



UDC 93/94

From Jan Luňák to Ivan Ivanovich Lun'jak and Back: An Austro-Hungarian Classicist and His *Iter Slavicum*

David Movrin

Department of Classics, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana,
2, Aškerčeva, Ljubljana, SI-1000, Slovenia; david.movrin@ff.uni-lj.si

For citation: Movrin D. From Jan Luňák to Ivan Ivanovich Lun'jak and Back: An Austro-Hungarian Classicist and His *Iter Slavicum*. *Philologia Classica* 2022, 17 (1), 173–189.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2021.114>

The present paper is the first attempt at a bio-bibliography of Jan Luňák (1847–1935), the peripatetic classicist who roamed the Austro-Hungarian, German, and Russian empires before founding the classical seminar at the University of Ljubljana, in 1919, in what was then the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians. Luňák studied in Prague and Leipzig and then moved to St Petersburg to earn his master's in classical philology from Dorpat (now Tartu) and his doctorate in Greek literature from Kazan. In 1890 he became extraordinarius in Moscow, and in 1892 ordinarius in Odessa, from where he retired in 1907. Known primarily for his *Quaestiones Sapphicae*, he was forced to launch a second career in 1919, after World War I and then the October Revolution permanently separated him from his family and deprived him of his pension. He served as contractual professor of classical philology in Ljubljana until 1930 when he finally returned to Prague. Based on both published and archival material, the paper provides a historical context for his academic career (which had its roots in the Russian Philological Seminary in Leipzig, where Luňák was recommended by Friedrich Ritschl). It thus attempts to understand the somewhat disparate aspects of his complex scholarly itinerary. Apart from providing his comprehensive bibliography, the study hopes to serve as a stimulus for other primary sources to surface in the future.

Keywords: Jan Luňák, history of classical philology, Russian Philological Seminary in Leipzig, Friedrich Ritschl, *res publica litteraria*, Sappho.

Introduction

The First World War centenary, with its series of commemorations, came with a series of associated centenaries. In the region between the Baltic and the Adriatic, a number of these secondary celebrations were academic. Recent scholarship ascertained that few

© St Petersburg State University, 2022

institutions were as profoundly impacted by the war as the universities. This was certainly true for Central Europe, with its scenic mosaic of continuities and breaks.¹ No less than four new universities sprung up in 1919, established by communities that recognized the *καιρός* offered by the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Poznań, Brno, Bratislava, and Ljubljana launched their respective higher learning institutions as soon as the war was over.

These were national universities, freed from the strait-jacket of the Dual Monarchy. The majority of teaching positions were held by their national scholars, finally teaching in their mother tongues.² Somewhat surprisingly, however, the classics seminary in Ljubljana was founded by an unlikely candidate. Jan Luňák was an experienced professor who came from the wider republic of letters, was not a part of the local academe, and could not even speak the language; but was able to build the new institution with the help of his vast international experience. This paper attempts to understand this counter-intuitive phenomenon — and establish a new network of scholars that could elucidate it with further primary sources.

Ad orientem

What historical forces and whims of Clio were operating behind his story? In his seminal study on Czech classicists in Russia, Karel Svoboda analyzed the social context that resulted in no less than a hundred classicists from Bohemia and Moravia finding their work in the Russian Empire by the end of the 19th century.³ Tzar Alexander II and his minister count Dmitry Andreyevich Tolstoy reformed the educational system in 1871, placing the institution of the classical gymnasium, with plenty of Latin and Greek, in its very center. The reform called for a veritable army of classicists. The Russian tradition of importing teachers went as far back as to Peter the Great, who brought Germans. Two centuries later, it was frequently Czechs who were called to the task.

Candidates were recommended by professor Jan Kvíčala from Charles University, a student of Georg Curtius, Ludwig Lange, Friedrich Ritschl, and Otto Jahn.⁴ They were given state scholarships for either the Russian Philological Institute in Leipzig or the Institute of History and Philology in Saint Petersburg. Apart from the classicists, Russian gymnasia hired Czechs with other qualifications — physical education, drawing, and singing. Czechs had a good reputation, and the administrator of the Moscow school district, Count Kapnist, once said that at those grammar schools where Czechs were teaching, students had proper knowledge.⁵ Many became inspectors, headmasters, or authors of textbooks. Ten of them eventually became university professors.⁶

¹ Maurer 2006, 22 ff.

² In Ljubljana, this process took no less than 70 years; Benedetič 1999.

³ Svoboda 1939, 349–351.

⁴ For more on Kvíčala, see the concise description in the ÖBL (Krestan 1969), with bibliography.

⁵ Kovářík 1932, 95.

⁶ Apart from Jan Luňák, the other nine were Josef Šebor, Alois Pospíšil, brothers Antonín and Josef Dobiáš, Václav Petr, Jan Netušil, Richard Šercl, František Režábek and Vladislav Škorpil. Svoboda is keen to stress their social mobility: “Almost all of them came from poor rural or small-town families: Luňák’s and Pospíšil’s father were cottagers, Režábek’s was a farmer, the father of Dobiáš brothers was a tailor, Netušil’s father was a dyer, Šebor’s a beltmaker, Škorpil’s a grain merchant, Petr’s a teacher and Šercl’s a small clerk” (Svoboda 1939, 350).

From Dolánky to Odessa

Luňák's younger contemporary with access to his documents,⁷ Karel Svoboda, constructed a short biography, details of which can be verified and augmented by Luňák's file preserved in the archives of the University of Ljubljana.⁸ Jan Luňák (Fig. 1) was born on December 12, 1847, in Dolánky near Jičín in north-eastern Bohemia, in the region of Hradec Králové.⁹ In 1862–1869 he studied at the Jičín Gymnasium, graduating cum laude on July 17, 1869. In 1869–1872, he finished his *triennium philologicum* at the University of Prague, where classical philology was represented by professors Jan Kvičala, Georg Bippart, and Gustav Linker; archaeology by Otto Benndorf; and comparative linguistics by Alfred Ludwig. This was still a decade before the institution was split into separate Czech and German universities in 1882.¹⁰ Afterward, he became an assistant teacher in 1872–1874 at the Jindřichov Hradec gymnasium (teaching Latin, Greek, Czech, and German to twelve-year-old boys, giving 17 classes each week to 31 students, as can be seen from the annual school report). Then, from 1874–1876, he studied at the Russian Philological Institute in Leipzig, finishing with a degree that allowed him to teach in Russian schools on March 15, 1876. Academically, this was another institution of great renown, where he was impressed with the work of the Plautus scholar Friedrich Ritschl (Fig. 2).¹¹ Other luminaries teaching in Leipzig were Ludwig Lange, Justus Hermann Lipsius, Georg Curtius and Johannes Overbeck.¹²



Fig. 1. Jan Luňák (Smyshljaeva 2021, 464)



Fig. 2. Friedrich Ritschl, cca. 1844 (ÖNB Digital, Porträtsammlung)

⁷ He mentions Luňák's manuscript with his *Curriculum vitae*; Svoboda 1939, 364.

⁸ AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, "Ivan Lunjak."

⁹ In his letter to the literary historian Semyon A. Vengerov, Luňák mentioned the fact that he was distant relative of the prominent politician František L. Rieger, the leader of the "Old Czechs" (Smyshljaeva 2021, 464).

¹⁰ Slapnicka 1984.

¹¹ Ritschl famously recommended another student, Friedrich Nietzsche, for the position of a professor in Basel in 1869, only to dismiss his first book, *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik*, published in 1872, as *geistreich Schwimelei*, "clever giddiness"; Danto 2005, 45.

¹² Kaiser 1984; Schröder 2013.

Ritschl recommended Luňák for St Petersburg,¹³ and his Russian journey could now begin. He got his master's in classical philology from Dorpat University (now University of Tartu) and his doctorate in Greek literature from Kazan University. From 1877 he taught at the Fifth Gymnasium in St Petersburg, in 1882 he became Privatdozent of Greek literature at the University of St Petersburg,¹⁴ in 1885 honorary Privatdozent at Kazan University (from where young Lenin was to be expelled in 1887), in 1890 extraordinarius at Moscow University and in 1892 ordinarius at Odessa University. He stayed there for 15 years, becoming emeritus on March 22, 1907.¹⁵

Early Research

Svoboda describes Luňák's scholarly work as focusing on the Greek and Roman literary history in the broadest sense, and draws parallels with two of his teachers, Ritschl and Kvíčala, for his textual criticism and interpretation, stylistic analysis, ascertaining of chronology and sources, and biographical questions. Luňák spoke of these tasks in his programmatic inaugural lecture, "On the Current State of Studying Ancient Classical Documents."¹⁶ His first paper was published in 1874 in the annual report of the gymnasium where he started teaching, in Jindřichov Hradec. It analyzed Ovid, focusing on the question of "How Ovid Connected Individual Myths in His *Metamorphoses*":¹⁷

What a vast diversity! We must be grateful to Ovid for keeping such an enormous collection of myths in the beautiful robes of poetry. However, this is not enough: Ovid does not present us with these flowers of fantasy of different nations as he tore them; he wreathed them in a beautiful garland, skillfully connecting each other.¹⁸

The way this was done, he explains, is in two tiers; the first one is the main narrative, the second one the parentheses that are added into it. Then, describing both in detail, he shows how myths are sorted either by content or protagonists and concludes that even the rare weaker passages can be forgiven. The reader "would not be angry with the poet, taking into account how difficult task it was, from this mixture of all ages and regions, to collect and form a continuous unity — *carmen perpetuum*."¹⁹

His master's thesis, *Observationes rhetoricae in Demosthenem*, published by "Ioannes Luňák, Quinti Gymnasii Petropolitani praeceptor" in 1878, in Latin, is an ambitious work on finer points of Demosthenian style. Luňák was particularly interested in his *gnomai* and *similes* (the two respective chapters are titled "De sententiis" and "De similitudinibus

¹³ Hausmann 1998, 357.

¹⁴ Luňák's colleagues in the Greek chair while teaching in St Petersburg were Karl Joakimovich Lugebil, Viktor Karlovich Jernstedt, Petr Vasil'evich Nikitin and Dmitri Pavlovich Lebedev; Verlinsky 2013, 197.

¹⁵ The details above are from the University Archives in Ljubljana and are further corroborated by the sources cited by Hausmann 1998, 538, namely *Poslužennyj spisok* [Послуженный список] in Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Archiv v S.-Peterburge, f. 733, op. 151, d. 570, 1903, g. ll. 55–62; and N. P. Zagoskin, *Za sto let: Biografičeskij slovar' profesorov i prepodavatelej Imperatorskago Kazanskago universiteta (1804–1904)* [За сто лет: Биографический словарь профессоров и преподавателей Императорского Казанского университета], ch. 1, Kazan 1905, 124–125 (autobiography with bibliography).

¹⁶ "O sovremennom' sostojanii" [O современном состоянии], 1893; for bibliographic details of his papers, see Bibliography below.

¹⁷ "Kterak Ovidius v *Proměňách*," 1874.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 5.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 23.

atque imaginibus”).²⁰ In his opening paragraph, he explains that the authors from Corax and Teisias to Tzetzes form “one single family.” (“Ad Graecos Romanos quoque doctores asciscere non dubitavi, cum longa omnium artis scriptorum series a Corace et Tisia, qui eius inventores fuisse dicuntur, usque ad Tsetzen tamquam unam familiam efficere videatur.”) Tellingly, the work is dedicated to the memory of his teacher, “memoriae Friderici Ritschelli,” who died in 1876, only months after Luňák left Leipzig. Later he kept returning to the Attic orators; in his “Rhetorical Studies,”²¹ he analyzed the Demosthenian *Oratio* 21 (Against Meidias), and a few years later he published a German treatise on Isaeus, *Oratio* 1 (On the Estate of Cleonymus).²² He focused on the stasis-theory, developed by the ancient rhetoricians from Hermagoras to Hermogenes. He was frequently polemizing with Richard Volkmann, whose book, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer*, was a standard work at the time. Luňák was not impressed: “In the following lines, we want to subject all this to a closer examination and show that most of the given reasons and explanations of the rhetorical terms in question, as well as the determination of the status itself, cannot be accepted.”²³ In a further paper, “On the question of the relationship of Demosthenes to Isocrates,”²⁴ he revisited Demosthenes and his *Oratio* 21, showing how its author used another speech by Isocrates, *Oratio* 20 (Against Lochites). He kept returning to Demosthenes throughout his career — *vetus amor non sentit rubiginem* — and two papers on this author are among the last he ever published, after returning from Ljubljana to Prague, in *Listy filologické*, and in *Philologische Wochenschrift*.²⁵

Quaestiones Sapphicæ

However, his most far-reaching breakthrough came with his doctoral thesis, *Quaestiones Sapphicæ*, defended and published in Kazan in 1888. Published with 114 pages, this is his most often-quoted work. It is divided into two main parts, *pars prior*, “De Ovidianæ Sapphus epistulae fontibus,” and *pars posterior*, “Sapphus notitiæ complendæ corrigendæque experimentum”; added to this is a “Corollarium criticum atque exegeticum ad Ovidianam epistolam.” He thus returned to his first research subject, Ovid’s poetry, this time focusing on the *Heroides*, on the last one among them, *Her.* 15, *Sappho Phaoni*, in which Sappho addresses her former lover. Luňák focuses on the sources of this particular Heroid, finding them in Sappho’s poems (as well as in Greek epigrams and Sappho’s Alexandrian biography):

Si autem demonstratum erit — quoad id fieri potest — latinum poetam ex ipsis Sapphus carminibus hausisse, tum multa, quae imprimis de vita poetriæ ab hominibus doctis illa epistula fretis tantum dubitanter prolata sunt, magis stabiliri poterunt.

²⁰ *Observationes rhetoricae in Demosthenem*, 1878.

²¹ “Ritoricheskie jetjudy” [Риторические этюды], 1881.

²² “Über den Status der ersten Rede des Isaeus,” 1884.

²³ *Ibid.* 275.

²⁴ “К вопросу об’ отнoшениях’ Демосфена к’ Исократу” [К вопросу об отнoшениях Демосфена к Исократу], 1890.

²⁵ See his “Kriticko-exegetické poznámky k Demosthenově řeči *O věnci*,” 1932, where he argued that ὧν ἔτυχεν in par. 130 does not relate to the parents of Aeschines, but rather to the Athenian patriots, and that the pronoun οἷς represents the traitors; he also proposed the reading ἰαμβιογράφος for par. 139; and his “Zu Demosthenes XVIII 130,” 1933, where he maintained that the Greek rhetoricians were right to understand this passage as a σχῆμα παρα προσδοκίαν.

Suppose it is demonstrated — as much as this is possible — that the Latin poet was using the poems of Sappho themselves as his source. In that case, many of the things, especially from the life of the poetess, which scholars have inferred only cautiously and with doubt, could be more established.²⁶

From there, he proceeds to draw the parallels. Sappho's address from her fragment 102,

Γλύκεια μάτερ, οὔτοι δύναμαι κρέκην τὸν ἴστον,
πόθῳ δάμεισα παίδος βραδίναν δι' Ἀφροδίταν

Sweet mother, I cannot weave my web,
for I am overcome with desire for a boy because of slender Aphrodite

sounds suspiciously like *Her.* 15. 9–14:²⁷

Uror [...]
nec mihi, dispositis quae iungam carmina nervis,
proveniunt.

I burn [...]
nor can I fashion aught of song to suit the well-ordered string;

In Ovid's verses, the "work" of Sappho are poems, Luňák explains while juggling with gerunds in his dulcet Latin, just like the girl in the Greek fragment, talking to her mother, is weaving behind the loom: "Apud Ovidium enim Sapphus solitum opus sunt carmina pangenda, illius autem puellae, quam poetria in graeco fragmento amorem matri confidentem facit, tela texenda." In both cases, the girl's work had been impeded by love. Furthermore, Sappho's fragment 120,

οὐ γὰρ τλάσομ' ἔγω συνοίκην
νέφ γ' ἔσσα γεραιτέρα

I will not endure being
the elder one in a partnership

sounds not unlike Ovid's *Her.* 15. 85–86:²⁸

quid mirum, si me primae lanuginis aetas
abstulit, atque anni quos vir amare potest?

What wonder if the age of first down
has carried me away, and the years that stir men's love?

Indeed, even for Sappho's famed reflection on midnight, moonlight, loneliness, and death, fragment 168b, there are parallels in Ovid, *Her.* 15. 155–56:²⁹

... μέσαι δὲ
νύκτες, παρὰ δ' ἔρχεται ὥρα,
ἔγω δὲ μόνα κατεύδω

²⁶ *Quaestiones Sapphicae*, 6.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 17.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 19.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 23.

it is midnight,
and time goes by,
and I lie alone

Sappho desertos cantat amores —
hactenus; ut media cetera nocte silent.

Sappho sings of love abandoned —
that is all; all else is silent as midnight

All in all, Luňák quotes 17 passages like these where Ovid's verses betray knowledge of her poetry. However, there is more. Not all of Sappho's poems are preserved. There are "antiquorum scriptorum loci," where the authors, familiar with the texts now no longer extant, provide further parallels to the text of Sappho's letter rendered by Ovid. There is, for instance, the story about the problematic relationship between Sappho and her brother Charaxus, who had a costly liaison with a prostitute, Rhodopis, in Egypt, described by Herodotus 2. 135:

Ῥοδῶπις ... ἐλύθη χρημάτων μεγάλων ὑπὸ Χαράξου ... Χάραξος δὲ ὡς ἀπενόστησε ἐς Μυτιλήνην, ἐν μέλει Σαπφῶ πολλά κατεκερτόμησέ μιν.

Rhodopis ... was for a significant sum of money freed by Charaxus ... Charaxus returned to Mytilene and was bitterly attacked by Sappho in one of her poems.

This is clearly related to Ovid's *Her.* 15. 63–67:

Arsit inops frater victus meretricis amore
mixtaque cum turpi damna pudore tulit;
factus inops agili peragit freta caerulea remo,
quasque male amisit, nunc male quaerit opes.
me quoque, quod monui bene multa fideliter, odit.

My poor brother was caught in the flame of harlot love and suffered loss together with foul shame; reduced to need, he roams the dark blue seas with an agile oar, and the wealth he cast away by evil means once more by evil means he seeks. As for me, because I often warned him well and faithfully, he hates me.

There are several further passages like this. From these and other details, Luňák concludes that one should reconsider the claim made by manuscripts (codex Harleianus and codex Parisinus), that Ovid's source, no longer extant, was Sappho's Greek letter to her lover:

Quae ita mihi interpretanda esse videntur: Antiquioribus temporibus, cum Sapphus carmina nondum temporum iniuria consumpta essent, homines litterati, qui et Sapphus et Ovidii carmina lectitabant, ex magna similitudine inter Ovidii Heroidem et Sapphus in Phaonem carmen intercedente coniectando assecuti sunt hanc epistolam ab Ovidio e Graeco translata esse, non quidem ad verbum, sed ut mos erat, liberius.

I think that all this is to be interpreted this way: During the more ancient times, when the songs of Sappho were not yet destroyed by the injustice of the times, scholars reading poems of both Sappho and Ovid were persuaded by the considerable resemblance between Ovid's Heroid and Sappho's poem to Phaon, so they followed the conjecture that this letter was translated from Greek by Ovid; not word by word, but as was customary, more freely.³⁰

³⁰ Ibid. 41–42.

From this point of departure, Luňák proposes further daring hypotheses. He posits that this was the first among the Heroides that Ovid had written: “Fieri potuit, ut Sapphus epistula Ovidiana prima omnium ceterarum Heroidum a Nasone Sapphonem imitante scripta sit.” Only later, realizing the poem’s popularity, he added other fictitious letters of heroic women to their absent husbands or lovers.³¹ This is confirmed by simple ontology; indeed, Sappho cannot be counted among the mythical women like Penelope, Briseis, Phaedra, Dido, Ariadne, or Medea, and later editors have thus placed this letter at the end of the series. Phaon, he speculates, was thus not an invention, as was believed by many contemporary scholars (“recentiorum plurimi Phaonem unquam fuisse negant”);³² he was a real person and Sappho’s lover. Those who think that he was a fabrication and his name derived from the root φα, meaning light, as the Sun to complement Sappho’s Moon (from σαφής), are barking at the wrong tree. The noun to consider for this etymology is, in fact, τάως, “peacock,” like the Latin “pavo,” not his real name, but merely Sappho’s surname “for that handsome and arrogant young man” (“Φάων non genuinum, sed tantum a Sapphone illi pulchro superhoque iuveni inditum cognomen esset”).³³ Similarly, Suda³⁴ was right, claiming that she was married to a rich man from Andros, Cercolas,³⁵ and had a daughter, Cleis, before becoming a widow.³⁶ Finally, Luňák proposes several emendations for Ovid’s Sapphic letter.³⁷

Quaestiones Sapphicæ were read widely. They were mentioned in the bibliographies by the *American Journal of Philology* in 1888 and 1889,³⁸ by *Revue des Études Grecques*,³⁹ the *Classical Review*⁴⁰ and the *Academy*⁴¹ in 1889, by *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*,⁴² *Revue de l’instruction publique*,⁴³ and *Polybiblion: Revue bibliographique universelle*⁴⁴ in 1890, by *Bursian’s Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*⁴⁵ — and even by *The Best Books: A Reader’s Guide to the Choice of the Best Available Books*,⁴⁶ in 1891.

Some of the reviews were descriptive, such as the one by Carlo Oreste Zuretti in *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, published in 1889, with a careful value judgement only thrown in at the end (“Il lavoro è ricco, e molto, di ipotesi, ma non tutte queste provate sufficientemente; e così resta contributo, certo importante, alla questione Saffi-

³¹ Ibid. 42.

³² Ibid. 66.

³³ Ibid. 74; Luňák proposes a non-extant form *πάων, which then became Φάων, when π became aspirated, as it did in several other cases (tenui π per illam Graecorum ‘vulgarem aspirationem’ in φ mutata, cuius exempla sunt Φερσεφόνη, Φίττακος).

³⁴ Suda s. v. Σαπφώ: ἐγαμήθη δὲ ἀνδρὶ Κερκύλα πλουσιωτάτῳ, ὀρμωμένῳ ἀπὸ Ἄνδρου, καὶ θυγατέρα ἐποίησατο ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἣ Κλεις ὠνομάσθη; “she was married to a very wealthy man called Cercylas, who traded from Andros, and she had a daughter by him, called Cleis.”

³⁵ *Quaestiones Sapphicæ*, 80–86.

³⁶ Ibid. 87–88.

³⁷ Ibid. 97–114.

³⁸ 1888, p. 531, 1889, p. 128.

³⁹ 1889, p. 459.

⁴⁰ 1889, p. 194.

⁴¹ Feb. 23, 1889, p. 133.

⁴² 1890, p. 54, 121, 189.

⁴³ 1890, p. 72.

⁴⁴ 1890, p. 55.

⁴⁵ 1891, p. 185, 315.

⁴⁶ 1891, p. 880.

ca”).⁴⁷ Other reviewers, closer to Luňák’s new home, were more critical; *nemo propheta in patria nova*. Tadeusz Zieliński, who was 11 years younger than Luňák and had just become a professor at Saint Petersburg University in 1890, published a review in *Filologicheskoe obozrenie* in 1891.⁴⁸ He was not convinced that *Heroid* 15 was even Ovid’s and promptly proceeded to dismantle other arguments built on that premise. French scholars were more favourably disposed towards the book and writing in *Revue critique d’histoire et de littérature*, Salomon Reinach spoke about the volume being “full of brilliant hypotheses” (“son livre abonde en hypothèses ingénieuses”).⁴⁹ Readers across the pond, however, were genuinely impressed. “This is a treatise of 114 pages written in Latin, and a model of what such a monograph should be,” H. T. Wharton enthused in the *Academy*,⁵⁰ bowing to its author’s perceptiveness even in the few points where he was not entirely persuaded by his arguments: “But the remaining difficulties are discussed with such erudition and critical acumen that, even where we may be inclined to differ from the author, we cannot help feeling that it would be a very difficult matter to convince him that there might be a reason for his conclusions to require reconsideration.” And from Charles W. Super, who published his review in the *American Journal of Philology* in 1891,⁵¹ both Luňák and his new alma mater eventually earned a veritable *canticum canticorum*:

Luňák, whom I need not follow further here, has done his work well; and, while he has to a considerable extent traveled in the footsteps of De Vries, Bahrens and Comparetti, the most important among recent champions for Ovid, he has not slavishly followed his guides, but has produced an essay that does credit for its originality both to its author and to the university to which he belongs. It is evident to the most superficial student of the subject that there has been for several years a strong tendency in philology in the direction indicated by Luňák’s thesis. But it is not a new phase of the question; it is rather a return to former conditions, for it was not until the beginning of the present century that the substantial historical validity of Ovid’s fifteenth *Heroid* began to be called in question. When one marshals the long and imposing array of formidable combatants on both sides, he is forced to conclude that it is not so much external evidence that has determined the place of each as his mental constitution. For us who examine this mass of accumulated evidence there remains little choice but to follow the advice of Tacitus, *ex ingenio suo quisque demat vel addat*.

From Russia with Love

While *Quaestiones Sapphicæ* were indeed the zenith of Luňák’s career, he continued to publish, albeit mostly shorter and more focused papers, dealing with textual criticism. They revisited a series of classical authors, both Greek and Latin — Aristotle, Arrianus, Athenaius, Cassius Dio, Demosthenes, Euripides, Herodotus, and Plato, as well as Apuleius, Cassiodorus, Cato, Cicero, Dictys, Gellius, Ovid, Paulus Diaconus, Porphyry, and Virgil. Up to the October Revolution, his texts were published by international as well as Russian venues, such as *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*. After the revolution, he kept publishing with *Wiener Studien*, *Philologische Wochenschrift*, *Atti dell’Accademia*

⁴⁷ *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 17 (1889), 408–409.

⁴⁸ *Filologicheskoe Obozrenie* [Филологическое Обозрение] 2 (1891), 25–28.

⁴⁹ *Revue critique d’histoire et de littérature* 35–36 (1889), 136–138.

⁵⁰ *Academy* 37 (July 19, 1890), 53.

⁵¹ *American Journal of Philology* 12 (1891), 229–237.

Properziana, *Listy filologické* and other European journals. It seems that Russia was now a foreign country, not least because its classics departments were shut down in 1921. As far as the content of these interventions is concerned, not all were equally convincing, as Svoboda remarked perceptively.⁵² Some were problematic paleographically, others unnecessary, or in one case, not entirely new. The same goes for his etymologies — he tried, for instance, to explain *pāricidium*, “parricide,” with *parare caedem*, “to prepare a massacre”; but the different quantities of the first syllable made this idea difficult to accept.⁵³

Apart from establishing his scholarly career, international publication record, secure position in Odessa,⁵⁴ and good links with the two major centers of learning, Moscow and St Petersburg, Luňák was able to find his place and even acceptance in the broader society within the Russian Empire. This was by no means guaranteed, and to say that the Czechs who came to teach in the gymnasia and the universities of the Russian Empire were not always welcomed with open arms would be an understatement. The journalist Nikita P. Giljarov-Platonov, otherwise a staunch proponent of *slavjanofil'stvo*, accused them of not knowing the Russian soul and not even trying to understand it. He complained that they had come to Russia chasing higher ranks of inspectors and directors because they were not needed at home due to their absolute incompetence. He even called them “Slavic locusts.”⁵⁵ His pamphlet started an avalanche of attacks in the press, both liberal and conservative, metropolitan and provincial. Fedor Kovářík from Plzeň, who was a few years younger than Luňák, went to become a headmaster in Russia and lived to tell the tale, wrote about this media stampede in his *Experiences and Impressions of the Russian Czech During the Empire*. Some of the Czech professors had to cope with their windows being smashed and even themselves being shot at. One of them was driven to suicide. When the case of a student who tried to shoot his professor appeared in the courtroom, the culprits were acquitted, with journalists sighing about professors pushing the unfortunate youth into such acts.⁵⁶ In the year when Luňák was preparing for his Russian career in Leipzig, the liberal writer and playwright Pyotr Boborykin published a novel, *Doktor Cybul'ka: Rapsodii v trjoh knigah* (1875). Its protagonist is a Czech classicist who uses the sentiments of Panslavism to gain acceptance among the Moscow aristocracy and to beguile their daughters — but eventually fails his teacher exams. Moreover, his real name is Zwiebel, he is half Czech and half German from Hranice, and favors exclamations such as “faktum je faktum, a punktum dost” [a fact is a fact, and punctum is enough], “sakramentský chlap” [cursed boy], and “me sme me” [we are us]. According to Boborykin, Czech professors in Russia were modern-day Argonauts looking for the Golden Fleece.⁵⁷ A somewhat inappropriate joke going around St Petersburg featured a Czech professor whose grasp on Russian was so shaky that he

⁵² Svoboda 1939, 353.

⁵³ See, for instance, the critical remarks by Josef Zubatý: “Even after Luňák’s interpretation, these words remain mysterious”; Zubatý 1901, 56.

⁵⁴ Luňák came to Moscow from Kazan in 1890 with the help of the head of the Ministry’s Academic Board, A. I. Georgievsky, replacing the classicist (and the Russian translator of France Prešeren) F. E. Korsh, who went to Odessa; in 1892 Korsh returned to Moscow and Luňák got his position in Odessa (Smyshljaeva 2021, 464).

⁵⁵ Svoboda 1939, 362.

⁵⁶ Kovářík 1932, 92–94.

⁵⁷ Boborykin 1875; Svoboda 1939, 363.

translated the Latin dictum *vita brevis, ars longa* as “zhivot korotok, shtuka dlinna,” “short body, long thing.”⁵⁸

In this sometimes less-than-inviting atmosphere, Luňák nonetheless flourished. In his biography preserved in the archives of the University of Ljubljana, he proudly enumerated the decorations he had been given by Imperial Russia: titulary councilor (1880); collegiate assessor (1881); state councilor (1895); full state councilor with the right to be called “excellency” (1905); knight of the order of St. Stanislaus, third class (1888); knight of the order of St. Stanislaus, second class (1895); knight of the order of St. Anne, second class (1901); knight of the order of St. Vladimir, fourth class (1908).⁵⁹ To put things into perspective, the entire Historico-philological faculty of the Novorussian Imperial University in Odessa had only eleven full professors in 1904, and Luňák was one of them.⁶⁰ For the times, his social mobility was quite astonishing. Among the 68 professors of the university in 1904, no less than 39 were from amongst the aristocracy; 12 were from amongst the clergy; 6 were from merchant and 3 from petit-bourgeois families, while 2 were from an unknown background. From the remaining 6 professors who were classified as “others,” Luňák was the only one who came from a family of farmers.⁶¹

He did what he could to fit in. He became the Russian subject, *poddanny*, and converted to Orthodoxy,⁶² conceivably following the predominant ideology of the empire, which “declared that all education in Russia must be conducted in the joint spirit of Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality” — *pravoslávie, samoderzhávie, and naródnost'*.⁶³ He married an upper-class widow from St Petersburg, Maria Pavlovna Koribut-Kubitovich (1840–1915), who was née Diaghileva and happened to be the aunt of Sergei Diaghilev. Better known as Serge Diaghilev, her nephew later became art critic, ballet impresario, and founder of Ballets Russes, perhaps the most significant dance company of the 20th century. Maria Pavlovna helped raise the infant Sergei after he was orphaned. Her son Pavel became his good friend and eventually “the only relative to attend Diaghilev’s funeral” in Venice in 1929.⁶⁴ Ivan’s and Maria’s only child, Andrei Ivanovich Lun’jak (1881–1957), studied chemistry in Berlin and became, between 1925 and 1928, the rector of the Kazan University, the fact that his father proudly stated on the first page of his employee’s file.⁶⁵

⁵⁸ Instead of “zhizn’ korotka, iskusstvo dlinna.” This bawdy tall story was ubiquitous and hurtful enough that Kovářík felt the need to point out how its protagonist, fictitious or not, must have been a *Pole*, as the word “sztuka,” Polish for “art,” does not even exist in Czech; Kovářík 1932, 93. His Slovenian colleague, Fran Celestin, who served as a professor in Russia between 1870 and 1873, noted how this defamatory anecdote became so popular in the Russian press that “finally the Ministry (!) saw the need to declare that this ill-famed translation had never taken place”; Celestin 1875, 287. Urbanity prevented Celestin from re-translating the ribald mistranslation into anything else than ancient Greek — and even that with a strategically placed omission to avoid triggering his audience: “τὸ μὲν σῶμα μικρόν, τὸ δὲ γ-ν μακρόν.”

⁵⁹ AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak,” chapter 10 (official recognition).

⁶⁰ His colleagues were A. N. Derevickij (who was also rector of the university), V. M. Istrin, A. A. Kochubinskij, N. N. von Lange, I. A. Lynnychenko, V. N. Mochul’skij, A. A. Pavlovskij, g. I. Peretjatkovich, E. von Stern, and A. I. Tomson; Hausmann 1998, 662.

⁶¹ Hausmann 1998, 295.

⁶² Ibid. 300–301; 307.

⁶³ Riasanovsky 2005, 132.

⁶⁴ Scheijen 2009, 11.

⁶⁵ AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak,” chapter 5 (children). Family data given by Luňák and preserved in the university archives in Ljubljana are further corroborated by the profile of Maria Pavlovna Lun’jak (Djagileva (Koribut-Kubitovich)) at the Geni genealogy website, managed by Leonid Semenov.

From Graz to Ljubljana

However, even being well-embedded into society was not much of a help when faced with “the great seminal catastrophe”⁶⁶ of the twentieth century, World War I. The war took its toll on the classicists on both sides. As far as Luňák’s kosmos of Central and Eastern Europe is concerned, both German and Russian participation in the “combat of the scholars,” *Krieg der Geister*, has been well researched.⁶⁷ While all the universities were affected by the war, its aftermath in the West was not as dramatic as in Russia. This was partly because “the Bolshevik regime gradually dismantled the old system of Russian higher education,” and the People’s Commissariat of Enlightenment (Narkompros) established control over the universities, eventually “stripping them of even the ghost of any autonomy.”⁶⁸

Fortunately for the aging scholar, he was no longer in Russia when the dual disaster of war and revolution struck. Retired on August 19, 1909, from the university in Odessa as ordinarius and emeritus, he moved, the very same year, to Graz in Styria.⁶⁹ Graz was known as the “Pensionopolis” of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, a *Pensionistenstadt* that attracted senior military officers, civil servants, as well as artists and nobility. It was particularly popular with people who wanted to spend their autumn years in the relative comfort of its provincial palaces, churches, theatres, and its well-connected railway network. At the same time, they would expend significantly less money than in a metropolitan milieu. Maria and Andrei stayed in Russia. Once the war started, Luňák could no longer leave due to his internment as an enemy alien, *feindlicher Ausländer*. His employee’s form states that he was “confined in Graz.”⁷⁰ Considering his (no longer military) age, social status, and ethnicity, he was probably not forced to move into the infamous Thalerhof camp.⁷¹ His financial circumstances, however, were a different story. After May 1914, his 3000 rubles of yearly pension stopped coming.⁷² With his income and liberty drastically reduced, the war years had to have been a challenging experience.⁷³

It probably seemed like a *deus-ex-machina* when Rajko Nahtigal, professor of Slavic philology at Graz University, offered him a second career. The process of establishing a new university in Ljubljana was well underway, and there were no Slovenian candidates with the necessary habilitation.⁷⁴ Nahtigal became the first Dean of the Faculty of Arts,

⁶⁶ The term was first used by George F. Kennan and later translated into German as *die Urkatastrophe des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts*; Maurer 2006, 9.

⁶⁷ Gavrilov 2006; Ungern-Sternberg 2006.

⁶⁸ Rostovcev 2006, 187.

⁶⁹ AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak,” chapter 18 (previous occupation).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, chapter 8 (employment during the war).

⁷¹ Stibbe 2014, 483–487.

⁷² AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak,” chapter 20 (material circumstances): “Owns a hut in Bohemia; has the right to a pension that has not been paid for 9½ years, 28.500 golden rubles in total, and to his deposit in the Odessa branch of the state bank, 20.800 golden rubles in total, both with interests.” *Terminus post quem* for this document is February 15, 1926, when Andrei Lun’jak became rector of Kazan University, as is mentioned on its very first page. His “personal and professional data form” provides the size of the pension and the month when it stopped.

⁷³ To quote a British woman confined with her elderly parents to the Lower-Austrian village of Raabs: “We were exploited in every way. It was impossible to get accommodation for three people for less than K. 90 monthly [...] Nothing [was] free and nothing cheap. The village shops [had] two distinct charges — one for the inhabitants — one for the interned” (Stibbe 2014, 486).

⁷⁴ The candidates considered at the time were Ivan Arnejc (for Greek) and Josip Koletič (for Latin). Both were professors at a gymnasium; Hriberšek, 2021a, 76. Apparently nobody mentioned Joža

and it appears that he was the one who had to solve the situation. As late as in March 1919, two Czech scholars were foreseen for the new seminary in Ljubljana, Otakar Jiráni (1879–1934) for Latin and Karel Wenig (1878–1964) for Greek.⁷⁵ It would seem, however, that both had other plans. Jiráni soon became a full professor in Prague and the editor of *Listy filologické* in 1920,⁷⁶ and Wenig became a full professor in Prague a year after that, in 1921.⁷⁷ Luňák finally left Graz, precisely one year after the war was ended, on November 11, 1919,⁷⁸ and became professor for classical philology in Ljubljana.⁷⁹ The one problem, namely the fact that his mastery of Slovenian was “merely theoretical,”⁸⁰ as he declared in his employee’s form, was tacitly overlooked. His classes were mostly held in German⁸¹ and decades later, one of his former students remembered him by one of his maxims in the same language: “Wissen Sie, meine Herren, also, also, ja, ja, die klassische Philologie ist wie eine Werkstatt für die präzise (sic!) Mechanik.”⁸²

His years in Ljubljana, the city built on the ruins of the ancient Roman Emona, were surprisingly productive. He almost single-handedly created a classics department, leading it through its first and decade, overseeing its first students to their degrees, and in some cases, doctorates. At the same time, Luňák continued to publish, as his bibliography from this period testifies; his interventions from the period range from papers about classical tradition in Slovenian press to specialist studies in international journals. Several documents about his work in Ljubljana have been discovered recently. They cannot be analyzed here due to space constraints, and they will be published in a forthcoming article.

Most importantly, Luňák also made sure to grow scholarly *Nachwuchs*, consciously establishing conditions for the department to flourish after his departure. There were classicists helping him as teaching assistants (Josip Pipenbacher,⁸³ Josip Debevec, and Ivan Maselj). The one who was eventually able to take over his predecessor’s work, Fran Bradač, started teaching in 1924, sharing the office and the lecture room with Luňák until the early spring of 1930, when the latter left university and finally returned to Prague.

De reditu suo

The circumstances of Luňák’s return are not entirely clear. His employee’s file in Ljubljana contains a letter from the Faculty Dean, dated March 26, 1930, stating that the previous

Lovrenčič, the literary brilliant young classicist who had recently finished his studies in Graz; Božič & Movrin 2019, 104.

⁷⁵ Hriberšek 2021a, 76.

⁷⁶ Plašilová 1985.

⁷⁷ Vysoký 1964.

⁷⁸ AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak,” “personal and professional data form,” VI.

⁷⁹ Other Russian émigré intellectuals found their new home in Ljubljana; Brglez & Seljak 2007. Indeed, when the university was established, they represented no less than a third of its professors, 10 out of 30; the number later grew to 14. Six of them were at the Technical Faculty (Frost, Nikitin, Grudinsky, Kopylov, Majdel, Isajevich), four at the Faculty of Law (Bilimovich, Spektorsky, Yasinsky, Makletsov), three at the Faculty of Arts (Preobrazhensky, Bubnov, and Luňák), and one (Kansky) was at the Faculty of Medicine; Brglez 2014, 247.

⁸⁰ AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak,” chapter 9 (knowledge of languages): “Czech, Russian, German; both classical languages; Slovenian, French, English and Italian merely theoretically.”

⁸¹ Hriberšek 2021a, 80.

⁸² Gantar 2014, 137.

⁸³ Hriberšek 2021b, 26.

contract will end on March 31 and that “the negotiations to renew the contract between the Faculty of Arts and Prof. Dr. Lunjak were not successful.”⁸⁴ What was behind this carefully-worded formulation is anyone’s guess. Luňák was born in 1847 when the life expectancy for males in Europe was about 41 years. In 1930, he was more than twice that age. So it is equally probable that he no longer felt like serving unless some extraordinary compensation was on offer — or that the faculty felt that the time has come for somebody younger.

Whatever the case, he took his “books he loved so much” with him to Prague, seemingly convinced that he would be eventually able to “take them back to Russia.” This was never going to happen, and he eventually bequeathed them to Charles University. His colleagues there noticed his optimism, sense of humor, keen scholarly curiosity, and tongue-in-cheek habit of calling himself “slovozpytec,”⁸⁵ a quaint Czech word for philologist or etymologist.⁸⁶ Some of the books, marked with the stamp “Ex bibliotheca Luňákiana,” are still preserved today. His short autobiographic sketch, still extant in manuscript in 1939, where Luňák described his ear for music, remains to be discovered. Apparently, he was explaining metrical minutiae to his students with the help of his violin.⁸⁷ He died five years later, on the Sunday of July 21, 1935, and was buried in the Orthodox section of the Prague Olšany cemetery, next to the Orthodox church of the Dormition of the Mother of God.⁸⁸

Conclusion

“Dwarfish people,” Aristotle observed in his treatise *On Memory and Recollection*, “have poorer memories” (*De memoria* 453b). He further pointed out that this is why small children have inferior memories as well; “small children are dwarfish until they are advanced in age.” One wonders what the Stagirite would

make of the fact that in the decades that followed his death, Jan Luňák became little more than a name at the eight universities that he belonged to, served, or even helped establish. This paper is an invitation to change that, to provide the name with a face, bibliography, even human complexity — and perhaps recreate a bit of the once-existing *res publica litteraria* in the process. The obvious difficulty in researching any globetrotter is the sheer distance between the relevant archives. The vast expanses between Prague and St Petersburg, between St Petersburg and Odes-



Fig. 3. The book stamp preserved in the books bequeathed by Luňák to the library of the Classics Department at Charles University, Prague

⁸⁴ The previous contract, signed by the Minister of Education Milan Grol in Belgrade, ended after two years and is preserved in the file; AMSU IV (rectorate), files of the professors, “Ivan Lunjak.”

⁸⁵ R[yba] 1935, 368.

⁸⁶ As defined by a contemporary dictionary: “qui studioso exquirat, unde verba sunt ducta”; Coufal, Pelikán, & Zába 1906, 241.

⁸⁷ Svoboda 1939, 352.

⁸⁸ I remain indebted to Sylva Fischerová for consulting the director of the Charles University Archives and discovering that there is no Luňák legacy in their repository (during that time, estates were not incorporated to the Archives, the policy was different). She was also kind enough to connect me with Martin Plohl, the librarian of the classics department at Charles University, whom I owe gratitude for finding both his bookstamp (Figure 3), about which I learned years ago from Vojtěch Hladký, as well as his grave (its coordinates being 50.0817333N, 14.4758369E). Perhaps combining his Russian and his Czech name, the classicist is buried there as “Ivan Luňák.”

sa, between Odessa and Kazan, and between Odessa and Ljubljana, measure some fifteen hundred kilometers each. Yet while such a project might sound ambitious, it is far from impossible. Jan Luňák's teacher Friedrich Ritschl liked to quote Terence's *Heauton timorumenos* 675, "Nil tam difficilē quin quaerendo investigari possiet." The writing of this paper nudged classicists from faraway places to start working together in a network, finding details none of them would have ever discovered on their own. One can be secretly hoping that more will be in touch.

References

a) Works authored by Luňák (in chronological order)

- Kterak Ovidius v *Proměnách* jednotlivé báje spojoval [How Ovid Connected Individual Myths in His *Metamorphoses*]. *Výroční zpráva c. k. gymnasia v Jindřichově Hradci za školní rok 1874*, 3–23.
- Observationes rhetoricae in Demosthenem. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 196 (1878), 91–109, 133–150; also independently (Petropoli 1878), master's thesis.
- Vergiliana. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 200 (1878), 151–156.
- De Homericis similitudinibus apud Vergilium. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 215 (1881), 206–207.
- Ritoricheskie jetjudy [Rhetorical Studies]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 217 (1881), 288–345, ch. 218, 219–268.
- Lager' Kvintilija Vara v' Tevtoburgskom' lesu [The Camp of Quintilius Varus in Teutoburg Forest]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 220 (1882), 193–196.
- Miscellanea critica. 1) Ad Herodoti I. II c. 79. 2) Ad Demosthenis or. XVIII par. 2. 3) Ad Philochori Atthidis I. III fragmentum. 4) Ad Arriani Anab. I. I. c. 1 par. 6. 5) Ad Castorionis fragmentum (apud Athen. p. 542 E). 6) Ad Platonis Phaedri p. 267 C. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 230 (1883), 161–174.
- Über den Status der ersten Rede des Isaeus *Über die Erbschaft des Kleonymos*. *Philologus* 42 (1884), 275–284.
- Reforma prepodavan'ja drevnih' jazykov' v' Avstrijskih' gimnazijah' [Reforming the of teaching of classical languages in the Austrian gymnasia]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 238 (1885), 1–22.
- Zu Athenaeus. *Philologus* 44 (1885), 177–178.
- Quaestiones Sapphicae* (Kazaniae, doctoral dissertation, 1888). Mentioned or reviewed in *American Journal of Philology* 9 (1888), 531; 10 (1889), 128; *Revue des Études Grecques* 2 (1889), 459; *Classical Review* 3 (1889), 194; *Academy*, Feb. 23 (1889), 133; *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica* 7 (1890), 54, 121, 189; *Revue de l'instruction publique* 1890, 72; *Polybiblion: Revue bibliographique universelle* 60 (1890), 55; *Bursian's Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 1891, 185, 315; also included in later volumes, such as *Scriptores Graeci Supplementband* etc.; *The Best Books: A Reader's Guide to the Choice of the Best Available Books* 1891, 880; *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 17 (1889), 408–409; *Filologicheskoe Obozrenie* 2 (1891), 25–28 (Tadeusz Zieliński); *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature* 35–36 (1889), 136–138, (Salomon Reinach); *Academy* 37 (July 19, 1890), 53 (H. T. Wharton); *American Journal of Philology* 12 (1891), 229–237 (Charles W. Super).
- K' voprosu ob' otnoshenijah' Demosfena k' Isokratu [On the question of relation between Demosthenes and Isocrates]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshhenija*, ch. 267 (1890), 72–81.
- K' voprosu o reforme prepodavanija drevnih' jazykov' v' gimnazijah' [On the question of reform in teaching classical languages in gymnasia]. *Uchenyje zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta*, vyp. 1 (1890), 214 ss.
- O proishozhdenii imen' Cheh', Leh', Rus' i Slavjane [About the origin of the names Chekh, Lekh, Rus and the Slavs]. *Uchenyje zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta*, vyp. 2 (1890), 277 ss.
- Miscellen: Zu Euripides' *Medea*. Zu Aristoteles *Rhetorik* II, 14. *Philologus* 51 (1892), 544–547.
- O sovremennom' sostojanii izuchenija drevne-klassicheskikh' pamjatnikov' [On the current state of research regarding ancient classical monuments]. *Zapiski Novorossiyskogo universiteta*, t. 58 (1893), 1–14.
- Miscellen: Zur Medeasage. Zu Dictys IV, 2. Zu den Horazscholien. Zu Cicero's *Cato Maior* 15, 51. *Philologus* 52 (1893), 205 ss.; 324; 327.
- Gostynskoe chudo (K voprosu ob istochnikah jepopei kraledvorskoj rukopisi *Jaroslav*) [Gostyn miracle (On the question of the sources of the epic of the Kraledvor manuscript *Jaroslav*)]. *Zapiski Novorossiyskogo universiteta*, t. 76 (1898), 147 ss.

- De paricidii vocis origine. *Zapiski Novorossiyskogo universiteta*, t. 81 (1900), 159 ss.
- Otzyv o dissertaciji O. F. Bazinera, pod zaglavjem: *Ludi saeculares*, predstavennoj dlja poluchenija stepeni doktora rimske slovesnosti [Review of the dissertation of O. F. Baziner titled *Ludi saeculares*, presented for the degree of Doctor of Roman Literature]. *Istoriko-filologičeskij fakul'tet Novorossijskogo universiteta*, Odessa 1902.
- Verisimilium decas. *Zapiski Novorossiyskogo universiteta*, t. 109 (1907), 445 ss.
- Otchet z. o. prof. I. I. Lun'jaka o nauchnoj komandirovke v Shvejcariju i Tirol' na kanikuljarnoe vremja 1908 g. (po izucheniju romanskogo govora) [Report by prof. I. I. Lunyak about a research trip to Switzerland and Tyrol during the vacations in 1908 (on the study of the Roman dialect)]. Odessa 1909.
- Ideja mira v' drevnem' Rim' v' jepohu Avgusta: Aktovaja rech' [The idea of peace in ancient Rome in the era of Augustus: Topical speech]. Odessa 1909.
- De Sapphus fragmento 52 commentarium. *Wiener Studien* 40 (1918), 97 ss.
- Die böhmischen Eigennamen *Crha* und *Strachota*. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 37 (1920), 538.
- Katonovo pravidlo o orbě [Cato's rule on plowing]. *Listy filologické* 49 (1922), 21–23.
1. Rušenje humanistične gimnazije v Nemčiji. 2. Sijajna zmaga humanistične gimnazije v Prusiji. 3. K reformi naših srednjih šol. [1. Demolition of the Humanist Gymnasium in Germany. 2. A brilliant victory for the Humanist Gymnasium in Prussia. 3. Towards the reform of our high schools.] *Slovenski narod* (9. January, 9. August, 24. December 1924).
- Zu Horat. sat. I., 10, v. 5 sq. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 45 (1925), 1055 ss.
- Zagreb i Agram [Zagreb and Agram]. *Jugoslavenski filolog* 5 (1925), 216 ss.
- De Propertii urbis patriae nomine. *Atti dell' Accademia Proporziana dei Subasio in Assisi* 4.5 (1927).
- Česko žeganje na vasi [Czech blessing festivity in the countryside]. *Slovenski narod* (18. February 1928).
- O slovanském původu jména *Rýbecoul* [On the Slavic origin of the name *Rýbecoul*]. Prague, J. Svátek, 1928.
- O původu jména *Žižka* [On the origin of the name *Žižka*]. Prague 1929.
- Die Grabinschrift der Natesia. *Glasnik Muzejskega društva za Slovenijo* 10 (1929), 17–21.
- Latein als Diplomatensprache. *Das humanistische Gymnasium* 40 (1929), 45.
- Kritické drobnosti. 1) *Demens sonus* u Apuleia Met. V 4. 2) K Dionu Cassiovi XLV 47. [Critical trifles. 1) *Demens sonus* in Apuleius, Met. V 4. 2) On Dio Cassius XLV 47.] *Listy filologické* 57 (1930), 506–508.
- Kriticko-exegetické poznámky k Demosthenově řeči *O věnci* [Critical-exegetical remarks on Demosthenes's speech *On the Crown*]. *Listy filologické* 59 (1932), 29–32.
- Zu Demosthenes XVIII 130. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 53 (1933), 812–813.
- Die Uebernahme der Benennung Daktylus in die Metrik. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 53 (1933), 1215–1216.
- b) *Archival Sources*
- AMSU, Arhivsko-muzejska služba Univerze v Ljubljani [University of Ljubljana Archives] IV — 33/541, Personal file Ivan Lunjak.
- AMSU Arhivsko-muzejska služba Univerze v Ljubljani [University of Ljubljana Archives] IV — Minutes of the sessions of the senate, council and administration of the University of Ljubljana (1919–1943).
- c) *Secondary Literature*
- Benedetič, A. *Poti do univerze: 1848–1898–1909–1919* [Paths towards the University: 1848–1898–1909–1919]. Ljubljana, Studia humanitatis, 1999.
- Boborykin, P. D. *Doktor Cybul'ka: Rapsodii v trjoh knigah* [Doctor Cybul'ka: A Rhapsody in Three Volumes]. Moscow, izdanie knigoprodavcev bračev Salaevyh, 1875.
- Božič, A., & Movrin, D. Joža Lovrenčič in makaronska latinščina v Sholarju iz Trente [Joža Lovrenčič and macaronic Latin in the Scholar from Trenta]. *Clotho* 1.1 (2019) 103–119.
- Brglez, A. Aleksander Vasiljevič Maklecev in začetki kriminologije na Slovenskem [Aleksander Vasiljevich Makletsov and the beginnings of criminology in Slovenia]. *Monitor ISH* 14.1 (2014) 245–270.
- Brglez, A., & Seljak, M. *Ruski profesorji na Univerzi v Ljubljani* [Russian professors at the University of Ljubljana]. Ljubljana, Inštitut za civilizacijo in kulturo, 2007.
- Celestin, F. *Russland seit Aufhebung der Leibeigenschaft*. Ljubljana, Kleinmayr & Bamberg, 1875.
- Chagnon, M.-E., & Irish, T. *The Academic World in the Era of the Great War*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Coufal, J., Pelikán, X. B., & Zába, G. *Slovník latinsko-český a česko-latinský* [Latin-Czech and Czech-Latin Dictionary]. Prague, I. L. Kober, 1906.
- Danto, A. C. *Nietzsche as Philosopher*. New York, Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Gantar, K. Dve pismi Božidarja Bajuka [Two letters by Božidar Bajuk]. *Razprave SAZU* 22 (2014) 131–142.

- Gavrilov, A. K. Russische Altphilologen und der Erste Weltkrieg, in T. Maurer (ed.), *Kollegen — Kommilitonen — Kämpfer: Europäische Universitäten im Ersten Weltkrieg*. Stuttgart, Steiner, 2006, 255–265.
- Hausmann, G. *Universität und städtische Gesellschaft in Odessa, 1865–1917: Soziale und nationale Selbstorganisation an der Peripherie des Zarenreiches*. Stuttgart, Steiner, 1998.
- Hriberšek, M. *Tantae molis erat seminarium condere philologicum Labacensem*: Začetki Oddelka za klasično filologijo na ljubljanski univerzi [The beginnings of the Department of Classical Philology at the University of Ljubljana], in K. Mahnič & B. Pihler Ciglič (eds.), *O poslanstvu humanistike in družboslovja: Ob stoletnici Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani* [On the mission of the humanities and social sciences: On the occasion of the centenary of the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana]. Ljubljana, Znanstvena založba FF UL, 2021a, 63–88.
- Hriberšek, M. Študij in učiteljsko delo Josipa Pipenbacherja [The university and teaching years of Josip Pipenbacher]. *Clotho* 3.1 (2021b), 5–38.
- Kaiser, F. B. Altphilologen für Rußland: Das Lehrerinstitut für Slawische Stipendiaten in Petersburg, das Russische Philologische Seminar (Institut) in Leipzig und das Russische Seminar für römisches Recht in Berlin, in F. B. Kaiser & B. Stasiewski (eds.), *Deutscher Einfluß auf Bildung und Wissenschaft im östlichen Europa*. Cologne, Böhlau, 1984, 69–115.
- Kovářík, F. *Zázitky a dojmy ruského Čecha za carství* [Experiences and impressions of a Russian Czech during the Empire]. Prague, Slovanský ústav, 1932.
- Krestan, L. Kvičala Jan, klass. Philologe, in L. Santifaller (ed.), *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950*, vol. 4. Vienna, ÖAW, 1969, 385.
- Maurer, T. Universitäten im Krieg: Aspekte eines lange vernachlässigten Forschungsthemas, in T. Maurer (ed.), *Kollegen — Kommilitonen — Kämpfer: Europäische Universitäten im Ersten Weltkrieg*. Stuttgart, Steiner, 2006, 9–28.
- Plašilová, J. Vzpomínka na Otakara Jirániho [In Memory of Otakar Jiráni]. *Listy filologické* 108.2 (1985) 110–111.
- Riasanovsky, N. V. *Russian Identities: A Historical Survey*. Oxford, OUP, 2005.
- Rostovcev, E. A. The Capital University in a Time of War: Saint-Petersburg/Petrograd 1914–1917, in T. Maurer (ed.), *Kollegen — Kommilitonen — Kämpfer: Europäische Universitäten im Ersten Weltkrieg*. Stuttgart, Steiner, 2006, 177–188.
- R[yba], B. Drobné zprávy: Jan Luňák [Brief news: Jan Luňák]. *Listy filologické* 62.4–5 (1935) 367–368.
- Scheijen, S. *Diaghilev: A Life*. Oxford, OUP, 2009.
- Schröder, W. A. Das russische philologische Seminar in Leipzig: Das seminar unter Ritschl und Lipsius (1873–1890) und der Versuch der Wiederbegründung (1911–1913). *Hyperboreus* 19 (2013), 91–146.
- Slapnicka, H. Die Teilung der Prager Karl-Ferdinands-Universität in eine deutsche und eine tschechische Universität im Jahre 1882, in F. B. Kaiser & B. Stasiewski (eds.), *Deutscher Einfluß auf Bildung und Wissenschaft im östlichen Europa*. Cologne, Böhlau, 1984, 137–157.
- Smyshljaeva, V. P. Lun'jak Ivan Ivanovich / Luňák Jan, in A. K. Gavrilov, O. V. Budaragina, N. K. Jijina, D. V. Keyer, A. I. Ruban, T. V. Shaburina, A. L. Verlinsky, Yu. A. Vinogradov, and V. V. Zelchenko, *Slovar' peterburgskikh antikovedov XIX. — nachala XX. veka v treh tomah* [A Biographical Dictionary of St Petersburg Classicists in the 19th — early 20th Centuries]. St Petersburg, Bibliotheca classica Petropolitana, 2021, 464–466.
- Stibbe, M. Enemy Aliens, Deportees, Refugees: Internment Practices in the Habsburg Empire, 1914–1918. *Journal of Modern European History* 12.4 (2014) 479–499.
- Svoboda, K. Čeští filologové na Rusi [Czech philologists in Russia]. *Listy filologické* 66.5–6 (1939) 349–364.
- Ungern-Sternberg, J. v. Deutsche Altertumswissenschaftler im Ersten Weltkrieg, in T. Maurer (ed.), *Kollegen — Kommilitonen — Kämpfer: Europäische Universitäten im Ersten Weltkrieg*. Stuttgart, Steiner, 2006, 239–254.
- Verlinsky, A. *Philologia inter disciplinas*: The Department of Classics at St Petersburg University 1819–1884. *Hyperboreus* 19 (2013) 162–202.
- Vysoký, Z. K. Prof. dr. Karel Wenig zemřel [In memoriam prof. dr. Karel Wenig]. *Listy filologické* 87.2 (1964) 380–387.
- Zubatý, J. De paricidii vocis origine: Scripsit I. Luňák. *Listy filologické* 28.1 (1901), 55–56.

Received: 10.12.2021

Accepted: 19.04.2022