

Introduction



Subject and Objective

When German historiography looks back on the tradition of its own discipline, in terms of scientification and professionalization, there is agreement on the pioneering role played in Europe until the last third of the nineteenth century by historicism. At the same time, the phrase “crisis of historicism” is often heard. This became apparent at the moment when specialized historiography obstructed the efforts to reorient historiography that were taking place on an international level at the turn of the century. While historicism was able to assert itself once again in the so-called *Methodenstreit* (methodological dispute) in Germany, pre-revolutionary Russian historiography was already based on completely different premises. Nevertheless, Soviet research resorted to the word “crisis,” which had been coined only for German historicism, in order to unmask “bourgeois Russian historiography” as backward. This pattern of interpretation obstructed Soviet historiography’s impartial view of the innovative achievements of pre-revolutionary historiography.

Decisive for the modernity of Russian historiography—modernity in the sense of “overcoming historicism”—was the influence of the so-called “Moscow School” of historians of Russia around Vasilii Osipovich Kliuchevskii (1841–1911). In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, this group initiated the transition from the individualizing political and legal history pursued by Sergei Mikhailovich Solov’ev (1820–1879) and the “State School” towards a collective social and economic history. Their achievements in the research fields of early modern and modern history continue to be relevant up to the present day.¹ The “school,” in the proper sense, included those young historians at Moscow University who had been influenced by the university politics of the 1880s and by the populist-Marxist discourse of the 1890s, and who, under the aegis of Kliuchevskii, completed a dissertation in Russian history before or in the wake of the 1905 revolution. Among them are Viacheslav Evgen’evich Iakushkin (1856–1912), Pavel Nikolaevich Miliukov (1859–1943), Matvei

Kuz'mich Liubavskii (1860–1936), Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Kizevetter (1866–1933), Mikhail Mikhailovich Bogoslovskii (1867–1929), Nikolai Aleksandrovich Rozhkov (1869–1927), and Iurii Vladimirovich Got'e (1873–1943). The contemporary name “Moscow School” or “Kliuchevskii School” has been taken up by researchers. However, thus far there has not been any unambiguous clarification of whether a grouping of Moscow historians of Russia into one scientific school is justified. This is one of the aims of this work.²

In order to capture the specifics of the *Moscow School* and the academic milieu of the 1880s and 1890s, Pavel N. Miliukov, who became known as the leader of the Constitutional Democratic Party after the 1905 revolution and as the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government after the February Revolution of 1917, seems to offer a particularly useful case study because he both played an active role in university life and led the way for his colleagues in terms of historical research. At the Paris ceremony in honor of his 70th birthday in 1929, Miliukov claimed that the function of the historian was “connecting the past with the present.”³ With this credo, as will be shown, he was indeed far removed from the scientific tradition of German historicism. For him, historical research meant deriving the effect from the cause, that is, explaining contemporary social structures in causal-genetic terms in order, irrespective of location, to define the future path. In this sense, historical discourse was always also, at the same time, social discourse.

In the field of teaching, Miliukov was committed to the universities' right to autonomy and to the spread of higher education in the provinces, independently of the state. In addition, he was active both in the scientific societies led by the liberal professoriate and in the controversies, shaped by agrarian socialists and Marxists, over the consequences of the deficits in socio-economic developments in Russia. The stages of his scientific career reflect a number of aspects typical of the time. In this respect, it is also significant that Miliukov's career as a Moscow historian came to an early end as a result of state repression.

In the field of research, and apart from Iakushkin, who had already studied under Solov'ev, Miliukov was the first student of Kliuchevskii to submit a magister's dissertation. His work on the “State Economy of Russia in the First Quarter of the 18th Century and the Reforms of Peter the Great”, published in 1892, has remained a standard work in professional terms to this day. Contemporaries received it as the first articulation of “economic materialism.” Moreover, Miliukov was also the first representative of the *Moscow School* to present an overall account of Russian history. His “Studies on the History of Russian Culture”, published in three volumes from 1896 to 1904, established, even before the appearance of

Kliuchevskii's "Course of Russian History", the "new direction" in Russian historical studies. Finally, in 1897 Miliukov also published the first volume of his study on the "Main Currents of Russian Historical Thought", with which he sought to provide an account of the scientific direction he had chosen in his magister's dissertation, and in which he demarcated the position of the *Moscow School* against Slavophile interpretations of Russian historiography. The renaissance that the work of the historian Miliukov experienced after the collapse of the Soviet Union is manifested by the 1993–1995 reissue of his anniversary edition of Russian cultural history, published in the 1930s.

This personal portrait is not only intended to place Miliukov within Russian historiography. The interest of the present work is furthermore directed towards the intellectual and socio-historical structural contexts in the period between the Great Reforms of the 1860s and the revolution of 1905. With regard to the institutional framework of historical scholarship, a recourse to the university statutes of 1863 and 1884 is unavoidable. When considering the scientific climate at the Historical-Philological Faculty of the University of Moscow, the year 1880 offers itself as a caesura in several respects. Politically, a new era followed the crisis of 1879–1881, which had led to the assassination of Alexander II. For the *Moscow School* this also represents a key date, due to the appearance of the pre-print of Kliuchevskii's pivotal doctoral dissertation "The Boiar Duma of Ancient Rus" and through his accession to the chair of Russian history which immediately preceded this. Finally, with regard to Miliukov, the year 1881 marked the resumption of his studies following a temporary relegation, and also the point at which he decided to specialize in the field of Russian history. The caesura of 1905 is set by the revolution. For Miliukov this represented a withdrawal from scientific life and the beginning of a career as a professional politician. Thus, for the period 1880–1905, there are three key aspects to be investigated: (a) the study of the organizational structure of Russian historiography in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, (b) the analysis of historiographical schemes developed before the 1905 revolution, and (c) the consideration of the interrelationship of historiography and politics among historians of the liberal camp.

Methodological Basis

In researching Miliukov and the *Moscow School*, it makes sense to consider the areas of "teaching" and "research" separately, so as to accentuate the particular specificities of these two aspects more clearly—without

ignoring the interactions between them. While the first main section, “Teaching,” deals with the crisis phenomena of the university discipline of history and the academic milieu of the 1880s and 1890s, the second main section, “Research,” emphasizes the modernity of the sociological research approach of the Moscow historians and the social dimensions of Russian historiography through an analysis of Miliukov’s work. In both cases, a prerequisite chapter first explains subject-specific terms and general outlines, namely the institutional framework for the formation of the “1880s generation” and “historical sociology” as a scientific paradigm of the *Moscow School*, respectively, and then uses a representative individual case—Miliukov—to illustrate their practical implications. The subsequent excursus deals with Miliukov’s role as a historian of the Russian Revolution and Bolshevik Russia. Methodologically, the first section is based on the ideal type of the “1880s generation” (1) and the second section on the “disciplinary matrix” derived from the concept of the paradigm (2). Each of the aforementioned content-related complexes is then subjected to a systematic principle of structuring within the general chronological framework (3).

*

(1) In 1904, in an essay on “The ‘Objectivity’ of the Sociological and Social-Political Knowledge,” Max Weber introduced the term “ideal type” as a methodological tool to nurture “attributive judgment” in cultural studies.⁴ Social phenomena should be illustrated “through the one-sided *accentuation of one or some* points of view.” The ideal type thus created then has the function of a utopia against which reality can be measured: the task of the historian is “to determine in *each individual case* how close to or how far from reality stands that ideal image....” Ideal types are thus a means, but not the goal of research. The “*purpose of ideal-typical* conceptualization” is “*not to* bring to consciousness the generic but, conversely, the *peculiarity of* cultural phenomena.”⁵ In this way, through the construction of an ideal type, the specificities of individual social phenomena can be examined and, at the same time, their significance can be clarified from an overarching point of view. This concept is by no means clearly defined by Weber. In his 1913 essay “On Some Categories of Understanding Sociology,” he used the term “Richtigkeitstypus” (literally: “correctness type”) as a standard by which to understand social behavior.⁶ Weber retained this shift in emphasis from determining the cultural significance of social phenomena to examining social action and rational behavior in his major work, “Economy and Society,” published posthumously in 1922, in which he generally preferred the term “pure

type.” At this point, the ideal type describes the a priori constructed purposive-rational course of an action, from which any “deviation” caused by irrationalities becomes understandable.⁷

In this work, the achievements of Kliuchevskii’s students will be examined against the background of the situation facing young scholars at the Faculty of History and Philology of Moscow University. In order to conceive of the scientific middle class as a social group, the phenomenon of the “1880s generation” (*vos’midesiatniki*), thematized in the memoir literature, is taken as an ideal type. In 1928, in an essay on “The Problem of Generation,” Karl Mannheim used two criteria to delineate the “generational context” as a social phenomenon: the “generational sequence,” that is, the biological rhythm in human existence, and the “class situation,” that is, the economic, hierarchical structure of society. In order to assign different individuals to a certain generation, the “chronological simultaneity” or the year of birth is not sufficient. Rather, a “common historical-social living space” is decisive. A generational connection exists when different persons participate in a common fate. Within this framework, dependent upon differing manners of processing, competing “generational units” can be formed.⁸

In the “generational sequence,” the *1880s generation* represents the part of the *intelligentsia* that experienced its political socialization during the reactionary period of Alexander III’s rule (1881–1894) and which had to complete their scientific education under the authoritarian university statute of 1884. The “class situation” was characterized by the combination of two factors significant for the Russian university system. On the one hand, obtaining an academic degree under Russian examination conditions was only possible as preparation for a professorship. Second, the 1884 law made the acquisition of a professorship contingent on three years of the “private lectureship” (*Privatdozentur*). Therefore, the *1880s generation*, which both presented its own scientific achievements and developed its own social activities in the 1890s, was bound to the private lectureship officially introduced in the 1884 statute.

Among those aged between thirty and forty years, the *Privatdozent* represented the penniless university teacher without any rights of his own. Despite existing vacancies in professorships, the Ministry of National Enlightenment failed to integrate the non-professorial teaching staff into the official academic establishment. Rather, fields of activity that the intellectual elite sought to pursue on their own in the sector of popular education were subject to state repression. As a result, the *1880s generation*, which had grown up at the universities, found itself in the camp of opposition to the autocratic regime. This anti-state attitude was fostered by the intellectual dominance of positivist social philosophies. In

the socio-political sphere, the *1880s generation* was confronted with the question of how to modernize Russia in the emerging industrial age. The model propagated at the universities called for political participation and social solidarity. In the revolution of 1905, the *Privatdozents* of the *1880s generation* then entered the political arena as ideologues of radical democratic or social reformist liberalism.⁹

This ideal-typical conceptualization of the *1880s generation* highlights the general social relevance of the analysis of the legal and material situation of *Privatdozents* and of the scientific environment at Moscow University which follows in Chapters 1 and 2. At the same time, it also helps to explain the reasons for the deviations that Miliukov's scientific career took from the course he had originally envisaged.

*

(2) In his 1962 essay "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions," Thomas S. Kuhn presented the thesis that progress in science does not take place through continuous change or the accumulation of factual knowledge and new findings, but through revolutionary processes, each of which represents a change in the "paradigms" that determine "normal science." "These I take to be universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners." The variety of interpretations of the term "paradigm" sparked a discussion of Kuhn's theses. In "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" Kuhn had characterized the paradigm term by two features: model solutions had to be sufficiently 'unprecedented' to consistently attract a group of adherents, and sufficiently 'open-ended' to offer experts a reservoir of unsolved problems.¹⁰ In a "Postscript" written for a Japanese translation in 1969 and in an essay on "Second Thoughts on Paradigms" published in 1974, Kuhn further specified his conceptualizations. He distinguished between two variants. (1) He confessed to having introduced the term "paradigm" to describe the theoretical and methodological consensus of a "scientific community," for which he now used the term "disciplinary matrix." (2) The function of "paradigm" originally intended in the essay, however, should be defined by the term "exemplar." Even if Kuhn later distanced himself from the concept of paradigm, due to the inflationary dimension it had taken on in the discourse on the theory of science,¹¹ his terminology does offer a useful tool for the following analytical approach based on the concept of the scientific school. One can speak of a paradigm when a certain historiographical work has the status of a model. The disciplinary matrix of historical science, on the other hand, describes the prevailing scientific paradigm.

Before determining the basic factors of the disciplinary matrix of historical science, a definition of scientific schools will first be derived from Kuhn's theory of science. Kuhn uses the term school in the sense of a competitive struggle for the assertion of a new scientific paradigm, without however firming this up. This task was first undertaken by the German science theorist Hubert Laitko and the American sociologist Edward A. Tiryakian. Both assumed that, in addition to the cognitive component—the “paradigmatic potency” (Laitko)—a social component—the “teacher-pupil relationship”—also had to be taken into account. In the first case, in Kuhn's logic, this meant that schools fulfilled their function at the moment when their respective positions within a scientific community attained a monopolistic position. In this context, Tiryakian proposed four criteria for the emergence of a scientific school: intellectual charismatic personality (school founder), institutional affiliation (university with a high reputation), use of a professional journal (media), and professional proclamation (program). In the second case, with regard to the personality of the teacher, Laitko described the range of variation of scientific schools by four different types: (a) school with a center-oriented structure and contact communication (grouping of students around a particular teacher); (b) a school with a center-oriented structure and indirect communication (gathering of followers around a particular theoretician); (c) a school without a center but with contact communication (cooperation of scientists of the same rank); (d) a school without a center and with indirect communication (individuals with a common research direction).¹²

Following Tiryakian's criteria, it is possible to identify seven characteristics or preconditions which, in a modified form, can be taken as a basis for justifying the designation of the Moscow historians of Russia as a scientific school. (1) The historical-philological faculty of the University of Moscow formed the *institutional framework*. (2) While Kliuchevskii, as an *intellectual charismatic personality*, inspired the junior historians to independent research work, the universal historian Pavel Gavrilovich Vinogradov (1854–1925) promoted the formation of a group by initiating joint projects. (3) The introduction to Kliuchevskii's “Boiar Duma of Ancient Rus',” published in 1880 in *Russkaia mysl'* and inaugurating the combination of administrative and social history, served as a *manifesto*. (4) Kliuchevskii's doctoral dissertation, published in full in 1882, was the *model* against which his students measured themselves. (5) The *scientific paradigm* subsequently elaborated was “historical sociology,” influenced by Western European positivism. (6) Under Russian examination conditions, the attainment of an academic degree was reserved only for a narrow elite. In fact, the public *defense of a dissertation* was a prerequisite for admission to the scientific community. (7) The writing of a dissertation

was in fact only feasible in Russia with a view to an academic career. According to the University Law of 1884, the young scientists who were eligible for it were obliged to *pursue a private lectureship*. Thus, within the “school” the principle of unity of research and teaching was preserved.

The Moscow historians of Russia had only a limited number of publications of their own. The preliminary publication of the extensive dissertations took place in the *Uchenye zapiski Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta* and the *Chteniia Imperatorskogo Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, but the actual research controversies or intellectual debates were generally carried out in the so-called “thick journals” (*tolstye zhurnaly*). Because of Kliuchevskii’s ambivalent role as a teaching personality, one can only speak of a school in the “classical” sense, following Laitko’s typology, with certain reservations. Although the professor constituted the center around which the historians of Russia orientated, direct communication was not particularly pronounced. This remained largely limited to the “Imperial Society for History and Russian Antiquities,” which Kliuchevskii chaired from 1893 to 1906.

Having integrated the *Moscow School* into Thomas S. Kuhn’s system of scientific theory, the next task is to establish the criteria for evaluating the scientific paradigm it represents. Jörn Rüsen laid the groundwork for this in his 1983 monograph “Historical Reason” by transferring Kuhn’s theses to historical science: “Disciplinary matrix means: the factors or principles of historical thought in their systematic context that are decisive for history as a discipline.” Rüsen designed a model in the form of a control circuit that captures the interaction of disciplinary and everyday factors specific to the science of history.¹³ After testing the model in research on historicism,¹⁴ Rüsen made some modifications and specifications in an essay on “Historical Meaning Formation through Narrative,” published in 1996. “Historical meaning, with reference to everyday life, denotes an experience-based, action-oriented, and motivating conception of the passage of time in the human world.”¹⁵

Rüsen defined the five regulatives or principles of historical meaning that constitute the disciplinary matrix of historical science as follows. (1) The starting point of historical thinking are the “interests” embedded in the practice of life. (2) Historical explanations are provided by “aspects of interpretation.” (3) Historical knowledge is gained from the sources with the “methods” of empirical research. (4) Historical knowledge gained from the research process is made accessible through “forms of representation.” (5) The task of historiography is to fulfill the “functions” of cultural orientation. In the interrelationship of these factors, Rüsen saw three dimensions of the formation of historical meaning. (1) Behind the

interrelation of interests and functions lies a “political strategy of collective memory.” (2) The interaction of aspects of interpretation and methods results in a “cognitive strategy of generating historical knowledge.” (3) The relation of forms of representation to the functions of cultural orientation generates an “aesthetic strategy of poetics and rhetoric of historical representation.”¹⁶

In practical application, the individual factors of the disciplinary matrix of historical science developed from Kuhn’s concept of paradigm need to be filled with content. Only in this way can Kuhn’s theories which, in the proper sense, refer to the experimental natural sciences, also be of use to specialist historians. It should be noted, however, that after an initially all-too-casual use of Kuhn’s instruments, skeptical voices have arisen. Rather than “paradigm shifts,” researchers have begun to speak of “developmental thrusts” or “modernization thrusts.” Kuhn’s approach becomes beneficial when it succeeds in subjecting historiography to a typology. Horst Walter Blanke, for example, has tested Rösen’s model on the scientific paradigms of “Enlightenment history,” “historicism,” and the “historical social sciences” for German historiography.¹⁷ On the basis of this structural-historical approach, Chapter 4 distinguishes the *Moscow School* of the last quarter of the nineteenth century from the *State School* around Solov’ev and the so-called “St Petersburg School” around Konstantin N. Bestuzhev-Riumin (1829–1897)¹⁸ and repudiates the Soviet thesis of the “crisis of bourgeois historiography” in Russia, which was taken from the debate on historicism in the Weimar Republic.

*

(3) The section “Teaching” focusses on the institutional level and deals with history as a university discipline. Here, the structure and the equipment of the history faculties as well as the curricula and examination regulations are considered, but so too are the social situation of teachers and students under the conditions of the university statutes of 1863 and 1884. The introduction of the private lectureship and the fee system were of particular relevance for young academics. In this context, four aspects of Miliukov’s integration into the scientific community will be examined: the study of history and the related examinations, the student movement, teaching activities, and cultural works. In the initial section, therefore, crisis phenomena in the historical-philological faculties will be elaborated, then the importance of universities for the development of political liberalism will be shown and, finally, a comprehensive picture of Miliukov’s university career will be outlined.

The overarching section “Research” focusses on the theoretical and methodological level and deals with historiographical questions. It deals with the “crisis of Russian bourgeois historiography,” which Soviet research elevated to a dogma. In this context, the comparison with German historicism forms an important basis for interpretation, since the *Moscow School* was characterized by the self-image of its own discipline as “historical sociology.” With regard to Miliukov, his main works will be analyzed and examined with regard to their reception. The innovations that Miliukov introduced into Russian historiography will be revealed by distinguishing them from corresponding contemporary works. The examination of reviews and disputes opens the view not only to research controversies, but also to ideological positions within the *intelligentsia*. In his “Studies on the History of Russian Culture,” Miliukov laid out his historical-theoretical and -methodological premises. Since the “Studies” have pedagogical pretensions, they must be examined in terms of their objectives and broad impact. In his other major works, Miliukov sought to dethrone two authorities who represented fixed points in pre-revolutionary historical thought, namely Peter the Great in the field of Russian historical process and Nikolai M. Karamzin (1766–1826) in the field of Russian historiography. Different standards are to be applied in the evaluation: as a standard work, the special study on “The State Economy in Russia in the First Quarter of the 18th Century and the Reforms of Peter the Great” is to be critically measured against the results of modern research. The historiography course on “The Main Currents of Russian Historical Thought” has the character of a survey and is to be distinguished from other contemporary contributions. Altogether, the second main part of this publication should thus provide new insights in three further areas: first, the concept of the *Moscow School*, hitherto used largely unreflectively in the research, will be given substance; second, the disciplinary matrix of Russian historiography dominated by this school at the end of the nineteenth century will be determined; and finally, Miliukov’s position in Russian historiography will be outlined.

Finally, a “digression” will discuss the form in which Miliukov represented the *Moscow School* in emigration. It should be borne in mind that the pre-revolutionary scientific paradigm was challenged not only by the Bolsheviks, but also by the Eurasians. In his contemporary historical works “History of the Second Russian Revolution” (1921–1923), “Russia To-day and Tomorrow” (1922), “Russia’s Collapse” (1925/1926), and “Russia in Upheaval” (1927), Miliukov took stock of the historical preconditions and political events that, in his view, had led to the fall of the Tsarist Empire and the establishment of Bolshevik rule. These works are important for the present study, firstly because, as a counterfoil, they illustrate the change

of position that Miliukov, as a historian of the *Moscow School*, undertook in the course of his political career, and, secondly, because they show how Miliukov portrayed his own part in political decision-making.

Notes

1. The founders of the “State School” (*gosudarstvennaia shkola*) or “Historical School of Law” included, in addition to Solov’ev, the legal historians Konstantin D. Kavelin (1818–1885) and Boris N. Chicherin (1828–1904). Influenced by Hegel’s organicist conception of history, this group sought to derive the origin of the modern state from the ancient Russian clan, from the *rodovoi byt*. In addition to the Kievan period, research interest focused primarily on the Varangian problem and the reforming activities of Peter the Great. The central historical-theoretical category was Hegel’s construct of “world-historical individuals.” From the ideological point of view, the *State School* belonged to the camp of the so-called Westerners. The founding generation, which had already been active at Moscow University in the 1840s, was joined in the 1860s by a loose association of younger legal historians from various universities. Cf. K.-D. Grothusen, *Die Historische Rechtsschule Russlands: Ein Beitrag zur russischen Geistesgeschichte in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Gießen: Schmitz, 1962), especially 235–38; G. M. Hamburg, “Inventing the ‘State School’ of Historians, 1840–1995,” in *Historiography of Imperial Russia: The Profession and Writing of History in a Multinational State*, ed. Thomas Sanders (Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 1999), 98–117; R. A. Kireeva, *Gosudarstvennaia skola: istoricheskaia kontseptsia K. D. Kavelina i B. N. Chicherina* (Moscow: OGI, 2004).
2. Cf. A. S. Popov, *V. O. Kliuchevskii i ego “shkola”: sintez istorii i sotsiologii* (Moscow: Signal, 2001); N. V. Grishina, “*Shkola V. O. Kliuchevskogo*” v istoricheskoi nauke i rossiiskoi ku’ture (Cheliabinsk: Entsiklopediia, 2010).
3. “[Otvetnoe slovo P. N. Miliukova],” *PNM SM*, 260.
4. M. Weber, “Die ‘Objektivität’ sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis,” *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 19 (1904): 22–87, here 64. Reprint in: idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, ed. J. Winckelmann, 7th edn (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988), 146–214, here 190.
5. Ibid. (1904), 64–67, 76; (1988), 190–94, 202.
6. M. Weber, “Über einige Kategorien der verstehenden Soziologie,” *Logos: Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Kultur* 4 (1913): 253–94, here 254. Reprint in: idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 427–74, here 428.
7. M. Weber, *Grundriss der Sozialökonomik: III. Abteilung. Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Tübingen, 1922), 1–4. Reprint in: idem, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriß der Verstehenden Soziologie*, ed. J. Winckelmann, 5th rev. edn (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1972), 1–4.
8. K. Mannheim, “Das Problem der Generation,” *Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie* 7, no. 2–3 (1928): 157–85 and 309–30, here 170–74, 180/181, 309–11. Reprint in: idem, *Wissenssoziologie. Auswahl aus dem Werk*, ed. K. H. Wolff (Berlin: Luchterhand, 1964) (2nd edn 1970), 509–65; here 524–28, 536, 541–44.

9. The Constitutional Democrats, referred to as the “Professors’ Party,” provide a convincing example. In April 1906, 21 members of the 47-member Central Committee were listed as university professors. The average age was forty years. They had attended university during the reactionary era of Alexander III. Cf. the list of members in: “Kadety v 1905–1906 gg. S predisloviem B. Grave,” *Krasnyi arkhiv* 46 (1931): 42–43. Of the six historians on the Central Committee, Viacheslav E. Iakushkin, Aleksandr A. Kizevetter, Aleksandr A. Kornilov (1862–1925, educated at the Law Faculty), and Miliukov had not yet passed the level of *Privatdozent*. Evgenii N. Shchepkin (1860–1920) had a professorship in Odessa from 1898, although he only submitted a magister’s dissertation in 1902. Only the Kievan universal historian Ivan V. Luchitskii (1845–1918) held a full professorship. According to Valentin V. Shelokhaev’s lists of the members of the Central Committee of the Constitutional Democrats, there were 22 university teachers among the total of 54 persons in 1905–1907, and in 1907–1914 there were 19 university teachers among the total of 45 members. V. V. Shelokhaev, *Kadety—glavnaia partiia liberal’noi burzhuazii v bor’be s revoliutsiei 1905–1907 gg.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983), 310–20; idem, *Ideologiia i politicheskaia organizatsiia rossiiskoi liberal’noi burzhuazii, 1907–1914 gg.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991), 207–11.
10. T. S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) (2nd enlarged edn 1970), 6, 10, citation, VIII.
11. T. S. Kuhn, “Second Thoughts on Paradigms,” in *The Structure of Scientific Theories*, ed. with a critical introduction by F. Suppe (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974) (2nd edn 1977), 460, 463, 471, 482.
12. H. Laitko, “Der Begriff der wissenschaftlichen Schule—theoretische und praktische Konsequenzen seiner Bestimmung,” in *Wissenschaftliche Schulen*, vol. I, ed. S. R. Mikulinskij et al. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977), 257–90, here 277/278; idem, “Nauchnaia shkola—theoreticheskie i prakticheskie aspekty,” in *Shkoly v nauke*, ed. S. R. Mikulinskii et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), 217–47, here 235; E. Tiryakian, “The Significance of Schools in the Development of Sociology,” in *Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective*, ed. W. E. Snizeh, E. R. Fuhrman, and M. K. Miller (Westport, CT: Aldwych Press, 1979), 211–33, here 222/223.
13. J. Rüsen, *Historische Vernunft. Grundzüge einer Historik I: Die Grundlagen der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 24–29, citation, 24.
14. Cf. J. Rüsen, “Historismus als Wissenschaftsparadigma: Leistung und Grenzen eines strukturgenetischen Ansatzes der Historiographieggeschichte,” in *Historismus in den Kulturwissenschaften: Geschichtskonzepte, historische Einschätzungen, Grundlagenprobleme*, ed. O. G. Oexle and J. Rüsen (Cologne: Böhlau, 1996), 119–37.
15. J. Rüsen, “Historische Sinnbildung durch Erzählen: Eine Argumentations-skizze zum narrativistischen Paradigma der Geschichtswissenschaft und der Geschichtsdidaktik im Blick auf nicht-narrative Faktoren,” *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 18 (1996): 501–44, here 509.
16. *Ibid.*, 515/516.
17. H. W. Blanke, *Historiographieggeschichte als Historik* (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1991), especially 47–66.

18. The term “St Petersburg School” is used in the literature to distinguish the historians of the University of St Petersburg from those of the University of Moscow. Cf. G. Vernadsky, *Russian Historiography: A History*, ed. S. Pushkarev, trans. N. Lupinin (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1978), 107 and 260; V. S. Brachev, “*Nasha universitetskaia shkola russkikh istorikov*” i ee sud’ba (St Petersburg: Stomma, 2001). There was no scientific school of St Petersburg historians in the sense defined in this work. Even Bestuzhev-Riumin’s doctoral students did not want to grant their teacher the nimbus of a school founder, since the latter had shown little openness to newer tasks and had largely withdrawn from university life in the 1880s due to his failing health. S. F. Platonov, “Konstantin Nikolaevich Bestuzhev-Riumin,” *ZhMNP*, no. 2 (1897): otd. 3-ii, 176. Reprint in: idem, *Stat’i po russkoi istorii (1883–1902 gg.)* (St Petersburg: Izd. A.S. Suvorina, 1903), 298. Izd. 2-oe. (1883–1912) (St Petersburg: Tip. M. A. Aleksandrova, 1912), 179; E. F. Shmurlo, *Ocherk zhizni i nauchnoi deiatel’nosti Konstantina Nikolaevicha Bestuzheva-Riumina. 1829–1897* (Iur’ev: K. Mattisen, 1899), 156–57. Cf. also R. A. Kireeva, *K. N. Bestuzhev-Riumin i istoricheskaia nauka vtoroi poloviny XIX v.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1990).