in organizing an exhibition, thoroughly deliberating on, and weaving all its minute details. Such a preparatory work is usually not obvious to the visitors, which is as it should be. Nevertheless, it is precisely during the course of this preparatory work, when curators put aside their quiet lives, and, sometimes, – even while they are dreaming – they continue to muse about the conception and the details of a future exposition, when the foundation on which the exhibition’s success lays is built. And an important part of this work is of course not to focus on success, but on succeeding in communicating the new information, the new knowledge of the past, that the exhibitions encapsulate.

The business-driven mentality, on the contrary, focuses solely upon the success of an exhibition and upon receiving from it some direct profit. "Exhibition businessmen," as it was mentioned above, associate the warranty of success with elaborate interior design, the surplus of masterpieces, and provocative facts in press reviews. And quite often this model works. The Royal Academy of Arts in London is especially well-known for this kind of exhibition mentality, and it has already begun exporting its methods of commercialism abroad. This fact is clearly demonstrated by the disreputable exhibition of modern art – "USA Today" – held at the Hermitage, Saint-Petersburg in 2007, which was made with the support of Sir Norman Rosenthal of the Royal Academy and Charles Saatchi, a notorious commercial dealer. Works employing faeces, sperm, and blood were displayed at the show as representative masterpieces of contemporary American art (USA Today 2007; 82-83, 136-137). It is unlikely that this kind of import brought any harm to art, not taking into account the reputation of the State Hermitage Museum. It is another matter entirely when world-class masterpieces have been moved for commercial exhibitions. The profit-chasing, exhibition businessmen demand the most famous pieces, often extremely fragile or, depending on their condition, unsuitable for transportation at all. With all this, art-businessmen do not think about the consequences for the works of art, but rather think about their own glorification and riches. Unfortunately, quite often they find methods to achieve their aims and in the end they get the masterpieces they want. We are talking not only about out and out bribes; there are many other ways to achieve their goals. As a result, activities of this kind of art-businessman (and it is with great regret that we have to add a number of our compatriot colleagues/scholars to this category) corrupt the museum administration and curators. Owing to this ill kind of business, corruption of various types and aspects, both direct and hidden, destroys as one mighty virus the souls and minds of museum personnel and the initially noble goals of every museum.

Successful exhibitions, as for example, the "*Gloria of Byzantium*" and "*Byzantium: Faith and Power*" at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and

"*Sinai, Byzantium and Russia*" at the Hermitage, did not summon the feeling of awe alone. The museum and scholarly world is very complex and nothing human is foreign to it. Success often provokes envy. There are scholars who wish to be the chief curators of sensationally successful shows; they want to loom large in society and enjoy seeing their names on the title page of a catalogue. But they do not wish or are incapable of performing the crucial, preparatory work, over many years. Instead, they slip into the same mold as the exhibit businessmen, in reiterating their demand for "as many masterpieces as possible". These scholars use similar methods and live according to the maxim: "The ends justify the means". And these ends are their excessive personal ambitions.

What kind of conclusion can we draw from all what is expounded above? Should museums abandon the practice of large international exhibition projects? Of course not! Great and serious exhibitions are necessary; exhibitions with an earnest and deep concept can open new pages in the *Book of World Culture* for the general public, and bring new perspectives into the understanding of culture and history. There is a necessity for that kind of blockbuster as the Byzantine exhibitions at the Metropolitan Museum of Art just mentioned, which (let us be fair about it) moved Byzantine studies forward. There is a necessity in that kind of Byzantine exhibition as the ones made by the State Hermitage Museum described in this article. They open the treasures of the museum collections, making the numerous items kept in storage available for both the general public and specialists. However, when starting a new project, we have to realize clearly the huge amount of work involved. Successful exhibitions cannot be cooked as quickly as a Russian pancake. While forming an exhibition and asking for fragile and unique objects, we must act professionally and put aside personal ambitions and petty desires, and consider the enormous responsibility towards future generations. Surely, the Communist leader Vladimir Lenin was right when he wrote that "*an individual cannot live in society and be free from society*". Yet one must add: an individual forms society by his moral actions and attitude.

Bibliography

- Афонские древности 1992:** Афонские древности. Каталог выставки из фондов Эрмитажа (Санкт-Петербург 1992).
- Банк 1956:** А.В. Банк, Выставка византийских материалов в Государственном Эрмитаже. Византийский Временник XI, 1956, 340-348.
- Банк 1960:** А.В. Банк, Искусство Византии в собрании Государственного Эрмитажа (Ленинград: Издательство Государственного Эрмитажа 1960).
- Банк 1960а:** А.В. Банк, Леонид Антонович Мацулевич. Некролог. Византийский Временник XVII, 1960, 373-378.
- Банк 1966:** А.В. Банк, Византийское искусство в собраниях Советского Союза (Ленинград/Москва 1966).
- Банк, Шандровская 1979:** А.В. Банк, В.С. Шандровская, Выставка «Искусство Византии в собраниях Советского Союза». Византийский Временник XI, 1979, 242-248.
- Варшавский, Рест 1940:** С. Варшавский, В. Рест, Эрмитаж: 1764-1939. Очерки из истории Государственного Эрмитажа (Ленинград 1940).
- Византия 1991:** Византия и византийские традиции. Памятники из фондов Эрмитажа и Русского музея. Путеводитель по выставке (Ленинград 1991).
- Византия, Балканы, Русь 1991:** Византия, Балканы, Русь. Иконы конца XIII - первой половины XV века. [Каталог выставки] (Москва 1991).
- Галич 2004:** Т.И. Галич, Мнение социолога. Ежегодный отчет Государственного Эрмитажа, 2003 (Санкт-Петербург 2004), 99.
- Довгалло 1995:** Г.И. Довгалло, СобираТЕЛЬСКАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ П.И. СЕВАСТЬЯНОВА (по материалам его личного архива). В сб.: Древнерусское искусство. Балканы. Русь. (Санкт-Петербург 1995), 242-256.
- Древности 2004:** Древности монастырей Афона X-XVII веков в России: из музеев, библиотек, архивов Москвы и Подмосковья. Каталог выставки (Москва: Северный паломник 2004).
- Жуков 2005:** Ю. Жуков, Сталин. Операция Эрмитаж (Москва 2005).
- Искусство Византии 1977:** Искусство Византии в собраниях СССР. Каталог выставки. Тома 1-3 (Москва 1977).
- Кондаков 1891:** Н.П. Кондаков, Императорский Эрмитаж. Указатель Отделения Средних веков и Эпохи Возрождения (Санкт-Петербург 1891).
- Косинский 1995:** М.Ф. Косинский, Первая половина века. Воспоминания (Paris: YMCA-Presss 1995).
- Крыжановская 1986:** М.Я. Крыжановская, Западноевропейское прикладное искусство Средних веков и эпохи Возрождения из коллекции А.П. Базилевского. Каталог выставки (Ленинград 1986).
- Матье 1956:** М.Э. Матье, Экспозиция памятников культуры и искусства Коптского Египта в Государственном Эрмитаже. Византийский Временник XI, 1956, 348-351.
- Мацулевич 1922:** Л.А. Мацулевич, Временная выставка церковной старины. Государственный Эрмитаж (Петроград 1922).
- Мацулевич 1923:** Л.А. Мацулевич, Византийские резные кости собрания М.П. Боткина. В сб.: Сборник статей Государственного Эрмитажа, вып. 2 (Петроград 1923), 35-49.
- Мацулевич 1929:** Л.А. Мацулевич, Византия и эпоха Великого переселения народов. Краткий путеводитель (Ленинград 1929).
- Путеводитель 1939:** Государственный Эрмитаж. Путеводитель по залам Отдела Востока (Ленинград 1939).
- Путеводитель 1940:** Государственный Эрмитаж. Общий путеводитель. Выпуск 1 (Ленинград 1940).
- Пятницкий 1988:** Ю.А. Пятницкий, О происхождении некоторых икон из собрания Эрмитажа. В сб.: (под ред. А. Банк и В. Луконина) Восточное Средиземноморье и Кавказ IV-XVI вв. Сборник статей (Ленинград 1988), 126-131.
- Пятницкий 1992:** Ю.А. Пятницкий, Памятники с Афона в собрании Эрмитажа. В: Афонские древности. Каталог выставки из фондов Эрмитажа (Санкт-Петербург 1992), 17-22.
- Пятницкий 1995:** Ю.А. Пятницкий, Происхождение икон с Афона из собрания П.И. Севастьянова. В сб.: Сообщения Государственного Эрмитажа, том LIII (Санкт-Петербург 1995), 42-44.
- Пятницкий 2003:** Ю.А. Пятницкий, Почему большинство византийских икон хранится в фондах Эрмитажа. В сб.: Эрмитажные чтения памяти Б.Б. Пиотровского (Санкт-Петербург 2003), 56-62.
- Пятницкий 2005:** Ю.А. Пятницкий, Византийское искусство X-XV веков в Эрмитаже. В сб.: Сообщения Государственного Эрмитажа, том LXIII (Санкт-Петербург 2005), 126-129.

- Русский 1859:** Русский художественный листок № 8. 8 февраля 1859 г.
- Севастьянов 1859:** П.И. Севастьянов, О светописи в отношении к археологии. В сб.: Известия Императорского русского археологического общества, том I, вып. 5 (Санкт-Петербург 1859), столбцы 257-261.
- Соломаха 2004:** Е.Ю. Соломаха, О «спецсредствах» Эрмитажа. К истории распродаж в 1920-1930-ых годах. В сб.: Сообщения Государственного Эрмитажа, том LXII (Санкт-Петербург 2004), 173-178.
- Срезневский 1858:** И.И. Срезневский, Записка о фотографических снимках П.И. Севастьянова. В сб.: Известия Императорской Академии наук по Отделению русского языка и словесности, том 7, вып. 1 (Санкт-Петербург 1858), 367-370.
- Шевырев 1859:** С.И. Шевырев, Афонские иконы византийского стиля в живописных снимках, привезенных в Санкт Петербург П.И. Севастьяновым (Санкт-Петербург 1859).
- Этингоф 2005:** О. Этингоф, Византийские иконы VI - первой половины XIII веков в России (Москва: Индрик 2005).
- Athos 2006:** Athos. Monastic Life on The Holy Mountain. [Exhibition catalogue]. Helsinki city Art Museum, Art Museum Tennis Palace (Helsinki: Maahenki Ltd 2006).
- Bank 1978:** A. Bank, Byzantine Art in the Collections of Soviet Museums (Leningrad/New-York 1978).
- Bank 1985:** A. Bank, Byzantine Art in the Collections of Soviet Museums (enlarged) (Leningrad 1985).
- Catalogue 1931:** Catalogue of the International exhibition of Persian Art (London 1931).
- Christian 1998:** Christian in the Holy Land. The Art of the Melchites and other denominations of Orthodox Church (Saint-Petersburg: Slavia 1998).
- Cutler 2001:** A. Cutler, Review. Burlington Magazine, volume CXLIII, 2001, 163-164.
- Darsel, Basilewsky 1874:** A. Darsel, A. Basilewsky, Collection Basilewsky: Catalogue raisonné (Paris 1874).
- Didron 1861:** A. Didron, Expédition archéologique au Mont Athos. In: Annales Archéologiques, tome 21 (Paris 1861), 173-183.
- Encyclopedia 2008:** Encyclopedia of nineteenth-century photography (ed. J. Hannavy), 2 vol (New York: Taylor & Francis Group 2008).
- Etingof 2000:** O. Etinghof, Pyotr Ivanovich Sevastianov and his activity in collecting Byzantine objects in Russia. In: (Eds. Robin Cormac and Elisabeth Jeffreys) Through the Looking glass: Byzantium through British Eyes (Hampshire 2000), 211-220.
- Exposition 1931:** Exposition d'art Byzantin 28 Mai - 9 Juillet 1931. Paris, Musée des Arts Décoratifs (Paris 1931).
- Galich 2006:** T. Galich, On the Problem of Modern Viewers' Attitude to the 12th-14th century Works of Byzantine Art. In: The Byzantine Idea: Byzantine under Komnenian and Palaiologan Rulers. Collected Papers (St. Petersburg 2006), 200-204.
- Kryzhanovskaya 1990:** M. Kryzhanovskaya, Alexander Petrovich Basilevsky. A frear collector of medieval and Renaissance works of art. Journal of the History of Collection 2, 1990, 143-155.
- Kryzhanovskaya 2006:** M. Kryzhanovskaya, Alexander Basilevsky and His Collection of Art Works Illustrating the Formation of Christian Art. In: The Byzantine Idea: Byzantine under Komnenian and Palaiologan Rulers. Collected Papers (St. Petersburg 2006), 62-71.
- Masterpieces 1958:** Masterpieces of Byzantine art. [Exhibition catalogue] (London 1958).
- Maculevič 1925:** L. Maculevič, Monuments disparus de Dzumati. Byzantion II, 1925, 77-108.
- Matzulewich 1929:** L.A. Matzulewich, Byzantinische Antike (Berlin/Leipzig 1929).
- Nelson 2005:** R.S. Nelson, Private Passions made public: The beginnings of the Bliss collection. In: (Ed. A. Kirin) Sacret Art, Secular context. Objects of art from the Byzantine collection of Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. (Athens/Georgia 2005).
- Papoulidis 2000:** C. Papoulidis, Piotr I. Sevast'janov (1811-1867) et ses collections. In: C. Papoulidis, Études archivistiques et historiographiques Russes. Collection d'études concernant les relations Greco-russes aux niveaux educational et civilisatrice des époques post-byzantine et moderne (Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Brothers s.a. 2000), 87-104.
- Pyatnitsky and al. 2000:** Yu. Piatnitsky, O. Baddeley, E. Brunner, M. Mundell Mango (eds.). Sinai, Byzantium, Russia. Orthodox Art from the Sixth to the Twentieth Century. [Exhibition catalogue] (London 2000).
- Piatnitsky 2001:** Yu. Piatnitsky, Icons from the Mount Athos in the Hermitage Museum. In: XX-e Congres International des Etudes Byzantines. Pre-Actes. III. Communication libres (Paris 2001), 423-424.
- Piatnitsky 2004:** Yu. Piatnitsky, Some Unpublished Icons from Mount Athos in the Hermitage Museum. Cahiers Archéologiques 50, 2004, 201-207.

- Pyatnitsky 2006:** Yu. Pyatnitsky, "Enlighten my soul, my heart and my spirit and show me Thy ways..." in Athos: Monastic Life on the Holy Mountain. [Exhibition catalogue] (Helsinki: Maahenki Ltd 2006), 24-29.
- Pyatnitsky (in print):** Yu. Pyatnitsky, Petr Sevastianov and his collection's activity (in print).
- Pilgrim treasures 2005:** Pilgrim treasures from the Hermitage: Byzantium-Jerusalem. [Catalogue of the exhibition] (Amsterdam 2005).
- de Ris L. 1875:** Clement de Ris L. Collection Basilevsky' par Mm A. Darcel et A. Basilevsky". In: Gazette des Beaux-Arts, tome XVI/1 (Paris 1875), 103-104.
- Ross 1962:** M.C. Ross, Metallwork, Ceramics, Glass, Glyptics, Painting. Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Medieval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, vol. 1 (Washington 1962).
- Ross 2005:** M.C. Ross, Jewelry, Enamels and Art of the Migration Period. Catalogue of Byzantine and Early Medieval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, vol. 2 (second edition) (Washington 2005).
- Sovastianoff 1859:** P. Sovastianoff, "Sur le mont Athos, ses monastères et les manuscrits de leurs bibliothèques". In: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes-Rendus des séances de l'année 1858, tome II (Paris 1859), 25-28.
- Treasures 1997:** Treasures of Mount Athos. [Exhibition catalogue] (Thessaloniki 1997).
- USA Today 2007:** USA Today. The choice by Charles Saatchi. [Exhibition catalogue. The State Hermitage museum] (Saint-Petersburg 2007).
- Walter 2004:** Ch. Walter, Review. Cahiers de civilization Medievale 47, 2004, 174-175.
- Weitzmann 1972:** K. Weitzmann, Ivories and Steatites. In: Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Mediaeval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, vol. 3 (Washington 1972).
- Weitzmann 1983:** K. Weitzmann, The St. Peter icon of Dumbarton Oaks (Washington 1983).
- Weitzmann 1994:** K. Weitzmann, Sailing with Byzantium from Europe to America: the memoirs of an Art Historian (München 1994).
- Weyl Carr 2002:** A. Weyl Carr, Review. CAA. Reviews, August 1, 2002.

O privire imperială în trecut. Expozițiile bizantine la Ermitaj (1861-2006)

Rezumat

În articolul de față este analizată istoria expozițiilor de artă bizantină, organizate în Ermitajul imperial, iar mai apoi în cel de stat în anii 1861-2006. Istoria colecționării și expunerii operelor de artă bizantină este strâns legată de istoria societății rusești, precum și de tendințele generale de cercetare a Bizanțului. În articole este expusă ideea că „muzee numai pentru artă”, „arta pentru artă” nu este altceva decât un vis romantico-idealist. În realitate, însă, în realizarea expozițiilor de artă, impactul societății și obiectivele politice sunt enorme, alături de ambițiile unor personalități. În articol, cronologic sunt analizate diferite perioade de activitate expozițională a Ermitajului.

Prima expoziție bizantină a fost organizată în martie 1861 și este legată de activitatea cercetătorului-amator rus, călător și colecționar P.I. Sevastianov la mănăstirile de la Athos. Datorită lui în Rusia a ajuns o remarcabilă colecție de icoane bizantine din secolele XI-XV, o bună parte a cărora se păstrează până în prezent în Ermitaj. În articol sunt analizate călătoriile lui Sevastianov la muntele Athos și atitudinea comunității europene și a celei ruse la rezultatele acestora. Cu părere de rău, societatea rusă nu era pregătită să perceapă adevăratele capodopere bizantine, aduse de P.I. Sevastianov. Invidia și intrigile, caracteristice mediului academic de atunci, au făcut ca activitatea și meritele lui P.I. Sevastianov să nu fie apreciate la justa lor valoare.

Prezența în Ermitaj a unui număr mare de obiecte de artă bizantină se datorează achiziției din decembrie 1884 la Paris a colecției lui A.P. Basilevski. Grație acestui fapt la Ermitaj a fost înființată secția medievală, care a funcționat până la revoluția bolșevică din 1917.

În 1927 L.A. Matzulevich a organizat în sălile Ermitajului o expoziție a Bizanțului și a epocii marilor migrații, care a funcționat până în anul 1930, când a fost închisă secția Bizanțului, exponatele fiind distribuite altor secții ale Ermitajului. După aceasta, centrul de cercetare a colecțiilor bizantine devine secția de artă orientală. Tot în 1930, în muzeu își începe activitatea A.V. Bank, care devine custodele colecțiilor de artă bizantină. Din păcate, tot în această perioadă, lui L.A. Matzulevich i se interzice cercetarea colecțiilor de artă bizantină. Și doar în 1935, cele mai semnificative piese din colecția de artă bizantină sunt etalate într-o expoziție, organizată în legătură cu desfășurarea lucrărilor Congresului III internațional de istorie și artă iraniană.

În timpul celui de-Al Doilea Război Mondial colecția a fost evacuată la Sverdlovsk. Abia în 1956, în Ermitaj este creată o expoziție tematică consacrată integral artei bizantine.

O semnificație deosebită a avut participarea Ermitajului și personal a lui A.V. Bank la Expoziția internațională de la Edinburgh și Londra din 1958. Impresionată de cele văzute, A.V. Bank, editează în 1966 un album-catalog „Arta bizantină în Uniunea Sovietică” («Византийское искусство в Советском Союзе»), iar în anii 1975-1977, organi-

zează la Muzeul Ermitaj din Leningrad, apoi și la Moscova o expoziție, intitulată „Arta bizantină în colecțiile URSS” («Византия в собраниях СССР»).

Inițiativa lui A.V. Bank de a cerceta și a organiza expoziții de artă bizantină a fost continuată la Ermitaj în anii 1990-2000 prin organizarea unor expoziții tematice dedicate mănăstirilor de pe Muntele Athos, artei Pământului Sfânt, pelerinajului etc. O expoziție unicat, având în vedere cantitatea și calitatea operelor a fost cea intitulată „Sinai, Bizanțul și Rusia” («Синай, Византия и Русь»), care a prezentat istoria artei ortodoxe, începând cu sec. VI și până la începutul sec. XX. În cadrul ei au fost etalate 10 icoane-capodopere de la mănăstirea Sf. Ecaterina din Sinai, Egipt. Catalogul acestei expoziții, editat în limbile rusă și engleză, a fost apreciat de comunitatea științifică internațională.

În partea finală a articolului autorul tratează aspectul moral al invaziei de „expoziții-blockbuster” cu tematică bizantină și problema conservării pieselor de muzeu în condițiile unei „exploatări” expoziționale intense.

Lista ilustrațiilor:

Fig. 1. Piotr Ivanovich Sevastianov (1811-1867). Litografie, 1859. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 2. Expoziția materialelor lui Sevastianov la Sfântul Sinod, St. Petersburg. Litografie, 1859. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 3. V.P. Vereschagin. Galeria lui A.P. Basilevsky din Paris. Acuarelă, 1870. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 4. Aspectul general al sălilor secției medievale și a epocii Renașterii. Fotografie de la sf. sec. XIX. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 5. Leonid Antonovich Matzulevich (1886-1959). Desen de Ernest Lipgart, 1919. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 6. Alice Bank (1906-1984). Fotografie din anii 1970. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 7. Expoziția „Arta Bizanțului în colecțiile din URSS”. Fotografie, 1975. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 8. Expoziția „Sinai, Bizanțul și Rusia” la Ermitaj. Fotografie 2000. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 9. Ceremonia de deschidere a expoziției „Sinai, Bizanțul și Rusia”: arhiepiscopul Sinaiului Damianos; arhiepiscopul St. Petersburgului Vladimir; Yuri Pyatnitsky, curatorul expoziției. Fotografie, 2000. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 10. Expoziția „Sinai, Bizanțul și Rusia” la Ermitaj. Fotografie 2000. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Fig. 11. Expoziția „Sinai, Bizanțul și Rusia” la Ermitaj. Fotografie 2000. Muzeul Ermitaj.

Имперский взгляд в прошлое. Византийские выставки в Эрмитаже (1861-2006 гг.)

Резюме

В статье освещается история выставок византийского искусства в императорском, а затем Государственном Эрмитаже в период 1861-2006 годов. История коллекционирования и экспонирования византийских произведений искусства связана с историей российского общества и мировыми тенденциями в изучении Византии. Автор полагает, что идея «музеев чистого искусства», и вообще «искусство ради искусства», – не более чем идеалистическая мечта. В действительности же влияние общественно-политического аспекта и персональных амбиций различных деятелей было огромно. В статье хронологически рассматриваются разные периоды выставочной истории Эрмитажа.

Первая византийская выставка была организована в марте 1861 года. Она была связана с деятельностью русского ученого-любителя, путешественника и коллекционера П.И. Севастьянова в афонских монастырях. Именно ему Россия обязана выдающейся коллекцией византийских икон XI - XV вв., значительная часть которой хранится сегодня в Эрмитаже. В статье подробно рассказывается о поездках Севастьянова на Афон и реакции европейского и русского общества на их результаты. К сожалению, в конечном итоге П.И. Севастьянов стал жертвой обычных в научной среде интриг и зависти, а русское общество оказалось не готовым к восприятию подлинных византийских памятников и не смогло достойным образом оценить деятельность и заслуги этого выдающегося человека.

Появление в Эрмитаже большой коллекции произведений византийского прикладного искусства связано с покупкой в декабре 1884 года в Париже собрания А.П. Базилевского. Благодаря этому приобретению Эрмитаж встал на один уровень с крупнейшими мировыми музеями. В нем был организован специальный отдел Средних веков и Ренессанса, который просуществовал до революции 1917 года.

В 1927 году Л.А. Мацулевичем была организована экспозиция, посвященная Византии и эпохе переселения народов. Она просуществовала до 1930 года, когда византийский отдел был закрыт, а его экспонаты распределены между другими отделами Эрмитажа. Отдел Востока, благодаря И.А. Орбели, стал основным средоточием изучения «восточного лица Византийской империи». В 1930 году началась активная работа в музее А.В. Банк, которая на долгие годы стала бессменным хранителем византийских коллекций. К сожалению, в то же время Л.А. Мацулевич был практически отстранен от работы с византийскими памятниками. Несколько лет коллекция хранилась в запасниках, и только в 1935 году, в связи с III Международным

иранским конгрессом, стало возможным вновь показать ее лучшие произведения. Во время второй мировой войны коллекция находилась в эвакуации в Свердловске. Отдельная экспозиция, посвященная Византии, была восстановлена в 1956 году.

Большое значение имело участие Эрмитажа и лично А.В. Банк в Международной выставке в Эдинбурге и Лондоне в 1958 году. Впечатления от этой поездки вдохновили А.В. Банк на издание в 1966 году научного альбома-каталога «Византийское искусство в Советском Союзе» и создание в 1975-1977 годах в Эрмитаже и Москве уникальной выставки «Византия в собраниях СССР». Традиции А.В. Банк были продолжены в 1990 - 2000-х годах серией тематических византийских выставок, посвященных монастырям Афона, искусству Святой Земли и паломничеству. Уникальной по количеству и качеству произведений была выставка «Синай, Византия и Русь», тематика которой охватывала историю православного искусства с VI по начало XX веков. На ней были представлены 10 шедевров иконописи из монастыря Св. Екатерины на Синае (Египет). Подробный каталог этой выставки, изданный на русском и английском языках, вызвал широкий мировой резонанс.

В заключительной части статьи рассматривается моральный аспект потока «выставок-блокбастеров» по византийской тематике и проблема сохранности музейных экспонатов в условиях интенсивной выставочной «эксплуатации».

Список иллюстраций:

- Рис. 1. Петр Иванович Севастьянов (1811-1867). Литография 1859 г. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 2. Выставка материалов Петра Севастьянова в помещении Святейшего Синода в Санкт-Петербурге. Литография 1859 г. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 3. В.П. Верещагин. Галерея А.П. Базилевского в Париже. Акварель 1870 г. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 4. Вид залов Отделения Средних веков и эпохи Возрождения Императорского Эрмитажа. Фото конец 19 в.
Рис. 5. Е.К. Липгарт. Леонид Антонович Мацулевич (1886-1959). Рисунок 1919 г. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 6. Алиса Владимировна Банк (1906-1984). Фото 1970-е гг. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 7. Выставка «Искусство Византии в собраниях СССР» в Эрмитаже. Фото 1975. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 8. Выставка «Синай, Византия и Русь» в Эрмитаже. Фото 2000. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 9. Открытие выставка «Синай, Византия и Русь» в Эрмитаже: архиепископ Синая Дамианос, митрополит Петербургский Владимир, куратор выставки Ю.А. Пятницкий. Фото 2000. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 10. Выставка «Синай, Византия и Русь» в Эрмитаже. Фото 2000. Государственный Эрмитаж.
Рис. 11. Выставка «Синай, Византия и Русь» в Эрмитаже. Фото 2000. Государственный Эрмитаж.

31.03.2011

Yuri Pyatnitsky, The State Hermitage museum, 34, Dvortsovaya emb., RU-190000 St. Petersburg, Russia, e-mail: pyatnitskiy1@yahoo.com