

NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

As a manuscript

TemurmaliK Kholmatov

**THE INTELLECTUAL BIOGRAPHY OF
S.B. VESELOVSKIY (1876–1952)**

Dissertation Summary

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in History

Academic supervisor:

Marina F. Rumyantseva, PhD

Moscow 2023

The work was accomplished at the Doctoral School of History, Faculty of Humanities, National Research University Higher School of Economics.

Academic supervisor: M.F. Romyantseva, PhD.

Relevance of the Study

Finding out how the ideas of historians of the past took shape is among the most relevant tasks of research in the history of historical studies. Of particular interest are the methods of knowledge production that a historian applied, and the epistemological principles on which their works rest. The choice of method depends, among other things, on the ethical principles of the scholar. The relationship between ethics and epistemology is a particularly important research subject in times of crisis or rapid sociocultural transformation. This makes the study of the intellectual biography of Stepan Borisovich Veselovskiy (1876–1952) so rewarding, since the early stages of his career as a historian fell in the time in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when the classical model of history was in crisis.

On the other hand, a significant part of Veselovskiy's active life as a scholar took place during the Soviet era. It is, therefore, of interest to find out how his ethical and epistemological principles worked under the new political and socio-cultural circumstances, how he adapted to them and pursued his work under the Soviet rule.

Degree of scientific development of the topic

The existing research on the topic of the dissertation can be divided into two parts. The first includes studies concerning Stepan Veselovskiy's life and work, the second includes studies in the history of pre-revolutionary Russian and Soviet historical studies that allow us to understand how his scholarly work fit into the historical culture of the time.

Stepan Veselovskiy as a historian and a person

Our analysis of historical research on Veselovskiy allows us to single out two periods in the study of his life and work. Biographical studies on Veselovskiy began to appear in the late 1970s. Among the publications describing the main stages of his scholarly career and his unique research style, the article by L.V. Cherepnin (1977, pp. 9–41) in the edited volume *History and Genealogy. Stepan Veselovskiy and Historical-Genealogical Research* stands out, which was a milestone in the study of Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage. Also noteworthy is the 1989 publication of a biobibliographical index of Veselovskiy's publications, edited by V.B. Kobrin and K.A. Aver'janov (1989), briefly outlining the evolution of Veselovskiy's views and interests. The most important contribution of this work to the study of Veselovskiy's life and work is an exhaustive account of his writings published both during his lifetime and posthumously until 1989.

Speaking of the Soviet-time publications on Veselovskiy, we should also mention two articles that focus on individual aspects of his work. The article by M.E. Bychkova (1977, pp. 42–56) offers a detailed description of Veselovskiy's methods of working with primary sources in his historical and genealogical research. The following year, an article by V.D. Nazarov was published (1978, pp. 212–230), analyzing the problems Veselovskiy encountered in his studies of feudal landownership in Russia between the 14th and the 17th centuries.

A new stage in the study of Veselovskiy's life and work opened in the 2000s, when many of his private papers were published. With the publication of Veselovskiy's memoirs, diaries, and correspondence, more and more works appeared which sought to elaborate on his personality, the conditions of his research work, his political views, his relationship with other historians, and his everyday life during the time of the 1917 Revolution and the subsequent Civil War. Examples include articles by A.L. Yurganov (2001, pp. 84–113), D.B. Sporov and S.Yu. Shokarev (2006, pp. 125–146), T.A. Bulygina (2008, pp. 177–185), and L.A. Sidorova (2013, pp. 291–297; 2017, pp. 276–285). At the same time, research continued on individual topics dealt with in Veselovskiy's

scholarly work, and on aspects of studying his academic trajectory, e.g. in the context of studying the intellectual atmosphere of the 1930s and 1950s (Dubrovskiy, 2005, pp. 554–568, 760–778), or the Moscow school of history (Tikhonov, 2012, pp. 115–141, 245–251, 298–303) as well as his principles and methods of analyzing various types of historical primary sources (Kisterev, 2013, pp. 10–16; Korzinin, 2014, pp. 133–142; Shokarev, 2020, pp. 187–195). Researchers have also studied the criticism of Veselovskiy and his writings in the context of ideological campaigns (Tikhonov, 2013, pp. 104–113).

On the thematic level, an article by I.A. Polyakov (2013, pp. 153–157) significantly stands out against the background of all the above-mentioned works, as it analyzes neither Veselovskiy's scholarly work as such nor the circumstances under which he worked, but the evolution of way this historian was remembered both in academia and in wider society in the second half of the 20th and early 21st centuries.

The topics of Veselovskiy studies depended to a large extent on the publication of source texts. During the Soviet era and up to the end of the 1990s, only Veselovskiy's studies were published, which explains the fact that researchers mainly wrote about his scholarly work. The publication of his papers of more private nature in the late 1990s and early 2000s allowed researchers to find out more about his personality, which, in turn, made it possible to better understand him as a scholar.

It should also be noted that focusing predominantly on the major works of Veselovskiy led to a number of his works remaining on the periphery of research. His biographies are often structured by moving from one major work to the next one. This allows us to understand the most significant contributions he made to historiography, but this perspective leaves out relatively small works (articles, essays and, especially, reviews), which, firstly, are of independent scholarly interest and, secondly, allow us to trace in more detail the direction of his thought and professional views, to identify the ties between his largest works and to show the evolution of his scholarly principles. A number of Veselovskiy's articles,

reviews, essays, and other works have only been mentioned, but barely analyzed. Considering them along with the ‘big ones’ will make it possible to present the scholar's scholarly work in all its diversity, to show the peculiarities of his research design, and to better understand how his practices fit into the historical culture of his time (Repina, 2011, pp. 470–493).

The History of Russian and Soviet Historical Studies

As publications in intellectual history since the late 1980s and early 1990s show, what it values the most are books that are embedded in a socio-cultural, intellectual historical context. Therefore, the thesis pays particular attention to a group of studies on the history of Russian (imperial as well as Soviet) historical studies. This group can be divided into several parts. One part includes studies focusing on the relationship between a historian's work and their socio-cultural environment. They help us understand the trends that were dominating the Russian and Soviet historical studies in the time of Veselovskiy and how his scholarly production fit into the Soviet reality, how it correlated with the writings of his fellow historians, whether and how it met the requirements for scholarly work in the new socio-cultural circumstances, and how his scholarly legacy was evaluated by the posterity (Afanas'eva, 1996; Sidorova, 1997; 2008; 2017; Korzun, 2005; Dubrovskiy, 2005; Tikhonov, 2016; Kiselev, 2020). For an encompassing understanding of the circumstances in which Veselovskiy had to work, the author has consulted studies on the history of the institutions (and their subdivisions) that Veselovskiy's ‘works and days’ were associated with (Prostovolosova and Stanislavskiy, 1997; Brachev, 1997; Shokhin, 1999; Gruzinskaja et al., 2018; Khorhordina, 2020).

An integral component of a historian's (or any other scholar's) professional activity is communication with their fellow researchers. The study of interpersonal informal ties is of interest for a deeper understanding of the ways in which a scholar enters the academic corporation and stays within it, what values,

professional views and scholarly interests they share with its other members, and what kinds of conflicts and rivalries they experience in the academic environment. In order to gain a deeper insight into Veselovskiy's relations with his colleagues, biographical studies on his contemporaries, historians of different generations, were consulted, including those on V.O. Klyuchevskiy, V.G. Druzhinin, S.F. Platonov, M.K. Lyubavskiy, A.S. Lappo-Danilevskiy, M.M. Bogoslovskiy, A.E. Presnyakov, Yu.V. Gauthier, A.I. Yakovlev, S.V. Bakhrushin, B.D. Grekov, M.N. Tikhomirov, N.V. Ustyugov, L.V. Cherepnin, and A.A. Zimin.

Veselovskiy's formative years as a historian fell on the time of when a number of historical scholarly schools were rapidly developing in Russia. This thesis makes ample use of studies in the history of academia and its intellectual currents to achieve a better understanding of their theoretical and methodological frameworks, the interpersonal relationships and intellectual continuity between historians of different generations (especially during the crisis of the classical model of their discipline). This provides a significant supplement to the literature on the life and scholarly work of historians (Myagkov, 2000; Korzun, 2002; Rostovcev, 2004; Alevras, 2006; Grishina, 2010; Tikhonov, 2012; Sveshnikov, 2016).

Furthermore, this dissertation considers the intellectual biography of a scholar in the context of professional and academic ethics. In general, ethical issues in the scholarly work and communication of historians have rarely been studied by Russian researchers. Studies that focus on ethics mainly analyze conflicts and deviations from norms and values (Sveshnikov, 2005, pp. 228–259; 2009, pp. 42–72; Grishina, 2015, pp. 455–458; Kiselev, 2020, pp. 124–133; Gruzinskaja and Kovalev, 2021, pp. 94–111; Kholmatov, 2022, pp. 134–143). It seems, however, equally important to study those aspects of ethics that organize scholarly work, uphold it, and are closely intertwined with epistemology.

In this dissertation, questions of ethics are of particular interest for understanding the principles on which Veselovskiy's characteristic practice of presenting the results of his research was based. From this point of view,

particularly important are the works of Chelyabinsk historians on the dissertation culture Russian historians (Alevras and Grishina, 2022). One of the central places in their research is occupied by the *dissertation* as a special genre of scholarly work which embodies scholarly norms and values of the historical academic community and represents "*a certain paragon (benchmark) of a scholarly study*" (Ibid, pp. 12). Taking into account the professional milieu's rituals and traditions concerning the dissertation as a scholarly product allows us to gain a deeper understanding of the normative foundations of academics' research activity and their value vectors. It appears heuristically productive to analyze ethical principles not only through writings, but also through their authors. As a sample of this approach, we should single out V.P. Korzun's studies of the classics of historical studies (Korzun, 2016, pp. 459–470; 2022, pp. 337–364). In her works, Korzun emphasized the close connection between the recognition/fixation/rejection of academic norms and values on the one hand and the (de)classicalization of historians, on the other. It was the classics who were regarded as exemplary representatives of the historical profession, embodiments of its values and virtues, which they made part of their research work and thus furthered the development of historical knowledge.

The **object of the study** in this thesis is the creative heritage of Stepan Veselovskiy, and the **subject matter of the study** is his research work.

The **goal of the study** is to reconstruct the intellectual biography of Stepan Veselovskiy. To achieve this goal, the following **tasks** have to be fulfilled:

- 1) to reconstruct the sociocultural and intellectual contexts of Veselovskiy's formation and development as a historian;
- 2) to trace the development of his research work principles, to analyze theoretical and methodological constructions in his works;
- 3) to explicate his ethical principles as a scholar;
- 4) to study the publication of Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage, to analyze the perception of his personality and scholarly work by the academic community.

Novelty of the Study

The novelty of this study consists, first, in its *applying of source criticism methods to historiography in order to reconstruct a scholar's intellectual biography*, which makes it possible to elucidate various forms of his intellectual work and understand how it was practiced and how it related to the national historical culture of its time.

Second, this dissertation analyses the posthumous publications of Veselovskiy's works and their reception as part of his intellectual biography. Source criticism as applied to historiography allows us to answer two key questions regarding historiographical source texts: *what* they are and *how* they were made. From the point of view of modern intellectual history studies, the dissemination of ideas is no less important than their generation. Taking into account the *reception* of a scholar's works in academia (and in the public sphere in general) opens up the possibility to understand the functioning of a historiographical source in historical culture, including – in the case of a number of Veselovskiy's works – under new sociocultural circumstances.

Thus, this dissertation offers a new understanding of intellectual biography, expanding its well-established "works and days"-model and adding novel ways of studying the scholarly heritage of the protagonist.

Theoretical and Methodological Guidelines of Research

As this study applies the methods of source criticism to the analysis of historiographical texts as the results of creative and research activities of an individual, the following definition of intellectual biography is formulated in this study: it is the explication in the dynamics of the forms of intellectual work of the individual, considered in the context of intellectual culture.

The above definition of intellectual biography raises a methodological problem: *how* should forms of the protagonist's intellectual work be explicated? This problem is solved through the *source criticism of historiography*. The source

criticist approach allows us to focus on the goal setting of the work at issue, to understand what motivated its author to set and solve some research problems or others, what sources / studies he drew upon, how the author constructed the narrative, what explanatory models they built, and how they constructed the theoretical and methodological framework of their study. Taken together, answers to these questions make it possible to better understand the way(s) the results of scholarly work presentation, and the relationship between the individual works of the scholar.

The concept of *historical culture*, which significantly complements the toolkit of the source criticism of historiography, occupies one of the key places in the dissertation. It refers to the fact that the works of a historian as a result of their intellectual work meant a conscious decision to the study of the past. It is, therefore, necessary to understand what contributed to this decision and, most importantly, what relationship existed between the research method the scholar opted for and other methods available at the time.

The concept of historical culture helps us better understand the ways of presenting research results that were chosen by a historian whose activity fell on the first half of the twentieth century. Taking into account the fact that the main result of a historian's work was usually a publication, special emphasis is placed in the thesis on the analysis of different kinds of scholarly publications. Therefore, from the point of view of source criticism of historiography, historical culture is seen as a system of historical knowledge production and presentation through a system of publications. This understanding of historical culture implies a close connection between the scholar's epistemological and ethical attitudes. As far as Veselovskiy's intellectual work is concerned, it's analysis also has to take into account the fact that a significant part of his scholarly heritage was published posthumously. This makes it necessary to analyze the peculiar ways the scholar's heritage was passed on to the posterity under new sociocultural circumstances.

Source Base of the Study

The main body of sources this study draws upon are *historiographical sources*. These include Veselovskiy's monographs, conference papers, articles, book reviews, thesis review reports, essays, source text editions, historical maps, etc. Taken together, these works allow us to trace the evolution not only of the author's scholarly opinions and interests, but also his research principles and epistemological attitudes. This particularly concerns books, which usually have introductory chapters containing the author's reflection on the outcome of their study.

The body of sources also includes drafts, sketches, working notes, and extracts from sources which are preserved in the Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences (in Veselovskiy's papers as well as in the papers of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR) and in the Scholarly Historical Archive of the St. Petersburg Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. These materials allow us to trace Veselovskiy's research plans, the course of his work, the evolution of his views and his scholarly principles, as well as the difficulties he experienced in the course of his research work.

To place Veselovskiy's writings in the context of the historical culture of his time, historiographical texts by other authors were included into the source base of the present study. Besides, works of other researchers are used to analyze one level of historiographical deconstruction, namely to understand what works Veselovskiy were guided by in his own research endeavors. For this end, the study draws on books by V.I. Sergeevich, V.O. Klyuchevskiy, S.F. Platonov, N.P. Likhachev, D.M. Petrushevskiy, M.M. Bogoslovskiy, J.V. Gauthier, among others. This list also includes works by younger historians who were inspired by the legacy of Veselovskiy: L.V. Cherepnin, A.I. Kopanev, A.A. Zimin, Yu.G. Alekseev, L.V. Milov, V.B. Kobrin, R.G. Skrynnikov, M.E. Bychkova etc.

The source base is supplemented by sources of personal provenance. In everyday life and work, the individual makes choices in a spectrum of decisions. Jacques Revel emphasized that "the spectrum of these possible decisions is not

arbitrary; it is socially determined, i.e. depends on ideas of social space, <...> and, on the one hand, provides means to achieve the goal, and on the other, generates unfreedom, coercion, which, in turn, are subjectively refracted in the minds of individuals and groups" (Revel, 2002, pp. 22). In striving to represent this choice, the researcher is aided by sources of personal origin, primarily those that stem from the person being biographed. It is also necessary to take into account the special nature of the historian's trade, which depends not only on scholarly views and competence, but also on values. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the historian's laboratory, his creative process, his everyday scholarly work and pursuits, one should study his life, goals, motives, experiences, ideals, and other components of his inner world. The study of all these is difficult to imagine without sources of personal origin: diaries, correspondence, and memoirs.

Diaries and memoirs of other researchers have become an aid to studying the perception of Veselovskiy's personality and works in the scholarly community, his relationships with other researchers, and also to analyzing the intellectual atmosphere in which his research work and the publication of his scholarly heritage took place. In particular, the diaries of M.M. Bogoslovskiy, Yu.V. Gauthier, A.N. Savin, M.N. Tikhomirov, the memories of P.N. Milyukov, L.V. Cherepnin, E.V. Gutnova, N.I. Pavlenko, A.A. Zimin, and others, including the scholar's family, were studied. The latter were instrumental in reconstructing Veselovskiy's everyday work and in studying the fate of his scholarly heritage.

'Red tape' documents played a significant role, too. They were used primarily to reconstruct the context and the circumstances of Veselovskiy's work. Unlike the sources mentioned above, these materials are largely not published. They are preserved in archives such as the Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the State Archives of the Russian Federation, the Scientific Archive of the Institute of Russian History, the Russian State Archive of Ancient Documents, Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History, and the Central State Archive of the City of Moscow. This category of sources comprises various certificates Veselovskiy received from the scholarly and educational institutions where he

worked, but also his research reports, autobiographies, personal files, reviews of works done, employee assessments, letters from various institutions and publishing houses, plans of scholarly projects, etc. In order to understand how the circumstances of Veselovskiy's scholarly activities took shape, this study drew on stenographic reports and minutes of meetings, and resolutions of the commissions he was member of. In particular, minutes of meetings of the Archaeography Commission, shorthand reports and minutes of meetings at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR were studied, which were mainly related to the discussion of collective projects of the late 1930s and early 1940s and with ideological campaigns in the postwar years.

Particular attention is paid to the study of the publication of Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage, drawing on documents of the Commission on the Publication of Veselovskiy's Works. These included, for example, the resolution of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR "On considering the issue of publishing Veselovskiy's works and setting up a commission to this end," excerpts from the minutes of the meetings of the Office of the Academy of Sciences' Department of History, plans of the commission, etc.

Statements Put Up for the Defense

1. Due to the fact that a significant part of Veselovskiy's pre-revolutionary works falls on the period of crisis of historical studies, the formation and development of his theoretical and methodological principles were shaped elements of both classical and non-classical models of historical studies. The elements of the classical model were reflected by the positivist principles he adhered to. His leaning towards the non-classical model was manifested in his tendency to raise new questions in his studies and to show the heuristic potential of the historical sources he drew upon to solve these questions, and in outlining the prospects of further dealing with the topic under discussion. The archeographic works of Veselovskiy were at the junction of two models of history.

2. Elements of both classical and non-classical models of history were also manifest in Veselovskiy's work during the Soviet time. The principles of classical science were reflected by his gravitation towards positivism as well as in his furthering the auxiliary sciences of history and source criticism, while the non-classical model was manifested, just as in the pre-revolutionary period, predominantly in the way he presented the results of his research.

3. Auxiliary sciences of history – in particular, archaeography, genealogy, historical geography, and onomastics – occupied a significant place in Veselovskiy's work. These disciplines were closely intertwined with each other to form a methodological unity, with Veselovskiy applying the methods of one of them to the others and mutually complementing them. As can be seen from Veselovskiy's writings, the expansion of the methodological potential of each of these disciplines was ensured through their interpenetration and complementarity.

4. Veselovskiy's inner emigration during the Soviet era was largely due to his ethical principles as a scholar. He viewed scholarly work as a space conducive to maintaining a sense of inner freedom. His consciously chosen manner of working helped him to fulfil his potential as a historian in inner emigration. He made a point of keeping his mind free of ideology, which enabled him not only to exist in the Stalin era USSR but also to successfully implement his own research design (within the limits of the permitted), at least until the ideological campaigns of late Stalinism changed the context.

5. The publication of much of Veselovskiy's scholarly legacy played a key role in shaping the scholar's profile as a classic. A broad inclusion of Veselovskiy's writings (even old ones) in scholarly and educational use was an integral part of his classicalization. An equally important role in this process was played by Veselovskiy's ideas and findings being in demand in Soviet academia of the time, as well as by the affinity of his ethical rules and values with the ones upheld by a number of late-Soviet scholars.

6. Veselovskiy's scholarly legacy became classical in the late 1970s and the first half of the 1980s, when it can be said to have fulfilled the key criteria of

classics: by this time, a considerable part of his scholarly heritage had been published and enjoyed an enthusiastic reception in academia. Veselovskiy's works also met the nominal criterion of scholarly classics as formulated by the Soviet regime at that time.

Structure and Summary of the Dissertation

The dissertation consists of an Introduction, three chapters, a Conclusion, a List of Abbreviations, a List of Sources and References, and Appendices.

The **first chapter**, titled "Stepan Veselovskiy in the Time of Theoretical and Methodological Quest in Russian Historical studies," examines Veselovskiy's research practices and the formation of his scholarly principles.

The *first section* of this chapter, titled "Stepan Veselovskiy's Youth, His Student Years and First Publications," recapitulates what we know on Veselovskiy's adolescent hobbies, his education, and his first publications, the majority of which, though not thematically related to his subsequent works, nevertheless allow us to trace back the typical features of his future style.

The second section, titled "From the History of Indirect Taxes to the History of Direct Ones: Russia's State Economy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," analyzes one of the protagonist's main fields of research in the pre-revolutionary years. Already in his first major work on this topic (*Sem' sborov zaprosnykh i pyatinnykh deneg v pervye gody tsarstvovaniya Mikhaila Fedorovicha*, 1908) elements of both classical and non-classical models of historical studies can be traced. Though lacking a representative corpus of sources, Veselovskiy nevertheless sought to share his findings and raise a number of questions that should be developed further. His position between the two models of historical studies also manifested itself on a theoretical and methodological level. Veselovskiy thought it important to establish historical facts, but the scarcity of data secured did not allow generalizations, which he pointed at in the Conclusion chapter.

Veselovskiy's understanding of the historian's role in the knowledge of the past is also evident in the archaeographic principles outlined already in *Seven Levies...*: a significant part of the primary sources he drew on is published in the Appendix of the book. Much the same principles were also followed in Veselovskiy's opus magnum, *Soshnoe pis'mo* (1915-16). It is difficult to categorize this two-volume work as a monograph or a non-monographic study. Given that only the general perspective of research (rather than a clear research goal) is specified in this book, it is impossible to say if its empirical base is representative enough.

The *third section*, titled "Legal History Studies," focuses on Veselovskiy's works on legal history topics. These works tend to put the main emphasis on source criticism of legislative texts, which was common for legal historians in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Veselovskiy's analysis of legal sources that served as the basis for the Sobornoye Ulozheniye legal code (especially its chapters 18 and 25) is interpreted as an attempt to gain a deeper insight into the practical application of law, in this case predominantly in the field of taxation.

In the *fourth section*, titled "Archeography," Veselovskiy's pre-revolutionary archeographic studies are analyzed, showing the logic that links them to Veselovskiy's views on the conditions of formation and development of the knowledge about the past. Veselovskiy's gravitation towards the non-classical model of historical studies compelled him to seek sustainable ways to cognize past social reality. He regarded archeography as a reliable aid to knowledge accumulation, because it provided for transparency of historian's work, could be of interest to researchers from different branches of historical studies and, to a higher extent than historical research proper, it claimed a 'permanent acquisition' status. For these reasons, much attention was paid by Veselovskiy to careful preparation of primary sources for publication, including source criticism, paleographic and textual analysis.

The **second chapter**, titled "The Historian in Inner Emigration: Stepan Veselovskiy's Research Work in the Soviet Era," focuses on the protagonist's activity during the Soviet period of his academic career.

Drawing on documents of personal origin, the *first section* of this chapter, titled "Stepan Veselovskiy's Ethical Principles while in Inner Emigration," deals with a range of issues concerning his professional ethics between the 1920s and early 1950s. The analysis leads to the conclusion that his research work supported his sense of inner freedom and was one of the key prerequisites for his inner emigration.

For the analysis of Veselovskiy's inner emigration, not only his personal papers, but also his scholarly writings are of importance, since they allow us to understand not only the historian's worldview, but also his research practices and his personal epistemological regime that took shape under the conditions of his rejecting the sociocultural and political transformations following the 1917 revolution.

The *second section*, titled "History of Landownership in Russia between the 14th and the 16th centuries," analyzes one of Veselovskiy's main research areas in the Soviet era. It shows that, when studying the history of landownership, the main form of findings presentation Veselovskiy used was *non-monographic study*, which is typical for the non-classical model of historical studies.

Elements of the classical model of historical studies were also present in Veselovskiy's research and teaching work. In the *third section* of this chapter, titled "Auxiliary Sciences of History and Source Criticism as Manifestations of the Scholar's Positivist Stance," the role he assigned to source criticism, archaeography, genealogy, onomastics, historical geography, and historical cartography is studied. His relying heavily on them was mainly caused by his positivist attitude. He looked for the most effective way to accumulate facts, which he thought would later allow him to proceed to generalization. At the same time, the way of studying past social reality that Veselovskiy chose made it possible for

him to observe scholarly ethos in inner emigration and keep doing what was beneficial to science.

In the *fourth section* of this chapter, titled "Historiography," special attention is paid to a small historiographical incidental in *Issledovaniya po istorii oprichniny* (1963). This text is examined apart from the main body of the edited volume, in which it only formally occupies the place of an introduction, because, unlike the rest of the collected essays, it deals exclusively with the historiography of the oprichnina.

The last, *fifth section*, titled "The Political History of Russia in the 15th-16th Centuries", concentrates on Veselovskiy's studies on the history of Ivan the Terrible's time. These were largely aimed at summarizing and generalizing earlier findings from his source-critical research.

The **third chapter** of the dissertation, titled "The Classicalization of Stepan Veselovskiy's Scholarly Heritage," deals with the posthumous publication of his works as well as with their perception in academia. Given their significant impact, this perception is regarded as classicalization of his scholarly heritage, a process that is analyzed in this chapter based on three criteria of scholarly classics proposed by Irina Savelieva and Andrei Poletayev (2009, p 6).

The *first section* of this chapter, titled "The Commission for Publishing Veselovskiy's Works in the 1950s and 1960s: the Reasons for Its Establishment, Its Plans, and Their Implementation", was necessary for understanding the circumstances under which Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage was published posthumously and the role which a special Commission established in 1957 played in this process. Even though this Commission failed to implement its plans in the 1960s, the publication of Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage continued in the following decades, which testifies to the interest academia took in his works. The following sections focus on this interest.

The *second section*, titled "Book Reviews as a Mechanism of Classicalization," analyzes the reviews of Veselovskiy's posthumously published works. On the whole, reviewers sought not only to pay tribute to the late scholar,

but also to stress the importance of his works for Soviet historical studies. They emphasized the fundamental character of Veselovskiy's writings and pointed out the enormous information potential of the sources he introduced into scholarly circulation and the further prospects for research, which only strengthened the process of the accumulation of Veselovskiy's posthumous scholarly capital.

The *third section*, titled "The Influence of Veselovskiy's Scholarly Legacy on Soviet Historiography," seeks to find out which of Veselovskiy's ideas and findings elicited the greatest response. The conclusion is that it was not individual ideas or findings, but the lion's share of his heritage (studies in auxiliary sciences of history, on history of land tenure, and on Ivan the Terrible) that continued to be in demand in Soviet historiography for a long time.

Apart from intellectual trends and the popularity of an author's specific ideas, the reasons for him or her to be included in the canon of scholarly classics include their values. Attention, therefore, should be paid not only to the perception of their scholarly heritage but also to their personality. This is what the *fourth section*, titled "Historians Remembering the Personality and Scholarly Heritage of Stepan Veselovskiy," focuses on. Drawing mainly on memoirs, it arrives at the conclusion that he "was considered/called classic in the academic community" (thus meeting the *nominal* criterion) and there was an affinity between his ethical principles and those of later generations of historians.

Being in demand in education is an indispensable criterion of a classic. The chapter's *fifth section*, titled "Stepan Veselovskiy's Scholarly Heritage in Education," seeks to establish the degree to which Veselovskiy's works comply with the *functional* criterion ("Is it studied in class?") of a scholarly classic. Analysis of textbooks (primarily historiography textbooks) has shown that it was Veselovskiy's pre-revolutionary works that attracted particular interest when his legacy was published posthumously. This can be explained, first of all, by the chronological frame of the textbooks, which often set a limited at the beginning of the 20th century. In addition, the purpose of educational texts has to be taken into account: they are aimed primarily at the accumulation of knowledge that is already

consolidated and widely accepted in the scholarly profession. Therefore, a temporal distance was needed for Veselovskiy's legacy (much of which was only being introduced into scholarly circulation at that time) to be fully appreciated.

The final, *sixth section*, titled "The Reception of Stepan Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage at the end of the 20th century and in the first decades of the 21st century" analyzes the interest for Veselovskiy's works in post-Soviet academia. This section's goal is to find out if under the new, post-Soviet socio-cultural circumstances there still is a reason to consider this scholar and his heritage classic. The section shows that Veselovskiy's studies, firstly, were highly appreciated by researchers, who at times called them classic; secondly, they were included in the reading lists and syllabi of leading Russian universities and research centers; thirdly, they continued, in general, to be used in the historiography of the 1990s - 2010s. Thus, in this period the works of Veselovskiy continued to meet all three criteria of scholarly classics.

The main conclusions of the dissertation are formulated in the final chapter, titled "**Conclusion.**"

Since his formative years at the turn of the 20th century, when history was in theoretical and methodological crisis, Veselovskiy's works showed signs of both classical and non-classical models of historical studies. His texts written prior to the 1917 revolution are indicative, on the one hand, of a desire for historical knowledge to rest on solid empirical foundations, for a gradual accumulation of facts, and for the development of new techniques of analyzing historical sources. On the other hand, the prerevolutionary decades saw the emergence of new ways of presenting historical knowledge to the public, and they were also reflected in Stepan Veselovskiy's academic practice. Thus, his book *Sem' sborov...* matches the criteria of a *non-monographic study*, a historiographic source genre that emerged within the framework of non-classical model as an attempt to raise new questions and to share the findings with the public despite the impossibility to ensure the representativeness of the source base. Also noteworthy is Veselovskiy's own reflection over *Soshnoe pis'mo*: he regarded his findings as an image of the

historian's understanding of past reality, rather than the reality itself. Thus, in Veselovskiy's pre-revolutionary research practice, neither of the two models of historical studies was rejected. They were combined instead.

Veselovskiy's research principles, which took shape in the pre-revolutionary years, persisted in the Soviet time, when he was in inner emigration. It was during this period that the connection between Veselovskiy's ethical and epistemological principles became particularly clear. Given that his research work was a space that provided him with a sense of inner freedom, it was necessary to develop special methods of knowing past social reality: on the one hand, they had to be permissible within the framework of Soviet historical studies and, on the other hand, they had to comply with Veselovskiy's ethical principles as a historian. A key role among such methods was assigned to positivism, which was particularly evident in the development of research design for studies in the field of source criticism and auxiliary sciences of history. By pursuing source criticism and realizing the heuristic potential of various auxiliary sciences of history, Veselovskiy contributed to the gradual accumulation of facts, which Veselovskiy expected to provide the necessary prerequisites for generalization. On the other hand, ways of presenting research findings that were characteristic of the non-classical model of historical studies were still available in the Soviet time, too. Such works as *K voprosu...* (1926), *Selo i derevnia v severo-vostochnoy Rusi XIV-XVI vekov* (1936) and *Feodal'noe zemlevladienie v Severo-Vostochnoy Rusi* (1947) were aimed at raising new questions in historiography and at sharing their observations (based on a wide range of sources) with the public. This is not to say, of course, that Veselovskiy did not seek to solve the questions posed, but he did so to the extent that the source base available to him allowed him.

After Veselovskiy's death, publication of his scholarly legacy began. It coincided with a period of considerable growth of Soviet historiography's interest for the problems Veselovskiy had been working on during his pre-revolutionary and especially Soviet periods: auxiliary sciences of history, source criticism, and the era of Ivan the Terrible. At the same time, as in the previous Soviet decades,

there remained considerable interest in the history of land ownership. A large corpus of Veselovskiy's works, introduced into scholarly circulation posthumously, contributed to the development of scholarly discussions on a number of problems of pre-Petrine Russian history. Veselovskiy's scholarly legacy was gradually introduced into the educational sphere, the importance of his works was praised in reviews and sources of personal origin of historians, and the image of an outstanding scholar was formed. Taken together, these processes contributed to the classicalization of Veselovskiy's scholarly heritage and his perception as a classic within the framework of Soviet historian profession.

Theoretical and Practical Value of the Work

The theoretical value of this study lies in the development of a new approach in the study of the intellectual biography of a scholar, based on the explication of the types of intellectual work. This approach allows for an evidence-based study of the dynamics of the scholar's scholarly views/interests, to understand how their works were embedded in historical culture, and to analyze the scholarly principles on which these works were based. Source criticism of historiography makes it possible to effectively use other approaches and methods of research, which increases its heuristic potential, opening new outlooks for the study of not only the "works and days" of scholars, but also their scholarly heritage.

The results obtained can be used as a theoretical and methodological core of the study of intellectual biography, as well as for educational purposes, for example, for the development of lecture courses or teaching aids.

Degree of Reliability and Evaluation of Results

The degree of reliability of the Dissertation is determined by representative historical sources and correct methods/approaches, which were chosen in accordance with the goal of the research. The main results were published in 7 papers (4 of them in journals indexed in the Scopus and/or Web of Science citation

databases). The main theses of the research were presented in reports at 10 international, all-Russian and interuniversity scientific conferences:

1. International scientific and practical conference “Xth Sytin readings. Problems of national and regional history in the context of museum and educational practices of the XIX – XXI centuries” (Museum Simbirsk Classic Gymnasium, Ulyanovsk, September 27–28, 2018). Paper: “Theoretical and methodological aspects in S.B. Veselovskiy's genealogical researches”;

2. All-Russian scientific conference “Laboratory of a Historian” (the Institute of World History RAS, Moscow, November 28–29, 2018). Paper: “Act sources in S.B. Veselovskiy's genealogical researches”;

3. International youth scientific school-conference “Actual problems of historical research: the view of young scientists” (The Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, October 12–14, 2020). Paper: “Heuristic possibilities of historiographic source studies in the reconstruction of the intellectual biography of S.B. Veselovskiy (1876–1952)”;

4. International scientific and educational conference “Nikolay Ivanovich Kareev: Life path and scientific heritage in the transdisciplinary context of modern historiography” (Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kazan, November 19–21, 2020) Paper: “Ethical norms and values of a scientist in inner emigration: scientific creativity of S.B. Veselovskiy in the 1920s – 1950s”;

5. IInd interuniversity school of young scientists “One day in the life of a scientist: everyday life, communications, meanings” (the Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, April 3, 2021). Paper: “Everyday life through ethics: the case of S.B. Veselovskiy”;

6. International scientific conference of young researchers “Neo Classical Scholar” (Chelyabinsk State University, Chelyabinsk, April 28, 2021). Paper: “The birth of the classic: publication of S.B. Veselovskiy's scientific heritage in the late soviet era”;

7. International scientific conference “Sixty years of the sixties: values, practices, actors” (Tyumen State University, Tyumen, September 24–26, 2021)

Paper: “The commemoration of S.B. Veselovskiy's scientific heritage in the 1960s”;

8. IIIrd interuniversity school of young scientists “One day in the life of a scientist: everyday life, communications, meanings” (the Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow, April 2, 2022). Paper: “Unpublished collective work: “Materials for the historical Atlas of the USSR””;

9. 20th biographical readings “The right to a name: biographies of the 20th century” in memory of Veniamin Iofe (“Iofe Foundation”, St. Petersburg, April 20–22, 2022). Paper: “How to build a biography of a scientist through ethical principles: the case of S.B. Veselovskiy”;

10. International youth scientific school-conference “Actual problems of historical research: the view of young scientists” (The Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, September 8–11, 2022). Paper: “Review as a type of historiographical sources”.

**List of author's main publications in the journals included in the list of
highlevel journals, recommended by HSE, as well as indexed by Scopus and
Web of Science:**

1. Kholmatov, T.K. (2021). ‘Klassikalizacija nauchnogo nasledija S.B. Veselovskogo’ [The Classicalization of S.B. Veselovskiy's Scientific Heritage], *Dialog so vremenem* [Dialogue with Time], 74, pp. 185–196.

2. Kholmatov, T.K. (2021). ‘Teorija i metodologija vspomogatel'nyh istoricheskikh disciplin v nauchnom tvorchestve S.B. Veselovskogo’ [Theory and Methodology of Auxiliary Historical Disciplines in Academic Activity of Stepan Veselovskiy] [Online], *Jelektronnyj nauchno-obrazovatel'nyj zhurnal “Istorija”* [The Journal of Education and Science “ISTORIYA” (“History”)], 12(9). Available from: <https://history.jes.su/s207987840012137-9-1/> (Accessed: 17 June 2023).

3. Kholmatov, T.K. (2022). ‘Istoki klassikalizacii: publikacija i vosprijatie nauchnogo nasledija S.B. Veselovskogo’ [The Origins of

Classicalization: Publication and Perception of Academic Heritage of S.B. Veselovskiy], *Filosofija. Zhurnal Vysshej shkoly jekonomiki* [Philosophy. The Journal of the Higher School of Economics], 6(1), pp. 184–212.

4. Kholmatov, T.K. (2022). “‘I’m Suffocating and Starving without the Interior Life’”: Stepan Veselovskiy’s Ethical Principles while in Inner Emigration’, *Quaestio Rossica*, 10(2), pp. 697–708.

Other publications

5. Kholmatov, T.K. (2019). “‘Iz etogo možhno sdelat knigu...’”: vospominaniya V.S. Veselovskogo “Problemy nashei zhizni” [“It could be a book”: The Problems of Our Life, Memoirs of V.S. Veselovskiy], *Novoe proshloe* [The New Past], 3, pp. 292–298.

6. Kholmatov, T.K. (2020). Jevristicheskie vozmozhnosti istochnikovedeniya istoriografii v rekonstrukcii intellektual'noj biografii S.B. Veselovskogo (1876–1952) [The Heuristic Possibilities of Historiography Source Studies in the Reconstruction of Stepan Veselovskiy's Intellectual Biography (1876–1952)], in Morozova, T.I. (ed.). *Aktual'nye problemy istoricheskikh issledovanij: vzgljad molodyh uchenyh* [Actual Problems of Historical Researches: the View of Young Scholars]. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State University, pp. 122–128.

7. Kholmatov, T.K. (2022) ‘Kollektivnye proekty sozdaniya istoricheskogo atlasa SSSR v konce 1930-h – nachale 1940-h gg.’ [The Collective Projects of Historical Atlas of the Soviet Union in the Late 1930s – Early 1940s], *Gumanitarnyj akcent* [Humanitarian Accent], 4, pp. 74–82.

List of references

1. Afanas'eva, Ju. N. (ed.) (1996). *Sovetskaja istoriografija* [Soviet Historiography]. Moscow: RSUH.

2. Alevras, N.N. (2006). Problema liderstva v nauchnom soobshhestve istorikov XIX – nachala XX veka [The Problem of Leadership in the Scientific

Community of Historians of the XIX – Early XX Century], in Alevras, N.N. (ed.). *Istoriik v menjajushhemsja prostranstve rossijskoj kul'tury: sbornik statej* [The Historian in the Changing Space of Russian Culture: Collection of Articles]. Chelyabinsk: Kamennyj pojas, pp. 117–126.

3. Alevras, N.N., and Grishina, N.V. (eds.) (2022). *Dissertacionnaja kul'tura rossijskogo istoriko-nauchnogo soobshhestva: opyt i praktiki podgotovki i zashhit dissertacij (XIX – nachalo XX v.): kollektivnaja monografija* [Dissertation Culture of the Russian Historical and Scientific Community: Experience and Practice of Preparation and Defense of Dissertations (XIX – early XX Century): Collective Monograph]. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-istorija.

4. Aver'janov, K.A. and Kobrin, V.B. (1989). *S.B. Veselovskiy. Zhizn'. Dejatel'nost'. Lichnost'* [S.B. Veselovskiy. Life. Activity. Personality]. Moscow: Nauka.

5. Brachev, V.S. (1997). *Peterburgskaja arheograficheseskaja komissija (1834–1929 gg.)* [St. Petersburg Archeographic Commission (1834–1929)]. Saint Petersburg: Nestor.

6. Bulygina, T.A. (2008). Gumanitarij v jepohu potrjasenij (po dnevniam S.B. Veselovskogo) [A Humanitarian in an Era of Upheaval (According to the Diaries of S.B. Veselovskiy)], in Krjuchkov, I.V. (ed.). *Stavropol'skij al'manah Rossijskogo obshhestva intellektual'noj istorii* [Stavropol Almanac of the Russian Society of Intellectual History]. Vol. 10. Pyatigorsk: PSLU, pp. 177–185.

7. Bychkova, M.E. (1977). Stepan Borisovich Veselovskiy – genealog [Stepan Borisovich Veselovskiy as a genealogist], in Pavlenko, N.I. (ed.). *Istorija i genealogija. S.B. Veselovskiy i problemy istoriko-genealogicheskikh issledovanij* [History and Genealogy. S.B. Veselovskiy and problems of Historical and Genealogical Researches]. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 42–56.

8. Cherepnin, L.V. (1977). Stepan Borisovich Veselovskiy (Tvorcheskij put') [Stepan Borisovich Veselovskiy (The Academic Path)], in Pavlenko, N.I. (ed.). *Istorija i genealogija. S.B. Veselovskiy i problemy istoriko-genealogicheskikh*

issledovanij [History and Genealogy. S.B. Veselovskiy and problems of Historical and Genealogical Researches]. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 9–41.

9. Dubrovskiy, A.M. (2005). *Istorik i vlast': istoricheskaja nauka v SSSR i koncepcija istorii feodal'noj Rossii v kontekste politiki i ideologii (1930–1950-e gg.)* [Historian and Power: Historical Science in the USSR and the Concept of the History of Feudal Russia in the Context of Politics and Ideology (1930s – 1950s)]. Bryansk: I.G. Petrovsky BSU.

10. Grishina, N.V. (2010). “*Shkola V.O. Kljuhevskogo*” v istoricheskoj nauke i rossijskoj kul'ture [“V.O. Klyuchevskiy's School” in Historical Science and Russian Culture]. Chelyabinsk: Jenciklopedija.

11. Grishina, N.V. (2015). “Slovo “plagiat” bylo skazano...”: nauchnaja jekspertiza, obshhestvennye ocenki i dan' tradicii (na primere disputa E.D. Stashevskogo) [“The Word “Plagiarism” Was Said ...”: Scientific Expertise, Public Assessments and Tribute to Tradition (on the Example of the Dispute of E.D. Stashevskiy)], in Korzun, V.P. (ed.). *Mir istorika: istoriograficheskij sbornik* [The World of the Historian: Historiographical Collection]. Vol. 10. Omsk: Dostoevsky OSU, pp. 455–458.

12. Gruzinskaja, V.S., and Klyuev, A.I., and Metel', O.V. (2018). *Ocherki istorii institucional'noj struktury sovetskoj istoricheskoj nauki 1920-h – 1930-h gg.* [Essays on the history of the institutional structure of Soviet Historical Science of the 1920s – 1930s]. Omsk: Izdatel'skij centr KAN.

13. Gruzinskaja, V.S., and Kovalev, M.V. (2021). ‘Izdanie knigi na nemeckom jazyke moglo by nanesti za granicej ser'eznyj ushherb dobromu imeni sovetskoj nauki’: sovetskie i chehoslovackie antikovedy v spore o plagiate (1950-e gg.)’ [“Publishing a Book in German May Cause Serious Damage to the Honest Name of Soviet Science Abroad”: Soviet and Czechoslovak Historians in the Plagiarism Dispute (1950s)], *Rossija XXI* [Russia XXI], 2, pp. 94–111.

14. Kholmatov, T.K. (2022). ‘Plagiat v sovetskoj istoricheskoj nauke vtoroj poloviny 1940 – 1950-h godov’ [Plagiarism in Soviet historical Science in

the Second Half of the 1940s – 1950s], *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istorija* [Perm University Herald. History], 56, pp. 134–143.

15. Khorhordina, T.I. (2020). *Istoriko-arhivnyj institut v istorii otechestvennoj vysshej shkoly: 1930–2020* [Historico-Archival Institute in the History of the Russian Higher School: 1930–2020]. Moscow: RSUH.

16. Kiselev, M.A. (2020). “Reguljarnoe” gosudarstvo Petra I v stalinskoj Rossii: sud'by istorikov prava v kontekste nauchnyh i ideologicheskikh batalij sovetskogo vremeni [The "Regular" State of Peter I in Stalinist Russia: the Fate of Legal Historians in the Context of Scientific and Ideological Battles of the Soviet Era]. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-istorija.

17. Kiselev, M.A. (2020). ‘Konflikty sovetskih istorikov prava iz-za plagiata v seredine 1930-h – nachale 1940-h gg.’ [The Conflicts of Soviet Legal Historians over Plagiarism in the mid-1930-s – Early 1940-s], *Ural'skij istoricheskij vestnik* [Ural Historical Journal], 68(3), pp. 124–133.

8. Kisterev, S.N. (2013). ‘Suzhdenija S.B. Veselovskogo o tamozhennykh knigah kak dokumente i istoricheskom istochnike’ [S.B. Veselovskiy's Thoughts on Customs Books as a Document and a Historical Source], *Vestnik «Al'jans-Arheo»* [Bulletin “Alliance-Archeo”], 2, pp. 10–16. Available from: <https://history.jes.su/s207987840012137-9-1/> (Accessed: 17 June 2023).

18. Korzinin, A.L. (2014). ‘Materialy po istorii feodal'nogo soslovija Rossii XIV–XVII vv. v arhivnyh fondah S.B. Veselovskogo’ [Materials on the History of the Feudal Estate of Russia in the XIV–XVII Centuries in the Archives of S.B. Veselovskiy], *Vestnik Sankt–Peterburgskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of the Saint Petersburg University], 4, pp. 133–142.

19. Korzun, V.P. (2002). *Obrazy istoricheskoy nauki v otechestvennoj istoriografii rubezha XIX–XX vv.* [Images of Historical Science in the Russian Historiography of the Turn of the XIX–XX Centuries]. Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences. Omsk State University.

20. Korzun, V.P. (2016). ‘N.M. Karamzin v uchebnikah po istoriografii: o zigzagah formirovaniya korporativnoj pamjati’ [N.M. Karamzin in Textbooks on

Historiography: about the Zigzags of Corporate Memory Formation], *Prepodavatel' XXI vek* [Teacher XXI century], 4(2), pp. 459–470.

21. Korzun, V.P. (2022). *Naznachenie v kumiry: praktiki klassikalizacii v nauchnom soobshhestve istorikov (1920 – seredina 1930-h godov)* [The Formation of Idols: the Practice of Classicalization in the Scientific Community of Historians (1920 – mid-1930s)], in Repina, L.P. and Nedashkovskaja, N.I. (eds.). *Istoriki ob istorikah. K jubileju professora G.P. Mjagkova* [Historians about Historians. To the Anniversary of Professor G.P. Myagkov]. Moscow: Akvilon, pp. 337–364.

22. Korzun, V.P. (ed.) (2005). *Ocherki istorii otechestvennoj istoricheskoy nauki XX veka: monografija* [Essays on the History of Russian Historical Science of the XX Century: Monograph]. Omsk: Dostoevsky OSU.

23. Myagkov, G.P. (2000). *Nauchnoe soobshhestvo v istoricheskoy nauke: opyt "russkoj istoricheskoy shkoly"* [Scientific Community in Historical Science: the Experience of the "Russian Historical School"]. Kazan: KFU.

24. Nazarov, V.D. (1978). *Problemy feodal'nogo zemlevladieniya v trudah akad. S.B. Veselovskogo* [Problems of Feudal Land Ownership in the Papers of Academician S.B. Veselovskiy], in Yanin, V.L. (ed.). *Sovetskaja istoriografija agrarnoj istorii SSSR* [Soviet Historiography of the Agrarian History of the USSR]. Kishinev: Shtiinca, pp. 212–230.

25. Polyakov, I.A. (2013). 'S.B. Veselovskiy i ego nasledie v istoriografii i pamjati obshhestva' [S.B. Veselovskiy and his Heritage in Historiography and Memory of Society], *Klio* [Clio], 12, pp. 153–157.

26. Prostovolosova, L.N. and Stanislavskiy, A.L. (1997). *Istorija kafedry vspomogatel'nyh istoricheskikh disciplin: uchebnoe posobie* [The History of Auxiliary Historical Disciplines Department: the Textbook]. Moscow: MSIHA.

27. Repina, L.P. (2011). *Istoricheskaja nauka na rubezhe XX–XXI vv.: social'nye teorii i istoriograficheskaja praktika* [Historical Science at the Turn of the XX–XXI Centuries: Social Theories and Historiographical Practice]. Moscow: Krug.

28. Revel, J. (2002). *Biografija kak istoriograficheskaia problema* [Biography as a Historiographical Problem]. Moscow: RSUH.
29. Rostovcev, E.A. (2004). *A.S. Lappo-Danilevskij i peterburgskaja istoricheskaja shkola* [A.S. Lappo-Danilevsky and the St. Petersburg Historical School]. Ryazan: P.A. Tribunskiy.
30. Savelieva, I.M. and Poletayev A.V. (eds.) (2009). *Klassika i klassiki v social'nom i gumanitarnom znanii* [Classics and classics in social and humanitarian knowledge]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.
31. Shokarev, S.Yu. (2020). Sinodiki v nauchnom tvorchestve S.B. Veselovskogo [Synodics in Academic Activity of S.B. Veselovskiy], in Kozlov, V.N. (ed.). *Dokumental'nyj istochnik v istoricheskom issledovanii i v issledovanii po istorii nauki: opyt ispol'zovanija, sovremennye problemy i zadachi: k 100-letiju so dnja rozhdenija A.A. Zimina: materialy Mezhdunarodnoj nauchnoj konferencii* [Documentary Source in Historical Research and in Study on the History of Science: Experience of Use, Modern Problems and Tasks: to the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of A.A. Zimin: Materials of the International Scientific Conference]. Moscow: Archive RAS, pp. 187–195.
32. Shokhin, L.I. (1999). *Moskovskij arhiv Ministerstva justicii i russkaja istoricheskaja nauka: arhivisty i istoriki vo vtoroj polovine XIX – nachale XX veka* [Moscow Archive of the Ministry of Justice and Russian Historical Science: Archivists and Historians in the Second Half of the XIX – the Beginning of the XX Century]. Moscow: Pamjatniki istoricheskoi mysli.
33. Sidorova, L.A. (2008). *Sovetskaja istoricheskaja nauka serediny XX veka: sintez treh pokolenij istorikov* [Soviet Historical Science of the mid-20th Century: Synthesis of Three Generations of Historians]. Moscow: Pamjatniki istoricheskoi mysli.
34. Sidorova, L.A. (2017). *Sovetskie istoriki. Duhovnyj i nauchnyj oblik* [The Soviet Historians. Spiritual and Academic Image]. Moscow: Institut rossijskoj istorii Rossijskoj akademii nauk; Centr gumanitarnykh iniciativ.

35. Sidorova, L.A. (1997). *Ottepel' v istoricheskoj nauke. Sovetskaja istoriografija pervogo poslestalinskogo desjatiletija* [The Thaw in Historical Science. Soviet Historiography of the First Post-Stalin Decade]. Moscow: Pamjatniki istoricheskoj mysli.

36. Sidorova, L.A. (2013). Obshhestvennye idealy istorika: akademik S.B. Veselovskiy [Social Ideals of the Historian: Academician S.B. Veselovskiy], in Kazakov, R.B. and Rumjanceva, M.F. (eds.). *Istoriograficheskie chtenija pamjati professora Viktora Aleksandrovicha Murav'eva: v 2h tomah* [Historiographical readings in Memory of Professor Viktor Aleksandrovich Muravyev: in 2 volumes]. Vol. 2. Moscow: RSUH, pp. 291–297.

37. Sidorova, L.A. (2017). Istorik, hudozhestvennaja literatura i revoljucija 1917 goda (Po materialam dnevnikov S.B. Veselovskogo, Ju.V. Got'e, M.V. Nechkinoj) [The Historian, Fiction and the Revolution of 1917 (Based on the Diaries of S.B. Veselovskiy, Yu.V. Gauthier, M.V. Nechkina)], in Polonskij, V.V. (ed.). *Russkaja revoljucija 1917 goda v literaturnyh istochnikah i dokumentah* [The Russian Revolution of 1917 in Literary Sources and Documents]. Moscow: A.M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the RAS, pp. 276–285.

38. Sporov, D.B. and Shokarev, S.Yu. (2006). 'Istorik Moskovskogo gosudarstvo v Stalinskoj Rossii: k biografii S.B. Veselovskogo (1876–1952)' [The Historian of the Moscow State in Stalin's Russia: to the biography of S.B. Veselovskiy (1876–1952)], *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* [New Literary Review], 78, pp. 125–146.

39. Sveshnikov, A.V. (2005). "Vot Vam istorija nashej istorii". K probleme tipologii nauchnyh skandalov vtoroj poloviny XIX – nachala XX v. ["Here's the History of our Story for You". On the Problem of Typology of Academic Scandals of the Second Half of the XIX – Early XX Century], in Korzun, V.P. (ed.). *Mir istorika: istoriograficheskij sbornik* [The World of the Historian: Historiographical Collection]. Vol. 1. Omsk: Dostoevsky OSU, 2005, pp. 228–259.

40. Sveshnikov, A.V. (2009). 'Kak possorilsja Lev Platonovich s Ivanom Mihajlovichem (istorija odnogo professorskogo konflikta)' [How Lev Platonovich Quarreled with Ivan Mikhailovich (the Story of a Professorial Conflict)], *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* [New Literary Review], 96(2) , pp. 42–72.

41. Sveshnikov, A.V. (2016). *Ivan Mihajlovich Grevs i peterburgskaja shkola medievistov nachala XX v. Sud'ba nauchnogo soobshhestva* [Ivan Mikhailovich Grevs and the St. Petersburg School of Medievalists of the Early XX Century. The Fate of the Scientific Community]. Moscow: Centr gumanitarnyh iniciativ.

42. Tikhonov, V.V. (2012). *Moskovskaja istoricheskaja shkola v pervoj polovine XX veka. Nauchnoe tvorcestvo Ju.V. Got'e, S.B. Veselovskogo, A.I. Jakovleva i S.V. Bahrushina* [Moscow Historical School in the First Half of the Twentieth Century. Scientific Creativity of Yu.V. Gauthier, S.B. Veselovskiy, A.I. Yakovlev and S.V. Bakhrushin]. Moscow: The Institute of Russian History of the RAS.

43. Tikhonov, V.V. (2013). 'Bor'ba s "burzhuaznym objektivizmom" v sovetskoj istoricheskoj nauke: S.B. Veselovskiy i ego kniga "Feodal'noe zemlevladienie v Severo–Vostochnoj Rusi"' [The Struggle against "Bourgeois Objectivism" in Soviet Historical Science: S.B. Veselovskiy and His Book "Feudal Land Ownership in North-Eastern Russia"], *Drevnjaja Rus'. Voprosy medievistiki* [Old Russia. The Questions of Middle Ages], 2, pp. 104–113.

44. Tikhonov, V.V. (2016). *Ideologicheskie kampanii "pozdnego stalinizma" i sovetskaja istoricheskaja nauka (seredina 1940-h – 1953 g.)* [Ideological Campaigns of "Late Stalinism" and Soviet Historical Science (mid-1940s – 1953)]. Moscow: Nestor-istorija.

45. Yurganov, A.L. (2001). "Vse jeto ushlo daleko v vechnost": dnevnik i zhizn' S.B. Veselovskogo' ["Everything Has Gone Far into Eternity": the Diary and Life of S.B. Veselovskiy], *Intellektual'nyj forum* [Intellectual Forum], 7, pp. 84–113.