

Robert Wipper and the Community of the Moscow Historians in Pre-revolution Time

D. A. Tsygankov

For citation: Tsygankov D. A. Robert Wipper and the Community of the Moscow Historians in Pre-revolution Time. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2019, vol. 64, issue 1, pp. 222–234. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2019.113>

Despite a large number of works devoted to the study of various aspects of Wipper's life and his works, his biography still has not been researched comprehensively. In many respects this situation can be explained by the fact that there has never existed a tradition of passing down the knowledge about Wipper from his followers. There are two Wippers. The first is a left-wing intellectual with original views, who was not accepted by the community of Moscow historians. And the second is a post-revolutionary professor, who initially turned to the traditions of classical historiography, but then, thanks to the works on the history of early Christianity, turned toward Soviet historiography. As a historian, Wipper was very successful. Wipper's pedagogical and scholarly career developed fast: the professor at the University in Odessa, one of three professors at Moscow University (since 1899), the leading professor of the university between the two revolutions. He met the revolution of 1917 without any obligations to the pre-revolutionary historians. At the same time, in the first years after the revolution, he selflessly began to defend the values of classical historical science. In this connection we can find a certain academic relationship between Wipper and the pre-revolutionary generation of historians. In this paper I will try to present Wipper against the background of the community of Moscow historians, with whom he had very uneasy relationships.

Keywords: Wipper, community of Moscow historians, methodology, history teaching.

Роберт Виппер и сообщество московских историков в предреволюционную эпоху

Д. А. Цыганков

Для цитирования: *Tsygankov D. A. Robert Wipper and the Community of the Moscow Historians in Pre-revolution Time // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2019. Т. 64. Вып. 1. С. 222–234. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2019.113>*

Dmitry A. Tsygankov — PhD in History, Associate Professor, M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, 27–4, Lomonosovskiy pr., Moscow, 119991, Russian Federation; senior researcher, Tomsk State University, 36, Lenina pr., Tomsk, 634050, Russian Federation; tsdm@yandex.ru

Дмитрий Андреевич Цыганков — канд. ист. наук, доц., Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова, Российская Федерация, 119991, Москва, Ломоносовский пр., 27, корп. 4; старший научный сотрудник, Национальный исследовательский Томский государственный университет, Российская Федерация, 634050, Томск, пр. Ленина, 36; tsdm@yandex.ru

The article was written within the framework of the project RNF 18-18-00121/2018 “The collective biography of lecturers of Russian universities as the mirror of social history (second part of the 18th — the beginning of the 20th centuries)”.

Статья написана в рамках проекта РНФ 18-18-00121/2018 “Коллективная биография преподавателей российских университетов в зеркале социальной истории (вторая половина XVIII — начало XX в.)”.

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2019

Несмотря на большое количество работ, посвященных различным аспектам жизни и творчества Роберта Виппера, нельзя сказать, что исследователями создана удачная синтетическая биография ученого. Во многом подобное положение дел может быть объяснено тем, что прямой традиции знаний о Виппере, донесенных до сегодняшнего дня его учениками, нет. Существуют как бы два Виппера — дореволюционный — левый интеллигент с оригинальными взглядами, занимающий видные позиции в сообществе ученых в целом, но не принятый московскими «всеобщими историками». И второй — послереволюционный, первоначально возвращающийся к традициям классической историографии, но затем благодаря работам по истории раннего христианства поворачивающийся в сторону советской историографии. За этими внешними поворотами судьбы историка, преподававшего в разных образовательных системах (дореволюционная Россия, Латвия в период между двумя войнами, СССР), хочется увидеть Виппера-человека. Научная карьера Виппера формально развивалась по нарастающей: профессор в Новороссийском университете в Одессе, один из трех профессоров в Московском университете (с 1899 г.), ведущий профессор университета в эпоху между двумя революциями. Однако нельзя не отметить и административные неудачи дореволюционного профессора. Виппер был не очень плодовитым научным руководителем: не один из его 12 учеников, оставленных для подготовки к профессорскому званию, не смог защитить диссертацию в дореволюционный период. К 1917 г. у ученого были практически разрушены все личные контакты с представителями московской школы историков. Таким образом, революцию 1917 г. он встречал без каких-либо обязательств перед дореволюционным сообществом историков. Вместе с тем в первые годы после революции он самоотверженно стал защищать ценности классической исторической науки. Следовательно, определенная академическая связь между Виппером и дореволюционным поколением историков существовала. Это и заставляет автора статьи нарисовать портрет Виппера на фоне сообщества московских «всеобщих историков», с которыми у него были весьма непростые отношения.

Ключевые слова: Р. Ю. Виппер, сообщество московских историков, методология, университетское преподавание.

On the one hand, the biography of Robert Y. Wipper is well-studied in modern historiography¹. In many respects this is due to the authority of the anti-clerical works of Wipper² on the problems of the early history of Christianity in Soviet historical science, his recognition as an academician (in 1943 he became an academician of the Academy of Sciences in the USSR) after the incorporation of Latvia, where the historian had lived after emigration from the Soviet Russia³, into the USSR⁴. Moreover, during the years of

¹ See: *Safronov B. G. Istoricheskoe mirovozzrenie R. Yu. Vipper a ego vremia. M., 1976; Volodikhin D. M. "Ochen' staryi akademik". Original'naiia filosofiiia istorii R. Yu. Vipper a. M., 1997; Georgiev P. V., Chigliintsev E. A. Rossiiskie istoriki v poiskakh politicheskogo ideala: V. P. Buzeskul i R. Yu. Vipper ob afinskoii demokratii // Mir istorika. Istoriograficheskii sbornik. Iss. 2. Omsk, 2006. P. 316–325; Golubtsova E. S. Robert Yur'evich Vipper // Portrety istorikov. Vremia i sud'by. Vol. 2. Vseobshchaia istoriia / eds G. N. Sevastianov, L. P. Marinovich, L. T. Milskaia. M.; Jerusalem, 2000. P. 7–15; Perfilova T. B. Obraz antichnoi istorii v "umstvennykh razrezakh" R. Yu. Vipper a. Yaroslavl, 2006.*

² Spisok nauchnykh trudov akademika R. Yu. Vipper a po drevnei istorii // Vestnik drevnei istorii. 1955. Iss. 2. One of the latest reprints of Wipper's works on the history of early Christianity see: *Vipper R. Rim i rannee khristianstvo // Vipper R. Izbrannye sochineniia. Lektsii po istorii Grecii. Ocherki po istorii Rimskoi imperii. Vol. 1–2. Rostov n/ D, 1995.*

³ About Wipper's stay in Latvia see: *Koval'chuk S. V. Istorii a ego istoriia: Robert Yur'evich Vipper // Russkii mir i Latviia. Al'manakh. 2011. Iss. 25. P. 200–210.*

⁴ Arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii nauk (future — ARAN). F. 1562.

Perestroika, numerous reprints of Wipper's textbooks, primarily for secondary schools⁵, generated interest in this extraordinary Russian historian again, motivating consideration of his methodological concept.

At the same time, it is clear that a noteworthy biography of Wipper has not been created yet. There are no significant reflections about the scientist in memoir literature. A grand biography written by faithful adepts of the Soviet period of his life hasn't not appeared. Wipper's Soviet period of life is obscure. As a result, the image of the historian lost human characteristics of a person with doubts and hopes.

In this study the author will try to create a portrait of Wipper against the background of the community of Moscow historians in the pre-revolutionary time. This new intellectual biography of Wipper is based primarily on the materials which was published by the author of this article⁶.

Robert Wipper was born into a family of foreigners-handicraftsmen settled in Russia. His father, Yuri Frantsevich, was the first in the family to graduate from the university, becoming a gymnasium teacher. For his father, who was a typical representative of the 1840s, the names of his teachers (T. N. Granovsky, P. G. Redkin, K. F. Roullier) were unforgettable. According to the memoirs of Wipper, his "father had to immediately begin teaching in secondary school after finishing university and lost contact with the university although he had all the potential to become a professor"⁷.

Robert Yuryevich was educated at Lazarev's Institute of Oriental Languages and graduated from it with a gold medal (1876). His interest in history was provoked by the popular textbook written by V. Ya. Shulgin. After leaving secondary school, Wipper entered the Faculty of History and Philology at Moscow University⁸. During his first and second years, the student received Nikolay Gogol Scholarship⁹. This early recognition of Wipper could be attributed to the support he received from his supervisor Vladimir Guerrier.

The relationship between professor and student was not so close. Wipper preferred to communicate with young scholars Nikolay Kareev, Pavel Vinogradov, Sergey Fortunatov and his classmate Mikhail Korelin. He was afraid of Guerrier and called him in a letter to Korelin "Torquemada in an office-dress with a course of Roman history in his hand"¹⁰. On the summer holidays before the fourth year, Wipper went abroad. He visited Berlin, Dresden, Leipzig, Vienna, Salzburg and attended lectures by W. Wundt and G. Voigt¹¹. In 1880, Wipper graduated from university, but Guerrier did not give him a recommendation letter for postgraduate training¹².

Wipper was appointed to the teacher's position in the School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, but he didn't abandon hopes of pursuing a scholarly career. Apparently, he decided to prepare independently for the master's exams. In the letter from Berlin

⁵ *Vipper R. Yu., Vasil'ev A. A. Istoriia drevnego mira. Istoriia srednih vekov. M., 1993; Vipper R. Yu.: 1) Istoriia Novogo vremeni. M., 1995; 2) Istoriia Srednikh vekov. Kurs lektsii. Kiev, 1996.*

⁶ See for example: Wipper's letters to Guerrier // Cygankov D. A. Professor V. I. Ger'e i ego ucheniki. M., 2010. P. 319–349.

⁷ *Safronov B. G. Istoricheskoe mirovozzrenie R. Yu. Vippere i ego vremia. P. 8.*

⁸ Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Moskvy (future — CGA Moskvy). F. 418. Op. 290. Ed. hr. 71.

⁹ CGA Moskvy. F. 418. Op. 476. D. 5. L. 32.

¹⁰ See: *Ivanova T. N. Dva neizvestnykh pis'ma // Vestnik of the Russian State Humanitarian University. Ser. Historical Sciences. Historiography, Source Study, Methods of Historical Research. 2011. Iss. 12. P. 282.*

¹¹ *Koval'chuk S. V. Istoriik i ego istoriia: Robert Yur'evich Vipper. P. 200–210.*

¹² For reasons, see: *Ivanova T. N. Dva neizvestnykh pis'ma. P. 282.*

on September 4/16, 1885, he asked Guerrier for advice on this type of work, and at the same time informed the teacher of his intellectual ambitions. It is possible that this letter was written under the influence of Korelin, with whom Wipper travelled in Europe in 1885–1887 (Berlin, Vienna, Munich, Paris). During that time, Korelin carefully guarded his classmate who had the intention of fleeing to Russia for a marriage. However, Korelin did not succeed in this mission. Wipper escaped Europe and married in Russia. His wife became Anastasia Vasilievna Akhramovich, a “bourgeois from Slutsk”, as Korelin named her with contempt in the letter to Guerrier¹³.

The marriage brought maturity to Wipper and enhanced his self-confidence. This event had a direct impact on his academic career¹⁴. Wipper had become a very purposeful person and tried to achieve high goals in the university career. On April 29, 1887, the University Council permitted Wipper to take the master’s exams¹⁵. In June 1891, Wipper became a privat-docent at Moscow University¹⁶ (a petition was filed on February 20, 1891). According to the university tradition, Wipper read two public lectures: “Carl Stein’s State Ideas” (lecture on Wipper’s choice) and “Estates General (États généraux in French:) in the Fourteenth Century” (lecture on Faculty’s choice)¹⁷. The lectures were attended by Guerrier and Vasily Klyuchevsky, who gave the highest evaluation of the pedagogical skills of the applicant (“very satisfactory”)¹⁸.

The period between the end of the 1880s — the beginning of the 1890s was a very important milestone in the life of Wipper, which is difficult to study due to the lack of adequate sources. During this time Wipper resumed the relationship with his teacher. Guerrier gave Wipper the topic for the master’s thesis, which was more indicative of his teacher’s historical interests rather than of the peculiarities of Wipper’s historical thinking¹⁹. In 1894, the faculty decided to award Wipper a doctor’s degree bypassing the master’s degree. Wipper’s thesis was a very well-grounded work, built on extensive quotes²⁰. Even Guerrier, who was oriented towards German model of the historical studies, had to admit that the extensive citations in the work made it very difficult for readers to understand. He pointed out that “it would be desirable to see less scrappy transmission of individual episodes, better grouping of material, more images and generalizations that would help the reader to distinguish between the main and the secondary in the book”²¹. However, Wipper received Soloviev’s Grant for his work, which was given to him on the initiative of Guerrier.

On the other hand, in the 1890s, the relationship between Wipper and his university friends began to deteriorate. The most remarkable in this respect was the line of communication with Korelin. Korelin was surprised by the weakness of Wipper’s thesis. At the same time, he understood perfectly well that his objection to awarding a doctoral degree

¹³ Letters of M. S. Korelin // Cygankov D. A. Professor V. I. Ger’e i ego ucheniki. M., 2010. P. 280

¹⁴ Wipper R. Yu. Komu i chem obiazan ia tem, chto stal istorikom. Lichnyi arhiv professora M. H Sterpemansa (Riga). Cit. by: Safronov B. G. Istoricheskoe mirovozzrenie R. Yu. Vipper a i ego vremia. P. 16.

¹⁵ CGA Moskvyy. F. 418. Op. 746. Ed. hr. 14. L. 11.

¹⁶ Rossiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (future — RGIA). F. 733. Op. 150. D. 722. L. 47–48.

¹⁷ The lecture was read on April 12.

¹⁸ Safronov B. G. Istoricheskoe mirovozzrenie R. Yu. Vipper a i ego vremia. P. 15–16.

¹⁹ For topic searches, see: Letters of Yu. Wipper // Cygankov D. A. Professor V. I. Ger’e i ego ucheniki. M., 2010. P. 322–323. — On the possible approval of the topic, see: Safronov B. G. Istoricheskoe mirovozzrenie R. Yu. Vipper a i ego vremia. P. 17–18.

²⁰ Wipper R. Yu. Vliianiia Kal’vina i kal’vinizma na politicheskie ucheniya i dvizheniia XVI veka. Tserkov’ i gosudarstvo v Zheneve XVI veka v epokhu kal’vinizma. M., 1894.

²¹ CGA Moskvyy. F. 418. Op. 63. Ed. hr. 250.

to Wipper would lead to a conflict with his friend, especially since his friend had been supported by two senior faculty professors. Korelin voted for Wipper. "Guerrier decided that on April 27 Wipper would be awarded a doctoral degree by the Faculty. In my heart I was against it, but maybe out of envy, and acted "pro" because of solidarity and decency", remarked Korelin in the diary²².

Korelin prompted his friend to move to Odessa to get a professor's position, thus removing a competitor from Moscow. "On June 27 Wipper was appointed to Odessa, and on August 30 he paid a farewell visit to me with his wife. He was cold... A sad story: from a friend he turned first into an indifferent person, and then into an enemy inside his soul"²³, noted Korelin.

The mediator behind Wipper's move to Odessa was the professor of this university Fyodor Uspensky, who was looking for a colleague in the department of World History. However, to achieve the goal it was necessary to obtain support in the ministry. At the end of June 1894, Wipper informed Guerrier: «My business with Odessa... did not move at all, although during this time there was much correspondence, and I went to Petersburg. The minister asked me with great pleasure about the dispute and mentioned the excellent recommendation written by you. He also pointed to my competitor in the person of Afanasyev, but noticed that he would be happy if I was appointed to the position of professor. Anichkov was more specific. With his clerical manner, he remarked that all these university recommendations do not matter, the minister alone decides on the basis of the opinions of «scientists». In order to be considered a candidate, I must file a petition enclosing the list of my scholarly works and a curriculum vitae²⁴. From Anichkov's point of view, it is clear that Afanasyev's chances are quite good. He said that Afanasyev has an advantage as a local and long-standing candidate... I forgot to say that Afanasyev had already visited Petersburg twice. Very similar to the Siloam pool. Summer, probably, will pass in full uncertainty. It is necessary to prepare the course on the history of Germany in the 19th century which I had promised for Moscow University»²⁵.

On 20 July, Wipper received good news. He was appointed to the position of an extraordinary professor (Professor extraordinarius)²⁶. On September 15, in the letter to Guerrier Wipper told about his professorial debut. He wrote to the teacher that he had read the "introductory lecture". He was pleased by the impression. There were faculty corporation and the mass of students, about 300 persons. He described the lecture: "I chose a general theme: about contemporary tasks and methods of historical science, and spoke against the mechanical understanding of the historical process from the sociological point of view, and then characterized the dispute between 'culturists' and 'materialists'. I insisted on the need for a comprehensive study of social development in all its manifestations... I ended by pointing out the significance of the historical school of thought in practical life... From the remarks of the professors I will quote the words of Kochubinsky: I love listening to Moscow and hearing it in every word"²⁷.

²² Diary of M. S. Korelin, see: Terra Europa: intellektual'noe prostranstvo moskovskikh istorikov. M., 2015. P. 282.

²³ Ibid. P. 392.

²⁴ See: RGIA. F. 733. Op. 150. D. 1057. L. 105–106, 117–118 ob.

²⁵ Pis'ma R. Yu. Vipper. P. 328.

²⁶ Ibid. P. 329.

²⁷ Ibid. P. 331.

During the autumn semester, Wipper read two core courses (History of Rome and Modern History of the 16th — 17th centuries) and conducted practical seminars. He pointed out that students were not very ready for core courses in the spirit of Moscow traditions²⁸. Wipper made a conclusion that this was largely a consequence of the manner of training by Uspensky. The courses of Uspensky was a summary of the material for exams and did not have any educational value. Wipper noted that “the students were not developed; they did not know what’s going on in the world”²⁹.

Wipper started the reform of teaching. Previously, students only read sources and abstracts during classes. Wipper initiated discussions, debates and attracted many outsiders³⁰. During the spring semester, the number of Wipper’s classes increased. Since students had never heard lectures on the Middle Ages, Wipper decided to read them for listeners (later, the administration would refuse to pay him for these lectures). In the historical and philological society, which Wipper entered in October 1894, the professor read a public lecture: “I read about ‘Utopia’ written by Thomas More. I characterized it as an expression of the Renaissance and as a typical political novel”, he wrote to Guerrier. “I am quite happy with the success. The auditorium was very crowded. There were no places to stand in our assembly hall. I was supported by students. The courses take a lot of my time, but I am satisfied with the acquired skills; core courses are a very good school. This year I had very good graduates. They worked with great zeal and interest”³¹.

In the summer Wipper visited Moscow, where he had sought contacts with colleagues, but Guerrier went to Rome, Korelin — to the Baltics, Vinogradov was absent. Robert Yurevich concentrated on his health, which had deteriorated because of the great burden of work in Odessa University. In the letter he asked the advice of Guerrier about writing a new course on Roman history. «This course now absorbs almost all of my time», wrote the professor from Odessa. “I did not want to delve into the complex issues of early Roman history, and wanted to examine Rome as an Empire with its administration and social movement. I do not know to what extent it will be possible”³². He pointed out that the History of Roman Empire and even the republic from the 3rd century BC for a long time, and may never have been read to students in Odessa.

In addition to the courses of the last year, Wipper began reading the course “The main problems of historical science”, which aroused great resonance and attracted many listeners in his auditorium. However, in contrast to the previous year, despite the moral satisfaction from the preparation to lectures, Wipper was disappointed by the general situation of intellectual life in Odessa: “You usually leave the chair with a heavy feeling that your work, your conclusions, comparisons are wasted ... No one has written it down”³³. Wipper made a humiliating verdict on the academic situation at Odessa university³⁴.

By the summer of 1896, Wipper wanted to exchange all his failures in Odessa for the position of faculty professor at the university, but he was passed over there. At the be-

²⁸ Ibid. P. 332.

²⁹ Ibid. P. 336.

³⁰ Ibid. P. 334.

³¹ Ibid. P. 336.

³² Ibid. P. 341.

³³ *Ivanova T. N. Dva neizvestnykh pis'ma. P. 286.*

³⁴ *Pis'ma R. Yu. Vipperu. P. 285.*

gining of 1897, Wipper had a plan to leave Odessa, at least, by transferring to Lazarev's Institute in Moscow³⁵.

On June 20 1897, Wipper arrived in Moscow and had an audience with Nikolai Pavlovich Bogolepov, the supervisor of Moscow educational district. Wipper told Bogolepov about the position of professor at Lazarev's Institute in Moscow. Bogolepov could not support Wipper because he did not know the situation at the Institute. At the same time Wipper received a position of privatdocent at Moscow University³⁶. In 1899, after the death of Korelin, he became an extraordinary professor (Professor extraordinarius), and after the resignation of Vinogradov in 1901 — an ordinary professor (Professor ordinarius)³⁷.

In 1902, Wipper was at the center of the conflict among the community of Moscow historians. E. Schepkin, the former student of Guerrier, was appointed to the position of professor in Odessa³⁸. He needed a Master's degree. To solve this problem, he decided to obtain a degree from Moscow University. The Faculty comment was written by Wipper. In an unofficial letter to Schepkin, Wipper doubted that the dissertation was a good work for the degree in history and suggested that it should be defended in another department.

Having received an unfavorable judgment from Wipper, Shchepkin asked Guerrier to give an independent assessment of his work and help to defend the thesis in Moscow³⁹. Guerrier held talks with Wipper. He found out that Wipper's objections primarily concerned the plan of the work, and the opponent had not read the thesis.

On May 29, 1902, the council of the faculty was held. Wipper criticized the thesis because Shchepkin's work ("The Russian-Austrian Union during the Seven Years War") was focused on the problems of international law⁴⁰. In contrast to Wipper's position, Guerrier and M. Lyubavsky supported Shchepkin.

On October 30, 1902, the Council of the Faculty ordered Guerrier and privatdocent Mikhail Bogoslovsky to write a report about Shchepkin's thesis. The report was positive. Shchepkin was granted an opportunity to defend the dissertation in Moscow. This was, probably, the last victory of Guerrier as the administrative leader of Moscow historians. After this event, the administrative power passed into the hands of Wipper.

At Moscow University, Wipper read different courses: History of Rome, History of Greece, History of the East, History of Ethnology, History of the Early Middle Ages (Byzantium and the Arabian East), History of the Late Middle Ages, Public Ideas and Theory of History⁴¹. Unlike his period in Odessa, the professor, taking advantages of his official position, very carefully approached the preparation of lectures and read only one course a year, spending free time on writing new courses. Wipper always read lectures using the synopses and never improvised⁴².

As a rule, on the basis of the courses he read, Wipper prepared the publication of textbooks. The first textbook ("Social doctrines and historical theories of the 18th and 19th

³⁵ Ibid. P. C. 343–344.

³⁶ CGA Moskvyy. F. 418. Op. 66. Ed. Hr. 365.

³⁷ See: Ibid. Op. 487. Ed. hr. 63.

³⁸ *Miagkov G. P., Ivanova T. N.* V tsentre "reabilitatsionnogo vnimaniia": E. N. Shchepkin i V. I. Ger'e // Vestnik of the Udmurt University. Ser. 5. History and Filosofyy. 2011. Iss. 3. P. 26–34.

³⁹ Pis'ma E. N. Shchepkina // Cygankov D. A. Professor V. I. Ger'e i ego ucheniki. M., 2010. P. 410.

⁴⁰ CGA Moskvyy. F. 418. Op. 476. Ed. hr. 29 (1902). L. 29.

⁴¹ See: Obozreniia prepodavaniia na istoriko-filologicheskome fakul'tete Moskovskogo universiteta. M., 1897–1917.

⁴² *Golubtsova E. S.* Robert Yur'evich Vipper. P. 8.

centuries in connection with the social movement in the West⁴³) came out in 1900. According to Wipper, the process of the formation of historical science began in the 18th century and was influenced by the philosophy of history and the epoch of the Enlightenment as a whole. At the same time, the philosophy of history itself was the legacy of the religious worldview of the Middle Ages. Wipper believed that the specific goal in this doctrine of history was stipulated in advance. The advantage of this approach was its pedagogical relevance. Under the influence of the philosophy of history, the order was introduced in historical representations, a harmonious and clear scheme of historical development arose, and clear models for explaining different epochs emerged.

After this course the problems of epistemology came to the fore in Wipper's work. In 191, he published the final work of the first decade of the 20th century ("Essays on the Theory of Historical Cognition"⁴⁴). The basic message of Wipper is clear: a historian involved in the process of the research is not passive. Therefore, Wipper paid close attention to the personality of the historian. Wipper concentrated not only on the psychology of the historian, but also on the conditions of his work, his social environment. In the framework of this approach, Wipper called for a revision of the language of historians. He showed that as a result of the misuse, concepts and terms had long been preconceived combinations, conceptual clichés that reflected the psychic complexes, the types of our reasoning⁴⁵.

In 1905, the first part of Wipper's "Lectures on the History of Greece" was printed, which in 1916 was supplemented by the "History of Greece in the Classical Age". In these two textbooks Wipper observed the external and domestic political events of Greek history from the dark ages to the loss of independence by Greece in 322.

In 1908, "Essays on the history of the Roman Empire" was published. The author also dedicated his attention to socio-political history in this course, dwelling on the problem of the influence of external conquests on the social structure of the state.

In 1913, Wipper's textbook "Ancient East and Aegean Culture" appeared. In this book the author reviewed various archaeological discoveries made at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, and also tried to identify cultural ties with the ancient world, very often, according to critics, pointing to the predominant influence of Babylon⁴⁶.

Wipper's core courses never had extensive theoretical introductions, in which the author expressed his theoretical and methodological views. The course concept acquired its shape and integrity in the topics and details of reviewing (from a brief review to detailed consideration). For example, in the foreword to the first edition of "Essays on the History of the Roman Empire", Wipper explained why he would not concentrate on the problems of Rome's early history, which Guerrier had always read. Wipper considered it impossible to restore early Roman history and refused to do so⁴⁷.

Indeed, on the other hand, in the lectures on the history of Greece, he paid careful attention to the "Homeric question". He considered "Ilyad" and "Odyssey" to be a collection of different songs created by different authors.

⁴³ Wipper R. Yu. *Obshchestvennye ucheniia i istoricheskie teorii XVIII i XIX vv. v sviazi s obshchestvennym dvizheniem na Zapade*. St. Petersburg, 1900 (reprint — M., 2007).

⁴⁴ Wipper R. Yu. *Ocherki teorii istoricheskogo poznaniia*. M., 1911.

⁴⁵ See details: Malinov A. V. *Filosofia i metodologiya istorii v Rossii*. M., 2015. P. 252–266.

⁴⁶ *Buzeskul V. P. Vseobshchaia istoriia i ee predstaviteli v Rossii v XIX i nachale XX veka*. M., 2008. P. 246.

⁴⁷ Wipper R. Yu. *Ocherki istorii Rimskoi imperii*. Moscow, 1908 (modern reprint: Wipper R. Yu. *Izbrannye sochineniia*. In 2 vols. Vol. 1. *Ocherki po istorii Rimskoi imperii*. Rostov n/D., 1995).

In his choice of topics, Wipper was guided first and foremost by the contemporary acute problems discussed in the academic community and society as a whole. He believed that one should take into account — “the impressions, moods and requests ... of modern society, which wants to have a science about itself”⁴⁸. In the early 20th century historical science was sociologized. Wipper paid much attention to the social aspects of the historical process. Some critics even point out the experiences of “social modeling” in Wipper’s courses⁴⁹.

In the socio-political history of antiquity, Wipper emphasized the problem of the crisis of the democratic movement. That is why the most popular part of his course on the history of Rome among the students was lectures on the fall of the Roman Republic. The severity of criticism in the lectures was directed at the concept of T. Mommsen, who argued that the Roman Empire was a “monarchically organized democracy”⁵⁰. Mommsen maintained that the Roman emperors were “at the same time unlimited sovereigns abroad... and the representatives of the lower classes in Rome”⁵¹. According to Mommsen, the emperor saved the republic from the “tyranny of the Republican Senate”. In this connection, Mommsen defined the principate as a diarchy, a compromise between republican and aristocratic forces⁵². Wipper eagerly criticized this approach to the principate. According to Wipper, Mommsen’s concept reflected the German conditions of his life rather than the times of the Roman Empire⁵³. “Although Europe has never seen democratic monarchs”, Wipper pointed out, “but from these hopes, a very vivid and persistent national-liberal history had emerged”⁵⁴. “The cult of Caesar”, according to Wipper, was closely connected with “political self-deception, which was expressed in Napoleonism and Bismarckianism”⁵⁵.

Wipper’s lectures aroused interest of young people. Wipper “was undisputedly the most outstanding professor of the Faculty in 1911–1916: he combined extensive and versatile knowledge, the ability to think independently and subtly; his lectures were academic and at the same time very fascinating”, recalled N. Druzhinin⁵⁶. To Wipper’s lecture on the history of Rome, which was dedicated to the redistribution of land during the reforms of the Gracchus, a large number of young people came to express their attitude to tyranny. They shouted during lectures: “Death to the tyrant”, “Land to the peasants!”⁵⁷.

Wipper’s textbooks and lectures were criticized by historians. Vladislav Buzeskul did not accept the terms used by Wipper in relation to antiquity from other historical epochs: “lords”, “imperialism”, “revolutionaries”. Responding to criticism, Wipper and his students answered: “The rapprochement of antiquity and modernity can be defined as heretical only as long as Hegelianism and the world-historical point of view prevailed. Only in

⁴⁸ *Vipper R. Yu. Novyie napravleniia v filosofii obshchestvennoi nauki // Vipper R. Yu. Dve intelligencii i drugie ocherki: sb. statei i publichnykh lekcii. 1900–1912. M., 1912. P. 142.*

⁴⁹ *Novikov M. V., Perfilova T. B. Modernizatsiia drevnei istorii v tvorchestve R. Yu. Vipper i V. P. Buzeskula // Yaroslavl Pedagogical Vestnik. 2008. Iss. 2 (56). P. 96–100.*

⁵⁰ *Vipper R. Yu. Izbrannyye sochineniia. Vol. 2. Ocherki po istorii Rimskoi imperii okonchanie. P. 7.*

⁵¹ *Ibid. Vol. 2. P. 6.*

⁵² *Ibid. P. 4–7.*

⁵³ *Ibid. P. 8.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid. P. 11.*

⁵⁶ *Druzhinin N. M. Vospominaniia i mysli istorika // Moskovskii universitet v vospominaniakh sovremennikov. Moscow, 1989. P. 610.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid. P. 610.*

these paradigms the ancient world was isolated from the contemporary one. It's high time one recognized that new methods of history writing, thanks to which the classical images come to life... are not only acceptable but also necessary"⁵⁸.

It is interesting to note that Wipper's students were influenced by this trend and tried to read lectures as Wipper did. Konstantin Uspensky, as Alexander Savin reported, "adapted himself to Wipper, and to the weak points: he built (during trial lectures at the faculty — about senatorial landownership under Justinian and Demosthenes) bold, almost fantastic constructions, he simplified class struggle in history very much"⁵⁹.

As an academic supervisor, Wipper was in charge of 12 postgraduate students (V.N. Pertsov, 1903, M.V. Berdonosov, 1904, V.N. Dyakov, 1907, G.M. Prigorovsky, V.P. Volgin, both — 1908; N.M. Lukin, 1909; S.A. Lyaskovskii, 1911; P. Kruglyakov, I.I. Troitsky, G.V. Asmolov, 1913–1914; K.K. Zelin, 1916; P.F. Preobrazhensky, 1917)⁶⁰.

The disciples of Wipper, like their predecessors, continued to be encyclopedically educated historians, although they had more noticeable specialization: the Ancient World (Prigorovsky, Zelin, Preobrazhensky, Lyaskovsky), the Middle Ages (Berdonosov), the Modern Time (Volgin, Lukin). In many respects, the disposition to prepare encyclopedically educated historians was realized owing to extremely complex master's exams, during which the fellows had to answer 18 questions on world history (six from each section of the world history). This required a wide outlook and encyclopedic knowledge from Wipper's students

Of the 12 students left by Wipper at the department, three students were able to pass the master's exams: G.M. Prigorovsky, N.M. Lukin and S.A. Lyaskovsky. The first two also successfully read trial lectures for a privatedocent position. None of Wipper's students had defended master's thesis before the Great Revolution of 1917. On the one hand, this occurred as a result of the events that unfolded at the beginning of the 20th century in Russia. But, on the other hand, it is an indirect evidence that the period of study at university and the time for obtaining the first degree clearly increased.

However, 9 out of 12 Wipper's postgraduate students were able to establish themselves in the Soviet historical science. They worked in Soviet scientific and higher educational institutions until the end of their lives. Some of them, such as K.K. Zel'in — became world renowned scholars.. Zel'in was for his students a symbol of continuity with the best traditions of pre-revolutionary historical science.

In general, Wipper preferred left-wing students. Druzhinin indirectly testified about this: "The sociological method and sympathy with advanced ideas brought him closer to the teachings of Marxism at the time"⁶¹. Sergey Bakhrushin called Wipper a Marxist "who created a school of Marxist historians"⁶². Two of Wipper's students — V.P. Volgin and N.M. Lukin — became administrators in the system of Soviet historical science.

⁵⁸ *Uspenskii K. N.* Prof. R. Vipper. Istoriiia Grecii v klassicheskuiu epokhu IX–IV vv. do R. H. // Golos minuvshogo. 1917. Iss. 11–12. P. 354.

⁵⁹ *Savin A. N.* Universitetskii dela. Dnevnik. 1908–1917. M., 2015. P. 241.

⁶⁰ See for details: *Naumov P. Yu.* Ucheniki R. Yu. Vipper // Vestnik of the Orthodox St. Tikhon Humanities University. Ser. II. History of the Russian Orthodox Church. 2018. Iss 1. P. 77–92.

⁶¹ *Druzhinin N. M.* Vospominaniia i mysli istorika. P. 22.

⁶² *Bakhrushin S. V.* Iz vospominanii // Problemy social'noi istorii Evropy: ot Antichnosti do Novogo vremeni. Bryansk, 1995. P. 153. However, at the same time, Bakhrushin testified: "After the October Revolution, he darted in the opposite direction and with a one-sided fanaticism of the proselyte he refuted the

By the beginning of the 1910s, Wipper was the most authoritative and administratively powerful figure in the department of World history at Moscow university. In many respects this was due to the fact that Wipper consolidated together junior professors of the department of World history (D. M. Petrushevsky and A. N. Savin), who were formally Vinogradov's postgraduate students. Wipper's power at the department of World History was not accepted by senior professors of the department — Pavel Vinogradov and Guerrier.

The position of Petrushevsky was largely due to the circumstances of his appearance at the department. On August 27, 1905, the Provisional Rules were introduced. Additions to the Statute of 1884 allowed the election of professors by Faculty Council. The Council of the History and Philology Faculty made the decision to restore professor Vinogradov (as it was done at St. Petersburg University with world historians Nickolay Kareev and Ivan Grevs, who had retired from the university in 1899). Wipper put forward the idea of the election not on the basis of competition, but on the recommendation of "the best specialists". Petrushevsky was recommended by Wipper. Wipper justified his proposal with several arguments. Firstly, he was overloaded with his duties because he had not been supported by other representatives of the department. Wipper had 12 lessons per week (lectures and seminars). Wipper believed that this workload would be distributed among 3 faculty members, as it was earlier⁶³. As a result of the long bickering between the Faculty and the Council of University, complicated by the position of Vinogradov, Petrushevsky became a professor.

However, after 1911, even within Wipper's team disagreements began to arise, On April 12, 1912, Wipper invited his closest colleagues to his home. According to Savin, after the party, "Wipper gave us a recently published collection of his articles and public lectures. Petrushevsky asked my opinion about the collection... I told him frankly that the collection and Wipper himself over the last few years has aroused in my mind sad and even bitter feelings... His responses to very complex things are narrow-minded... In his collection there is only one printed article "Dve intelligentsia"; this is a public lecture... This article seems to provide such a false approach to early Christianity, to Plato, to "Vekhi", to the Russian intelligentsia and to other subjects. Of course, great talent is reflected in many ways, but signs of wilting are evident. Wipper is not engaged in special research at all; his first and last research is his only and very good dissertation. His printed lecture courses contain a lot of talented, but also a lot of arbitrary, capricious judgments. Rostovtsev, a very competent critic, not without reason called Wipper's chapter on Augustus a historical novel. Petrushevsky sees the root of evil in the growing and now almost full isolation from colleagues, in the harmful influence of Wipper's wife. These explanations seem to me insufficient"⁶⁴.

Wipper belonged to the generation of liberal students of Moscow University of the late 1870's. Wipper sought to serve students at the university, he relied on pure science which attracted public attention.

doctrine he had recently adopted, and from the materialists abruptly switched to the camp of idealists, saying that the revolution showed him the power of ideas and propaganda" (Ibid. P. 153).

⁶³ CGA Moskv. F. 418. Op. 249. D. 97. Ed. hr. 45–46. See also: *Antoshchenko A. V.* Professor imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta P. G. Vinogradov. P. 283–285.

⁶⁴ *Savin A. N.* Universitetskie dela. Dnevnik A. N. Savina. P. 234–235.

In the community of Russian historians, Wipper was specific. He denied the actual existence of world history as a single unidirectional process. Wipper regarded world history as a kind of pedagogical discipline that allows conducting experiment with a large amount of factual data that is entirely arbitrary or more or less scientifically arranged by historians.

As an administrator, Wipper was not a follower of Guerrier's traditions. He destroyed the system of training for postgraduate students which was introduced by Guerrier. The oldest professor of Faculty Guerrier did not participate in the teaching process at the university. Nevertheless, Wipper's older colleagues, Kareyev and Vinogradov, still treated Guerrier as an informal leader of the community of Moscow historians and did not accept Wipper's management. Relationships between Vinogradov and Wipper were especially hostile. On the other hand, the real head of the department of World history at Moscow University was Wipper. Wipper's entourage included only young professors — A. N. Savin and D. M. Petrushevsky. At the same time, Wipper maintained the standards of historical research of the community of Moscow historians. This explains a small number of defended theses among Wipper's postgraduate students. The quality of the lectures, with their close attention to all the complex issues of historical science, also make it possible to consider Wipper a typical representative of Moscow historians.

References

- Buzeskul V. P. *Vseobshchaia istoriia i ee predstaviteli v Rossii v XIX i nachale XX veka*. Moscow, Indrik, 2008, 832 p. (In Russian)
- Danilova A. P. R. Yu. Vipper kak istorik antichnosti. *Vestnik drevnei istorii*, 1984, iss. 167, no. 1, pp. 160–174 (In Russian)
- Frank A. V. R. Yu. Vipper i razvitie shkol'nogo istoricheskogo obrazovaniia v pervoi chetverti XX veka. *Sibirskii pedagogicheskii zhurnal*, 2014, no. 2, pp. 150–154 (In Russian)
- Georgiev P. V., Chiglintsev E. A. Rossiiskie istoriki v poiskakh politicheskogo ideala: V. P. Buzeskul i R. Yu. Vipper ob afinskoj demokratii. *Mir istorika. Istoriograficheskii sbornik*. Iss. 2. Omsk State University Press, 2006, pp. 316–325 (In Russian)
- Golubtsova E. S. Robert Yur'evich Vipper. *Portrety istorikov. Vremia i sud'by*. Vol. 2. Vseobshchaia istoriia. Eds G. N. Sevastianov, L. P. Marinovich, L. T. Mil'skaya. Moscow; Jerusalem, Universitetskaya kniga, 2000, pp. 7–15 (In Russian)
- Ivanova T. N. Dva neizvestnykh pis'ma. *Vestnik of the Russian State Humanitarian University*. Ser. Historical sciences. Historiography, source study, methods of historical research, 2011, iss. 74, no. 12, pp. 281–289 (In Russian)
- Koval'chuk S. V. Istoriia i ego istoriia: Robert Yur'evich Vipper. *Russkii mir i Latviia*. Al'manakh, 2011, no. 25, pp. 200–210 (In Russian)
- Malinov A. V. *Fiilosofia i metodologiya istorii v Rossii*. St. Petersburg, "Intersotsis", 2015, 380 p. (In Russian)
- Miagkov G. P., Ivanova T. N. S. F. Fortunatov i moskovskoe nauchnoe soobshchestvo. *Istoriki mezhdru ochevidnym i voobrazhaemym: problemy vizualizatsii v istoricheskoi mysli*. Materialy XVII chtenii pamiati chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR S. I. Arkhangel'skogo. Nizhny Novgorod, Nizhny Novgorod University Press, 2011, pp. 24–28 (In Russian)
- Naumov P. Yu. Ucheniki R. Yu. Vippere. *Vestnik of St. Tikhon Orthodox Humanities University*. Ser. II. History of the Russian Orthodox Church, 2018, iss. 80, no. 1, pp. 77–92. (In Russian)
- Novikov M. V., Perfilova T. B. Modernizatsiia drevnei istorii v tvorchestve R. Yu. Vipper i V. P. Buzeskula. *Yaroslavl Pedagogical Vestnik*, 2008, iss. 56, no 2, pp. 96–100 (In Russian)
- Perfilova T. B. *Obraz antichnoi istorii v "umstvennykh razrezakh" R. Yu. Vippere*. Yaroslavl', Yaroslavl' State Pedagogical University Press, 2006, 346 p. (In Russian)
- Safronov B. G. *Istoricheskoe mirovozzrenie R. Yu. Vippere i ego vremia*. Moscow, Moscow State University Press, 1976, 223 p. (In Russian)
- Savina A. R. Yu. Vipper o Zh. Kal'vine: reviziia obraza "zhenevskogo diktatora". *Dialog so vremenem*, 2012, iss. 40, pp. 258–266 (In Russian)

- Tsygankov D. A. Avtoritet uchitel'ia i nauchnye konflikty v soobshchestve moskovskikh istorikov v kontse XIX — nachale XX v. *Klio*, 2016, vol. 116, no. 8, pp. 54–61 (In Russian)
- Tsygankov D. A. R. Yu. Vipper ego put' v sovetskoi istoricheskoi nauke. *Istoriia i istoriki v prostranstve natsional'noi i mirovoi kul'tury XVIII — nachala XXI v.* Chelyabinsk, Entsiklopediia, 2011, pp. 241–245 (In Russian)
- Volodikhin D. M. Kritika teorii progressa v trudakh R. Yu. Vipper. *Voprosy istorii*, 1999, no. 2, pp. 64–69 (In Russian)
- Volodikhin D. M. "Ochen' staryi akademik". *Original'naiia filosofiia istorii R. Yu. Vipper.* Moscow, URAO, 1997, 99 p. (In Russian)

Received: July 5, 2018

Accepted: November 30, 2018

Статья поступила в редакцию 5 июля 2018 г.

Рекомендована в печать 30 ноября 2018 г.