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The notion of a private collection is a historical phenomenon. Today, its boundaries have shifted; anyone can be an antiquarian and this does not even depend on the character of the collectible items. Art and memory have become objects of mass production, provoking people to tie themselves with invisible ropes belonging to things they have never known. As David Lowenthal put it: “Heritage growth thus reflects traumas of loss and change and fears of the menacing future.” Even since the beginning of the 20th century, the essence of the antiquarian’s activity has changed. Looking at the pre-war world period and, especially, the Russian Empire, we can see various private collections belonging to the nobility and bourgeoisie. The famous names of the Gagarins, Uvarovs, Shuvalovs, Tenisheva belonging to the former period, and the Tretyakovs, Morozovs, and Mamontovs belonging to the latter, are well-known to those who have visited Russian museums.

No doubt, in today’s Russia there are no private collections that date back more than 30-35 years, since much nationally valuable private property was nationalized after the Revolution. Before that, these collections served various aims. They were both private and public, exhibited for educational and identification purposes. The Revolution nationalized all of them as the property of the people. Russia’s many collections remain in state institutions and are often open to researchers. Thus, the collections of the antiquarians of the Russian Empire are still significant for contemporary scholarship.

Klimanov defines an antiquarian as “a special type of cultural figure” whose functions are diverse and are not carried out within the framework of professional activity. This puts antiquarians in a rather precarious position: the results of their activities can either bring significant benefits to the academic world or can sink into obscurity. Nikolai Petrovich Likhachev is an example of the first; his collection is diverse, comprising manuscripts, coins, etc.
Besides the major sources, Likhachev focused on a variety of artefacts, including small and nondescript ones which normally did not attract the attention of amateur antiquarians: according to Borovkova-Maikova, Likhachev called these artifacts “the black sheep” of his collections, since they were seemingly excluded from mainstream antiquarian fashion. That is why Likhachev’s collection can be studied with the use of approaches implying that everyday objects that do not have a special collectible value often become remarkable sources. The results of his work are still used by scholars to this day.

However, the success of such a collection cannot be accidental and as Liublinskii said, Nikolai Likhachev was an “antiquarian of fabulous scope.” According to Beneshevich, he was a researcher “from head to toe.” Klimanov, one of the main researchers of Likhachev, wrote that the approximate number of Likhachev’s published works exceeds 160. Although a significant part of Likhachev’s works remained only as manuscripts or were completely lost: many works are now known only by indirect references. Having such a wide knowledge of history and auxiliary historical disciplines, Likhachev went beyond the simple collecting of.

22 Vladimir Nikolayevich Beneshevich (1874-1938) was a Russian and Soviet Byzantinist, paleographer, Corresponding Fellow of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Most notable studies: “Kanonicheskij sbornik XIV titulov so vtoroj chetverti VII v. do 883 g. K drevnejshey istorii istochnikov prava greko-vostochnoj cerkvi”, “Drevneslavjanskaia kormchaja XIV titulov bez tolkovanija”, “Sinagoga v 50 titulov i drugie juridicheskie sborniki Ioanna Sholastika. K drevnejshey istorii istochnikov prava greko-vostochnoj cerkvi” etc.
antiquities: he created a collection that corresponded to the interests in academic research in society and to his view of history. Likhachev perceived Russian history as a part of universal history. This perception was reflected in Likhachev's collection of documentary monuments. It was based on the idea of creating Russian “diplomacy” in a broad context, in conjunction with the European tradition.

These, as well as the scientific flexibility of his collection, which included palaeography, filigree and the history of art, explain the variety and impressiveness of his collection. According to Klimanov, “During the years of teaching at the Faculty of History and Philology of Kazan University, a scientific task was defined – it was “the criticism of sources and collecting material for this”, Likhachev engaged in "historical source studies.” During his life, his fellow researchers noted the outstanding role that he played in the development of "historical source studies". Working with sources had provoked interest in their content and in their form. Likhachev reasonably believed that material for auxiliary historical disciplines was lacking in Russia, and that is why he set a goal of collecting the missing material so it could be studied by Russian scholars. Unlike the scholars from many archives and projects, who were interested primarily in national history, he paid attention to historical documents of different countries. It is important to note that palaeography was understood in a broad sense, so the collection included not only documents written on paper and parchment, but also epigraphic artefacts, coins, and seals.

The collection expanded with an eye to his scientific work and provided material for teaching and research, so that Likhachev's scientific, pedagogical and antiquarian activities were closely linked. His life strongly influenced this collection as well: other researchers noted that Likhachev treated his personal papers as historical documents, kept them, although

30 E.g., A.V. Oreshnikov and V.N. Beneshievich.
some, apparently, are still lost. As a result, they formed a separate division inside this collection, and nowadays historians have an opportunity to study the activities of Likhachev and his life in detail.

Likhachev’s biography largely explains the greatness of his heritage. He was born on 12 (24) April 1862 in the town of Chistopol on the River Kama, the second largest town after Kazan in the Kazan Governorate. He originated from the Kazan branch of the old noble family. Among his ancestors were amateurs and professionals, who collected different things – from books to coins; his grandfathers were renowned bibliophiles and antiquarians in the late 18th century, as was his uncle Andrei Fyodorovich, who was an archaeologist and numismatist. Some of their materials later formed part of the Likhachev’s collection, namely, a big library, which is now located in the Saint Petersburg Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Science. In 1913, in one of his books, Likhachev reflected on his genealogical passion to collect antiquities. His uncle’s archaeological and art collection later became the basis for the Kazan city museum. Moreover, Likhachev was influenced by his uncle’s passion for coins, and his first collection was numismatic. The young Likhachev learned both the basics of antiquarianism and some scientific knowledge from the amateur antiquarians who communicated with his family.

Likhachev himself wrote that starting from the age of thirteen he tried to make catalogues for his coins – an important practice for any serious antiquarian; Likhachev particularly valued this part of his collections even in later years and considered it worthy of close attention. Further, Likhachev began to travel outside Kazan, in order to expand his collection.

After he graduated from the Second Kazan gymnasium, he was matriculated into the Faculty of History and Philology at Kazan University in 1880, where he studied the history of

---

39 Lihachev N. P. Genealogicheskaja istorija odnoj pomeshchic'ej biblioteki. SPb.: Sirius, 1913.
the Western and Oriental Middle Ages, including medieval Russia.\textsuperscript{44} Likhachev studied at a time of turbulent student unrest, and witnessed the closure and re-opening of the University.\textsuperscript{45} This, however, did not prevent Likhachev, in his third year of study, from writing and defending his thesis on the chronicle of Henry of Valenciennes, where he tried to work out his own principles and approaches to the historical sources. Since then, all Likhachev’s works contained strong source criticism.\textsuperscript{46} The fact that all the evidence should be based on source material influenced Likhachev’s individual approach to historical knowledge and a nearly Bollandist approach to the analysis of historical narrative.

Klimanov thinks that the beginnings of the collection of manuscripts, one of the main collections, can be traced back to the researcher’s youth in Kazan, where he received family documents and acquired a small collection of documents of the 17th-18th centuries, mainly associated with the “state servants” of the Volga region.\textsuperscript{47} However, only in the 1890s did Likhachev begin to collect more serious documents, which formed the basis of the Museum of Palaeography.\textsuperscript{48}

After graduating from university, Likhachev was invited to the departments of Russian history, General history and the History of the Ancient East. He chose the Department of Russian history, where he was accepted by the resolution of the Council of the Imperial Kazan University to prepare for a professorship without a doctorate, on a non-stipendiary basis.\textsuperscript{49} Klimanov thinks that Likhachev himself conceded a stipendiary position to a nee\textsuperscript{50}der colleague. In April 1888, he got the position of Privat-docent, but never received a full professorship.\textsuperscript{51} It is believed that the reason for Likhachev not getting a professorship, even after defending his doctorate, was because of “an uncontrollable craving for scientific research.”\textsuperscript{52} He began to pay more attention not to teaching, but to research: Likhachev

worked actively in the archives and libraries of St. Petersburg and Moscow. In this period he met such researchers as Klyuchevsky, Kobeko, Zabelin and others. Another reason for Likhachev’s wary attitude to the professorship may be the University Charter of 1884, which abolished promotion within the Table of ranks for research trips and the tenure-track path of preparation for a professorship. Thus, his position would be lower than a chancery clerk. The impossibility of promotion hurt his own honour and the honour of his family. In a letter to Maykov, Likhachev commented on his current situation: "I have no salary, no rank, no orders, no respect, because I have always passed in the fight against critics." Nevertheless, this did not prevent him from his scientific activities. In St. Petersburg and Moscow, Likhachev continued the work on the clerks (разрядные дьяки), which he had started in his student years. It became his first major monograph: “Разрядные дьяки XVI в.” published in 1888. It was highly estimated by his colleagues, and soon a professorship at the university was proposed. Moreover, it allowed the researcher to meet Emperor Alexander III in person himself and present his work to him, as it was written in “Правительственный вестник” and “Новое время.” A paper published by Likhachev in 1887 in the Society of Amateurs of Ancient Writings66 titled “Of certain events and persons enrolled in our

54 Vasily Osipovich Klyuchevsky (1841 - 1911) - Russian historian, doctor of Russian history. Professor Emeritus of Moscow University, supernumerary Academician of the Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences on Russian history and antiquities. Most notable studies: «Боярская Дума древней Руси», “Происхождение крепостного права в России”, “Курс русской истории” etc.
55 Dmitry Fomich Kobeko (1837-1918) was a Russian historian and bibliographer. He wrote a number of studies about the Tsarskoye Selo Lyceum.
56 Ivan Egorovich Zabelin (1829-1908) was a Russian archaeologist and historian, an Honorary Fellow of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. Most notable studies: “История русской хижины с древнеших времен”, ochery po istorii Smuty, “О современных задачах русской истории и древности” etc.
58 Established by Peter the Great in 1722, the Table of Ranks contained the hierarchy of ranks (military, civil, court), distributed in 14 categories.
60 Vladimir Vladimirovich Maykov (1863-1942), Soviet and Russian archaeographer, paleographer, bibliographer, Corresponding Fellow of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
62 Лихачев Н. Н. Разрядные дьяки XVI в. СПб.: Тип. В. С. Балашева, 1888. 759 е.
64 «Правительственный вестник» (The Government Gazette) was the official daily newspaper of the General Directorate for Press Affairs (главное управление по делам печати). The newspaper was created in 1869 following the Emperor’s order. It used to be published in St. Petersburg in 1869-1917.
65 Magazine “Новое время” (The New Time) used to be published in St. Petersburg in 1868 - 1917.
66 Society of Amateurs of Ancient Writings (Императорское Общество любителей древней письменности) was founded under the Emperor Alexander II. It was mainly engaged in the publication of ancient Russian manuscripts.
genealogical collections from fictitious ranks” caused unrest among the nobility. According to Klimanov, this could serve as a presentation to the Emperor on the work of the clerks. From this point on, the ambivalence towards Likhachev as a researcher became apparent: some scholars treated him as a high-level researcher; others barely recognized him as a scholar whatsoever. Simmons noted that, despite the publication of two substantial studies in the auxiliary historical disciplines, Likhachev remained outside the mainstream of the historical sciences of the time, and outside academic life. However, Klimanov notes that the rejection of Likhachev’s new methods was characteristic of Kazan professors, who accused his work on clerks of having a weak research component, while among the historians of St. Petersburg and Moscow, the researcher found understanding and a more favourable attitude. Most likely, this became one of the main reasons for Likhachev’s move to St. Petersburg. Soon there was positive change in his life. In 1894, he became a member of the Archaeographic Commission. In contrast to the Archaeological Institute, this organization was under the control of the Ministry of National Education. This fact allowed Likhachev to start his career, rising step by step in the Table of Ranks. He finally became a college assessor.

Likhachev was also an active educator, who taught for about thirty years. Once Likhachev became a member of the Archaeographic Commission, he launched a course of lectures on Russian diplomatics at the Archaeological Institute in St. Petersburg, and in order to improve this course Likhachev toured Europe or the Near East every year from 1892 to 1914, and familiarized himself with local museums and archives, also purchasing all exemplar artefacts for his collection. Icons, notarial deeds, bullae, books and other documents and objects were of unfading interest to him. He visited antiquaries, looked

72 The Imperial Archaeographic Commission (Императорская Археографическая комиссия): its main activity was the scientific description and publication of written sources. It was established on December 24, 1834 (January 5, 1835).
73 The Imperial St. Petersburg Archaeological Institute (Императорский Санкт-Петербургский Археологический институт) was active in 1877-1922. It trained archaeologists and archivists.
74 The Ministry of National Enlightenment (Министерство народного просвещения) existed in 1802-1817 and 1824-1917. It was the main state body engaged in the management of public education and science institutions.
through catalogues and bought everything he could afford. These trips gave Likhachev profound knowledge and experience which were useful to him not only in teaching, but also in his activities as a scholar and an antiquarian. He made contacts with dealers in European antiquarian trade centres. After 15 years of travel, Nikolai Likhachev gained renown among European antiquarians and collectors, such as Charavay, Casella and Champion. Likhachev recalled a very flattering situation about his meeting with Champion: “I came into his study room, where I found my portrait among the rest of the portraits of bibliophiles and people of science.”

Thanks to these trips, his collection was enriched; Italy was especially important – here he acquired not only documents, seals and watermarks, but also icons, which now appeared to the researcher as part of Russian history, though not as obviously as Byzantine iconography. According to Klimanov, the icons were not connected with the general idea of the collection which was mainly devoted to palaeography and diplomacy; they formed a special but no less important part of the collection. Likhachev began to collect them on his trips to the old cities and monasteries of Russia, the trips which he began with the aim of finding documents and books. Collecting icons was a new practice for that time, unlike collecting books and manuscripts, although it also followed Likhachev's ideas about antiquarianism as a part of the historical sciences: his own collection comprised not only unique documents, but also small, nondescript icons that otherwise would have been lost.

This collection expanded not only with the acquisition of Old Russian icons; gradually Italian and Byzantine icons appeared too. Likhachev devoted several writings to the history of ancient Russian icon painting: an article about two icons (1894), an article on the painters of the original (1897), studies on the publication of the "Лицевой иконописного подлинника," a description of the ancient icons from the collection of Tretyakov, a two-volume study "Материалы для истории русского иконописания" (1906), an edition that described and reproduced the "Лицевого жития князей Бориса и Глеба" (1907) and "Хождение по..."
мукам" (1911) based on manuscripts of the 15th and 16th centuries, a study on Rublev’s manner of icon painting (1907), a study on the historical significance of Italian and Greek iconography and its influence on the old Russian style (1911). These studies attracted the attention of domestic and foreign art historians. However, due to financial difficulties in 1913, Likhachev had to sell this huge collection consisting of 1,497 icons to the Russian Museum of Alexander III. This acquisition resulted in the Russian Museum receiving a unique Russian collection of the Greek and Italian icons, as well as such masterpieces as the icon of St. Boris and Gleb. Likhachev later wrote about this forced step with regret: "it was unbearably painful for me to part with the icons."

Likhachev got many benefits from his trips abroad in other areas of his work as well. In 1892, in his first trip abroad, Likhachev began to create a large sphragistics collection. It included Old Russian, Byzantine, and Western European seals – originals, copies and forgeries. For Russia, it was a unique collection containing "the entire area of distribution and use of hanging metal seals throughout the middle ages and modern history." It was a collection that formed the basis of studies in sphragistics both for Likhachev himself and for other researchers in the fields of Russian, Byzantine, Ancient Eastern and Venetian sphragistics. Yanin describes Likhachev as a scholar who "managed to lay a solid foundation for scientific sphragistics."

His trips to Europe were also useful for his palaeographic activity, to which he devoted his most important studies. He worked in the archives of Europe and acquired documents which were rare in the Russian market. These trips gave Likhachev an opportunity to expand

86 Simmons J. S. G. Nikolai Petrovich Likhachev (1862 - 1936) Scholar and Pioneer Russian Codicologist and Student of Watermarks // Likhachev's watermarks : an English-language version / edited by J.S.G. Simmons and Bé van Ginneken-van de Kasteele. Amsterdam: The Paper Publications Society, 1994. P. XLII. The Emperor Alexander III Russian Museum (now the State Russian Museum) is a museum in St. Petersburg containing and exhibiting the largest collection of Russian art. It was planned by Alexander III, but the idea was implemented by Nicholas II: in 1895, Nicholas II signed a decree "on the establishment of a special institution called the 'Russian Museum of Emperor Alexander III'. The Museum was opened to the public in 1898.
91 Valentin Lavrentyevich Yanin (born 1929) is Soviet and Russian historian and archaeologist. In 1963 he defended his thesis of the Doctor of Historical Sciences, and in 1990 he became a Full Fellow of the Russian Academy of Sciences. He holds the position of Professor at the Moscow State University. (URL:http://hist.msu.ru/departments/8827/people/teachers/17738/). Date accessed: 29.11.19).
his geographical and chronological frame of research, which is noticeable in his extant works. His doctoral dissertation, "Paper and the oldest paper mills in the Moscow state" (1891) is based on the source materials on the history of Russia, and touches on the history of Western Europe. Further, his «Палеографическое значение бумажных водяных знаков» (1899) was largely based on the materials of his own collection – about 90 per cent of the watermarks of “Палеографическое значение...” had not been published before, despite the fact that almost all of them came from Western Europe. These works, where 5,041 signs are studied, did not lose value after the release of the volume of Briquet with the description of 16,112 signs, since Likhachev’s study surpassed Briquet in chronological scope – from 1293 to 1832 while Briquet stopped at 1600. Moreover, Likhachev added Russian material to that from Western Europe.

Likhachev was interested in the history of the old Russian administration and the bureaucratic class, as well as the history of diplomatic relations between Moscow and foreign sovereigns. Among other studies, he published monographs on the family of Adashev («О происхождении А. Ф. Адашева любимца царя Ивана Грозного» 1890 г., «Государев родословец и род Адашевых», 1903 г.), «Тысячная книга» (together with N.V. Miatlev), which is a list of the 1,000 "best boyar children" дети боярские of the 16th century, and biographies of figures of the 16th century. In the early 1890s, Likhachev was involved in a dispute over the alleged existence of a secret "czar library" in Moscow; in his book «Библиотека и архив Московских государей в 16 столетии» (1894) he spoke out against its existence.

A period of intensive publication activity started in the 1890s. In addition to the studies mentioned, which related to Likhachev’s collection of Western European sources, he published a lot based on Russian sources. A series of studies were devoted to the diplomacy of the Grand Duchy of Moscow. First is «Дело о приезде в Москву папского посла

---


95 Charles-Moise Briquet (1839 - 1918) - a noted Swiss filigranologist. He was among the first, who use watermarks for dating paper. His famous book: Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600 avec 39 figures dans le texte et 16 112 fac-similés de filigranes


Антония Поссевина» (1903), where he investigates the relations between Moscow and the Vatican at the end of the Livonian war, and also touches on Ivan the Terrible’s murder of his own son. Second, Likhachev published a letter from Pope Pius V to Ivan the Terrible, together with a study on papal diplomatics, as well as some diplomatic documents from the time of Boris Godunov. He devoted a separate study to the question of the meaning and appearance of the Khan's basma.99 Separate studies on Russian history were based on Likhachev’s random acquisitions for his collection: a study on the events of the 15th century and Tver's hopes for hegemony inspired by «Инока Фомы слово похвальное о (Тверском) благоверном великом князе Борисе Александровиче»; an essay on the importance of private correspondence as a historical source, inspired by the «Письмо Смутного времени»; the publication of the Declaration of the Zemsky Sobor with state revenues and expenditures for 1616 in the ministries (prikazy) of Moscow with a foreword by Likhachev.100

In the course of his research, Likhachev actively corresponded with experts in various historical fields from Western European countries. Simmons, describing Likhachev’s research on watermarks, writes that “it should have no impact abroad”101, while Klimanov emphasizes the close contacts Likhachev had with foreign colleagues, noting that such people shaped the image of Russian historical science, bringing it international prestige102.

Panchenko's article is devoted to Likhachev's contacts in the world of science; in this article she studied the autographed books in Likhachev's library as the main source, often indicating not only the names of the senders, but also their position occupation and relationship with the addressee.103 A significant number of the books that Likhachev received as gifts were not published in Moscow or St. Petersburg, which shows the breadth of Likhachev's scientific contacts and his active involvement in the intellectual life of his time not only in central but also in provincial cities.104 Books were given both by the representatives of the scientific community of the time and by the friends and acquaintances of the researcher.105 Klimanov also writes about Likhachev's active scientific life, who

---

mentions correspondence and the exchange of works with foreign researchers and antiquarians. Klimanov also refers to such personal qualities of Likhachev as “the desire for mutually enriching human and professional communication”; Likhachev tried not only to embody his ideas in his academic studies, but was also actively involved in other activities: lectures, reports, communication with historians and archival research fellows; he was an organizer and member of various societies, such as the Russian historical society.

Likhachev’s library deserves special mention. Many of the books he inherited from his relatives, but many were collected by him for research purposes. Likhachev supplemented his collection of antiquities and documents with an impressive amount of scholarly literature; his collection is still considered one of the best in Europe with regards to the collections of books on the topic of diplomatics and palaeography, and auction catalogues published before 1917, when the search for and acquisition of books became difficult for him. The library and collections of Likhachev grew, as did the researcher’s knowledge of auxiliary historical disciplines. Collections became more and more thematic; and an idea emerged to collect them under a certain name; of creating a museum. The researcher "had the idea to leave a Museum of the history of the country". The only thing from Likhachev’s collections that did not fit this scope was the collection of icons; however, as mentioned, it was sold to the Russian Museum. His museum, which would later be called the “Museum of historical source studies”, became one of the main achievements of Likhachev. Tsypkin notes that, in fact, Likhachev “planned a Museum of technology of the expertise of books and historical documents”, however this statement is controversial. In any case, to implement the idea, Likhachev had to transfer his collection to the institution, which would allow him to display it publicly.

As a result, Likhachev needed a place to store and display his collections. Here begins the story of a famous house in Saint Petersburg. The Likhachevs bought a plot of land in 1901 on the bank of the Neva, in Peterburgskaya storona, which was undergoing considerable

urbanization and development in the early 20th century. The land was actually in the possession of Likhachev’s wife\(^{114}\) and was supposedly bought with her savings. In 1894, he had married Natalya Gennadievna Karpova, who was a daughter of a famous Moscow historian Gennady Karpov\(^{115}\). Karpov was one of Sergei Solovyov’s\(^{116}\) favourites and protégés. Natalya Karpova’s mother was Anna Timofeevna Morozova, the daughter of a famous Moscow millionaire and manufacturer Timofey Morozov\(^{117}\). That was a lucky union for Likhachev since he was able to spend all wife’s dowry to establish his museum.\(^{118}\) Gossip said that Natalya’s mother promised to give 50,000 rubles for every child born in the family\(^{119}\) and by the 1910s the Likhachevs had had nine children. We cannot ignore the fact that Likhachev owed much to his wife and mother-in-law for his beautiful collection and newly-built house; many professors of the same rank could not even dream of such a luxurious lifestyle. For example, Aynalov lived in a house on the 11th line of Vasilievsky Island and Platonov only moved into a new housing cooperative flat on Kamennostrovsky prospect in 1916. In this sense it is better to compare Likhachev to the famous antiquarian Botkin, who also held a huge art collection in his private house on the bank of the Neva River.

Likhachev had enough space in the two-floor neoclassical mansion in a privileged district with rising land prices. Judging by the house today, it was planned as a semi-public building. At least, it is not modernistic, but quite functional with major corridors having branches to spacious rooms; it resembled more an academic building than a private home. The layout also reflected the personality of the architect, Vorotilov, a prominent Saint-Petersburg Master of Social Architecture. Mostly working in the classical style, he planned hospitals, institutes and the new building of the Imperial Public Library.\(^{120}\)

The collection grew tremendously, so that even in the two-storey house it was not possible to keep everything and the family’s budget was going through a tough period. That was the time when he decided to sell his icons for 300,000 rubles. This sum was enough to satisfy the scholar’s need to renovate the house.\(^{121}\)

\(^{114}\) Source URL: http://www.citywalls.ru/house6634.html (Last access: 15. 11.2018)

\(^{115}\) Gennady Fyodorovich Karpov (1839 - 1890) a Russian, who studied history of Ukraine, XV—XVII centuries.

\(^{116}\) Sergei Mikhailovich Solovyov (1820 - 1879) was a Russian historian, Professor and Rector of the Moscow University, Academician of the Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. The most notable study - “History of Russia since ancient times” in 29 volumes.

\(^{117}\) Timofey Savvich Morozov (1823-1889) was a Russian industrialist, merchant from the Morozov family. He was engaged in charity, mainly related to education (scholarships to students of the Moscow technical school, etc.) and medical care (opened a hospital in Belgrade, a gynecological clinic on the Devichiye pole, etc.).


\(^{120}\) URL: http://www.citywalls.ru/search-architect219.html (Date access: 16.11.2018)

What was the purpose of the renovation? Likhachev planned to have another floor added in order to open the first two floors of the house as public museum of palaeography. We can see Likhachev going even further in his plans than Botkin, whose mansion was open every Sunday for visitors interested in the collection of art. Three floors was enough space for the private life of the family and a public museum. Another interesting aspect concerning the city space around the house was laying of a tram line along Petrozavodskaya Street in 1914.\textsuperscript{122}

This last occurrence had an importance that cannot be overestimated. A tram line in pre-revolutionary Saint Petersburg would guarantee the public access to the museum. The question of transport was very important while planning the locations of different public buildings. For instance, a document published in the journal “Russkiy Bibliophil” shows how the municipal authorities planned the location of the city archive. The city duma of Saint Petersburg proceeded with the preparatory work on the construction process of the City Archive building, the significance of which seems to be great today, as the actual rooms of the archive are poorly equipped and quite unreliable in terms of fire safety.

Likhachev started working in the Imperial Public Library in 1902 as a vice-director. Despite the fact that this work was often unrelated to his scientific activities (drafting statutes, repairs, working with the staff), it helped Likhachev to delve into the field of bibliography, follow scientific developments, and become acquainted with a large volume of diverse literature and with the history of writing in general.\textsuperscript{123} Additionally, a senior position in the Public library also helped him in the purely utilitarian sense – it gave him a position in society and a decent salary, which contributed to the expansion of his great collection.\textsuperscript{124}

However, Likhachev’s collection often required considerable efforts from him. In 1918, the Likhachev’s financial situation deteriorated markedly; the only income that remained was his teacher’s salary, which was not enough either for his family or for collecting.\textsuperscript{125} In this regard, he had to look for additional sources of income, sometimes distracting him from his main interests, and sometimes contradicting them. Thus, in the post-revolutionary period Likhachev had to sell another part of his collections.\textsuperscript{126} Nonetheless, the consequences of 1917 were not unambiguously negative for Likhachev. After the termination of his duty in


the Public Library, Likhachev had time to engage with his Museum: “a cherished dream was fulfilled to devote his old age to the studies on collected and classified material. There were plans for [...] extensive writing”.

On 1 August 1925, there was a significant event: he received the title of Full Fellow of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR of the Department of Russian history. In 1925, Likhachev transferred the Palaeographic Office to the Academy of Sciences, this institution was renamed the Palaeographic Museum, and Likhachev himself became its director. In this position, he carried out the systematization and classification of museum materials, and the on-going expansion of the collection. However, despite the fact that the museum was awarded the title of an institution within the Academy of Sciences, some researchers (Moskalenko) note the duality of reports about this: many among the museum staff wrote about the formality of the inclusion of Likhachev’s collection under the authority of the Academy of Sciences, arguing that the museum continued to operate under the rules of a private collection. The scientific results of this period are also ambiguous. On the one hand, Likhachev wrote much at this time and his works on Byzantine sphragistics were published. On the other hand, many of his works remained unpublished, and a significant number of manuscripts were lost. The existence of a number of works is now known only from indirect references.

Then tragedy struck. During the global purge of scientific institutions, including the Academy of Sciences, in 1930 Likhachev, together with a number of famous researchers of the time (such as Platonov), was accused of anti-Soviet activities, lost his status as a Full Member of the Academy of Sciences and spent more than one and a half years in prison; he was then exiled to Astrakhan, and the collection moved to the Library building of the
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133 Sergej Fedorovich Platonov (1860 - 1933) was a Russian and Soviet historian, Fellow of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Most notable studies: “Ocherki po istorii smuty v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVI—XVII vv.”, “Drevnerusskie skazanija i povesti o Smutnom vremenii XVII veka, kak istoricheskij istochnik” etc.
Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Likhachev’s mansion was used in the 1930s to house the postgraduate students of the Academy of Sciences.135 During the transportation of Likhachev's archive to the Library of the Academy of Sciences its organization was violated, and the scholar's long-term work on the systematization of the collections was reduced to zero.136 Likhachev himself considered this move a personal tragedy. He wrote that his museum was “transported and therefore confused and broken. [...] The results of the work of several decades destroyed!”137

The Museum of Palaeography itself underwent several changes and renamings in a short space of time: first it became The Museum of Books, Documents and Letters at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; however, in 1931 it was renamed the Institute of Books, Documents and Letters, and in 1935 it became the Sector of Auxiliary Disciplines of the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences.138 All this had a negative impact on the integrity of the collection: some of its parts are currently stored in the Hermitage (the writings of Ancient Egypt, China, Sumer, Greece, Rome and Byzantium), in the Institute of Oriental manuscripts, (paper and parchment manuscripts in Oriental languages), in the Library of the Academy of Sciences, (the studies by Likhachev, reference literature); in the Museum of the history of religion, in the Historical Museum in Moscow; and the St. Petersburg branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences. However, most of the collection of manuscripts and documents on the history of Russia and Western Europe returned to their former place in the Likhachev’s house as part of the Scientific Historical archive of the St. Petersburg Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Currently, these sources make respectively the Russian and Western European sections of archive of this institution.

After return from exile, Likhachev’s health was inevitably weak, but he tried to continue his work. However, despite all attempts to find a job, either reinstated or as a researcher, Likhachev's petition for the return of his scientific works and permission to continue his activities was not satisfied.139 Nevertheless, Likhachev continued his activities as much as he could under those circumstances; until his death, he was preparing for publication the second volume of his «Материалы для истории Византийской и русской

However, the 1930 edition was suspended and the entire printed edition destroyed. In addition to trying to publish the work he created over decades, Likhachev kept in touch with scientific colleagues, advising the Institute of Books, Documents and Letters, which was a transformation of the former Museum of Palaeography. At that period, he also communicated with Beneshevich, who was destined to be executed in 1938. Likhachev was probably saved from the same fate by his own death in 1936. History became ideologically instrumentalized and therefore, there was no any longer space for the old specialists; they were simply unwanted. In the later Soviet times on the wall of Likhachev’s house was placed a memorial plate: “In this house, from 1902 to 1936 lived and worked the outstanding historian and academician Nikolai Petrovich Likhachev”. In fact, this is a confusing lie. From 1931 to 1933 he was in exile in Astrakhan and after his return his academic life was ruined. These are few words concerning the biased commemoration and silence about the things which happened from the late 1920s to the late 1930s.

Contemporaries appreciated the work of Likhachev, for example the great academician Shakhmatov, the Byzantinist Beneshevich, and a specialist in filigree Briquet; it was mostly the conservative professors at the University of Kazan who did not accept the work of Likhachev, since his studies were too innovative therefore incomprehensible for them. Over time, the achievements of Likhachev were not forgotten and a number of studies devoted to his life and work appeared.

In 1966, at least a third of the collection of the Library of the Leningrad Division of the Institute of History (ЛОИИ, today the Institute of the History of the Russian Academy of Sciences) consisted of the collection of Likhachev. The Archive of the Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences is now located in Likhachev’s former mansion, where the Museum of Palaeography was previously located. As in the case of the library, Likhachev's collection forms a significant part of the archive's documents, many of them still
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143 URL: http://www.citywalls.ru/house6634.html (Date access: 14.11.2018)
144 Alexey Aleksandrovich Shakhmatov (1864-1920) was a Russian philologist, linguist and historian, Academician of the Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, and the founding father of the historical study of the Russian language. Most notable studies: “Issledovanie o jazyke novgorodskich gramot XIII i XIV veka”, “K voprosu ob obrazovanii russkih narechij i russkih narodnostej”, “Vvedenie v kurs istorii russkogo jazyka” etc.
147 For example, the studies of L. G. Klimanov, J. Simmons, E. V. Stepanova and others.
The archive of the Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences is divided into two sections: the Russian section and the Western European section. Both of them contain a considerable number of documents collected by Likhachev.

The Russian section contains 12,340 items, including more than 700 ancient manuscripts; 122 books are the oldest types of manuscript book on parchment and paper of the 13th-16th centuries. The collection also contains the Russian Chronicles, Stepennye and Razryadnye books, Sudebniki, the lives of saints, historical and geographical manuscripts produced by Russian medieval scholars, a collection of homilies and teachings of the fathers of the Church, the so-called Pandects of Nikon of the Black Mountain (14th century), signed by the Bulgarian Patriarch Theodosius. The documents from the Likhachev collection include more than 11,000 items. They are distributed among smaller collections, such as a collection of ancient letters, a collection of patents and diplomas of the nobility, a collection of autographs containing 1,252 autographs of political figures from Russia and abroad.

The Western European section of the Archive mostly consists of Likhachev’s collection. The documents of this collection include more than 24,000 items from throughout Europe. Many of these documents, acquired by Likhachev on his trips to Europe, are still poorly studied.

The memory of the great antiquarian and scholar is preserved and expressed not only in the work of subsequent researchers in the fields of palaeography, art history, sphragistics and many others, but also in more open activities aimed at a broader audience. Museum exhibitions are held based on Likhachev’s collections, often combining parts of his acquisitions stored in various museums and institutes; such exhibitions are visited by researchers and those outside of academia, and from these exhibitions much is learnt about this great man.

Recognition came to Likhachev not only from the scientific world, but also from the state: on July 20, 1967, the Joint State Political Directorate (OGPU) verdict of August 8, 1931 was annulled followed by Likhachev's posthumous restoration as a Full Fellow of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
Recognized during his lifetime as an antiquarian and a scholar, Likhachev remains in the memory of posterity, and his collection continues to play a significant role in historical research of our time.
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