

SAINT-PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY

Manuscript copyright

PYZIKOV DENIS DMITRIEVICH

**THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF ORTHODOXY IN SOVIET SCIENCE
(1943-1988)**

Scientific speciality 5.7.9.

Philosophy of religion and religious studies

Dissertation submitted for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences

Translation from Russian

Supervisor:

Doctor of Philosophy,

Professor Tatiana V. Chumakova

St. Petersburg

2023

Table of contents

Introduction	3
1. Historical and political context of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR	19
1.1. The influence of ideology and anti-religious propaganda on the study of religion in the USSR.....	19
1.2. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich - researcher of russian religious movements	29
2. Historiography of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR (1943-1988)	42
2.1. Directions of the study of Orthodoxy	42
2.2. The history of Orthodoxy as the main direction of the study of Orthodoxy	46
2.3. Research problems of the history of Orthodoxy	67
2.3.1. The Baptism of Rus'	77
2.3.2. Old Russian writing	85
2.3.3. Problems of feudalism and monastic land ownership	89
2.3.4. The struggle of peasants against church land ownership.....	101
2.3.5. Anti-feudal religious movements.....	107
2.3.6. Church as a social institution in the history of Russia.....	116
2.3.7. The evolution of Orthodoxy and the "modernization" of Orthodox theology.....	126
Conclusion.....	138
Bibliography.....	144

Introduction

Relevance of the study. An urgent task of research in the history of science is the analysis of socio-historical processes that influenced the formation of a particular discipline. The task is solved by restoring the historical, sociocultural and political context. Such a context determines the nature of the emergence, development, content and essence of a particular scientific direction. Over the past 30 years, interest in the study of humanities in the USSR and in Soviet science of religion has increased in Russia and abroad. However, unfortunately, some topics remain outside the field of view of researchers. This is due to the insufficient number of comprehensive and generalizing historiographical works devoted to the history of Soviet religious studies, in particular the history of the study of Orthodoxy, and the reconstruction of the history of the development of religious discourse in the USSR in the second half of the 20th century.

Appeal to this topic is motivated not only by the possibility of introducing new facts and assessments into the paradigm of studying the history of Soviet religious studies, but also by the increased interest in various aspects of the study of Orthodoxy. After the collapse of the USSR, a radical change occurred in the worldview of citizens, which required a reassessment of old values, primarily on the ideological "front". For seventy years, the state has been the regulator of not only social and legal, but also moral and ethical norms, sometimes trying to replace religion with itself, creating a quasi-religious ideology¹. In recent decades, the pendulum has swung in the other direction, especially due to the work of individual researchers declaring the ideological and unscientific nature of religious studies of the Soviet period. Such approaches to the Soviet humanitarian heritage are completely untenable. In this work, the main thesis is that despite the general politicization, not all studies of Orthodoxy during the Soviet period were the product of

¹ Berdyaev N. A. The origins and meaning of Russian communism. M.: Nauka, 1990. 220 p.; Tumarkin N. Lenin is alive! The cult of Lenin in Soviet Russia. St. Petersburg: Acad. project, 1997. 285 p.; Luchshev E. M. Russian god: at the origins of Soviet atheism. St. Petersburg: Shareholder i K, 2003. 118 p.; Ryklin M.K. Communism as a religion: intellectuals and the October Revolution. M.: New Literary Review, 2009. 128 p.; Slezkin Y. L. Government House: The Saga of the Russian Revolution. M.: AST: Corpus, 2019. 969 p.

direct propaganda and took place under the banner of “militant atheism,” as is often believed.

Researchers of the history of Soviet science note that for it "due to the obvious features of its formation and functioning, it was very important to comply with the already established basic truths ("laws") of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. It was the presence of a general theoretical basis, proven in practice and shared by all Soviet scientists, that was perceived as the most important difference between Soviet historiography and that which was generically called "bourgeois"². Obviously, in such a scientific paradigm, the study of the history of the Christian church could not be "mainstream" (with the exception of the study of economic problems, the study of the economic activities of church institutions, as well as anti-clericalism and "freethinking"), and sometimes researchers who at the beginning of their careers worked on topics related to the history of the Orthodox Church, later changed their priorities³. But, "periphery" had its positive properties, and, as S. B. Krikh rightly notes in his article, it was "periphery" that contributed to a greater variety of approaches to the study of “peripheral” phenomena, which we observe in Soviet works on the history of Orthodoxy, which were dealt with by both historians and philologists, and even philosophers.

In order to build a complete picture of the history of the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet science, it is necessary to identify patterns and correlations in the development of Russian religious studies, depending on the current political situation and the ideological agenda in the USSR. It seems that in order to fulfill the task, in the context of a permanent change in the course of the party in relation to Orthodoxy and the Church and constantly changing ideologemes, the best object of research will be monographs by Russian authors and scientific periodicals, which acted as a specific form of scientific communication. Using examples of specific scientific papers, one can track changes in rhetoric, the

² Krikh S. B. The phenomenon of peripherality in Soviet historiography // Problems of History. 2017. No. 10. P. 165.

³ R. G. Pikhoy's Ph.D. thesis, defended in Sverdlovsk, was devoted to penitential practice and the ancient Russian schools of canon law: «The Church in Ancient Rus'. (The end of the 10th - the first half of the 13th century) (Old Russian penitential law as a historical source)», Sverdlovsk, 1974, and this work has not lost its relevance to this day, and the doctoral thesis was devoted to a completely different topic («The social and political thought of the working people Ural of the 18th century», Sverdlovsk, 1987).

Pikhoya R. G. Notes of an archeographer. M.: Dmitry Pozharsky University, 2016. 496 p.

appearance of policy articles in journals, the development or disappearance of certain research topics, continuity, or, conversely, differences in the assessments of different generations of religious scholars in certain eras in the history of atheism in the USSR. As M. M. Shakhnovich notes: "The study of rhetoric is very useful for understanding the era, the study of ideological clichés and polemical discourse allows us to understand the public mood and intellectual atmosphere..."⁴. Thus, an objective analysis of the history of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR will make it possible to see the creative heritage of Russian science.

The object of the study is the Soviet religious discourse of studying Orthodoxy in Russia within the framework of the sociocultural and political context of 1943–1988.

The subject of the study is the works of historians and religious scholars, which are devoted to a wide range of issues in the study of Orthodoxy in Russia and were published from 1943 to 1988.

The historiography. The history of religious studies in the USSR, as well as the history of the study of Orthodoxy itself, cannot be reconstructed outside the context of the development of Soviet historical science as a whole. Religious studies is a complex interdisciplinary scientific project, along with other social sciences, using the methodology and theoretical base of various humanities. Many well-known Russian historians of the last century turned to certain aspects and issues of the history of Orthodoxy in Russia. Thus, the political tendencies and perturbations that influenced the state and development of historical science in the USSR also influenced and were reflected in Soviet religious studies in the same way. In the 1990s, many works were published that analyzed the development of humanities in the USSR in the 1920s - 1950s⁵. One of the important topics for Russian scientists was "repressed science"⁶. The legacy

⁴ Shakhnovich M. M. Ethos of the history of science: on the reconstruction of Russian religious studies of the Soviet period // *State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad*. 2015. No. 1. P. 189.

⁵ *History and Stalinism* / comp. and ed. foreword A. N. Mertsalov. M.: Politizdat, 1991. 446 p.; Alekseeva G. D. Historical science of Russia in search of new concepts // *Russia in the XX century: Historians of the world argue* / ed. ed. I. D. Kovalchenko. M.: Nauka, 1994. P. 635-642; Gerasimenko G. A. On the mutual influence of totalitarianism and historical science in the USSR // *Russia in the XX century: Historians of the world argue* / ed. ed. I. D. Kovalchenko. M.: Nauka, 1994. P. 654-664.

⁶ Yaroshevsky M. G. Stalinism and the fate of Soviet science // *Repressed science* / comp. A.I. Melua, V.M. Eagle. Under total ed. M.G. Yaroshevsky. L.: Nauka, 1991. P. 9-33; Alpatov V. M. *The history of one myth: Marr and Marrism*. M.: Nauka,

of M. N. Pokrovsky and the generation of "red professors" deserves special attention from researchers⁷. There were active discussions about the historiography of Soviet science⁸. The interest of researchers was also attracted by the "thaw" period, and here it is possible to highlight the publications of G. D. Alekseeva⁹ and L. A. Sidorova¹⁰.

In the 21st century the vector of the methodology of domestic historiography has partially shifted from chronological description to the analysis of individual plots. However, of course, general works continue to be published¹¹. Topics of "scientific discussions" and internal corporate communication between different generations of historians are becoming relevant¹². In recent years, S. B. Krikh has been actively developing the "peripheral" approach to Soviet humanities¹³. Numerous publications by

1991. 240 p.; Ashnin F. D., Alpatov V. M. «The Case of the Slavists»: 30s. M.: Nasledie, 1994. 284 p.; Dubrovsky A. M. S. V. Bakhrushin and his time. M.: Publishing House of RUDN University, 1992. 165 p.; Dubrovsky A. M. Alexander Alexandrovich Zimin: a difficult path of searching // *Russian History*. 2005. No. 4. P. 140-151; Kobrin V. B. To whom are you dangerous, historian? M.: Moskovsky Rabochiy, 1992. 223 p.; Gorskaya N. A. Boris Dmitrievich Grekov. M.: IRI, 1999. 271 p.; Tikhonov V. V. Moscow historians of the first half of the 20th century: Y. V. Gauthier, P. B. Veselovsky, A. I. Yakovlev and S. V. Bakhrushin. Moscow: Publishing Center of the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2012. 387 p.

⁷ Gerasimenko G. A. On the mutual influence of totalitarianism and historical science in the USSR // *Russia in the XX century: Historians of the world argue / otv. ed. I. D. Kovalchenko*. M.: Nauka, 1994. P. 654-664; Litvin A. L. Without the right to thought: Historians in the era of the Great Terror. Fate sketches. Kazan: Tatar book publishing house, 1994. 189 p.

⁸ Afanasiev Y. N. The phenomenon of Soviet historiography // *Soviet historiography / ed. ed. Y. N. Afanasiev*. M.: RSUH, 1996. P. 7-41; Alekseeva G.D. Some issues of the development of historical science in the 60-80s. // *Historical science of Russia in the XX century / G. D. Alekseeva, A. A. Ovsyannikov, Tamas Kraus and others*. M.: Scriptorium, 1997. P. 269-301.

⁹ Alekseeva G.D. Some issues of the development of historical science in the 60-80s. // *Historical science of Russia in the XX century / G. D. Alekseeva, A. A. Ovsyannikov, Tamas Kraus and others*. M.: Scriptorium, 1997. P. 269-301; Alekseeva G. D. *Historical science in Russia: Ideology. Politics: (60-80s of the XX century)*. M.: IRH of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2003. 246 p.

¹⁰ Sidorova L. A. Thaw in historical science. Mid 50's - mid 60's. // *Historical science of Russia in the XX century / G. D. Alekseeva, A. A. Ovsyannikov, Tamas Kraus and others*. M.: Scriptorium, 1997. P. 244-268; Sidorova L. A. *Thaw in historical science: Soviet historiography of the first post-Stalin decade*. M.: Monuments of historical thought, 1997. 288 p.

¹¹ Korzun V. P., Knysh N. A., Kolevatov D. M. Transformation of the image of Soviet historical science in the first post-war decade: the second half of the 1940s - the middle of the 1950s. M.: ROSSPEN, 2011. 470 p.

¹² Dubrovsky A. M. *Historian and power: historical science in the USSR and the concept of the history of feudal Russia in the context of politics and ideology, (1930-1950s)*. Bryansk: Publishing House of the Bryansk State University, 2005. 798 p.; Kasyan A. A., Demicheva T. N., Kurevina P. V. *Ideology and science: discussions of Soviet scientists in the middle of the 20th century*. Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 2008. 286 p.; Sidorova L. A. *Soviet historical science of the middle of the XX century: a synthesis of three generations of historians*. Moscow: Institute of Russian History, 2008. 292 p.; Tikhonov V. V. *Ideological Campaigns of «Late Stalinism» and Soviet Historical Science (mid-1940s - 1953)*. M.; St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2016. 424 p.

¹³ Krykh S. B. Being a Marxist: The Cross of a Soviet Historian // *Historiographic Studies in Ukraine*. 2012. No. 22. P. 153-176; Krikh S. B. The image of antiquity in Soviet historiography. M.: KRASAND, 2013. 319 p.; Krikh S. B. The language of Soviet historiography: main characteristics // *Scientific Notes of Kazan University*. 2014. V. 156. No. 3. P. 214-222; Krikh S. B., Metel O. V. *Soviet historiography of antiquity in the context of world historiographic thought: analysis of texts created in the Soviet period. Analysis of the «periphery of scientific discourse» (forewords, reviews, applications). Evaluation of the main achievements and problems of Soviet conceptual constructions in the field of ancient history*. M.: LENAND, 2014. 249 p.; Krikh S. B. The system of Soviet historiography: the main actors and forces of influence // *Problems of History*. 2016. No. 7. P. 162-167; Krikh S. B. The phenomenon of peripherality in Soviet historiography // *Problems of History*. 2017. No. 10. P. 164-169.

O. V. Metel are noteworthy¹⁴. Issues of Soviet historiography of Orthodoxy are addressed in the works of researchers of "antiquity"¹⁵(which include the above-mentioned S. B. Krikh and O. V. Metel), in works on the history of archeology¹⁶ and Byzantine studies¹⁷.

In the last quarter of a century, comparative studies have appeared on the reflection of humanities in the USSR¹⁸. Works devoted to the historiography of religious diversity are published¹⁹, also ancient Russian religious diversity is actively studied by those who are engaged in the historiography of the political history of pre-Petrine Russia²⁰.

Since the late 1990s issues of the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet humanities are beginning to be analyzed in works on the historiography of Russian philosophy²¹ and ancient Russian philosophical thought²².

In Russian and Western historiography there are no works that comprehensively represent the Soviet religious discourse of the study of Orthodoxy. However, many of the disparate aspects discussed collectively in this study are reflected in the research literature.

¹⁴ Metel O. V. Institute of History of the Communist Academy (1929–1936) // Scientific Notes of Kazan University. 2016. V. 158. No. 6. P. 1522-1532; Gruzinskaya V. P., Metel O. V. Institute of Red Professorship: Problems of Institutional Building (1921–1923) // Tomsk State University Bulletin. 2018. No. 426. P. 82-87; Metel O. V. Development of historical research at the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU in the 1940-1960s. // In the collection: Omsk Scientific Readings - 2020. Materials of the Fourth All-Russian Scientific Conference. Omsk, 2020. P. 2218-2222; Metel O. V. The development of Soviet historical science in the second half of the 80s of the XX century: the challenges of perestroika // Scientific Notes of Kazan University. 2021. V. 163. No. 6. P. 31-47.

¹⁵ Ladynin I. A. Features of the landscape (how Marxist was "Soviet antiquity"?) // Bulletin of Dmitry Pozharsky University. 2016. No. 2. P. 9-32.

¹⁶ Klein L. S. History of Russian archeology: teachings, schools and personalities. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Eurasia, 2014. 640 p.; Formozov A. A. Russian archaeologists during the period of totalitarianism. Historiographical essays. M.: Znack, 2004. 320 p.

¹⁷ Khrushchev E. N. The concept of the Byzantine state in Russian Byzantine studies of the last quarter of the 19th-20th centuries. Abstract of the thesis for the academic degree. Ekaterinburg, 2003. 28 p.

¹⁸ Kappes O. «Militant» Science: Elaboration of the Past Dictatorships in German and Russian Historiographies of the Second Half of the 20th Century. M.: AIRO-XXI, 2015. 351 p.

¹⁹ Pechnikov M. V. Church and strigolniki in Pskov at the end of the 14th - first third of the 15th century // Ancient Rus'. Problems of medieval studies. 2009. No. 3(37). P. 88-89.

²⁰ Pechnikov M. V. Was Pskov one of the heretical centers at the end of the 15th century? // Bulletin of Dmitry Pozharsky University. 2019. No. 2(14). P. 118-128; Khalyavin N. V. Russian historiography of modern times on the role of the church in the political history of Novgorod the Great // Bulletin of the Udmurt University. Series History and Philology. 2010. No. 3. P. 11-22.

²¹ Ermichev A. A. An episode from the history of the "nomenklatura" historiography of Russian philosophy // Bulletin of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy. 2023. No. 2. P. 98-110; Chernoskutova L. B. Basic ideas and directions of modern historiography of Russian philosophy. Thesis for the academic degree. Petersburg, 2010. 152 p.; Shirokova M. A. The place and role of Slavophilism in Russian philosophy and social thought: historiography of the problem // News of the Altai State University. 2013. No. 2-2(78). Pp. 220-225.

²² Chumakova T. V. Soviet historiography of ancient Russian philosophical thought // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 6. 2004. No. 2. P. 13-17

Since the end of the 20th century an active study of religious thought began, and many works by Russian researchers appeared, which also touched upon issues of the historiography of Orthodoxy in Soviet science. Among modern general works devoted to the history of Russian religious studies of the 20th century, which raise the problems of studying Orthodoxy in the USSR during the period under review, it is necessary to note the studies of E. I. Arinin²³, O. Y. Vasilyeva²⁴, E. S. Genina²⁵, A. V. Gorbatova²⁶, E. S. Klimova²⁷, A. G. Koshkarova²⁸, E. V. Menshikova²⁹, V. A. Ovchinnikova³⁰, M. V. Sentyabova³¹, S. G. Sizova³², L. I. Soskovets³³, M. Y. Smirnova³⁴, I. V. Smolina³⁵, D. A.

²³ Arinin E. I. The question of the origin and modern development of Russian religious studies // Scientific Notes of the Oryol State University. 2011. No. 1. P. 93-97.

²⁴ Vasilyeva O. Y. Russian Orthodox Church in the politics of the Soviet state in 1943-1948. M.: IRI RAS, 1999. 212 p.; Vasilyeva O. Y. State-church relations of the Soviet period: periodization and content. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.pravoslavie.ru/5206.html> (Date of access: 09.21.2023); Vasilyeva O. Y. «I am against the opposition of Soviet and Russian science of religion...» // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2014. No. 3. P. 295-301.

²⁵ Genina E. S. The State and the Russian Orthodox Church in the mid-1940s - early 1950s (based on materials from the Kemerovo region) // Bulletin of the Kemerovo State University of Culture and Arts. 2010. No. 10. P. 105-111.

²⁶ Gorbatova A. V. State and religious organizations of Siberia in the 1940s - 1960s. Tomsk: Kemerovo State University, 2008. 406 p.; Gorbatova A. V. State and religious organizations of Siberia in the 1940s -1960s. Thesis for the academic degree. Kemerovo, 2009. 437 p.

²⁷ Klimova E. S. Restoration of parish life in the Kemerovo region in 1944-1947. // Bulletin of Kemerovo State University. 2015. No. 1-2. P. 53-56.

²⁸ Koshkarov A. G. State influence on the Orthodox tradition in Soviet society from the 1940s to the 1980s. (on the example of the south of Western Siberia) // Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art history. Questions of theory and practice. 2013. No. 11. Part 2. P. 81-84.

²⁹ Menshikova E. V. From the history of Russian religious studies: understanding the subject and methods in the 20-30s. 20th century // Bulletin of the RSPR. 2008. No. 1. P. 70-76.

³⁰ Ovchinnikov V. A. On the issue of periodization of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in Siberia during the Soviet period (1917-1991) // Bulletin of Kemerovo State University. 2015. No. 1-1. P. 72-80.

³¹ Sentyabova M. V. Daily life of parishes of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Krasnoyarsk Territory in the 40s - 70s. XX century // Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University. 2012. No. 6. P. 239-245.

³² Sizov S. G. Religious life of Omsk during the years of "post-war Stalinism (1945 - March 1953) // Intelligentsia and the diversity of culture of the Russian province. Materials VIII All-Russian. scientific conf. with international participation in preparation for the 300th anniversary of Omsk and the celebration of anniversary events in Russian history. Omsk, 2012. 3. 301-305.

³³ Soskovets L. I. Religious confessions of Western Siberia in the 40-60s of the XX century. Tomsk: Vol. state Univ., 2003. 346 p.

³⁴ Smirnov M. Y. On Russian Religious Studies: Controversial Issues // Issues of Religion and Religious Studies. Issue. 2: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2010. P. 126-127.

³⁵ Smolina I. V. Life of the Irkutsk diocese in the context of state-church relations in the second half of the 20th century. // News of Altai State University. 2009. No. 4-1. 3. 211-215.

Uzlaner³⁶, A. A. Fedotova³⁷, S. L. Firsova³⁸, T. V. Chumakova³⁹, T. A. Chumachenko⁴⁰, M. M. Shakhnovich⁴¹, M. V. Shkarovsky⁴², E. S. Elbakyan⁴³, I. N. Yablokova⁴⁴ and etc.

Publication in 2014 of the monograph "The Science of Religion", "Scientific Atheism", "Religious Studies": Current Problems of the Scientific Study of Religion in Russia in the 20th – Early 21st Century"⁴⁵ gave rise to an extensive discussion about the ethos of Soviet science of religion, the platform for which was the magazine "State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad". On this occasion, M. M. Shakhnovich writes the following: "Within the so-called "Soviet religious studies" there was no ideological

³⁶ Uzlaner D. A. Soviet model of secularization // Sociological studies. 2010. No. 6. P. 62-69.

³⁷ Fedotov A. A. Russian Orthodox Church in 1943-2000: intra-church life, relationships with the state and society (based on materials from Central Russia). Ivanovo: Institute of Management, 2009. 400 p.

³⁸ Firsov P. L. The Orthodox Russian Church and the Civil War in the Reflection of the Soviet Anti-Religious Press (1920–1941) // Church and Time. 2018. No. 1. P. 229-272.

³⁹ Chumakova T. V. Soviet historiography of ancient Russian philosophical thought // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 6. 2004. no. 2. P. 13-17; Chumakova T.V. «Map of Religions» for the Failed All-Union Census of 1937: A Forgotten Page of Soviet Religious Studies // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2012. No. 3-4. P. 106-133; Chumakova T. V. Studying the history of Orthodoxy in Russia in the 19th - early 20th centuries // History of Religious Studies and the Intellectual History of Russia in the 19th - first half of the 20th century. Archival materials and research. St. Petersburg: Publishing house of St. Petersburg State University, 2018. P. 58-70.

⁴⁰ Chumachenko T. A. State, Orthodox Church, believers: 1941-1961. M.: AIRO-XX, 1999. 246 p.

⁴¹ Shakhnovich M. The Study of Religion in the Soviet Union // Numen. 40. 1993. P. 67-81; Shakhnovich M. M. Anthropological Religious Studies in Russian Academic Science in the First Quarter of the 20th Century // St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences in the History of Academies of the World. T. 4. St. Petersburg, 1999; Shakhnovich M. M. Russian Religious Studies of the 1920-1980s. What legacy are we giving up? // Essays on the history of religious studies. St. Petersburg., 2006. P. 181-197; Shakhnovich M. M. Cultural revolution in the USSR and the science of religion // Religious Studies. 2015. No. 3. P. 127-135; Shakhnovich M. M. Ethos of the history of science: on the reconstruction of Russian religious studies of the Soviet period // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2015. No. 1. P. 185-197; Shakhnovich M. Religious studies and anti-religious propaganda in the USSR in 1920-1930s // European Researcher. Series A. 2016. No. 8 (109). P. 456-461; Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. Ideology and science: The study of religion in the era of the cultural revolution in the USSR. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016. 367 p.; Shakhnovich M. M. The Cold War and the Ideological Struggle on the «Religious Front»: On Some Models of Soviet Propaganda // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2017. No. 1. P. 164-184; Shakhnovich M. M. The study of the history of religion in the 1920s and the first anti-religious expositions in Leningrad // Religious Studies. 2018. No. 4. P. 152-157; Shakhnovich M. Comparative Religion and Anti-Religious Museums of Soviet Russia in the 1920s // Religions. 2020 Vol. 11. Issue 2, 55. P. 1-12; Shakhnovich M. M. Presentation of the cult of Christian saints in anti-religious museum expositions of the era of the «Great Break» // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Philosophy and Conflictology. 2021. No. 4. P. 706-717; Shakhnovich M. M. The cult of saints in anti-religious propaganda and historical science in the USSR in the 1920s - early 1930s // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2023. No. 1. P. 151–177.

⁴² Shkarovsky M. V. Russian Orthodox Church under Stalin and Khrushchev (State-Church relations in the USSR in 1939-1964). M.: Krutitskoe Patriarchal Compound and others, 1999. 400 p.

⁴³ Elbakyan E. S. The phenomenon of Soviet religious studies // Religious Studies. 2011. No. 3. P. 141-161; Elbakyan E. S. The outline of religious studies in Russia: did soviet religious studies really exist? // Numen Book Series. 2015. V. 149. P. 276-314.

⁴⁴ Menshikova E. V., Yablokov I. N. On the periods in the history of Russian religious studies // Bulletin of the Moscow State University. Series 7: Philosophy. 2011. No. 5. P. 98-116; Yablokov I. N. To the discussion about the current state and history of Russian religious studies // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2011. No. 1. P. 165-173; Yablokov I. N. Religious studies and the history of religious studies. Discussions in Russian Literature // Religious Studies. 2011. No. 3. P. 127-140.

⁴⁵ Antonov K. M., Vorontsova E. V., Kolkunova K. A. The Science of Religion, Scientific Atheism, Religious Studies: Actual Problems of the Scientific Study of Religion in Russia in the 20th - early 21st centuries: a collective monograph. M.: Publishing House of Saint Tikhon's Orthodox University, 2014. 261 p.

unity, and therefore it is impossible to "paint all the authors who wrote about religion in Soviet times with the same paint", and besides, call them all "scientists" or "researchers". One can find numerous documentary evidence that contradictions constantly arose between those who were exclusively engaged in agitprop and those who wanted to conduct scientific research"⁴⁶.

In recent decades, the number of works devoted to various scientific institutions has increased, and some of the most significant studies for the national religious studies tradition have been republished. In 2010, a large anthology on the history of Russian religious studies, "Questions of Religion and Religious Studies" was published in several volumes as a supplement to the scientific journal "State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad" including works published during the Soviet period. The second issue opens with an article by Y. P. Zuev and V. V. Shmidt about the Institute of Scientific Atheism and its role in the development of domestic religious studies^{47,48}. The fourth issue of the anthology was dedicated to the St. Petersburg school of religious studies, which has a rich tradition rooted in the Faculty of History and Philology of St. Petersburg University in the mid-19th century. Of particular importance for all Russian religious studies is the Museum of the History of Religion of the USSR Academy of Sciences (Leningrad), which was opened in 1932. The second part of the fourth issue of the anthology "Questions of Religion and Religious Studies" was entirely devoted to the State Museum of the History of Religion⁴⁹. In 2014, a fundamental study on the history of the Museum was published⁵⁰. This work, among other things, combines previous publications of the authors⁵¹. In addition to describing all aspects and milestones of the Museum's work, the

⁴⁶ Shakhnovich M. M. Ethos of the history of science: on the reconstruction of Russian religious studies of the Soviet period // *State, religion, church in Russia and abroad*. 2015. No. 1. P. 192.

⁴⁷ Zuev Y. P., Schmidt V. V. From the Institute of Scientific Atheism to the Department of State-Confessional Relations: The Formation of the School of Religion (1964–1991, 1992–2010) // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 2: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2010. P. 15-28.

⁴⁸ In the context of the Institute of Scientific Atheism, it is also worth noting the article by O. V. Metel: Metel O. V. The Institute of Scientific Atheism and the Development of Religious Studies in the USSR in the 1960s-80s. // *Journal of the Belarusian State University*. Story. 2022. No. 2. P. 40-50.

⁴⁹ *Questions of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 4: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies: St. Petersburg School of Religious Studies. Book 2: State Museum of the History of Religion. Part I. M.: MediaProm Publishing House, 2010. 490 p.

⁵⁰ Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961)*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2014. 457 p.

⁵¹ Shakhnovich M. M. *Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961)* // *Religious Studies*. 2008. No. 4. P. 150-157; Shakhnovich M. M. *Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in the Kazan Cathedral: the struggle to save the building and preserve the Museum*

book contains valuable archival documents. In modern historiography the State Museum of the History of Religion continues to be a relevant object of research.⁵²

In recent years works have also been published dedicated to other state, scientific and public organizations that studied religious phenomena: the Central Anti-Religious Museum⁵³, Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography⁵⁴, Communist Academy⁵⁵, Union of Militant Atheists⁵⁶.

In recent years, many works have been published devoted to Soviet researchers of religion, whose works touched upon various aspects of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR (including Orthodox diversity). Noteworthy works dedicated to the work of

(1946–1951) // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 4: *Anthology of Russian Religious Studies*: St. Petersburg School of Religious Studies. Book 2: *State Museum of the History of Religion*. Part I. 2010. P. 55-76; Shakhnovich M. M. Section for the study of religions of the peoples of the USSR at the Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1934) // *State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad*. 2013. No. 1. P. 202-219; Chumakova T. V. Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in the early 30s. 20th century // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 4: *Anthology of Russian Religious Studies*: St. Petersburg School of Religious Studies. Book 2: *State Museum of the History of Religion*. Part I. 2010. P. 41-54.

⁵² Teryukova E. A. A cult object in a museum (from the history of museum business in Russia in the 20-30s of the XX century) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University*. Series 17. Philosophy. Conflictology. Culturology. Religious studies. 2014. No. 3. P. 110-115; Teryukova E. A. Museum of the History of Religion during the Great Patriotic War // *Proceedings of State Museum of the History of Religion*. 2019. No. 19. P. 64-78; Shakhnovich M. M. Scientific atheism of the era of «developed socialism» in the visual arts: about a series of decorative panels «Soviet Way of Life» (1983–1986) from the collection of State Museum of the History of Religion // *Religious Studies*. 2019. No. 3. P. 100-109; Shakhnovich M. M. Correspondence of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич and L. I. Emelyakh as a source on the history of the Manuscript Department (Scientific Archive) of the Museum of the History of Religion of the USSR Academy of Sciences // *Auxiliary historical disciplines in modern scientific knowledge*. Proceedings of the XXXII International Scientific Conference. Moscow: IVI RAN, 2019. P. 444-446; Shakhnovich M. M. «Funny Pictures»: from the history of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography and the Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1932–1933) // *Anthropological Forum*. 2020. No. 47. P. 139-153; Yusupova T. I., Chumakova T. V. «What should we do with this museum?» Museum of the History of Religion in the Soviet Academic Space of the 1930s. // *Dialogue With Time*. 2020. No. 73. P. 360-375.

⁵³ Teryukova E. A. Central anti-religious museum in Moscow: historical landmarks (1929–1947) // *Religious Studies*. 2019. No. 4. P. 121-127.

⁵⁴ Shakhnovich M. M. «Funny Pictures»: from the history of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography and the Museum of the History of Religion of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1932–1933) // *Anthropological Forum*. 2020. No. 47. P. 139-153.

⁵⁵ Shakhnovich M. M. Discussions at the Communist Academy and the Science of Religion in the USSR (late 1920s - early 1930s) // *Religious Studies*. 2015. No. 4. P. 151-159; Shakhnovich M. The activity of the commission on the history of religion of the Communist academy (Moscow, 1928–1930) and the study of religiosity in the USSR // *Religiski-Filozofiski Raksti*. 2017. Vol. 23. P. 9-24.

⁵⁶ Chumakova T. Political propaganda and scholarly research in periodicals of the League of Militant Atheists (1925–1935) // *Religiski-Filozofiski Raksti*. 2017. Vol. 23. P. 25-36.

V. D. Bonch-Bruevich⁵⁷, N. S. Gordienko⁵⁸, N. A. Kazakova⁵⁹, A. I. Klibanova⁶⁰, Y. S. Lurie⁶¹, N. M. Matorina⁶², B. A. Rybakova⁶³, S. A. Tokareva⁶⁴, M. I. Shakhnovich⁶⁵ and etc.

The Soviet period of studying Orthodoxy is touched upon to one degree or another in all domestic dissertation research, the subject of which is one or another aspect of Orthodoxy. In particular, these are works devoted to the study of the cult of saints⁶⁶ or regional history. Also, issues of the study of Orthodoxy are touched upon in review works by art historians devoted to the history of Russian art history and the creativity of individual art historians⁶⁷. And the historiography of the Soviet period of study of the Old Believers, which intensified in the late 50s, deserves a separate large study. XX century N. N. Pokrovsky noted: "Regular scientific search for ancient manuscripts and early printed books, preserved for centuries by Old Believers in the East of Russia, began in

⁵⁷ Teryukova E. A. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich – Researcher of Religious Minority Groups in Russia: Based on the Materials of the Scientific and Historical Archive of State Museum of the History of Religion // *History of Religious Studies and Intellectual History of Russia in the 19th – First Half of the 20th Century*. Archival materials and research. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University, 2018. P. 168-184; Pyzikov D. D. The archive of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich in State Museum of the History of Religion as a source of information on the history of church-state relations after the revolution of 1917 // *Religious Studies*. 2019. No. 2. P. 138-143; Pyzikov D. D. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich: a «professional» revolutionary and one of the founders of Soviet religious studies // *Concept: philosophy, religion, culture*. 2020. No. 1. P. 95-104; Zlobina D. A., Pyzikov D. D. Project of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich: Community «Beginning of the Century» and State Farm «Forest Glades» // *Bulletin of the SVGU. Story*. Electronic international scientific journal. Volume 1. Issue 2. 2020. [Electronic resource] URL: http://vistory-svgu.ru/?page_id=264 (date of access: 08.22.2023); Shakhnovich M. M. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, «Library of scientific and atheistic literature» and the struggle for the reconstruction of the sector of the history of religion of the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1953–1954) // *Religious Studies*. 2022. No. 2. P. 140-150.

⁵⁸ The path of the scientist. Nikolai Semyonovich Gordienko / comp. M. Y. Smirnov. M.: Special book, 2013. 96 p.

⁵⁹ Dmitriev L. A., Droblenkova N. F., Lurie Y. S. Natalya Aleksandrovna Kazakova (obituary) // *TODRL*. 1988. Vol. 41. P. 47-48; List of works by N. A. Kazakova / Comp. A. L. Khoroshkevich, V. F. Andreev // *Novgorod historical collection*. 1989. No. 3(13). P. 239-244.

⁶⁰ Dmitriev M. V. The scientific heritage of A. I. Klibanov and the prospects for a comparative historical study of the history of Christianity in Russia // *Russian History*. 1997. No. 1. P. 77-93.

⁶¹ In memoriam. Collection in memory of Y. S. Lurie. St. Petersburg, 1997. 428 p.

⁶² Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. N. M. Matorin and his program for the study of folk religiosity // *Religious Studies*. 2012. No. 4. P. 191-202; Shakhnovich M. M. Return from non-existence: publications about N. M. Matorin (1898–1936) and his scientific and organizational activities // *Religious Studies*. 2020. No. 3. P. 112-119.

⁶³ Medyantseva A. A. B. A. Rybakov - a historian-encyclopedist of our time // *Culture of the Slavs and Rus'*. M.: Nauka, 1998. P. 3–29; Klein L. S. Voyevoda of Soviet archeology // *History of Russian archeology: teachings, schools and personalities*. T. 2: Archaeologists of the Soviet era. St. Petersburg: Eurasia, 2014. P. 192-201.

⁶⁴ Zabiayko A. P. S. A. Tokarev: traditions are a connecting thread // *Religious Studies*. 2002. No. 3. P. 151-152.

⁶⁵ Tipsina A. N., Shakhnovich M. M. In memory of Mikhail Iosifovich Shakhnovich (life and career) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University*. Ser. 6. 1992. No. 20. Issue. 3; Shakhnovich M. M. M. I. Shakhnovich as a researcher of Russian culture // *Veche: almanac of Russian philosophy and culture*. 2009. No. 20. P. 218-223.

⁶⁶ Melnik A. G. Cults of Russian saints in the late XIV-XVI centuries: social aspects and practices of veneration. Thesis for the academic degree. M., 2023. 690 p.

⁶⁷ Morozova A. V. Russian art history (1964-1985) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Story*. 2014. No. 1. P. 124-137; Rykov A. V. Mikhail Alpatov and the canon of Soviet art history // *New art history. History, theory and philosophy of art*. 2021. No. 1. P. 142-147; Rykov A. V. Boris Vipper and the canon of Soviet art history // *Current problems of theory and history of art*. 2022. Vol. 12. P. 624-633.

the late 1950s on the initiative of the Chairman of the Archaeographic Commission of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician. M. N. Tikhomirov"⁶⁸.

In foreign research literature, the topic of the history of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR has not been studied in detail. There are a number of works that touch on the history of Soviet religious studies and "scientific atheism" in the context of the history of the attitude of the party and the state towards the church, the history of anti-religious policy and the persecution of religion⁶⁹. Separately, it is worth highlighting the work of the emigrant historian D. V. Pospelovsky, who considered the history of Soviet atheism as part of a repressive policy towards believers in the USSR⁷⁰. Some researchers have written about "scientific atheism" as a methodology and even a worldview of Soviet science⁷¹. Very few works deal with the relationship between science, religion and Soviet political ideology⁷².

Despite the large number of works devoted to both the study of the history of Russian historical science in general and the history of Russian religious studies in particular, unfortunately, one can observe a shortage of specialized works on the history of the study of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy in Russia in Soviet science did not become the object of a comprehensive, comprehensive study, but was presented as a set of diverse topics and highly specialized areas. The historiography of the study of Orthodoxy is relevant and important for clarifying the cultural and historical context of the

⁶⁸ Pokrovsky N. N. Archaeographic research in the work of the Institute of History SB RAS (1965-2006) // *Archaeographic Yearbook*. 2011. Vol. 1. No. 1. P. 61.

⁶⁹ Grossman J. D. Leadership of Antireligious Propaganda in the Soviet Union // *Studies in Soviet Thought*. 1972 Vol. 12. No. 3. P. 213-230; Peris D. *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless*. Cornell University Press, 1998. 237 p.; van den Bercken W. *Ideology and Atheism in the Soviet Union*. De Gruyter, 1988. 199 p.; Luukkanen A. *The Party of Unbelief: The Religious Policy of the Bolshevik Party 1917–1929*. Helsinki, 1994. 274 p.; Husband W. "Godless Communists": *Atheism and Society in Soviet Russia*. Northern Illinois University Press, 2000. 241 p.

⁷⁰ Pospelovsky D. A. *History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer*. In 3 vol. Palgrave Macmillan, 1987–1988. 325 p.; Pospelovsky D. A. *History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Antireligious Policies*. New York: St. Martin's, 1987. 189 p.

⁷¹ Throver J. Marxist-Leninist «Scientific Atheism» and the Study of Religion and Atheism in the USSR. De Gruyter, 1983. 529 p.; Kääriäinen K. Discussion on Scientific Atheism as a Soviet Science. 1960–1985 *Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia*, 1989. 196 p.; Luehrmann P. Antagonistic Insights: Evolving Soviet Atheist Critiques of Religion and Why They Matter for Anthropology // *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Anthropology*. 2015. Vol. 59. P. 97-113; Luehrmann P. *Religion in Secular Archives: Soviet Atheism and Historical Knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. 256 p.

⁷² Pollock E. *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006. 288 p.; David-Fox M. Religion, Science, and Political Religion in the Soviet Context // *Modern Intellectual History*. 2011 Vol. 8. No. 2. P. 471-484; *Science, Religion and Communism in Cold War Europe* / Ed. by P. Betts, S. A. Smith. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 307 p.

development of science in Russia. In this work, when studying the Soviet historiography of Orthodoxy (1948 - 1988), the main emphasis was placed on works on the history of Orthodoxy, due to the special importance for Soviet researchers of socio-economic issues.

Research objective identify and analyze the main themes and directions of research on Orthodoxy in Soviet science from 1943 to 1988. To achieve the objective, it is necessary to solve the following **task**:

1. Conduct an analysis of the historical, sociocultural and political context in the country when the works of Soviet researchers were published.
2. Analyze how the sociocultural context influenced the methodology and topics of research at various stages of anti-religious propaganda.
3. Using the method of intellectual history, to actualize the role of the researcher in the conditions of “repressed science” and the pressure of state ideology.
4. Conduct an analysis of interdisciplinary research, considering it as part of the general Soviet religious discourse.
5. Conduct an analysis of the works of domestic researchers of Orthodoxy and compose thematic blocks, which will allow us to comprehensively consider the problems that were of interest and seemed relevant to Soviet researchers of religion.

The methodological basis of the study includes modern approaches to the study of history and philosophy of science, which are actively developed and used in the works of Russian religious scholars, philosophers of science and historians⁷³.

⁷³ Academy of Sciences in the Context of Historical and Scientific Research in the 18th-First Half of the 20th Centuries: Historical Essays / E. A. Ivanova, P. V. Ilyin, T. V. Chumakova. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016. 701 p.; Arinin E. I. The question of the origin and modern development of Russian religious studies // Scientific Notes of the Oryol State University. 2011. No. 1. P. 93-97; Zabyako A. P. Methodology of interpretation of rock carvings: religious heritage of A.P. Okladnikova // Religious Studies. 2014. No. 3. P. 172-186; Kasavin I. T. Science as a political subject // Sociological research. 2020. No. 7. P. 3-14; Kasavin I. T. Science and modern humanism // Problems of Philosophy. 2022. No. 9. P. 47-58; Kasavin I. T. Metaphysics of progress and disciplinary structure of science // Epistemology and Philosophy of Science. 2023. V. 60. No. 2. P. 35-41; Kolesnikov A. S. Historian of philosophy in search of meaning // Man and society in the context of modernity. Philosophical readings in memory of Professor P. K. Grechko: collection of materials of the All-Russian scientific conference with international participation: in 2 volumes. T. 1. M.: RUDN, 2017. P. 167-172; Repina L. P. Historical and historiographic research in the context of modern intellectual culture // History and historians in the space of national and world culture of the XVIII-XXI centuries: collection of articles. Chelyabinsk: Encyclopedia, 2011. P. 21-36; Shakhnovich M. M. The cult of saints in anti-religious propaganda and historical science in the USSR in the 1920s - early 1930s. // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2023. No. 1. P. 151-177; Shipovalova L. V. Is science worth thinking historically? // Epistemology

In this dissertation research, a microhistorical approach, a biographical method and methods of intellectual biography were used to analyze the scientific activities of Soviet historians and religious scholars. To analyze the research itself in the sociocultural and political context of the USSR in the second half of the 20th century. The work used traditional approaches and methods for humanities research: a systematic approach, a descriptive approach, a method of analytical study of sources, a historical-chronological method, a method of comparative historical and sociocultural contextual analysis and historiographic description.

The scientific novelty of the study are follows:

1. The history of the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet science over half a century is comprehensively traced, taking into account the constant change in the ideological climate, which had a direct impact on the object, methods, assessments, results and rhetoric of research.
2. An analysis of the works of Soviet researchers of Orthodoxy was carried out, dividing the works into thematic groups depending on the object of study.
3. The role of studying Orthodox diversity in Soviet humanities is demonstrated.
4. The role of personality in the history of science is explored using the example of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich as one of the founders of Soviet religious studies, who largely determined the main directions of the study of Orthodox diversity in the USSR.
5. Some archival documents from the archive of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich in the State Museum of the History of Religion (Scientific-Historical Archive of the State Historical Museum, f. 2. Op. 4) are introduced into scientific circulation, which served as sources in the course of this research.

and Philosophy of Science. 2017. Vol. 51. No. 1. P. 18-28; Shipovalova L. V. Distributed cognition and its limits in the context of public scientific communication // *Sociology of Science and Technologies*. 2019. V. 10. No. 3. P. 56-71; Shipovalova L. V. On the possibility of freedom of science from politics // *Bulletin of the Tomsk State University. Philosophy. Sociology. Political science*. 2020. No. 57. P. 128-140; Shipovalova L. V. History and historians in politics // *After postpositivism. Materials of the Third International Congress of the Russian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science*. Moscow: Russian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science, 2022. P. 435-437.

The chronological framework of the study implies political factors in the history of the country. Thus, the beginning of changes in relation to Orthodoxy and the church on the part of the authorities will be carried out from September 4–8, 1943, when a new patriarch was elected since the death of Tikhon in 1925. The upper limit of the study dates from June 5–12, 1988, when the millennium of the baptism of Rus' was celebrated officially on a national scale. The turning point in church-state relations changed approaches to the study of Orthodoxy and contributed to a sharp increase in the number of works and expansion of research topics.

The scientific significance of the study. During the dissertation research, a comprehensive description and analysis of the works of Soviet researchers of Orthodoxy was carried out; Thematic groups were compiled, within which changes in approaches and rhetoric were highlighted. Tracking this trend is relevant for modern religious studies and its history.

The practical significance of the study. The materials and conclusions of the dissertation research can form the basis with further scientific research on the history of Russian religious studies, the historiography of Soviet atheism, the history of church-state relations in Russia in the 20th century, the historiography of Orthodoxy. The results of the dissertation can be used in the preparation of lectures and seminars, in the compilation of textbooks and manuals in the field of philosophy of religion and religious studies and the history of Russian science.

Provisions for the thesis defense are follows:

1. The works of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич largely determined the theme and direction of research into Russian Orthodox dissent in the Soviet period, which was considered as a form of social protest.

2. Soviet studies of Orthodoxy in Russia were to some extent of the nature of "peripheral" studies, because in the Soviet scientific paradigm, the study of the Orthodox Church was not a leading academic direction.

3. Generalizing works on the history of Russian culture touched on a complex of narrowly focused topics within the framework of the study of Orthodoxy. Soviet historians of the Old Russian period laid the foundation for future specialized research on the history of Christianization of Rus', the influence of Byzantine culture, the history of church-state relations in Russia, etc.

4. The topic of the baptism of Rus' is one of the central ones in Soviet historical science in the context of the study of Orthodoxy. Despite the differences in style, rhetoric and argumentation, which changed over almost half a century, all authors recognized the historical pattern and progressiveness of this event.

5. When studying Orthodoxy in the Soviet period, socio-economic issues acted as the dominant research focus. During the indicated period, many works on the economic history of Orthodoxy were published.

6. The struggle of peasants against church land ownership was considered by Soviet researchers as a consequence of enslavement on monastic lands. Studies described peasant uprisings as progressive movements and assessed them as manifestations of class struggle against oppressors. A certain type of anti-feudal movement was Orthodox dissent, original religious movements, which in Soviet historiography were called "reformation-humanistic".

7. One of the most pressing sets of problems for Soviet religious scholars was the history of the evolution of Orthodoxy in the 20th century. and the "modernization" of Orthodox theology. This complex included issues of changing the economic base of the church, political loyalty, transformation of social (ethical) position, etc. "Adaptation" was understood as the external level of political transformation of the positions of the Orthodox Church in relation to the Soviet state, and "modernization" was the internal level of changes in the very doctrine and cult practice. From the point of view of atheist researchers, in this way the church tried to adapt to the new social reality.

Approbation of the thesis. The main scientific conclusions and provisions of the thesis were presented in the form of reports at various international and Russian scientific

conferences: III (April 21, 2018) and VI (April 20, 2019) student Matorin's readings on problems of religious studies and philosophy of religion (St. Petersburg); XXI interuniversity scientific conference "God. Human. Mir", December 13–14, 2018 (RCAH, St. Petersburg); International Youth Scientific Forum "Lomonosov", April 8–12, 2019 (MSU, Moscow); Plenary session of the scientific and practical conference "XXIII Religious Studies" "Religion and museums: problems of presentation, collecting and preserving monuments of religious culture", November 13, 2019 (The State Museum of the History of Religion, St. Petersburg); International Conference "The Science of Religion in Russia: From the Past to the Future", November 20–21, 2020 (The State Museum of the History of Religion, St. Saint Petersburg); Third International Congress of the Russian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science "After postpositivism", September 8–10, 2022 (Saratov State University, Saratov); Round table "Infosphere of theological educational institutions of the Russian Empire XIX - early XX centuries", November 12, 2022 (St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg); International conference "Civilization codes of Russia (on the centenary of the "Philosophical steamboat")", November 17–19, 2022 (St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg).

The structure of the dissertation. The dissertation consists of an introduction, two chapters, a conclusion and reference list.

1. Historical and political context of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR

1.1. The influence of ideology and anti-religious propaganda on the study of religion in the USSR

Five periods can be distinguished in the history of Soviet atheism, which differ in the goals and methods of ideological work.

1) Pre-Soviet period: 1917–1922 - a period of anti-religious, and often anti-clerical, propaganda, when the church was perceived as a political opponent.

2) With the publication of V. I. Lenin's article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" in 1922, a period of atheistic propaganda begins.

3) At the end of the 1930s within the framework of the militant propaganda of atheism and materialism, a period of natural science propaganda is outlined, which became a full-fledged third stage in the history of Soviet atheism from 1944 to 1954. G. F. Aleksandrov in 1946 in his book "The History of Western European Philosophy" (for which will be followed by the Stalin Prize and the "philosophical discussion"⁷⁴) first uses the term "scientific atheism" to describe Marxist atheism as the highest form of atheism in general: "only dialectical materialism created scientific atheism"⁷⁵.

4) 1954–1961 can be called the period of "scientific-atheistic propaganda", when this propaganda was presented as an integral element of education, culture and the Soviet way of life. The beginning of this stage was laid by the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 7, 1954 "On shortcomings in scientific-atheistic propaganda" and the resolution of November 10, 1954 "On errors in conducting scientific-atheistic propaganda among the population".

⁷⁴ Dubrovsky A. M. Historian and power: historical science in the USSR and the concept of the history of feudal Russia in the context of politics and ideology, (1930-1950s). Bryansk: Publishing House of the Bryansk State University, 2005. 798 p.; Tikhonov V. V. Ideological Campaigns of «Late Stalinism» and Soviet Historical Science (mid-1940s - 1953). M.; St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2016. 424 p.

⁷⁵ Aleksandrov G. F. History of Western European Philosophy. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1946. P. 345.

5) 1961–1988 - the period of "scientific-atheistic education", enshrined at the XXII Congress of the Central Committee and in the Third Program of the CPSU⁷⁶.

O. Y. Vasilyeva leads the periodization of church-state relations as follows: she identifies six chronological stages (or periods)⁷⁷. Thus, the first (1917–1929) is the period of implementation of the Decree "On the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church" with all the pressure from the Cheka, GPU, OGPU on religious organizations, the seizure of church valuables, etc. The second (1929-1943) - "totalitarian" period is characterized by the struggle of J. V. Stalin for power, the creation of a totalitarian system of government, complete control over religious life and actions in the country, the physical elimination of many believers and clergy. The third (1943-1953) is the period of the "new course" of state policy, when the party abandons the plan for the complete "destruction" of the church and begins to use it for foreign policy purposes. Fourth (1953-1958), - the first post-Stalin period, characterized by the desire of the new political elite to return church-state relations to the pre-war position. Fifth (1958-1964) - the period of Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign, when an attempt was made to completely do away with religion in the USSR and "show the last priest on TV". The sixth (1965–1991) is the last period, inextricably linked in its internal content with the previous fifth, when the state, in a twenty-year plan for reforming church administration, was still going to overcome religion, only with smoother methods and in the long term.

One can combine these classifications and see which methods of atheistic work corresponded to periods of church-state relations. It turns out that the period of implementation of the Decree "On the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church" corresponds to anti-clerical, and then atheistic propaganda. The second period, with attempts to physically destroy the church, is also characterized by

⁷⁶ Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961)*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2014. P. 84-85.

Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Ideology and science: The study of religion in the era of the cultural revolution in the USSR*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016. P. 10.

Shakhnovich M. «Scientific atheism» as an ideological construct and educational project (1950s-1980s) // *Religiski-Filozofiski Raksti*. 2021 Vol. 31. P. 11.

⁷⁷ Vasilyeva O. Y. *Power and religion in Russia: the XX century* // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 2: *Anthology of Russian Religious Studies*. 2010. P. 50-62.

militant propaganda of atheism. The third period of the "new course" completely chronologically coincides with the new methods of ideological struggle - the promotion of scientific knowledge without additional emphasis and pressure on atheism. The fourth and fifth Khrushchev periods, which ended with an anti-religious campaign, correlate with new methods of introducing scientific-atheistic propaganda into education and culture. The last, longest, Brezhnev period was the stage of twenty years of scientific-atheistic education.

At the end of the 1930s, there was an interest among ideologists in strengthening the patriotic component, thus requiring an appeal to the archaic, so necessary to legitimize the new political myth. In this regard, the rehabilitation of Alexander Nevsky begins first⁷⁸, and later other "great ancestors" (Dmitry Donskoy, Dmitry Pozharsky, Alexander Suvorov, Mikhail Kutuzov)⁷⁹. Due to the fact that the authorities began to appeal to "Slavic antiquities", the study of ancient Russian literature became possible again, and with them such a direction of research as Slavic biblical philology. The Soviet leadership was forced to turn to the historical past⁸⁰. The October Revolution continued to be the main event of not only domestic but also world history; in parallel, there was a rejection of negative assessments of domestic history. A positive assessment of the pre-revolutionary history of Russia was more typical for historians of the old school, while Marxist historians of the generation of "red professors" who were educated in the 1920s–1930s (some of whom belonged to the school of M.N. Pokrovsky), it was common to defend the principles of the class approach in assessing Russian history.

Late 1950s - early 1960s was marked by a change in the political situation within the country and the intensification of ideological work in the field of religion. This was preceded by two resolutions of the Central Committee of the CPSU: of July 7, 1954 "On major shortcomings in scientific-atheistic propaganda and measures to improve it" and of

⁷⁸ Shenk F. B. Political myth and collective identity. The myth of Alexander Nevsky in Russian history (1263-1998) // *Ab Imperio*. 2001. No. 1-2. P. 141-164; Shenk F. B. Alexander Nevsky in Russian cultural memory: saint, ruler, national hero (1263-2000). M.: New Literary Review, 2007. 589 p.

⁷⁹ Yekelchik P. Stalinist Patriotism as Imperial Discourse: Reconciling the Ukrainian and Russian "Heroic Pasts", 1939-1945 // *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. 2002. No. 3. P. 51.

⁸⁰ Brandenberger D. National Bolshevism. Stalinist mass culture and the formation of Russian national identity (1931-1956). St. Petersburg: Academic project, 2009. P. 52.

November 10, 1954 "On errors in conducting scientific-atheistic propaganda among the population." The authors of the first resolution called on the Ministry of Education to saturate the school curriculum with atheistic content, the Komsomol to more actively conduct atheistic propaganda among young people, the State Political Publishing House to publish more works of atheistic literature, and the Znanie society to start publishing the monthly journal *Science and Religion*: "We must decisively put an end to passivity in relation to religion, to expose the reactionary essence of religion and the harm"⁸¹. In October 1954, the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Council for Religious Affairs sent a joint letter to the Central Committee pointing out the counterproductive results of the campaign. The second resolution was devoted to the results of the summer anti-religious campaign and was an attempt to correct the harm caused by it: "... the Central Committee of the CPSU has facts indicating that recently gross errors have been made in scientific and atheistic propaganda among the population in a number of places <...> insulting actions in relation to the church, clergy, believing citizens are incompatible with the line of the party and the state in conducting scientific-atheistic propaganda and contradict the Constitution of the USSR, which provides Soviet citizens with freedom of conscience"⁸². Unlike the July decree, which was intended for internal use, the November decree was published in *Pravda* and widely disseminated. A new stage of scientific-atheistic propaganda began, which until 1958 was contradictory due to the opposition of these two resolutions. Religion began to be perceived as more of an ideological and worldview problem than a political one. One of the important achievements of the Thaw period was the introduction of large document arrays into scientific circulation: "the fresh wind of the 20th Congress opened the doors of Soviet archives"⁸³.

⁸¹ The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee (1898-1986). T. 8: 1946-1955. Moscow: Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the CPSU, 1985. P. 428-430.

⁸²The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee (1898-1986). T. 8: 1946-1955. Moscow: Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the CPSU, 1985. P. 446-449.

⁸³ Sidorova L. A. Thaw in historical science: Soviet historiography of the first post-Stalin decade. M.: Monuments of historical thought, 1997. P. 169.

Researchers consider the main feature of the Thaw era to be de-Stalinization, i.e. rejection of the Stalinist reading of history, "rediscovery" of archives and "revival of the desire for scientificity in research"⁸⁴. But by the mid-1960s. Soviet historical science became an effective ideological weapon of the party⁸⁵, aimed at building and nurturing a new communist worldview. Thus, the Thaw period was a fragmentary wave of sanctioned freedom, after which a full-fledged spring never came.

In 1956, for the first time in Soviet history, the Bible was published in Russian, with a circulation of 28,000 copies⁸⁶. The Moscow Patriarchate was given the opportunity to publish books of the Bible for the second time only in 1968. In 1976, the centenary of the publication of the Bible in Russian was celebrated, and in honor of this event, permissions were also obtained for the publication of Bible books.

After a short period of thaw, Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign began (1958–1964). The main motivation was the increased interest in Orthodoxy among Soviet citizens, which was expressed in petitions and petitions to the authorities to open churches. In ideological terms, for N. S. Khrushchev and his entourage (M. A. Suslova (head of the propaganda department), P. N. Pospelov (Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee), E. A. Furtseva (Minister of Culture), etc.) "calm" in the past the relationship between church and state was a "Stalin's legacy" and the cause of a religious revival that should be gotten rid of.

In accordance with the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU of October 4, 1958, departments of scientific atheism, the House of Scientific Atheism, etc. were created in the country. This resolution was aimed at intensifying atheistic propaganda, creating a scientific basis for this work and, ultimately, at sharply limiting the role and influence of the Russian Orthodox Church and other religions in the Soviet Union⁸⁷. So, in 1959, the Department of the History and Theory of Atheism and Religion was created

⁸⁴ Ibid. P. 3-4.

⁸⁵ Ibid. P. 108.

⁸⁶ Chumakova T. V., Pyzikov D. D. The Bible in the USSR // *Istoriya*, an electronic scientific and educational journal. 2020. T. 11. Issue. 1. [Electronic resource]. Access for registered users. URL: <https://history.jes.su/s207987840007423-4-1/> (date of access: 08.16.2023).

⁸⁷ Alekseev V. A. Church and power: lessons of history // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 2: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2010. P. 155.

at Moscow State University⁸⁸. The first heads of the department were I. D. Pantskhava and M. P. Novikov. At the Leningrad State University, the study of religion was suspended from 1934, and only in 1946 was the teaching of the relevant disciplines resumed⁸⁹, and the department of the history and theory of atheism appears only in 1983.

In 1959, the Znanie society began publishing the popular science magazine *Science and Religion* (which was conceived as early as 1954), which became the mouthpiece of the party's official attitude towards religion as part of the propaganda of the scientific worldview. The journal, which arose at the height of Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign, brought back the old methods of atheistic struggle, namely, anti-clerical propaganda, which was combined with educational work (the dissemination of scientific and technical knowledge and the establishment of scientific materialism).

In 1960, G. G. Karpov was removed from his post as chairman of the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church, and V. A. Kuroyedov was appointed in his place. The activities of the SDRPTS in terms of functions are very similar to the activities of the Executive Committee for Clergy Affairs of All Russia (*Ispolkomdukh*⁹⁰) in 1919–

⁸⁸ Yablokov I. N. Department of Philosophy of Religion and Religious Studies of Moscow State University: milestones of history // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 2: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2010. P. 133-138.

I. N. Yablokov admits that in the history of Soviet religious studies, «scientific atheism» (as the name of a branch of knowledge and academic discipline) did not receive sufficient and convincing theoretical justification, which in many cases led to distorted assessments and conclusions.

⁸⁹ Shakhnovich M. M. Petersburg School of Religious Studies: Origins and Traditions // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 4: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2010. P. 13.

M. M. Shakhnovich especially notes the merit of the dean of the Faculty of Philosophy M. V. Serebryakov, who not only resumed teaching religious studies at the university, but also transferred it from the Philological to the Faculty of Philosophy. Until the 1980s Religious studies were taught within the Department of the History of Religion and Atheism (headed by M. I. Shakhnovich) at the Department of the History of Philosophy or later at the Department of the History of Marxist Philosophy.

⁹⁰ The Committee was created in 1919 by the efforts of Alexander Frolovich Filippov (1868-1936), according to some researchers, a secret collaborator of the Cheka. So, for example, P. G. Petrov writes that after the revolution, the Cheka adopted a number of measures to «destroy and disintegrate the Russian Church», one of such measures, along with supporting and supervising the renovationist split, was the creation of the Executive Committee of the Spirit. After the revolution of 1917, A. F. Filippov gained the acquaintance and personal favor of A. V. Lunacharsky and F. E. Dzerzhinsky. It is debatable who initiated the creation of such a committee under the Cheka, which, according to Filippov himself, is independent and not directly subordinate to the Cheka, but always provides it with all the information it has collected. It is logical that A.F. Filippov, at every convenient moment in official addresses or correspondence, does not miss the opportunity to repeat that the initiative to create the Executive Committee of the Spirit came from him personally and that the organization itself exists on a voluntary basis. The Committee was created to weaken the opposition to the current government sentiments and tendencies among the clergy of various confessions and to attract the clergy to dialogue and cooperation with the state. The executive committee prepared the text, and A. F. Filippov was able to convince Patriarch Tikhon to sign the patriarchal («peacekeeping») message on non-interference in the political struggle of October 8, 1919. The position of the committee and A. F. Filippov himself began to deteriorate when he began appeal to the government with complaints and criticism of the actions of various executive authorities, first of all, the VIII Department of the People's Commissariat of Justice. VIII Department of the PCJ was one of the main inspirers and conductors of the plan for the removal and destruction of relics in

1920 When initially created, both bodies were meant to be intermediary bodies between the state and the church with the task of establishing dialogue.

The 22nd Party Congress (1961) decided to correct major shortcomings in scientific-atheistic propaganda and strengthen scientific-atheistic education. The concept of scientific-atheistic education, connected with the problems of youth, education, morality and life, has now acquired great importance and emphasis; it is also characteristic that the phrase "atheistic propaganda" returned to the socio-political discourse instead of "scientific enlightenment". The result of the congress was the Third Program of the CPSU, in which a separate item postulated the overcoming of the remnants of capitalism, bourgeois ideology, religious superstitions and prejudices within the framework of the communist education of the masses ("The tasks of the party in the field of ideology, education, education, science and culture").

Volume VI of the Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism⁹¹ (1962) begins with the directive article "The 22nd Congress of the CPSU and the tasks of the atheistic education of the working people"⁹². The article itself is written according to the scheme of similar directive and program articles, for example, in "Problems of History" or "Problems of Philosophy" of the last Stalinist decade. Strengthening atheistic propaganda and atheistic education of the masses was planned to be carried out, including by means of cultural and educational institutions. As a result of the changes, the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism was transferred from the department of the Academy of Sciences to the Ministry of Culture (1961), which facilitated control over it by the Leningrad Regional Party Committee. After the transfer of the museum from the Academy of Sciences of the USSR to the Ministry of Culture,

Orthodox churches. And the Executive Committee of the Spirit was just one of the opponents of this campaign. A. F. Filippov wrote to Metropolitan Veniamin (Kazansky) of Petrograd and Gdov that the state should not care about people's faith in miracles; if it nevertheless considers it necessary to do this, then it must be done through scientific enlightenment. In September 1920, having learned about the intention of the Cheka to artificially liquidate the committee, A. F. Filippov asked to be given the opportunity to voluntarily dissolve the organization so as not to portray him as a provocateur and not to expose the entire Cheka. However, on September 13, 1920, he himself was arrested.

⁹¹ For more information about the Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism, see: Pyzikov D. D. The History of Orthodoxy in the Articles of the Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism of the USSR Academy of Sciences // *Modern Studies of Social Problems*. 2021. No. 4. P. 196-213; Shakhnovich M. M., Teryukova E. A. *Scientific Atheism: From Science to Utopia*. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2022, P. 99-123.

⁹² Vorontsov V. G., Krasnikov N. P. XXII Congress of the CPSU and the tasks of atheistic education of workers // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 3-17.

the museum's attitude towards scientific work changed, the new leadership focused on propaganda, in connection with which scientific projects began to curtail. As the authors of the only large-scale study on the history of the museum write: "... the close attention of the party bodies to the activities of the museum was associated with a new strengthening of the ideological dictate in matters of religion. The museum began to be accused of excessive enthusiasm for the history of religion, in the absence of a struggle to overcome religious survivals, they demanded that the museum reflect the "current political moment", expose and sharply criticize religion"⁹³.

After the dismissal of N. S. Khrushchev and the end of the anti-religious campaign, religion continued to be considered not a political enemy, but an ideological opponent, believers turned into patriotic Soviet citizens - albeit in need of salvation from their own superstitions and backwardness. As M. P. Novikov wrote: "Atheists and believers in our country, being carriers of views on life that are opposite in their essence, are not political opponents. They participate hand in hand in the construction of a communist society, strengthen the power and greatness of their homeland"⁹⁴. At the end of the anti-religious campaign, in the scientific and public discourse, the negative characteristics of religion were replaced by the positive content of atheism. The latter was used in a new way, namely in the subject of addressing issues of morality and morality, which was directly reflected in scientific and popular science journalism. This has become a characteristic feature of scientific-atheistic education.

In 1964, in accordance with the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU on "measures to strengthen the atheistic education of the population", the Institute of Scientific Atheism was founded at the Academy of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the CPSU. His activities were supervised by the ideological department of the Central Committee. The most important tasks of the institute were the development of a "deep theoretical understanding of religion and atheism" and the coordination of all atheistic work, including that carried out by the institutes of the USSR Academy of

⁹³ Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961)*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2014. P. 87.

⁹⁴ Novikov M. P. *Orthodoxy and modernity*. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1965. P. 4-5.

Sciences, higher educational institutions and institutions of the USSR Ministry of Culture. As Y. P. Zuev writes: "The success of the Institute was facilitated by the fact that the basis of its creative team was initially made up of specialists transferred to it from the institutes of philosophy, history, ethnography of the USSR Academy of Sciences. A. I. Klivanov and D. M. Ugrinovich collaborated with the Institute on a part-time basis"⁹⁵.

The article by Y. P. Zuev describes the attempts of M. P. Novikov (Head of the Department of History and Theory of Atheism, Moscow State University) and P. K. Kurochkin (Director of the Institute of Scientific Atheism) to give the concept of "scientific atheism" a positive content⁹⁶. However, it is rightly noted that this term was imposed on Russian religious studies by the ideological guidelines of the CPSU. In the 1960s–1970s One of the central journalistic and research topics in Soviet religious studies was the idea of modernizing religion, especially Orthodoxy. Numerous publications in *Problems of Scientific Atheism*⁹⁷ reflect this trend. The merit of the Institute can be considered the development of sociological studies of the level of religiosity in the USSR, primarily through an extensive network of field studies in various regions and corners of the country. Expedition reports were published in *"Problems of Scientific Atheism"*. They show that in the 60s and 70s 20th century the level of religiosity of the population turned out to be much higher than it seemed to propagandists, scientists and party leaders until then. Such data objectively did not allow us to talk about the "withering away of religion" and religion as a "relic of the past", although the thesis about the inevitability of the withering away of religion as the socialist development of society and the transition to communism continued to be fundamental in the Soviet model of secularization. Research in the 1970s–1980s record the growth of religiosity, especially among educated youth. However, this rather reflects not the influence of Orthodoxy itself, but the situation of the "market of religions" opening in the country and the spread of counterculture. The process of liberation of all spheres of life from religious influence was conceived as objective,

⁹⁵ Zuev Y. P. *Institute of Scientific Atheism (1964–1991) // Issues of Religion and Religious Studies. Issue. 1: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2009. P. 15.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷ For more information on *"Problems of Scientific Atheism"*, see Shakhnovich M. M., Teryukova E. A. *Scientific Atheism: From Science to Utopia. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2022. P. 123-150.*

however, a large role in it was assigned to the subjective factor - the anti-religious activities of political institutions, thus it is possible to explain the relevance of creating a specialized atheistic institution⁹⁸.

In March 1971, the XXIV Congress of the CPSU was held, at which the party invented a new ideologeme - "developed socialism". It is interesting to note that, paradoxically, in the 1970s the desacralization of militant atheism became widespread, when many propagandists had to soften or change the rhetoric of their studies. Also, interest in objects of material culture and cultural heritage is growing, i.e. churches, monasteries, etc. Indicative in this regard is the creation of the Russian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments (RSPHCM) in 1965.

After the death of L. I. Brezhnev in 1982 and the coming to power of Y. V. Andropov (until 1984) and K. U. Chernenko (until 1985), the official position regarding religion and atheism did not change significantly. Only during the leadership of Y. V. Andropov can we note the tightening of the persecution of dissent, which was customary for the former chairman of the KGB.

With the coming to power of M. S. Gorbachev in 1985 and the beginning of reforms, including in the field of ideology, the last years of state atheism began to count down, which outlived its usefulness in 1988, when from June 5 to 12 at the national level the millennium of the baptism of Rus' was celebrated. Solemn events were accompanied by all the necessary symbolic attributes of state patronage. "The meeting of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Mikhail Gorbachev with the permanent members of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, which took place in April 1988 on the eve of the celebration of the 1000th anniversary of the Baptism of Rus', was a harbinger of important changes in the religious policy of the authorities. In the Council for Religious Affairs, with the participation of a number of employees of the Institute [of

⁹⁸ For the Institute of Scientific Atheism, see also Metel O. V. The Institute of Scientific Atheism and the Development of Religious Studies in the USSR in the 1960s–80s. // Journal of the Belarusian State University. Story. 2022. No. 2. P. 40-50.

Scientific Atheism], consultations have begun on the development of the fundamental provisions of a new law on freedom of conscience"⁹⁹.

Thus, state and party policies in the field of religion directly influenced historical and religious studies. Changes in the vectors of church-state relations and waves of various types and types of scientific-atheistic propaganda affected rhetoric, methodology, objects of scientific research, choice of topics, etc.

1.2. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich – researcher of russian religious movements

Despite a large number of studies, many key figures in Soviet religious studies still remain in the shadows. This fully applies to such a prominent researcher of minority religious groups and Orthodox differences of opinion as Vladimir Dmitrievich Bonch-Bruevich (1873–1955). Despite the fact that in the Soviet period there were works about V. D. Bonch-Bruevich authored, for example, by A. I. Klibanov¹⁰⁰, M. I. Shakhnovich¹⁰¹, G. G. Demidenko¹⁰², O. D. Golubeva¹⁰³ and others, all of them mainly focused on the political and organizational activities of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich as the manager of the affairs of the Council of People's Commissars. A. I. Klibanov can be considered an exception, for whom V. D. Bonch-Bruevich was, first of all, an authoritative scientist. This, firstly, is evidenced by numerous references in the works of A. I. Klibanov to the works of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, and secondly, the study dedicated to V.D. Bonch-Bruevich¹⁰⁴. But be that as it may, in Soviet historiography it was impossible to avoid clichéd formulations that appeal to the scientist's revolutionary past. Therefore, as often

⁹⁹ Zuev Y. P. Institute of Scientific Atheism (1964–1991) // Issues of Religion and Religious Studies. Issue. 1: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies. 2009. P. 23.

¹⁰⁰ Klibanov A. I. From the memoirs of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1983. No. 31. P. 269-295.

¹⁰¹ Shakhnovich M. I. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich is a researcher of religious and social movements in Russia // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 293-300.

¹⁰² Demidenko G. G. The revolution has a lot to do: An essay on the life and work of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich. M.: Politizdat, 1976. 207 p.

¹⁰³ Golubeva O. D. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich - publisher. Moscow: Book, 1972. 136 p.

¹⁰⁴ Klibanov A. I. The history of religious sectarianism in Russia (60s of the 19th century - 1917). M.: Nauka, 1965. 348 p.

happens in such cases, the word "Bolshevik" in the folk memorial culture gives rise to a certain kind of association "anti-religious", "persecutor of the Orthodox Church", etc. In turn, the ideological mainstream of the state historical policy rewarded him with such stereotypical definitions as "famous", "faithful", etc. It should be emphasized that the works of V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich should be considered primarily as the activity of a scientist and representative of Russian science in the study of religion, despite the ideological censorship imposed from above. This is important to note, because since the early 1920s in the country anti-clerical propaganda is replaced by anti-religious propaganda, which is a consequence of the fight against the costs of the NEP. Such adherence to principles in strict adherence to the ethos of science cost many scientists and/or their relatives their freedom. According to the exact remark of modern researchers, it is impossible to "smear with the same paint" and put all Soviet authors who wrote about religion at that time in one row¹⁰⁵. It is necessary to make a clear distinction between scientists and agitators/propagandists who produced rather superficial anti-religious pamphlets. Thus, such scientists as V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, V. G. Bogoraz, N. M. Matorin and others will stand on the one hand. On the other: B. P. Kandidov¹⁰⁶, I. A. Spitsberg¹⁰⁷, F. M. Putintsev¹⁰⁸ and others. The latter can also include the head of the VIII ("church") department of the People's Commissariat of Justice P. A. Krasikov¹⁰⁹. He, as well as F. M. Putintsev and E. M. Yaroslavsky, often discussed with V. D. Bonch-Bruevich on issues of state policy towards believers and religious organizations. So, already being the director of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism in Leningrad, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich fought against the "spirit of anti-religious propaganda" in the museum, noting that the exposition should not be simply anti-religious. It is necessary to conduct

¹⁰⁵ Shakhnovich M. M. Ethos of the history of science: on the reconstruction of Russian religious studies of the Soviet period // *State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad*. 2015. No. 1. P. 185-197; Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Ideology and science: The study of religion in the era of the cultural revolution in the USSR*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016. P. 16.

¹⁰⁶ Kandidov Boris Pavlovich (1902-1953) - Soviet publicist, writer, propagandist.

¹⁰⁷ Spitsberg Ivan Anatolyevich (1881-1933) - former lawyer, employee of the Cheka and the 8th («Church») Department of the PCJ, since 1922 the organizer of the publishing house «Ateist», editor of the magazine of the same name.

¹⁰⁸ Putintsev Fedor Maksimovich (1899-1947) - propagandist, researcher of sectarianism.

¹⁰⁹ Krasikov Pyotr Ananyevich (1870–1939) – Soviet statesman.

scientific propaganda, but one should be extremely careful about offending religious feelings¹¹⁰.

V. D. Bonch-Bruевич was, of course, a gifted and hardworking person, only this can explain that during his life he could simultaneously engage in so many different types of activities. A young land surveyor, fond of Marxism, meets the future leader of the proletarian revolution at one of the Narodnik meetings, begins to cooperate with him and engage in publishing activities of a revolutionary nature, which in the future will lead him to the post of manager of the Council of People's Commissars; in parallel with this, he studies the so-called "sectarian" movements and becomes an authoritative specialist in this field. A position in the Council of People's Commissars and professional scientific interests lead V. D. Bonch-Bruевич to the idea of creating the country's first exemplary labor state farm "Forest Glades", after working in which he continues to engage in scientific activities and receives the position of director of the State Literary Museum. Towards the end of his life, Bonch-Bruевич became the head of the sector of the history of religion and atheism at the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism at the USSR Academy of Sciences. Interestingly, V. D. Bonch-Bruевич successfully managed to combine his scientific passion for sectarianism and organizational political activity. These areas were the main ones for the researcher in the first half of his life. Bonch-Bruевич successfully managed to combine his scientific passion for sectarianism and organizational political activity. These areas were the main ones for the researcher in the first half of his life. Bonch-Bruевич successfully managed to combine his scientific passion for sectarianism and organizational political activity. These areas were the main ones for the researcher in the first half of his life.

V. D. Bonch-Bruевич became interested in small religious groups in his youth while studying the life of peasants and workers. The importance of revolutionary agitation among the social classes, he explained their socio-economic oppression and the desire for

¹¹⁰ Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961). St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2014. P. 82.

change.¹¹¹. So, in the essay "The Path Traveled" he writes that he found in his old diary an entry of the following nature¹¹². V. D. Bonch-Bruевич began with a passion for the ideas of the populists, when in the early 1890s lived and studied in Kursk after being expelled from the Konstantinovsky Land Survey Institute in Moscow for organizing a student protest against the administration. Before returning back, he breaks with populism and identifies himself as a convinced Marxist: "... I consider February 1892 decisive in my life, when I self-determined as a Marxist, and since then I have always worked under the banner of revolutionary Marxism"¹¹³. When he returned to Moscow at the age of twenty, he began to take part in meetings of Marxist circles. Around that time, his memoirs also date back: "... for me it became completely clear the meaning of life, which everyone then loved to achieve so much: serving the people, fighting for their better lot, suffering with him and for him, for his fate and happiness"¹¹⁴. "Working under the banner of Marxism" and "serving the people" meant publishing and ideological work among workers in production and peasants in the countryside.

Shortly before leaving for Geneva as a member of the Moscow Workers' Union to help the Emancipation of Labor group, V. D. Bonch-Bruевич made a trip to the villages to promote social democratic ideas. In a letter to his future wife V. M. Velichkina¹¹⁵ dated December 25, 1895, he writes: "Peering into this white sea of snow, into these poor, dilapidated villages, into these robbed peasants, cold, emaciated, accustomed to hunger, it somehow becomes ashamed and very ashamed to live in mansions, to sleep on soft pillows, under soft blankets, it is sweet to eat and still ashamed to rest, little tired, and most importantly, having done little. I do not miss a single face, not a single movement from the peasants, adults, teenagers and boys I meet, and the general impression so far is

¹¹¹ Bonch-Bruевич V. D. My study of the peasant question // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 263-280.

¹¹² Bonch-Bruевич V. D. The path traveled // Bonch-Bruевич V.D. Selected Works. In 3 volumes. T. 2. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 150.

¹¹³ Ibid. P. 151.

¹¹⁴ Bonch-Bruевич V. D. First steps // Young Guard. 1927. No. 12. P. 192.

¹¹⁵ Vera Mikhailovna Velichkina (1868 - 1918) was an active participant in the populist and social democratic movement. She graduated from the medical faculty of the University of Bern, was engaged in cultural and educational work among the peasants, publishing and revolutionary activities. Author of scientific and educational books. She began her social activities in 1891 with the work of canteens created by L. N. Tolstoy to help the starving. See details: Figures of the revolutionary movement in Russia: Bio-bibliographic dictionary: From the predecessors of the Decembrists to the fall of tsarism. In 5 vols. Vol. 5: Social Democrats. 1880-1904: No. 2. P. 746-749.

this: darkness, darkness and darkness. On the faces I often read stupid obedience to fate and the phrases "Everything is from God", "As God wants it will be so" ... I just become disgusted to the point of disgust. After all, God here is the equivalent of a policeman, a constable, a sotsky! <...> One of these days I am leaving for the villages, this trip will give me a lot¹¹⁶. The following letter, dated January 2, 1896, contains a fundamentally important circumstance that may have persuaded V. D. Bonch-Bruevich to study precisely the sectarian element in the peasantry: "This trip brought me a lot of benefits ... I can't even say that I saw a lot, but what he saw made a great impression, was forever deposited in the brain and soul and produced a certain (some) metamorphosis in concepts (practical). Peasant life, with all its squalor, malaise, chronic hunger, life, outwardly not recommended by science even for livestock, made me think a lot about "simplification", about that simplification that strives to approach the life of peasants to the smallest detail. <...> Before Christmas I couldn't get acquainted with the Chertkovs, not because I didn't want to, because in the literal sense of the word there was not a single free minute. Yesterday, exactly as you wrote in your letter to Mikhail Nikolayevich, and as I myself wanted to do before, I simply came and introduced myself. Sat all evening; in the evening Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy came, Popov was there, Strakhov and Semyonov were there. We talked for a long time about various differences. I liked the Chertkovs very much, and L. N. [Lev Nikolaevich - P. D.] even more. We talked about many things; I did my best to shake their opinion of the revolutionaries. Told them a lot of facts about modern movements, etc." We talked for a long time about various differences. I really liked the Chertkovs, and L.N. [Lev Nikolaevich - P. D.] even more. We talked about many things; I did my best to shake their opinion of the revolutionaries. Told them a lot of facts about modern movements, etc." We talked for a long time about various differences. I really liked the Chertkovs, and L. N. [Lev Nikolaevich - P. D.] even more. We talked about many things; I did my best to shake their opinion of the revolutionaries. Told them a lot of facts about modern movements, etc"¹¹⁷.

¹¹⁶ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. From a letter to V.M. Velichkina // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected Works. In 3 volumes. T. 2. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 471-472.

¹¹⁷ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. From a letter to V.M. Velichkina // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected Works. In 3 volumes. T. 2. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 473-474.

Perhaps by "simplification" is meant the liberation or cleansing from oppression and social hardship; but liberation is not in a direct socio-political vein, but ideological and spiritual liberation, i.e. religious, where in religion its compensatory function is manifested. In his work "Split and Sectarianism in Russia" (1903), Bonch-Bruевич writes that "in political protest, all sects have common points of contact"¹¹⁸. The protest is expressed in the so-called "Law of God", which is an expression of socio-political interests and requirements that depend on the class position of each individual sect and are not yet recognized as such, but denounced by popular thought in a religious form: "The "Law of God" is nothing else, as the sincere desire of sectarians or schismatics of one or another segment of the population. The "laws of God" are different for different groups, and this difference depends on the economic conditions in which the given sectarian and Old Believer group of the population finds itself. One thing is always common to all the "Laws of God" - this is dissatisfaction with the modern autocratic order"¹¹⁹. This is where the roots of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич's special attitude towards minority religious groups come from, as having a special revolutionary potential.

The meeting of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич with L. N. Tolstoy and his religious followers (Tolstoyans) opens a long mutual dispute over the participation of sectarians in the revolutionary struggle, which will escalate in 1902-1903. The Tolstoyans, as you know, adhered to the idea of "non-resistance to evil by violence", that is, they denied any kind of violence, including revolution. While in exile, V. D. Bonch-Bruевич for some time collaborated with the Tolstoy publishing house Free Word, from whose pages in his articles and notes he called on sectarians to protest and fight against the tsarist government and violence from the Orthodox Church, to commit "black redistribution" of the means of production from the hands of the exploiters into the hands of the producers"¹²⁰. The editors of the journal even had to make a separate reservation that they did not agree at all with these provisions of the author. In his work "Among the sectarians" (1902), V. D.

¹¹⁸ Bonch-Bruевич V. D. Schism and sectarianism in Russia. Report of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич to the Second Ordinary Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Party // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 183.

¹¹⁹ Bonch-Bruевич V. D. Old Believers and autocracy // Bonch-Bruевич V.D. Selected Works. In 3 vols. T. 1. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 99.

¹²⁰ Klibanov A. I. V. D. Bonch-Bruевич and the problems of religious and social movements // Bonch-Bruевич V. D. Selected Works. In 3 volumes. T. 1. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 10.

Bonch-Bruevich singles out the leaders of the Tolstoyans I. M. Tregubov and V. G. Chertkov, who, apparently, claimed leadership and unification under their word of all sectarian directions in Russia, and who attacked the revolutionary movement, characterizing the Social Democrats as "educated people" and "wishing the good of the Russian people", but at the same time "terribly slandering the people" that they were supposedly ready to join the revolutionary struggle¹²¹. In 1951, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich wrote a note about the old "Tolstoy" letter, which, among other things, said: "He [V. D. Bonch-Bruevich - P. D.] wants to use the sectarians in this way as a tool for revolutionary purposes. And he calls on the revolutionaries to go and propagandize the sectarians in this spirit. This article ["The Significance of Sectarianism for Russia" – P. D.] and everything that Bonch-Bruevich writes in a similar spirit can do much harm to sectarians..."¹²². As a result of disagreements with the Tolstoyans, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich insisted on the need to protect the sectarians from "utopian reactionaries". As A. I. Klibanov notes: "The goal that V. D. Bonch-Bruevich set himself as a leader of revolutionary social democracy was, among other things, to paralyze the influence of Tolstoyism on the sectarian masses and at the same time use it for social democratic propaganda among the sectarians, those channels through which the Tolstoyans maintained contacts with sectarian movements"¹²³.

In Geneva, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich worked in the printing house of the revolutionary group "Emancipation of Labor" and collaborated in Lenin's *Iskra*. He shares his memories and thoughts about the life of sectarians with G. V. Plekhanov and V. I. Lenin. The latter will be extremely interested in the conclusions of the scientist, which will later result in their joint work to attract sectarians to the revolutionary discourse. Based on the notes and observations of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, V. I. Lenin noted that sectarianism within itself contains favorable ground for agitation¹²⁴.

¹²¹ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Among sectarians // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 150-166.

¹²² Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Concerning the letter of the below published // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 172.

¹²³ Klibanov A. I. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich and the problems of religious and social movements // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected Works. In 3 vols. T. 1. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 8.

¹²⁴ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Vladimir Ilyich and the religious question // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected Works. In 3 volumes. T. 1. M.: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 31-73.

In 1899, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, together with his wife, left London for Constantinople, from where they began their journey to Canada, accompanying a group of Doukhobors from the Russian Empire. For two years of living in the community and communicating with the Dukhobors, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich managed to collect the richest ethnographic and literary material, which will be reflected in the *Animal Book* published by him in 1909.

In 1903, for the second congress of the RSDLP, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich wrote a report entitled "Split and Sectarianism in Russia." In this report, he formulates the main provisions of this problem in particular, which fits perfectly into the "peasant question" in general. First of all, one should clearly distinguish between "schismatics" and "sectarians". At the heart of the church schism, the scientist saw social and economic differentiation. The division of the Old Believers into priests and bespopovtsy is also explained socio-economically: the ruling economic classes joined the priesthood, the poor strata of the population joined the priestless. The priests went to reconciliation with the official church, while the bespopovtsy took part in the riots of S. T. Razin, E. I. Pugachev and others. "Sectarians", in contrast to the "militant schism", in addition to criticizing the present situation, also laid down a positive program for the future. V.D. Bonch-Bruevich divides all sectarians into two types: freethinkers and evangelicals (depending on the interpretation of Scripture), which potentially should be taken into account when promoting socialist propaganda among them. According to his classification, the "free-thinkers" include: Khlysty, Doukhobors, Molokans, Novoshtundists, Jehovahists, Tolstoyans, etc. The "Evangelicals": Baptists (Old Shtundists), Pashkovites, Evangelical Christians, etc. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich criticizes the traditional for of that time, a religious classification that divides sectarians into mystics (which, from his classification, include sectarians of old origin from the Eastern cycle, such as whips, eunuchs, Doukhobors) and rationalists (related to the newest origin of the Western cycle: New Shtundists, all "evangelicals"); in his opinion, this division is meaningless, because all religious associations have an element of mysticism. In external form, all communities have the concept of the "Law of God", i.e. some universal law of justice; but essentially it is

different, because expresses socio-political interests that depend on the "class position of each particular community". As a result, the "Law of God" is a socio-political protest against the existing system. Thus, revolutionary propaganda among sectarian communities is necessary, according to the conclusion of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, their ideologies implicitly contain protest and proto-communist principles. Among the difficulties for agitation, the researcher noted the extreme suspicion of the sectarians and their conspiratorial allegorical language, which is incomprehensible to an unprepared listener. The necessary measures included: creation of popular literature for sectarians; the need to resist clericalism; participation of sectarians in the revolutionary struggle. The congress instructs the Central Committee to deal closely with this issue, and V. D. Bonch-Bruevich himself begins to publish a special newspaper, *Rassvet*.

By 1916, he published 7 volumes of "Materials for the history and study of Russian sectarianism and the Old Believers"¹²⁵, which is a fundamental work for the study and collection of living sources of sectarian teachings and worldviews of various currents and interpretations. At the beginning of each volume, an appeal was printed for everyone (including the sectarians themselves) to participate in the collection of materials, fixing data according to a certain developed scheme, which was applied by the author. Thus, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich developed a special methodology and classification of religious and social movements. On this occasion, A. I. Klibanov wrote: "The works of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, written in 1902-1903. introduced a number of new provisions into the study of sectarianism. The main thing was that the history of Russian sectarianism began to be considered by him in close connection with the struggle of classes..."¹²⁶. In the preface to

¹²⁵ Materials for the history and study of Russian sectarianism and schism / Ed. [and with a preface] by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich. St. Petersburg: B. M. Wolf, 1908-1916.

Header issue 3-5: Materials for the history and study of Russian sectarianism and the Old Believers; in issue 7: Materials for the history and study of religious and social movements in Russia.

Issue. 1: Baptists. 1908. XII, 314 p.

Issue. 2: The Animal Book of the Doukhobors / Recorded and collected. Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich. 1909. XL, 327 p.

Issue. 3: Stundists. 1910. IV, 311 p.

Issue. 4: New Israel / With preface and note by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich. 1911. CXXXII, 485 p.

Issue. 5: Collected works of G.S. Skovoroda: T. 1: Portr. and fax. author / With a biography of G. P. Skovoroda M. I. Kovalinsky, with notes by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich. 1912. XVI, 543 p.

Issue. 7: Chemreki: An offshoot of Old Israel / Intro. Art., notes and notes. Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich. 1916. XXVIII, 705 p.

¹²⁶ Klibanov A. I. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich and the problems of religious and social movements // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected Works. In 3 vols. T. 1. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 14.

the 3rd volume of the collected works, Y. Y. Kogan writes: "He was the first Russian scientist who applied the Marxist method to the analysis of these movements, in a religious form expressing in some of their manifestations the peasant protest against tsarism and landlord exploitation"¹²⁷.

Until 1917, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, on the instructions of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, often went on expeditions to various parts of the empire to study the life and doctrines of numerous religious communities. Also, he was known as a forensic expert during hearings on accusations of Khlysty, Old Believers, etc. All these facts of the biography testify to the authority of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich as a prominent specialist in his field.

After the October Revolution, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich served as manager of the Council of People's Commissars from 1917 to 1920. During these three years of work, he fought against "excesses on the ground" in the implementation of the Decree on the separation of church and state; which, for example, is evidenced by many documents from the Scientific Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion: inquiries, appeals of the victims to him with a request for help, etc. For example, the appeal of Patriarch Tikhon to the Council of People's Commissars regarding the closure of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra in 1919 and the accompanying note by Bonch-Bruevich himself that the Decree does not allow the authorities to interfere in the religious rights of citizens¹²⁸; accompanying note on the seizure of church utensils from the Kazan Cathedral by the local department of the Cheka¹²⁹; conversion of the nuns of the Serafimo-Diveevo convent in Nizhny Novgorod¹³⁰; conversion of the nuns of the Spassky Convent¹³¹;

¹²⁷ Kogan Y. A. Preface // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected Works. In 3 vols. T. 3. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963. P. 14.

¹²⁸ Letter to the 8th department of the PCJ. Addendum: Patriarch Tikhon's statement to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. November 26, 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 98.

¹²⁹ Letter to the Civil Committee of the Council of the Kazan Fortified Region. Attachment: a copy of the application to the Administration of the Kazan Diocesan Council. 1919 // Scientific and historical archive of State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 99.

¹³⁰ Correspondence on the allotment of land to the former nuns of the Serafimo-Diveevo Monastery. September 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 102.

¹³¹ Nuns of the Spassky Convent. Petition to the manager of the affairs of the Council of People's Commissars. October 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 109.

complaints of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Spirit A. F. Filippov¹³²; appeal of the wife of the former missionary I. G. Aivazov regarding the arrest of her husband¹³³ and others. The complaint of the former priest M. V. Galkin with a request to V. D. Bonch-Bruevich for help in getting him into the commission on the separation of church and state is knocked out from the general series¹³⁴. In his monograph, M. Y. Krapivina writes that, as head of the Council of People's Commissars, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich used his position to protect sectarian leaders and communities, for example, in August 1918 he issued special letters of protection to the Sober Life community for special forms of CPC¹³⁵. For this he was severely reprimanded. In the human rights activities of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, there is additional information: "In particular, [V. D. Bonch-Bruevich - P. D.] tried to help the Orthodox labor community of Penza (existed since 1908), the commune of the Molokans of the Bogorodsk volost of the Pavlovsk district of the Nizhny Novgorod province and the communes of Orthodox monastics of the same province, the labor community of Evangelical Christians in the estate of F. P. Savelyeva in the Velyaminovskaya volost of the Serpukhov district of the Moscow province, which contained a shelter for the elderly and children. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich advised the latter to register an agricultural commune with the PCA, which would protect them from confiscation of property"¹³⁶. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich really sincerely helped many people, even after leaving his post in the Council of People's Commissars¹³⁷. Such a perspective is practically not covered in any way either in Soviet or in modern literature.

¹³² Filippov A. Statement by the manager of the Council of People's Commissars. 1. Extracts from the letters of Hieromonk Sevastyan, who was sent to Siberia with a patriarchal appeal. July 20, 1920 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 115; Statement by the head of the CPC. September 1, 1920 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 116.

¹³³ Documents in the case of the arrest of I. G. Aivazov, ex. Orthodox missionary. November 1919 - February 1920 // Scientific and historical archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 142.

¹³⁴ Galkin M., priest. 3 letters to V. Bonch-Bruevich. April 9 - May 5, 1918 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 106.

¹³⁵ Krapivin M. Y., Leikin A. Y., Dalgatov A. G. The fate of Christian sectarianism in Soviet Russia (1917 - late 1930s). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University, 2003. P. 34-35.

¹³⁶ Redkina O. Y. People's Commissariat of Agriculture and the VIII Department of the People's Commissariat of Justice of the RSFSR: the problem of state cooperation with religious collective farms during the years of «war communism». [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://rusoir.ru/03print/03print-04/03print-04-13/> (accessed 22.08.2023)

¹³⁷ Matkhanova N. P. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich and «academic work»: assistance to repressed historians // Siberian link. Collection of scientific articles. 2017. P. 519-535.

The result of the combination of state duties and scientific activities by V. D. Bonch-Bruevich was: the publication in 1919 of the Decree of the Council of People's Commissars on exemption from military service on religious grounds, and the appeal of the People's Commissariat of Agriculture dated October 5, 1921 "To sectarians and Old Believers living in Russia and abroad". The appeal offered land to the sectarians for organizing labor communities - state farms - on the plots. In this matter, V. D. Bonch-Bruevich went beyond armchair theorizing, and with the help of V. I. Lenin, he created and for 9 years led the Lesnye Polyany state farm in the Moscow Region, where representatives of the Beginning of the Century community moved specifically for this » new Israeli current¹³⁸.

V. D. Bonch-Bruevich played a big role in the study of Orthodoxy, because showed its internal heterogeneity. He influenced subsequent directions in the study of Orthodoxy, in which the emphasis was placed on the study of heterogeneity and freethinking as forms of "deviation" from canonical Orthodoxy, and socio-economic research was the main dominant. Perhaps it was under the influence of his works that many researchers of the Old Believers who worked during the designated period considered the Old Believers as a form of social protest¹³⁹. However, this was also emphasized by researchers who did not so clearly examine the phenomenon of Old Believers, in particular N. N. Pokrovsky in his fundamental monograph "Anti-feudal protest of the Ural-Siberian peasants-Old Believers in the 18th century"¹⁴⁰.

Thus, after clarifying the cultural and historical background of the era of interest, demonstrating the contradictions in church-state relations and the party's policy in the field of atheism in the post-war USSR, and microhistorically emphasizing the role of a scientist in this context using the example of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, the study

¹³⁸ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. How the state farm «Forest Glades» was organized // Memories of Lenin. M.: Nauka, 1969. P. 398-402.

¹³⁹ Fedorenko F. I. Sects, their faith and deeds. M.: Political literature, 1965. 360 p.; Kaushansky P. L. Ideology and activities of Christian sects. Kemerovo: Book publishing house, 1965. 108 p.; Milovidov V. F. Old Believers in the past and present. M.: Mysl, 1969. 112 p.; Kartsov V. G. Religious schism as a form of anti-feudal protest in the history of Russia. Part 1. Kalinin: Kalinin. State Univ., 1971. 160 p.; Katunsky A. E. Old Believers. M.: Politizdat, 1972. 120 p.; Baidin V. I. Old Believers of the Urals and autocracy. Late 18th - mid 19th centuries. Abstract of the thesis for the academic degree. Novosibirsk, 1983. 18 p.

¹⁴⁰ Pokrovsky N. N. Anti-feudal protest of the Ural-Siberian peasants - Old Believers in the 18th century. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1974. 394 p.

approaches detailed analysis of Soviet works on Orthodoxy. A detailed description and analysis will include monographs and articles in scientific periodicals. The works of not only specialized specialists in the science of religion, but also historians in a broader sense will be considered. Almost half a century of historical and political context is of extreme importance for the construction and analysis of cause-and-effect relationships in the further historiographical part of this study.

2. Historiography of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR (1943-1988)

2.1. Directions of the study of Orthodoxy

Studies published in the USSR in 1943 - 1988, in which the issues of studying Orthodoxy were raised in one way or another, touch upon completely different subject areas of humanitarian knowledge.

In particular, this is a huge body of work devoted to the study of religious architecture and fine arts of the countries of the Byzantine macroregion. Researchers noted the importance of the Soviet period in the study of "Christian antiquities"¹⁴¹. These are the works of archaeologists, Byzantinists and art historians, as well as Soviet aesthetic philosophers. Thus, G. K. Wagner made a significant contribution to the understanding of the Orthodox church as a complex ideological structure, as the materialization of religious ideas¹⁴². Although the bulk of his conceptual works were published after 1988, individual works that touched upon not only archeology and architecture, but also religious, philosophical and theological issues of Orthodox church architecture came out during the period under study¹⁴³.

The study of the historiography of Soviet works devoted to the study of fine arts and architecture should be the topic of a separate study, since Soviet art criticism in the 1960s - 1980s. developed very actively, including the topic of religion in the field of art historical research¹⁴⁴, and not limited only to the study of the phenomena of ancient

¹⁴¹ Belyaev L. A. Christian antiquities: Introduction to comparative study. St. Petersburg: Aletheya, 2000. 574 p.; Vainshtein O. L. History of Soviet medieval studies (1917-1966). L.: Nauka, 1968. 435 p.; Ioannisyanyan O. M. P. A. Rappoport: life and creative credo of a scientist // Architecture of Medieval Rus'. Selected articles. To the 100th anniversary of his birth. St. Petersburg: Faces of Russia, 2013. P. 3-35.

¹⁴² Protsenko V. V. Temple as a sociocultural phenomenon // Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region. 1999. No. 6. P. 423-427.

¹⁴³ Wagner G. K. On the fate of the Byzantine heritage in Vladimir-Suzdal plastic arts // Vizantiyskiy Vremennik. 1964. No. 24. P. 121-128; Wagner G. K. The Byzantine temple as an image of the world // Vizantiyskiy Vremennik. 1986. No. 47. P. 163-181.

¹⁴⁴ Melikova V. D. Some features of the relationship between art and religion (on the example of the fine arts of Ancient Rus') // Bulletin of Moscow State University. Philosophy. 1967. No. 2. P. 81-89.

Russian culture¹⁴⁵, included a study of the Orthodox cult heritage throughout the Byzantine macroregion¹⁴⁶.

Soviet Byzantine studies, the development of which stopped in the second half of the 1930s, began to actively revive from the late 1940s¹⁴⁷. The researchers note that "The creation of the Byzantine studies sector in 1955 completed the process of institutionalization of Soviet Byzantine studies. The path she traversed in a fairly short period of time had a complex trajectory that determined its fractional periodization, in which ideological campaigns played a key role. If in the mid-40s, Soviet Byzantine studies was thought of as a direct heir to the best traditions of pre-revolutionary science, then by the mid-50s, in connection with the emergence of the Marxist project of Soviet science, this disciplinary branch was reoriented towards a complete break with past scientific experience"¹⁴⁸. The scope of research work focused on the study of socio-political and economic problems of Byzantium and the Byzantine macroregion, as well as on art historical problems and philological research. However, since the 1970s the situation is changing¹⁴⁹, and (often under the guise of studying Byzantine philosophical thought) works devoted to the study of Orthodox theology appear. Here we cannot fail to mention the publications of S. S. Averintsev in the 1980s¹⁵⁰.

¹⁴⁵ Borisova E. A., Kazhdan T. P. Russian architecture of the late XIX – early XX centuries. M.: Nauka, 1971. 239 p.; Voronin N. N. Ancient Rus': history, art // Problems of history. 1967. No. 2. P. 44-58; Zotov A. I. Russian art from ancient times to the beginning of the 20th century. M.: Art, 1971. 375 p.; Lazarev V. N. Moscow school of icon painting. M.: Art, 1971. 235 p.; Likhacheva V. D., Likhachev D. S. The artistic heritage of other Russias and modernity. L.: Nauka, 1971. 120 p.; Melikova V. D. Worldly issues in religious painting of ancient Rus' // Problems of scientific atheism. 1968. No. 5. P. 137-158; Rappoport P. A. Old Russian architecture. M.: Nauka, 1970. 147 p.; Zhegalova S. K. Russian wooden sculpture // Artist. 1965. No. 1. P. 52–57.

¹⁴⁶ Popova O. S. Light in Byzantine and Russian art of the XII-XVI centuries // Soviet art history. 1978. No. 1. P. 75-99.

¹⁴⁷ Ivanov S. A. Byzantine studies and power in the USSR (1928-1948) // Totalitarianism. Historical experience of Eastern Europe: Sat. Art. M.: Institute of Slavic Studies, 1995. P. 244-254; Levchenko M. V. Byzantine studies in the USSR // Scientist. Notes of Leningrad State University. Ser. East. Sci. 1949. Issue. 14. No. 112. P. 216-236; Kurbatov G. L. History of Byzantium (historiography). L.: Publishing house Leningr. State Univ., 1975. 256 p.; Udaltsova Z. V. Soviet Byzantine studies for 50 years. M.: Nauka, 1969. 362 p.; Sashanov V. V. Experience of defending dissertations by Byzantine historians in the 1940-1950s: to pose the question // Dissertation on history in the context of Russian scientific culture of the 19th - mid-20th centuries: experience and prospects for studying: collection of articles based on the results of the interregional scientific seminar. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk State University, 2016. P. 119-131; Sashanov V. V. "...Study Byzantium, this is a goldmine": all-Union sessions on Byzantine studies in 1944-1950 // General history and historical science in the 20th - early 21st centuries: materials of the II International Scientific and Educational Conference: in 2 volumes. Vol. 1. Kazan: Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, 2020. P. 226-230.

¹⁴⁸ Sashanov V. V. The formation of Soviet Byzantine studies in the 40-50s of the XX century: institutional aspect // Scientific Notes of Kazan University. Series Humanities. 2016. Vol. 158. No. 3. P. 840-850.

¹⁴⁹ Kurbatov G. L. History of Byzantium (historiography). L.: Leningrad State University Publishing House, 1975. 256 p.

¹⁵⁰ Gusev E. I. Articles by S. S. Averintsev on Byzantine culture of the first half of the 80s of the XX century // Russian philology: Scientific Notes of Smolensk State University. 2018. No. 18. P. 235-245.

Many problems that arose within the framework of Orthodox religious and philosophical discourse during the Soviet period were touched upon in the works of historians of Russian religious philosophy¹⁵¹. An important event in Soviet philosophical science is the publication of the work of A. A. Galaktionov and P. F. Nikandrov "History of Russian Philosophy"¹⁵². Since the late 1960s¹⁵³ Many works appear in which the topic of Orthodoxy is touched upon within the framework of the study of the philosophy of the Slavophiles¹⁵⁴. These are the works of E. A. Dudzinskaya¹⁵⁵, Z. A. Kamensky¹⁵⁶, V. V. Kozhinova¹⁵⁷, V. A. Kosheleva¹⁵⁸, V. I. Kuleshova¹⁵⁹, N. A. Tsimbaeva¹⁶⁰ and others. And in the works of other researchers of Russian religious philosophy, among whom it is necessary to note B. V. Emelyanov¹⁶¹ and V. A. Kuvakina¹⁶².

It is also worth highlighting works devoted to ancient Russian philosophical thought. Various aspects of ancient Russian philosophizing during this period became the subject of study not only by philosophers, but also by historians and researchers of religion (A. G. Mankov, P. A. Sadikov, R. G. Skrynnikov, L. V. Cherepnin, etc.), especially I would like to highlight the works of A. A. Zimin¹⁶³, A. I. Klibanova¹⁶⁴, N. A. Kazakova and Y. S. Lurie¹⁶⁵, which raised questions related to the themes of "autocracy"

¹⁵¹ Kamnev V. M. Historians of philosophy in transitional times: 1980-1990s in Russian philosophy // Bulletin of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy. 2017. No. 4. P. 99-106.

¹⁵² Galaktionov A. A., Nikandrov P. F. History of Russian philosophy. M.: Sotsekgiz, 1961. 459 p.

¹⁵³ Dmitriev S. S. The approach should be concretely historical // Russian literature. 1969. No. 12. P. 76-77.

¹⁵⁴ Galaktionov A. A., Nikandrov P. F. Slavophilism, its national origins and place in the history of Russian thought // Problems of history. 1966. No. 6. P. 120-130.

¹⁵⁵ Dudzinskaya E. A. Slavophiles in the social struggle. M.: Mysl, 1983. 272 p.

¹⁵⁶ Kamensky Z. A. Moscow circle of wise men. M.: Mysl, 1980. 327 p.

¹⁵⁷ Kozhinov V. V. About the main thing in the heritage of the Slavophiles // Russian literature. 1969. No. 10. P. 113-130.

¹⁵⁸ Koshelev V. A. Aesthetic and literary views of Russian Slavophiles (1840-1850s). L.: Nauka, 1984. 193 p.

¹⁵⁹ Kuleshov V. I. Slavophiles and Russian literature. M.: Fiction, 1976. 288 p.

¹⁶⁰ Tsimbaev N. I. Slavophilism: from the history of Russian society.-political. 19th century thoughts M.: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1986. 269 p.

¹⁶¹ Emelyanov B. V., Knyazev V. M., Rusakov V. M. The problem of man in Russian religious-idealistic philosophy of the late XIX - early XX centuries: (Critical analysis) // Historical and philosophical studies. 1983. No. 7. P. 49-67; Emelyanov B. V., Rusakov V. M. The problem of man: Russian origins of modern bourgeois human studies // Worldview problems in the history of philosophy. Novosibirsk, 1985. P. 79-88; Emelyanov B. V., Lyubutin K. M. Introduction to the history of philosophy: Textbook. manual for universities. M.: Higher School, 1987. 160 p.; Emelyanov B. V., Bushmileva I. "The Science of Man" by the Russian theologian V. Nesmelov: Critical assessment // Scientific and technical progress and creativity: abstract. report scientific-theoret. conf. Izhevsk, 1987. P. 139-141.

¹⁶² Kuvakin V. A. Religious philosophy in Russia: The beginning of the 20th century. M.: Mysl, 1980. 310 p.

¹⁶³ Zimin A. A. I. S. Peresvetov and Russian freethinkers of the 16th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 311-324.

¹⁶⁴ Klibanov A. I. Reformation movements in Russia in the 14th - first half of the 16th centuries. M.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1960. 411 p.

¹⁶⁵ Kazakova N. A., Lurie Y. S. Antifeudal heretical movements in Rus' in the 14th - early 16th centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1955. 544 p.

freedom and diversity of thought. Researchers note that the institutionalization of ancient Russian philosophy as an independent direction of historical and philosophical research begins with a short essay by M. N. Tikhomirov "Philosophy in Ancient Rus"¹⁶⁶. Following his pre-revolutionary predecessors, he noted that in ancient Russian culture there were two traditions: monastic (ascetic) and secular. The institutionalization of the study of ancient Russian philosophical thought occurs in the 1980s, largely thanks to the works of M. N. Gromov¹⁶⁷, A. F. Zamaleeva¹⁶⁸ and V. V. Milkova.

Among the philosophical works, it is also worth noting studies devoted to the understanding of Byzantine and Old Russian aesthetics, and here, of course, it is necessary to highlight the publications of V. V. Bychkov, which began to appear in the early 1970s¹⁶⁹.

Speaking about Soviet research, one cannot fail to mention confessional researchers who published in publications of the Russian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate). In 1943, the publication of the official printed organ of the Russian Orthodox Church (MP) – the "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate" – was resumed¹⁷⁰. During the period under study, this publication mainly published articles devoted to church life in 1943-45 the patriotic activities of the church, etc. were brightly sanctified, which made the magazine a valuable source on the history of Orthodoxy in the second half of the 20th century¹⁷¹. As researchers of church periodicals note: "By the 50s the main sections of the JMP have been determined: official. part, theological department, sermons, "Church Life" (with subheadings "From the Life of Dioceses", "Eternal Memory", etc.), "From the Life of Orthodoxy". In 1949-1988 there was a column "In Defense of Peace", since 1989 - "For Peace and the Survival of Humanity", where "articles were published demonstrating the Russian Orthodox Church's support for the

¹⁶⁶ Tikhomirov M. N. Russian culture X-XVIII centuries. M.: Nauka, 1968. 447 p.

¹⁶⁷ Gromov M. N. Maxim Greek philosopher. M.: Nauka, 1984. 189 p.

¹⁶⁸ Zamaleev A. F., Zots V. A. Theologians are looking for God: Philosopher-atheist. essays on the history of Christians. theology. Kyiv: Molod, 1980. 166 p.

¹⁶⁹ Bychkov V. V. Image as a category of Byzantine aesthetics // *Vizantiyskiy Vremennik*. 1973. No. 34. P. 151-168.

¹⁷⁰ Kalashnik V. V. Power and the Church in the USSR (1940-1950): towards the historiography of the problem // *Bulletin of the Omsk Orthodox Theological Seminary*. 2016. No. 1. P. 141-144.

¹⁷¹ Nikitin S. S. Specifics of the relationship between the Finnish and Russian Orthodox Churches after the restoration of prayerful and Eucharistic communion (1957-1960) // *Theological Bulletin*. 2016. No. 3-4. P. 207-234; Serpeninov A. "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate" as a source for studying the history of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra (to the 75th anniversary of the opening of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra) // *Theological Bulletin*. 2021. No. 4. P. 180-191.

peace-loving initiatives of various countries: the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the establishment of good neighborly relations between states; materials were often published criticizing capitalist countries as "warmongers"¹⁷². Since 1961, the magazine began to pay significant attention to ecumenism and the activities of other Orthodox churches. It also contained publications on the history of Orthodoxy (in particular, publications by Professor I. N. Shabatin)¹⁷³.

Since 1960, a very significant publication of the Russian Orthodox Church (MP) for the Soviet period, "Theological Works" began to be published¹⁷⁴. They published theological Orthodox works of modern authors, as well as the heritage of Russian religious and philosophical thought (the most significant works of Father Pavel Florensky were published in this way). "Theological Works" also published translations of numerous sources (in particular the translation of "Church History" by Eusebius of Caesarea), ancient Russian book monuments, as well as works on the history of the church (in 1971 "Essays" by priest Sergei Mansurov were published), in 1986 two issues were devoted to the history of the Moscow and St. Petersburg theological academies, works were published on the history of local churches and on the history of the Old Catholic movement¹⁷⁵. This layer of Soviet historiography of Orthodoxy requires a separate, thorough study, taking into account various factors.

2.2. The history of Orthodoxy as the main direction of the study of Orthodoxy

Soviet scientists of the first two decades showed in their works the dependence of religion in society on the interests and goals of certain social classes in their political struggle. Despite the unconditional critical attitude to accusatory "vulgar sociology", we still cannot ignore and throw out from historiography all the works of the 20-30s 20th

¹⁷² Polishchuk E. S. "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate" // Orthodox Encyclopedia. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.pravenc.ru/text/182369.html> (Date of access: 07.21.2023).

¹⁷³ Veretennikov P. I. Church historian Professor Ivan Nikolaevich Shabatin // Theological Bulletin. 2010. No. 11-12. P. 537-547.

¹⁷⁴ For the historiography of works devoted to the history of the "Theological Messenger", see: Bochkov P. V., priest. Theological periodicals of the higher school of the Russian Orthodox Church: domestic experience and an attempt at analysis // Ipatiev Bulletin. 2022. No. 1. P. 91-115.

¹⁷⁵ Sergeenko A., prot. Essays from the history of the Old Catholic movement // Theological works. 1960. No. 1. P. 111-141.

century on the history of religion and Orthodoxy, some of which were distinguished by academic accuracy, a deep understanding of the problem area and analysis of the material.

On October 30, 1922, at the solemn meeting of the Belarusian State University, the famous historian of religion, biblical scholar, orientalist and one of the founders of Soviet religious studies N. M. Nikolsky read the report "Religion as a subject of science"¹⁷⁶. In his report, he characterized the science of religion as new in the universities of Russia and young in the universities of the West. The historian noted that science cannot consider the phenomena being studied as something supernatural or supranatural, thus the science of religion must place its object of study in a series of natural ones, like any phenomenon for science. The author pushes aside theology as a field for the study of religion. Nikolsky is also the author of the first work on the history of the Russian Orthodox Church, written from the perspective of Marxism-Leninism in 1930¹⁷⁷ and twice reprinted in 1931 and 1983. In the book, all the most important events in the history of the Orthodox Church in Russia were considered in the context of the country's socio-economic development, incl. the social prerequisites and conditions for the emergence and development of the Old Believers and sectarianism in Russian society were shown. The last issue, despite the title of the book "History of the Russian Church", was given special attention. This is the reason for the criticism of his work. Immediately after the release of the first, and then the second edition, reviews of Nikolsky's book were published on the pages of the Anti-Religious magazine, where, as a minus of the work, a bias was noted on the presentation of the situation in antiquity than on current events before and post-revolutionary times. It was also noted that the topics of "punitive" actions by the church against the participants in peasant uprisings, the "intrigues" of spiritual censorship, and essays on the history of the Old Believers and sectarianism are generally inappropriate. On the other hand, as all Soviet authors will later note, for a long time (until 1967) N. M. Nikolsky's book was the only work of a generalizing nature.

¹⁷⁶ Nikolsky N. M. Religion as a subject of science. Minsk: Beltrestpechat, 1923. 47 p.

¹⁷⁷ Nikolsky N. M. History of the Russian Church. Moscow: Atheist, 1930. 248 p.

In general, if we evaluate studies of Orthodoxy before the Great Patriotic War, they took place under the banner of anti-religious propaganda. After J. V. Stalin held a meeting with the hierarchs of the Orthodox Church in 1943, headed by Metropolitan (and a little later, Patriarch) Sergius (Stragorodsky), the official state rhetoric in relation to the church softened. Many authors have studied completely different aspects of Orthodoxy and the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the context of Russian history, culture, church-state relations, Russian religious diversity, cult, etc.

Before turning to the analysis of the main topics of research within the framework of the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet science, it is important to pay attention to how domestic religious scholars of the last century themselves determined the range of topics they studied, how they classified the objects of research, what questions of Orthodoxy seemed especially relevant and pressing to them and controversial.

In 1958, in "Problems of Religion and Atheism History" M. I. Shakhnovich published an article "Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism of the USSR Academy of Sciences" which described in detail the exhibition plan of the department "History of Orthodoxy and Russian Atheism" in the Museum of the History of Religion and atheism: "The central department - "History of Orthodoxy and Russian Atheism" - consists of 57 stands and many showcases. Stand names: Baptism of Rus', Feudalism in ancient Rus', Cult of saints during the period of feudal fragmentation, Church and the Tatar yoke, Freethinkers of ancient Russia, State and church in the 16th century, Feudal monasteries, Medieval anti-scientific ideas, School in ancient Russia, State and Church of the 17th century, Schism of the church, Persecution of schismatics, Popular movements of the 17th century. and the church, Popular anticlericalism in the 17th century, Peter I and the church, Freethought in the first half of the 18th century, Autocracy and Orthodoxy in the 18th century, Freethought and atheism in the second half of the 18th century, Popular movements in the 18th century. and the church, Popular free-thinking of the first half of the 19th century, Clericalism and the church in the first half of the 19th century, Deification of the nobility in the 18th - early XIX century, Atheism of the Decembrists, Atheism of A. S. Pushkin, Religion and art in the XIX century, Church and serfdom, Atheism of the revolutionary democrats of the

XIX century, N. A. Nekrasov and N. Shchedrin about the church, L. N. Tolstoy about the church, The Church in the fight against the revolutionary movement in the second half of the 19th century, Social roots of religion in the village of the 19th century, Remnants of pre-Christian beliefs in the 19th century, Religion is the support of darkness and ignorance, Anti-scientific Orthodox ideas, The class essence of Orthodox ethics, Woman and Orthodoxy, Old Believers of the 18th-19th centuries¹⁷⁸. All of the above sections (stands) represented independent topics for Soviet scientists as part of the study of the history of Orthodoxy.

One of the most important and detailed reviews of the literature on the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet science was published by E. F. Grekulov and P. K. Kurochkin in "Problems of Scientific Atheism" in 1967. The review was timed to coincide with the fiftieth anniversary of the "victory of the scientific-atheistic worldview". E. F. Grekulov and P. K. Kurochkin note that in Soviet historiography, the only generalizing work until then was still only the History of the Russian Church by N. M. Nikolsky. Nikolsky's work was created as part of the work of M. N. Pokrovsky "Russian History from Ancient Times", therefore, as the authors of the historiographic review write, "it is not without known shortcomings" in the spirit of "vulgar sociologism". But the main merit of the "History of the Russian Church" is that it is the first attempt to consider the history of Orthodoxy from a Marxist position.

The first issue that E. F. Grekulov and P. K. Kurochkin address in their review is the topic of the baptism of Rus', noting that Nikolsky paid little attention to this problem, because he considered the relevance of this issue inspired from outside and not so important for Marxist criticism of the history of Orthodoxy. E. F. Grekulov and P. K. Kurochkin name three works that set the tone for the entire discourse on the topic of the baptism of Rus' - these are the works of S. V. Bakhrushin, B. D. Grekov and I. U. Budovnits.

¹⁷⁸ Shakhnovich M. I. Twenty-fifth anniversary of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism of the USSR Academy of Sciences // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. Vol. 5. M., 1958. P. 417-418.

S. V. Bakhrushin in 1937 publishes in the journal "Historian-Marxist"¹⁷⁹ article "On the issue of the baptism of Kievan Rus"¹⁸⁰; in which, as noted by E. F. Grekulov and P. K. Kurochkin, he exaggerated the progressive significance of the process of the baptism of Rus', which influenced a number of subsequent studies: "S. Bakhrushin made the first attempt to explain the adoption of Christianity by processes of internal development. The baptism of Rus' became possible due to favorable social conditions, and Christianity began to spread in it long before it was accepted by Vladimir. S. Bakhrushin noted that this act had a progressive significance and contributed to the elimination of the remnants of the tribal system and the development of the feudal mode of production. The adoption and spread of Christianity helped the development of feudal legislation, the ideological justification and strengthening of princely power"¹⁸¹.

B. D. Grekov in his fundamental work "Kievan Rus"¹⁸², according to the authors of the review, gave a clear explanation of the reasons for the spread of Orthodoxy and the adoption of Christianity by Russia and showed many examples of the resistance of the "masses" to this process: "The church organization, according to B. D. Grekov, has become a new and powerful tool for influencing the masses in order to their subordination to the government. The scientist showed that writing was in Rus' even before the adoption of Christianity, its development was caused by the social needs of that time. B. D. Grekov gave numerous examples of the stubborn resistance of the masses to the introduction of a new religion"¹⁸³.

I. U. Budovnits¹⁸⁴ emphasized the reactionary role of the new religion, which stupefied the minds of the masses, muffled class contradictions and hindered the course of social development. "I. U. Budovnits, criticizing the exaggeration of the progressive

¹⁷⁹ Subsequently, the journal «Istorik-Marxist» will be merged with the «Historical Journal» and from 1945 will be published under the name "Problems of History".

¹⁸⁰ Bakhrushin S. V. On the Issue of the Baptism of Kievan Rus // Historian-Marxist. 1937. No. 2. P. 40-77.

¹⁸¹ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 289.

¹⁸² Grekov B. D. Kievan Rus. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1953. 568 p.

¹⁸³ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 290.

¹⁸⁴ Budovnits I. U. On the Issue of the Baptism of Rus' // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 402-434.

nature of the Christianization of Rus', notes that baptism was not a one-time and mass act, but was a long process. He points to the originality of Russian literary works that arose on the basis of Russian political and social relations"¹⁸⁵.

Researchers see the next topic in the history of the church during the Tatar-Mongol yoke: "The modern church press writes a lot about the patriotic role of the clergy during the Mongol invasion. In fact, individual representatives of the clergy showed patriotism, while the church as a whole - and this fact was recognized even by the church historian E. E. Golubinsky - not only did not raise its voice against the invaders, but called on God's blessing on the khans"¹⁸⁶. Among the works that address problematic issues, the work of B. D. Grekov and A. Y. Yakubovsky "The Golden Horde and its fall" is noted¹⁸⁷ and an article by I. U. Budovnits in "Problems of Religion and Atheism History"¹⁸⁸: "Budovnits on a large material shows that the clergy were imbued with the spirit of servility to the conquerors, they used the people's disaster in their own interests and sought protection from the khans for their privileges. In turn, the khans highly appreciated the importance of the church as an ideological tool that helped strengthen their dominance in Rus"¹⁸⁹.

The theme of the church as a medieval feudal lord stood out separately in Soviet historiography. Particular attention of researchers was paid to the monasteries, which most often became the object of research/criticism: St. Sophia Cathedral¹⁹⁰, Joseph-Volokolamsk Monastery¹⁹¹, Solovetsky Monastery¹⁹², Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery¹⁹³.

¹⁸⁵ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 290.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Grekov B. D., Yakubovsky A. Y. The Golden Horde and Its Fall. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1950. 479 p.

¹⁸⁸ Budovnits I. U. Russian Clergy in the First Century of the Mongol Yoke // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. No. 7. 1959. P. 284-302.

¹⁸⁹ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 291.

¹⁹⁰ Grekov B. D. Essays on the History of the Economy of the Novgorod Sophia House of the 16th-18th Centuries. // Chronicle of the studies of the Archeographic Commission. Issue. 33. 1926. P. 201-332.

¹⁹¹ Tikhomirov M. N. Monastery-patrimony in the 17th Century. // Historical Notes. 1938. V. 3. P. 130-160.

¹⁹² Savich A. A. Solovetsky Estate in the XV-XVII Centuries. Perm: Perm State University, 1947. 280 p.

¹⁹³ Gorfunkel A. K. The patrimonial economy and the peasants of the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery: Abstract of the thesis for the academic degree. L., 1956. 16 p.; Kopanov A. I. History of land tenure in the Belozersk region in the 15th—16th centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. 255 p.

For the study of church estates, the works of L. V. Cherepnin were of great importance¹⁹⁴: "Based on the act material, the author traced the growth of church land ownership in northeastern Rus', the situation of the peasants and the methods of their exploitation"¹⁹⁵. Also, not a single Soviet study on the period of feudalism could do without references not only to B. D. Grekov, but also to M. N. Tikhomirov¹⁹⁶. The topic of monastic economics was also the main one in A. A. Zimin's Ph.D. thesis, which he defended in 1947 under the scientific guidance of S. V. Bakhrushin. Zimin later recalled: "Deepening into the topic, I gradually moved away from its original intent, Zimin recalled. — The dissertation... dealt with source studies, the history of the creation of the monastery, its land ownership and social composition, and finally, the ideology and politics of the monastic brethren (Josephites). Since ideas have always fascinated me, everything in the dissertation was subordinated to one of them: the ideology and politics of the Josephites, in my opinion, were determined by land ownership and the social composition of Volokolamsk monasticism"¹⁹⁷.

Soviet researchers of Orthodoxy have always "separated by commas" the themes of the feudal estates of the church and anti-feudal popular movements: "Increased exploitation on the lands of spiritual feudal lords, the growth of church land ownership at the expense of black peasant and patrimonial boyar lands infringed on the interests of not only the peasants, but also the urban population and caused protest of different strata of Russian society. This protest was expressed in various forms of socio-political struggle"¹⁹⁸. The last topic seemed to be quite extensive and included, like the peasant struggle against church and monastic land ownership¹⁹⁹, and anti-feudal reformation-

¹⁹⁴ Cherepnin L. V. *Russian feudal archives. XIV-XV centuries Part II*. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. P. 10-65; Cherepnin L. V. *Formation of the Russian centralized state in the XIV—XV centuries*. M.: Sotsekgiz, 1960. P. 355-363.

¹⁹⁵ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. *The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 4. P. 292.

¹⁹⁶ Tikhomirov M. N. *Medieval Moscow in the XIV-XV centuries*. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1957. P. 179.

¹⁹⁷ Dubrovsky A. M. *Historian and power: historical science in the USSR and the concept of the history of feudal Russia in the context of politics and ideology, (1930-1950s)*. Bryansk: Publishing House of the Bryansk State University, 2005. P. 703.

¹⁹⁸ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. *The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 4. P. 293.

¹⁹⁹ Samsonov A. M. *Anti-feudal popular uprisings in Russia and the church*. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 184 p.; Budovnit's I. U. *Monasteries in Rus' and the struggle of peasants against them in the XIV-XVI centuries. (according to the «lives» of the saints)*. M.: Nauka, 1966. 392 p.; Koretsky V. I. *The struggle of peasants*

humanist movements²⁰⁰, the activities of heretics-freethinkers of a non-possessive sense²⁰¹. A. A. Zimin and A. I. Klibanov developed this topic especially fruitfully. In his autobiographical notes, Zimin noted that as a researcher, back in the 40s, he was formed largely under the influence of Klibanov's pre-war works.²⁰² However, they also had some differences of opinion: "The author [A. A. Zimin - P. D.] believes that the representatives of the nobility were the main conductor of the humanistic ideas of this time, since the burgher elements were not yet of great importance. In contrast to A. A. Zimin, A. I. Klibanov proceeds from the fact that representatives of the townspeople were the conductors of humanistic ideas"²⁰³. A separate topic of peasant uprisings led by I. I. Bolotnikov can be added to the list.²⁰⁴, S. T. Razina²⁰⁵, E. I. Pugacheva²⁰⁶. For researchers, the peasant wars were a clear manifestation of the class struggle, and they paid special attention to the position of the church and the clergy in the suppression / support of uprisings, as well as anti-clerical sentiments.

with monasteries in Russia in the 16th - early 17th centuries. // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1958. No. 6. P. 169-215; Gorfunkel A. K. Anti-church struggle of peasants in the 17th century. based on materials from the Belozersky Monastery // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1960. No. 4. P. 248-262; Ustyugov N. V. Unrest of the peasants of the Simonov Monastery in the village. Ilyinsky, Yaroslavl district in 1682-1683 // *Russian state in the XVII century*. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 284-292; Schmidt P. O. On the history of monastic colonization in the 17th century. // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1964. No. 12. P. 297-316; Shunkov V. I. Essays on the history of the colonization of Siberia in the XVI-XVII centuries. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1946. P. 369-397; Lebedev N. A. Anti-church and anti-religious sentiments among the peasants of the Nizhny Novgorod province at the beginning of the 20th century // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1959. No. 7. P. 116-127.

²⁰⁰ Kazakova N. A., Lurie Y. P. Anti-feudal heretical movements in Rus' in the XIV - early XVI centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 544 p.; Klibanov A. I. Reform movements in Russia in the XIV - the first half of the XVI century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 411 p.

²⁰¹ Lapshin R. G. Theodosius Kosoy - the ideologist of the peasantry of the 16th century // *TODRL* 1953. No. 9. P. 235-250; Shelestov D. K. Freethinking in the teachings of F. Kosoy // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1954. No. 2. P. 194-217; Koretsky V. I. To the question of the social essence of the new doctrine of F. Kosoy // *Bulletin of the Moscow State University*. 1957. No. 2. P. 105-124; Zimin A. A. M. Bashkin - a freethinker of the 16th century. // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 230-245; Zimin A. A. The case of the «heretic» Artemy // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1958. No. 5. P. 213-232; Zimin A. A. Peresvetov and his contemporaries. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 498 p.

²⁰² Dubrovsky A. M. Historian and power: historical science in the USSR and the concept of the history of feudal Russia in the context of politics and ideology, (1930-1950s). Bryansk: Publishing House of the Bryansk State University, 2005. P. 716.

²⁰³ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 4. P. 295.

²⁰⁴ Smirnov I. I. Bolotnikov's uprising of 1606-1607. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1951. P. 287-288.

²⁰⁵ Borisov A. M. The Church and the uprising under the leadership of P. Razin // *Problems of History*. 1965. No. 8. P. 74-83.

²⁰⁶ Kadson I. Z. The Pugachev Rebellion and Schism // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1960. No. 4. P. 222-238; Kadson I. Z. The Church is an active participant in the suppression of the peasant uprising under the leadership of E. Pugachev // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 291-304.

Scientists closely examined the history of church-state relations in Russia, especially in the medieval period of the unification of the lands, where the church and the clergy were assigned various roles in the political struggle²⁰⁷. No matter how often in general works the church was not called the "support of tsarism" in the XIX - early XX centuries (or the support of princely power in the 10th century), in the context of this topic, it was contradictorily endowed with the features of an antagonist of secular power and imputed to resist the "progressive" tendencies of the centralization of the state: "Orthodox ideologists seek to elevate the role of the church in uniting the Russian lands around Moscow. Being a large feudal lord, the church often came into conflict with secular authorities and resisted the development of a centralized state. She supported secular power as long as it did not contradict her own interests, and often came into direct conflict with her. In turn, the secular authorities sought to undermine the economic basis of the independence of the church, deprive it of its privileges, subordinate it to its control"²⁰⁸. The classical axiom about the church as "an accomplice of the tsarist regime" was often described in Soviet historiography through the metaphor of the "Orthodox Inquisition"²⁰⁹. The history of church-state relations can also include a specialized research topic on the attitude of the church to the abolition of serfdom²¹⁰.

Church schism in the 17th century and the emergence of the Old Believers in Soviet science in the second half of the 20th century received little attention. Surprisingly, one finds a larger number of specialized works in the pre-war period (here we are talking about the number of works, but, of course, their quality is not compared). In the post-war period, the mention of the Old Believers is most often found in works of a generalizing

²⁰⁷ Cherepnin L. V. Formation of the Russian centralized state in the XIV-XV centuries. M.: Sotsekgiz, 1960. 899 p.; Sakharov A. M. The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State // Problems of History. 1966. No. 1. P. 49-65.

²⁰⁸ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 295.

²⁰⁹ Grekulov E. F. The Orthodox Inquisition in Russia. M.: Nauka, 1964. 168 p.

²¹⁰ Grekulov E. F. The Church and the abolition of serfdom // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 76-112; Krikunov V. P. Anti-church sentiments of peasants in post-reform Russia // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 128-142; Poyda D. P. The struggle of the peasants of the Right-Bank Ukraine against the clergy in the post-reform period // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 113-127; Limantov N. V. The cult of the reactionary Filaret in modern Orthodoxy // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 90-101.

nature, where the development of the movement is described through the struggle of peasants, artisans and merchants (townspeople) against feudal exploitation.

A particular reaction of Soviet researchers of Orthodoxy was caused by the theme of the church's struggle with science in Russia: "Orthodoxy treated science, especially materialistic science, with irreconcilable hostility. The clergy preached about the impotence of science, rebelled against the spread of materialistic ideas, against the popularization of scientific knowledge among the broad masses. The activities of revolutionary democrats, advanced scientists who fought for the victory of science along with religion, against church influence on education, were especially attacked"²¹¹. Proclaiming an atheistic worldview, which, in their opinion, is completely built on the foundation of scientific knowledge, scientists in the USSR even emotionally wrote somewhere about the religious influence on education²¹². As you can see, it was typical for Soviet historiography to attribute the work of, for example, revolutionary democrats, Petrashevists, and other "freethinkers" of the 19th century. directly to the promotion of the scientific picture of the world.

Throughout the history of Soviet science, the research problems of the revolution of 1917, the central event of Soviet historiography and the beginning of a new Soviet chronology, have retained enduring relevance. Of course, for religious scholars, the main interest was the position of the church and the clergy in relation to the revolution, the revolutionary masses, the new government, the civil war, etc.²¹³: "The majority of the

²¹¹ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 300.

²¹² Shakhnovich M. I. The Russian Church in the fight against science. L.: Lenizdat, 1939. 192 p.; Grekulov E. F. The Orthodox Church is the enemy of enlightenment. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962. 192 p.; Budilova E. A. The struggle of the church against the reflex theory of I. M. Sechenov // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 152-183; Kovalev I. F. Persecution of the teachings of Charles Darwin by tsarist censorship // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 410-421; Kharahorkin L. R. From the history of the struggle of Darwinism with religion // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1959. No. 3. P. 222-248; Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of the Church and the Clergy in the Works of I. G. Pryzhov // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 128-153; Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of religion and church by I. A. Khudyakov // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 184-213; Leikina-Svirskaya V. R. Atheism of the Petrashevites // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 214-236; Chubinsky V. V. Questions of religion in the works of M. A. Antonovich // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 137-158; Kirpotin V. Y. Criticism of religion in the works of M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 120-136.

²¹³ Platonov N. F. The Orthodox Church in the fight against the revolutionary movement (1900-1917) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 103-209; Emelyakh L. I. Atheism and anti-clericalism of the masses in 1917 // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 64-72; Emelyakh L. I. From the history of anti-clericalism and atheism of Russian peasants in 1905-1907 // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and

clergy met the October Revolution with irreconcilable hostility. Modern defenders of Orthodoxy, distorting the real history, argue that the Russian Church has always been together with the people, lived by their interests and aspirations. The clergy opposed the Decree on the separation of church and state, the measures of the Soviet government to confiscate church valuables <...> During the years of the civil war and intervention, the Orthodox Church took an active part in attempts by internal and external counter-revolution to strangle the young Soviet republic. Patriarch Tikhon, who headed the church hierarchy, conducted anti-Soviet propaganda, incited believers to active counter-revolutionary actions, helping the enemies of the new social order"²¹⁴. Often, immediately after the topic of the Orthodox Church and the revolution, a range of issues devoted to renovationism was considered: "The renovation movement of the 20-30s. inherited the traditions of Russian religious liberalism of the pre-revolutionary period and anticipated the modernization of modern Russian Orthodoxy. This is the relevance of the study of this movement"²¹⁵. On the one hand, the issues of the Renovationist schism in the Orthodox Church in the 1920s anticipate one of the most important themes in the history of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR in the second half of the 20th century - renewal of Orthodox theology in the middle of the 20th century. However, on the other hand, as you can see, the return to the problems of the renovationist split in the post-war period does not really seem relevant to Soviet authors, which is clearly demonstrated by the number of relevant studies noted in the review by P. K. Kurochkin and E. F. Grekulov²¹⁶.

The proclamation at the XXII Congress of the Central Committee of the CPSU of the onset of a period of scientific and atheistic education marked the beginning of work on the "modernization of Orthodox theology", "the evolution of modern Orthodoxy" and

Atheism. 1959. No. 3. P. 265-286; Emelyakh L. I. Anti-clerical movement of peasants during the first Russian revolution. M.; L.: Nauka, 1965. 201 p.; Garkavenko D. A. The growth of atheistic and anti-religious sentiments in the army and navy in 1917 // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1960. No. 8. P. 193-218; Osipova E. P. The Church and the Provisional Government // Problems of History. 1964. No. 6. P. 65-76.

²¹⁴ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 304-305.

²¹⁵ Ibid. P. 307-308.

²¹⁶ Only one work was noted: Sheinman M. M. Renovation movement in the Russian Orthodox Church after October // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 41-64.

"the adaptation of Orthodoxy to socialism"²¹⁷. A separate subtopic can be called the "social and moral concept of Orthodoxy" (and "clerical attempts to bring it closer to the moral concept of communism")²¹⁸. E. F. Grekulov and P. K. Kurochkin separately note the collective monograph "Modern Orthodoxy and its ideology"²¹⁹, about which they write that "the book considers the issue of Orthodoxy as a variety of Christianity, seriously analyzes the modern Orthodox interpretation of science and morality, the role and place of worship in the modern Russian church ... True, considering the relationship between old and new in the ideology and cult of modern Orthodoxy, the work underestimates scope and depth of his modernist tendencies"²²⁰. They also mention the monograph by M. P. Novikov "Orthodoxy and Modernity"²²¹, which received "high praise from the atheist public". However, according to the authors, "neither the scope nor the level of research work on modern Orthodoxy - with all its indisputable achievements - still does not satisfy the needs of the practice of scientific and atheistic education"²²².

In 1974, E. F. Grekulov publishes a bibliographic index of Soviet historical literature on the study of Orthodoxy, Old Believers and sectarianism²²³. In total, the author identifies 15 thematic groups: "V. I. Lenin on Religion and the Church", "The Attitude of the CPSU and the Soviet State to Religion and the Church", "The Orthodox Church, Its

²¹⁷ Platonov N. F. The Orthodox Church in 1917-1935. // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1961. No. 5. P. 206-271; Ladorenko V. E. On the issue of changing the political orientation of the Russian Orthodox Church (1917-1945) // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1964. No. 12. P. 106-123; Kurochkin P. K. Criticism of modern Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1963. 48 p.; Kovalev P. I. Orthodox theology and discoveries in the Dead Sea area // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 3-9; Novikov M. P. On the modernization of religious ideologies // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 1. P. 415-425; Krasnikov N. P. On the adaptability of the Orthodox clergy to modern conditions // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 107-112; Yankova Z. Y. Modern Orthodoxy and the Antisocial Essence of Its Ideology // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1963. No. 11. P. 67-94.

²¹⁸ Kurochkin P. K. Orthodoxy and humanism. M.: Publishing House of HPS and AON, 1962. 167 p.; Anisimov P. F. Moral progress and religion. M.: Thought, 1965. 183 p.; Gordienko N. S. Elements of modernism in the Orthodox dogma // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 167-197; Kharahorkin L. R. Russian Orthodoxy against science in the past and present // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 30-51; Shalaev Y. M. Modern Orthodoxy and Science. M.: Thought, 1964. 87 p.; Gordienko N. S. New trends in Orthodox exegesis // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 1. P. 150-178.

²¹⁹ Gordienko N. S., Nosovich V. I., Kharahorkin L. R. Modern Orthodoxy and its ideology. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963. 205 p.

²²⁰ Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 311.

²²¹ Novikov M. P. Orthodoxy and modernity. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1965. 253 p.

²²² Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 309-310.

²²³ Grekulov E. F. Bibliographic index of literature on the study of Orthodoxy, Old Believers and sectarianism in Soviet historical science for 1922-1972. Moscow: Knowledge, 1974. 258 p.

History", "Modern Orthodoxy, Attempts to Modernize It", "Old Believers", "Sectarianism - works of a general nature", "On freedom of conscience in the USSR", "Religious morality, its criticism. Communist morality", "The fight against religious ideology in matters of upbringing and education", "The opposite of science and religion", "The opposite of the ideology of Orthodoxy and scientific communism", "The use of monuments of church art and literature in anti-religious propaganda", "Anti-church and atheistic movement in USSR", "Activities of the most prominent atheists", "The study of religiosity in the USSR. Overcoming Religious Relics".

About the attitude of V. I. Lenin to religion and the church, E. F. Grekulov mainly indicated articles of 1967 - 1971 in Problems of Scientific Atheism, Science and Religion, and Problems of Philosophy. This fact is explained by the eve of the celebration of the centenary of the birth of the leader of the proletarian revolution, which was celebrated in 1970. In 1969, a whole volume was published in the "Problems of Scientific Atheism" completely devoted to the reception of the ideas of V. I. Lenin in relation to religion. Sources also include articles²²⁴, brochures²²⁵, monographic studies²²⁶ and collections²²⁷ famous Soviet religious scholars.

"The Attitude of the CPSU and the Soviet State to Religion and the Church" by E. F. Grekulov is noted by the works of M. M. Persitsa²²⁸, P. K. Kurochkina²²⁹ and Chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs V. A. Kuroyedov²³⁰.

²²⁴ Kryvelev I. A. V. I. Lenin and some topical issues of atheistic propaganda // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1960. No. 8. P. 3-28; Shakhnovich M. I. Lenin on the Orthodox Church // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 52-102.

²²⁵ Emelyakh L. I. Criticism of Orthodoxy by V. I. Lenin. Leningrad: Knowledge, 1971. 31 p.; Tsameryan I. P. V. I. Lenin on religion. Moscow: Knowledge, 1959. 32 p.; Shakhnovich M. I. Lenin's atheistic heritage in the crooked mirror of the revisionists. Moscow: Knowledge, 1971. 40 p.

²²⁶ Kryvelev I. A. Lenin on religion. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 239 p.; Shakhnovich M. I. Lenin and the problems of atheism. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. 671 p.

²²⁷ V. I. Lenin on atheism, religion and the church / Sat. articles ed. Y. P. Frantseva. Compiled by: M. M. Persits et al. M.: Thought, 1969. 318 p.

²²⁸ Persits M. M. The Great October Socialist Revolution and the Separation of the Church from the State // Problems of History. 1954. No. 11. P. 11-22. Persits M. M. The separation of the church from the state and the school from the church in the USSR (1917-1919). M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 198 p.

²²⁹ Valentinov A. A., Kurochkin P. K., Tsameryan I. P. Building communism and overcoming religious remnants. M.: Nauka, 1966. 254 p.

²³⁰ Kuroyedov V. A. Religion and law. Moscow: Knowledge, 1970. 61 p.

The direct theme of the history of the study of Orthodoxy in the index is divided into two parts: the history of Orthodoxy and the current state (at the time of 1974). From the historical subtopic stand out multiple references to articles in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate and popular short notes from Science and Religion. In the historical part, E. F. Grekulov attributed the theme of renovationism²³¹, incl. the pamphlets of the Renovationist Metropolitan A. I. Vvedensky and the main work of A. A. Shishkin, which was published in 1970 and could not be reflected in the previous historiographic review of 1967, are indicated. The author included issues of the baptism of Rus' in the historical theme²³²; church / monastic land ownership and the people's struggle against it²³³; social thought, freethinking and heretical movements²³⁴; the political role of the church in the

²³¹ Sheinman M. M. Renewal movement in the Russian Orthodox Church after October // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 41-64; Gordienko N. S., Kurochkin P. K. Liberal Renovation Movement in Russian Orthodoxy at the Beginning of the 20th Century // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1969. No. 7. P. 313-340; Shishkin A. A. Essence and critical assessment of the «renovationist» schism of the Russian Orthodox Church. Kazan: Publishing House of Kazan University, 1970. 367 p.; Trifonov I. Y. Rampant in the Russian Orthodox Church (1922-1925) // Problems of History. 1972. No. 5. P. 64-87.

²³² Bakhrushin S. V. On the issue of the baptism of Kievan Rus // Historian-Marxist. 1937. No. 2. P. 40-77; Grekov B. D. Kievan Rus. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1953. 568 p.; Budovnit I. U. On the issue of the baptism of Rus' // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 402-434.

²³³ Borisov A. M. The economy of the Solovetsky monastery and the struggle of peasants with the northern monasteries in the XVI-XVII centuries. Petrozavodsk: Karel book publishing house, 1966. 284 p.; Budovnit I. U. Monasteries in Rus' and the fight against them by peasants in the XIV-XVI centuries (According to the «Lives of the Saints»). M.: Nauka, 1966. 392 p.; Budovnit I. U. The first Russian non-possessors // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 264-284; Veselovsky P. B. Feudal land tenure in northeastern Rus'. T. 1. Part 1: Private land ownership; Part 2: Land tenure of the metropolitan house. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. 496 p.; Gontaev N. M. Church and feudalism in Rus'. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 167 p.; Gorfunkel A. K. The patrimonial economy and the peasants of the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery. L., 1956. 16 p.; Kadson I. Z. Anti-church struggle of the masses in Russia in the works of Soviet historians // Problems of History. 1969. No. 3. P. 151-157; Kadson I. Z. The Church is an active participant in the suppression of the peasant uprising under the leadership of E. Pugachev // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 291-304; Kazakova N. A. The struggle against monastic land ownership in Rus' at the end of the XIV - early 15th century // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1958. No. 2. P. 151-171; Kazakova N. A. The question of the reasons for the condemnation of Maxim the Greek // Byzantine Times. 1968. No. 28. P. 109-126; Kazakova N.A., Lurie Y.S. Anti-feudal heretical movements in Rus' in the XIV - early XVI centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 544 p.; Koretsky V. I. Peasants' struggle with monasteries in Russia in the 16th - early 17th centuries // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 6. P. 169-215; Koretsky V. I. Famine in 1601-1603 in Russia and the Church // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 218-256; Ryndzyunsky P. N. Anti-church movement in the Tambov region in the 60s. 18th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 154-193; Samsonov A. M. Anti-feudal popular uprisings in Russia and the church. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 184 p.; Tikhomirov M. N. Class struggle in Russia in the 17th century. M.: Nauka, 1961. 445 p.

²³⁴ Budovnit I. U. Russian journalism of the 16th century. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. 308 p.; Zimin A. A. Bashkin M. - a freethinker of the 16th century. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 230-245; Zimin A. A. The case of the «heretic» Artemy // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 213-232; Zimin A. A. I. P. Peresvetov and his contemporaries: Essays on the history of Russian society.-polit. thoughts of the mid-sixteenth century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 498 p.; Klibanov A. I. Reformation movements in the XIV - half of the XV centuries. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 411 p.; Lurie Y. P. Ideological struggle in Russian journalism of the late 15th - early 16th centuries. L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 532 p.

period of centralization of the medieval Russian state²³⁵; connections of the church with the general level of cultural development in antiquity and the Middle Ages²³⁶; oprichnina²³⁷; religious philosophy²³⁸; revolutionary upheavals at the beginning of the 20th century²³⁹; patriotic position of the church during the Great Patriotic War²⁴⁰ and others. The problems of worship and dogma are also mentioned.²⁴¹, modern Orthodoxy²⁴². Encyclopedia articles highlighted²⁴³ and general work²⁴⁴. Separately, E. F. Grekulov indicated the works of his own authorship²⁴⁵.

²³⁵ Lurie Y. P. The struggle of the church with the high society power in the late 70s - the first half of the 80s of the XV century. // TODRL. 1958. No. 4. P. 209-218; Budovnits I. U. Russian clergy in the first century of the Mongol yoke // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 284-302; Sakharov A. M. The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State // Problems of History. 1966. No. 1. P. 49-65; Cherepnin L.V. Formation of the Russian centralized state in the XIV-XV centuries. M.: Sotsgiz, 1960. 899 p.; Shchapov Y. N. Old Russian state and its international significance. M.: Nauka, 1965. 476 p.; Shchapov Y. N. The Church and the Formation of Old Russian State // Problems of History. 1969. No. 11. P. 55-84; Shchapov Y. N. Princely statutes and churches in Ancient Rus' XI-XIV centuries. M.: Nauka, 1972. 338 p.

²³⁶ Voronin N. N., Kuzmin A. G. Spiritual culture of ancient Rus' // Problems of History. 1972. No. 9. P. 113-120; Likhachev D. S. Man in the literature of Ancient Rus'. M.: Nauka, 1970. 180 p.; Moleva N. M. Music and religion in Russia in the 17th century // Problems of History. 1971. No. 11. P. 143-154; Tikhomirov M. N. Russian culture of the X-XVIII centuries. M.: Nauka, 1968. 447 p.; Tikhomirov M. N. Medieval Moscow in the XIV-XV centuries. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1957. P. 238-272.

²³⁷ Zimin A. A. Metropolitan Philip and Oprichnina // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1963. No. 11. P. 269-292.

²³⁸ Galaktionov A. A., Nikandrov P. F. Russian Philosophy. L.: Nauka, 1970. 651 p.; Grigoryan M. M. On the characterization of the religious and philosophical concept of Slavophilism // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1970. No. 10. P. 130-148; Semenkin N. P. Apology of Christianity in Russian religious philosophy (Towards a critique of the ideas of Vl. Solovyov and his followers) // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1969. No. 7. P. 38-62; Sinyutina K. P. Criticism of Christian sociology of P. N. Bulgakov // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1972. No. 13. P. 94-118; Yanov A. L. Slavophiles and Konstantin Leontiev // Problems of Philosophy. 1969. No. 8. P. 97-106.

²³⁹ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Gapon and Gaponism // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 15-47; Osipova E. P. Local Cathedral of the Orthodox Church in 1917-1918 // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 3. P. 204-226; Osipova E. P. The Church and the Provisional Government // Problems of History. 1964. No. 6. P. 65-76; Petrenko M. Z., Shidenko V. A. Kiev-Pechersk Lavra in the fight against the revolution // Problems of History. 1956. No. 3. P. 132-136; Plaksin R. Y. The collapse of the church counter-revolution of 1917-1923. M.: Nauka, 1968. 192 p.; Plaksin R. Y. Church counter-revolution in the days of October // Problems of History. 1964. No. 11. P. 45-53; Platonov N. F. The Orthodox Church in the fight against the revolutionary movement (1900-1917) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 103-209.

²⁴⁰ Russian Orthodox Church and the Great Patriotic War. Collection of church documents. M.: Moscow Patriarchy, 1943. 100 p.; Suglov G. A. The Union of the Cross and the Sword. (Church and war). M.: Military Publishing House, 1969. 145 p.

²⁴¹ Belov A. V. The Truth About Orthodox «Saints» M.: Nauka, 1968. 168 p.; Belov A. V. Christmas. M.: Politizdat, 1965. 80 p.; Voropaeva K. L. About Easter. M.: Gospolizdat, 1959. 47 p.; Emelyakh L. I. The origin of religious rites. L.: Lenizdat, 1959. 78 p.

²⁴² Limantova N. Y. The cult of the reactionary Filaret in modern Orthodoxy // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 90-101.

²⁴³ Averintsev P. S., Kurochkin P. K. Orthodoxy // Philosophical Encyclopedia. T. 4. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1967. P. 333-336; Koretsky V. I., Buganov V. I. Orthodox Church // Soviet Historical Encyclopedia. T. 2. M.: Soviet encyclopedia, 1968. P. 504-510; Kazhdan A. P. Orthodox Church // Soviet Historical Encyclopedia. T. 2. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1968. P. 502-504.

²⁴⁴ Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917). M.: Nauka, 1967. 336 p.

²⁴⁵ Grekulov E. F. The Orthodox Church is the enemy of enlightenment, M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962. 192 p.; Grekulov E. F. The Church and the abolition of serfdom // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 76-112.; Grekulov E. F. Church, autocracy, people (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th centuries). M.: Nauka, 1969. 184 p.; Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet Literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 287-325.

The sub-topic of modern Orthodoxy mostly included materials on "attempts to modernize it", incl. aspects of the social and moral teaching of the church and its comparison with communist morality²⁴⁶. This thematic block of the author is represented mainly by articles, brochures and books by N. S. Gordienko, P. K. Kurochkin and N. P. Krasnikov.

Separately highlighted themes of the Old Believers²⁴⁷ and sectarianism, and the last topic, after works of a general nature, has the following subparagraphs for various trends: Adventists, Evangelical Baptists, Doukhobors, Jehovahists, True Orthodox Christians, Mennonites, Molokans, Pentecostals, eunuchs, Tolstoyans, teetotalers, etc.

²⁴⁶ Gordienko N. S. The ideology of modern Orthodoxy (a critical analysis of modernist tendencies in modern Orthodoxy). Abstract dis. for the competition scientist degree cand. philosopher. Sciences. Minsk, 1969. 38 p.; Gordienko N. S. Criticism of the philosophical argumentation of modern Orthodoxy // *Problems of Philosophy*. 1962. No. 10. P. 48-56; Gordienko N. S. New trends in Orthodox exegesis // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 1. P. 150-178; Gordienko N. S. Modern Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1968. 143 p.; Gordienko N. S. Modern ecumenism. Movement for the Unity of Christian Churches. M.: Nauka, 1972. 200 p.; Gordienko N. S. Elements of modernism in the Orthodox dogma // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 2. P. 167-197; Gordienko N. S., Kurochkin P. K. The liberal-renovation movement in Russian Orthodoxy at the beginning of the 20th century. // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1969. No. 7. P. 313-340; Gordienko N. S., Nosovich V. I., Kharahorkin L. P. Modern Orthodoxy and its ideology. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963. 205 p.; Kovalev P. I. Orthodox theology and discoveries in the Dead Sea region (On the modernization of the Orthodox Church) // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1960. No. 4. P. 3-9; Krasnikov N. P. In pursuit of the century (Reflection of social processes in theological works and preaching activities of Orthodox clergy). M.: Politizdat, 1968. 160 p.; Krasnikov N. P. On the adaptability of the Orthodox clergy to modern conditions // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1963. No. 7. P. 107-113; Krasnikov N. P. The evolution of the social concept of Orthodoxy // *Problems of History*. 1970. No. 9. P. 16-33; Kryvelev I. A. The latest methods of religious apologetics. Moscow: Knowledge, 1971. 63 p.; Kurochkin P. K. To the assessment of the process of modernization of religion in modern conditions // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 2. P. 5-40; Kurochkin P. K. Criticism of modern Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1963. 48 p.; Kurochkin P. K. The social position of Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1969. 45 p.; Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. Abstract dis. for the academic step. Dr. Phil. Sciences. M., 1970. 44 p.; Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1971. 270 p.; Novikov M. P. On the modernization of religious ideology. (Illumination of modern Orthodoxy in atheistic literature) // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 1. P. 415-425; Novikov M. P. Orthodoxy and modernity. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1965. 253 p.; Nosovich V. I. The role of the cult in the Orthodox Church // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 74-89; Chertikhin V. E. The ideology of modern Orthodoxy M.: Nauka, 1965. 136 p.

²⁴⁷ Bakhtinsky V. S., Moldavsky D. M. Old Believer folk legends about the beginning of the split, about tobacco and barbering // *TODRL*. 1958. No. 14. P. 421-422; Grekulov E. F. Orthodox Inquisition in Russia. M.: Nauka, 1964. 168 p.; Kadson I. Z. The Pugachev Rebellion and the Schism // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1960. No. 4. P. 222-238; Kogan D. M. On overcoming religious survivals among the Old Believers // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1964. No. 12. P. 37-43; Milovidov V. F. Old Believers in the past and present. M.: Thought, 1969. 112 p.; Milovidov V. F. Old Believers and social progress // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 2. P. 198-224; Muller R. B. From the history of the split in the north of Russia (Self-immolation in Paleostrov) // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1958. No. 2. P. 172-182; Rumyantseva V. P. Ognepalny Avvakum // *Problems of History*. 1972. No. 11. P. 111-125; Ryndzyunsky P. G. Old Believer organization in the conditions of development of industrial capitalism // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1950. No. 1. P. 188-248; Sarafanova N. S. The idea of human equality in the writings of Archpriest Avvakum // *TODRL*. 1958. No. 14. P. 385-390.

The theme of freedom of conscience in the USSR²⁴⁸ similar to the previous topic "the attitude of the CPSU and the Soviet state to religion and the church". A number of the following topics, most of which became relevant after 1961, were already partially reflected in the lists of works devoted to the general history of Orthodoxy and its current state: "religious morality, its criticism and communist morality"²⁴⁹, "the fight against religious ideology in matters of upbringing and education"²⁵⁰, "the opposite of science and religion"²⁵¹, "the opposite of the ideology of Orthodoxy and scientific communism"²⁵².

The last three topics of the index: "the anti-church and atheist movement in the USSR", "the activities of the most prominent atheists", "the study of religiosity in the USSR and overcoming religious survivals" are "classic" for Soviet researchers of religion. It can be noted that a number of works on the history of anti-church and atheistic sentiments and movements are largely identical in subject matter to other works that were

²⁴⁸ Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Freedom of conscience in the USSR // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1954. No. 2. P. 11-28.

²⁴⁹ Andreev G. L., Ladorenko V. E., Polyakova L. P. Social and moral principles of communism in the interpretation of modern Christian theologians // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1966. No. 2. P. 110-140; Gordienko N. S. Biblical morality in the service of the ideologists of Orthodoxy // *Problems of Philosophy*. 1963. No. 10. P. 80-90; Gordienko N. S. The moral code of the builders of communism against Christian morality // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1963. No. 7. P. 8-24; Gordienko N. S. Orthodox clergy about morality // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1962. No. 6. P. 102-120; Pritykin Y. M. Modern Orthodox «moralists» and historical reality (From the history of the struggle of the Orthodox Church against socialism and atheism) // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1963. No. 8. P. 155-168; Sytenko L. T. On the moral image of the modern believer // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 3. P. 113-130.

²⁵⁰ Persits M. M. The separation of the church from the state and the school from the church in the USSR. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 198 p.; Ryndzyunsky P. G. The struggle to overcome religious influences in the Soviet school (1917-1919) // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 3. P. 47-86.

²⁵¹ Boyarintsev V. I. New attempts to adapt religion to modern natural science // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 2. P. 141-164; Ivanov I. G. Atheistic significance of the works of Soviet naturalists // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 4. P. 205-242; Kryvelev I. A. Religious picture of the world and its theological modernization. M.: Nauka, 1968. 292 p.; Kharahorkin L. V. From the history of the struggle between Darwinism and religion // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1959. No. 3. P. 222-248; Kharahorkin L. V. On the attitude of modern Orthodoxy to science // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 60-78; Kharahorkin L. V. Russian Orthodoxy against science in the past and present // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1960. No. 4. P. 30-51; Kharahorkin L. V. Modern Orthodoxy and Science // *Problems of Philosophy*. 1969. No. 11. P. 117-123; Shakhnovich M. I. Mysticism before the court of science. Moscow: Knowledge, 1970. 62 p.; Shakhnovich M. I. Soviet science against religion. L.: Lenizdat, 1958. 87 p.; Shakhnovich M. I. Modern mysticism in the light of science. M.; L.: Nauka, 1965. 207 p.

²⁵² Mitrokhin L. N. On the «dialogue» of Marxists and Christians // *Problems of Philosophy*. 1971. No. 7. P. 48-58; Okulov A. F. Social progress and religion // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 4. P. 445-453; Tsameryan I. P. Communism and religion. M.: Nauka, 1967. 200 p.

found in the block on the general history of Orthodoxy, but have now been separated by the author into an independent group²⁵³.

In 1986, employees of the State Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism L. I. Emelyakh²⁵⁴ and Y. Y. Kozhurin, on the eve of the millennium anniversary of the adoption of Christianity in Rus', wrote a work on the representation of this event in Soviet historical science. As part of their historiographic review, the authors identified the following topics: "Fictions about the Catholic "baptism of Rus'", "Was the Apostle Andrew in Russia? ", "How did Christianity appear in Russia", "Orthodox paganism", "The class essence of the Christianization of Rus'", "Old Russian culture and Christianity", "Old Russian freethinking".

²⁵³ Borisov A. M. The Church and the uprising under the leadership of P. Razin // *Problems of History*. 1965. No. 8. P. 74-83; Garkavenko D. A. The growth of atheistic and anti-religious sentiments in the army and navy in 1917 // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1960. No. 8. P. 192-218; Emelyakh L. I. Anti-clerical movement of peasants during the first Russian revolution. M.; L.: Nauka, 1965. 201 p.; Emelyakh L. I. Atheism and anti-clericalism of the masses in 1917 // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1958. No. 5. P. 64-72; Emelyakh L. I. From the history of anti-clericalism and atheism of Russian peasants in 1905-1907 // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1959. No. 3. P. 265-286; Emelyakh L. I. Secret reports of the Orthodox Church on anti-clericalism and atheism of the peasants during the first Russian revolution // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 320-338; Itenberg B. S. Revolutionary populists and questions of religion // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1963. No. 11. P. 293-305; Kirpotin V. Y. Criticism of religion in the works of M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 120-136; Klibanov A. I. «Independent heresy». (From the history of Russian free-thinking at the end of the 15th - half of the 16th centuries) // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 203-229; Klibanov A. I. Freethinking in Tver in the 15th-16th centuries // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1958. No. 6. P. 231-260; Klibanov A. I. To the study of the genesis of heretical movements in Russia // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1959. No. 7. P. 186-217; Kovalev I. F. On the struggle of the church with L. N. Tolstoy // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1960. No. 8. P. 348-376; Kogan Y. Y. From the history of the distribution of anti-Christian pamphlets in Russia in the 18th century // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1955. No. 3. P. 253-277; Kogan Y. Y. The persecution of Russian freethinkers in the 2nd half of the 18th century // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 182-202; Kozachkova D. A. The origin and development of anti-church ideology in other Rus' // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1958. No. 5. P. 283-314; Krikunov V. P. Anti-church sentiments of peasants in post-reform Russia // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1962. No. 10. P. 128-142; Lapshin R. G. Theodosius Kosoy - the ideologist of the peasantry // *TODRL*. 1953. No. 9. P. 235-250; Lebedev N. A. Anti-church and anti-religious sentiments among the peasants of the Nizhny Novgorod province at the beginning of the 20th century // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1959. No. 7. P. 116-127; Persits M. M. Atheism of the Russian worker. M.: Nauka, 1965. 257 p.; Persits M. M. The Great October Socialist Revolution and the creation of conditions for the spread of atheism among the masses // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1967. No. 4. P. 15-37; Persits M. M. From the history of popular free thought in Russia // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1950. No. 1. P. 137-154; Persits M. M. Russian atheistic collections of the late 18th - early 19th centuries // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1969. No. 7. P. 361-409; Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of religion and church by I. A. Khudyakov // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1955. No. 3. P. 104-123; Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of the Church and the Clergy in the Works of I. G. Pryzhkov // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1954. No. 2. P. 128-153; Cherepnin L. V. From the history of heretical movements in Rus' in the XIV-XV centuries // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1959. No. 7. P. 257-283; Chubinsky V. V. Questions of religion in the works of M. A. Antonovich // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 137-158; Shakhnovich M. I. Criticism of the legend of the Russian God-bearing people // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 257-290; Shelestov D. K. Freethinking in the teachings of F. Kosoy // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1959. No. 11. P. 194-217.

²⁵⁴ See also: Emelyakh L.I. Origin of religious rituals. L.: Lenizdat, 1959. 78 p.; Emelyakh L.I. Origin of the Christian cult. L.: Lenizdat, 1971. 200 pp.; Emelyakh L.I. Origin of Christian sacraments. M.: Sov. Russia, 1978. 125 p.

The work is both a historiographic study and a direct source, which, given the time of publication, represents the final point in the development of the theory and the conclusions reached by Soviet religious studies on the history of the baptism of Rus'. The latter circumstance will be considered further in the corresponding section.

The authors note that in connection with the approaching anniversary, the "clerical propaganda" of the divine providence of this event is intensifying. Thus, the dissemination of the conclusions of Soviet historical science about the true causes, essence and consequences of the Christianization of Ancient Rus' is relevant²⁵⁵. N. S. Gordienko and his book "The Baptism of Rus'": facts against legends and myths are called one of the fighters against the church interpretation of the event and "providentialist fabrications"²⁵⁶, where the author "exposes the political speculations of the reactionary emigrant church circles around the issue of the "baptism of Rus'", which are trying to use their fabrications in the field of national history for anti-Soviet purposes"²⁵⁷.

In the work of L. I. Emelyakh and Y. Y. Kozhurin, the anti-Soviet propaganda of the Vatican about the "Western roots of the baptism of Rus'" is also mentioned. Exposing this "propaganda" in this context sounds like an apology for the independence of Eastern Orthodoxy: "scientific criticism of the inconsistency of these claims of the Vatican, which portrays itself as a distributor of Eastern Christianity, is very relevant"²⁵⁸. It's hard to imagine that in the 50's and 60's XX century, but for the "perestroika" USSR it was an unconscious reality that Soviet historians, speaking primarily with criticism of the Vatican anti-communism, moving on to the question of the origins of the Christianization of Russia, will indirectly, consciously or not, but defend Orthodoxy and its role in the development of the Russian state throughout all previous centuries. The authors highlight B. Y. Ramm and his book "The Papacy and Rus' in the X-XV centuries"²⁵⁹, as "revealing the fictions of Catholic authors". Answering the question of where Orthodoxy came to

²⁵⁵ Emelyakh L. I., Kozhurin Y. Y. Soviet historical science about the baptism of Rus'. L.: Knowledge, 1986. P. 5.

²⁵⁶ Gordienko N. S. «Baptism of Rus'»: facts against legends and myths: Polem. notes. L.: Lenizdat, 1984. 287 p.

²⁵⁷ Emelyakh L. I., Kozhurin Y. Y. Soviet historical science about the baptism of Rus'. L.: Knowledge, 1986. P. 5.

²⁵⁸ Ibid. P. 6.

²⁵⁹ Ramm B. Y. Papacy and Rus' in the X-XV centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. 283 p.

Rus' from, L. I. Emelyakh and Y. Y. Kozhurin rely on a number of previous researchers: "A. A. Shakhmatov, M. D. Priselkov, A. E. Presnyakov, V. V. Mavrodin, A. G. Kuzmin and other Soviet scientists suggest that the origins of the Christianization of Rus' go back to Bulgaria, which, 100 years before the baptism of Kievan Rus, adopted Christianity. Greek missionaries, who fought in Bulgaria and in the Czech Republic against Catholic influence, contributed to the development of the Slavic alphabet and the translation of Christian cult books into the Slavic language <...> Church literature from Bulgaria began to penetrate into Kievan Rus even before its baptism. The literary church language of Ancient Rus' became the language of Old Bulgarian, or Old Church Slavonic"²⁶⁰.

L. I. Emelyakh and Y. Y. Kozhurin in their research relied, among other things, on the works of pre-revolutionary authors, in particular on the works of V. O. Klyuchevsky and E. E. Golubinsky. For example, the works of E. E. Golubinsky were used to confirm the thesis that the story of the "walk" of the Apostle Andrew in Rus' was fiction²⁶¹.

On the issue of the emergence of Christianity in Rus', the authors are in line with the classical theory of B. D. Grekov. The baptism of Rus' was a logical and natural part of the general process of the feudalization of the state, where the church was supposed to help strengthen the grand ducal power and develop class relations. The process of Christianization was not instantaneous and not massive, but progressive, of course, met with resistance. The new faith achieved success only when feudalism was strengthened, to which it directly contributed. The authors note that such barbaric aspects of paganism as human sacrifice hindered the establishment of feudalism: here one of the aspects of the progressiveness of the adoption of Christianity manifested itself - Orthodoxy removed such remnants. "Kievan Rus" is listed as textbook works²⁶² B. D. Grekov, articles of the same name "On the question of the baptism of Rus'" by S. V. Bakhrushin²⁶³ and I. U. Budovnitza²⁶⁴, as well as studies by M. V. Levchenko, V. T. Pashuto, A. N. Sakharov.

²⁶⁰ Emelyakh L. I., Kozhurin Y. Y. Soviet historical science about the baptism of Rus'. L.: Knowledge, 1986. P. 13.

²⁶¹ Ibid. P. 9.

²⁶² Grekov B. D. Kievan Rus. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1953. 568 p.

²⁶³ Bakhrushin S. V. On the issue of the baptism of Kievan Rus // Historian-Marxist. 1937. No. 2. P. 40-77.

²⁶⁴ Budovnitza I. U. On the issue of the baptism of Rus' // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 402-434.

As already mentioned, the process of Christianization dragged on in time and often had a violent character: "Academician M. N. Tikhomirov studied the uprisings of the population in the 11th century, which took place from Kiev to Novgorod and Beloozero, from the Volga to the West Slavic lands. He proved that the people met with hostility the new faith and its ministers. Christianity was forcibly imposed, and its spread dragged on for several centuries"²⁶⁵. L. I. Emelyakh and Y. Y. Kozhurin agree with the point of view of V. O. Klyuchevsky on the problem of the emergence and existence of the original "Orthodox paganism", or dual faith, even despite the development of feudal relations: "The outstanding Russian historian V. O. Klyuchevsky was right in arguing that the adoption of Christianity was not a way out of the darkness of idolatry into the light, for the old gods were not abolished as fictions of superstition, they continued to believe in their existence only by subordinating the old gods, who were now considered demons, to the new god <...> Klyuchevsky wrote, that Orthodox people, having built Christian churches, continued to live in the former pagan hut and according to the pagan covenant, only hanging icons on the walls ... Feudalism itself gave rise to the need to preserve pagan polytheism, various types of fetishism and magic in the form of the cult of saints, icons and prayers"²⁶⁶. Only after mentioning Klyuchevsky, the authors of the review turn to Soviet historians and ethnographers, who at the beginning of the 20th century. collected materials on "Orthodox paganism": D. K. Zelenin, N. M. Matorin, S. A. Tokarev, E. I. Chicherin, N. S. Derzhavin.

Thus, two aspects of Soviet historiographic research can be distinguished. The first is that specialized historiographic works on the history of the study of Orthodoxy in the USSR were extremely insufficient. Especially in comparison with the generalized indexes of atheistic literature, which, due to the scope of the material, have little relation to this particular problem. The second aspect is expressed in a limited range of questions on the history of the study of Orthodoxy, which were of interest to Soviet historians and religious scholars. These problems can be combined into specific thematic blocks: the influence of Orthodoxy on ancient Russian culture and writing, the problems of the Christianization

²⁶⁵ Emelyakh L. I., Kozhurin Y. Y. Soviet historical science about the baptism of Rus'. L.: Knowledge, 1986. P. 19.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

of Rus' in a historical retrospective, issues of feudalism and monastic land ownership, popular uprisings and the struggle against church land ownership, anti-feudal religious movements.

2.3. Research problems of the history of Orthodoxy

Before revealing the content of the main topics that interested Soviet historians and religious scholars in the history of Orthodoxy, several general works on the history of Russian culture and socio-political structure should be identified. Such generalizing works touch upon a complex of narrowly focused subjects, which will be singled out in the future as independent thematic blocks.

It would be logical to start with one of the very first works of the period considered in this study. During the Great Patriotic War, the director of the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the most authoritative Soviet historian B. D. Grekov, published a small work of a predominantly popular science nature, "The Culture of Kievan Rus". Written during the period of natural science, and not scientific-atheistic propaganda, B. D. Grekov's book noticeably stands out, in comparison with subsequent studies, by the absence of atheistic rhetoric.

B. D. Grekov argues, based on the discoveries of B. A. Rybakov, about the developed craft, trade, military points among the Slavs. All this allows the historian to talk about the cultural viability of Rus' in the pre-Rurik era. The theme of a developed and high culture already by the 10th century. leads to a critique of the Norman theory (and A. L. Schlozer as its representative). Already in the VI-VIII centuries. The Middle Dnieper had a high level of relations with the East: Byzantium and Iran. B. D. Grekov, being influenced by the studies of not only B. A. Rybakov, but also A. S. Lappo-Danilevsky, speaks of the genealogical connection of the tribes of the Slavs (Antes) with the Scythians and of cultural and trade relations with the Hellenes, Romans, Arabs and Byzantine Greeks.

B. D. Grekov speaks very positively about the far-sighted, from his point of view, religious policy of Prince Vladimir, which first consisted in creating a pantheon of Slavic gods, which included the deities of various tribes with the aim of uniting them, and then in adopting Christianity: "When Vladimir Svyatoslavovich made an attempt to use religion to strengthen the unity of his state, he did it widely and deliberately..."²⁶⁷ and "when Christianity was declared the state obligatory religion, Russian and non-Russian people continued to recognize for a long time all those gods that Vladimir approved in Kiev on a hill and took care of their approval in other places of his vast state"²⁶⁸. The religiosity of the Slavs, according to B. D. Grekov, changed over time: initially, the people worshiped ghouls and coasts, then the figures of the Family and the Woman in Childbirth appear, finally leading to the cult of Perun, which later transforms into a whole pantheon of pagan deities under the influence of the need for unification country, which is assessed by the author as a competent political step. With different religions, incl. Orthodoxy, the Slavs were familiar precisely thanks to close contacts with other peoples. The adoption of Christianity, as the author believes, was natural and was prepared by the entire previous cultural history. And here it is important to note that B. D. Grekov does not use the thesis of the feudal formation of society as one of the interrelated reasons for the adoption of Christianity.

But the main point still lies in the progressive significance of the Christianization of Rus': "There is no doubt, however, that the official adoption of Christianity, as it was calculated, brought Rus' into even closer communication with the peoples of Europe. This communication, like the Christian teaching itself, undoubtedly introduced a lot of new things into the Russian social environment, made us think about a number of new problems, gave rise to many new requests and was a turning point in the history of Russian culture. All this is absolutely true. We must not forget only that the Christian doctrine itself and the accompanying demands for the restructuring of certain aspects of life were not a simple transplantation of someone else's onto new soil, but were perceived as an urgent need for Russian society, capable of independently understanding what exactly he

²⁶⁷ Grekov B. D. Culture of Kievan Rus. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1944. P. 25.

²⁶⁸ Ibid. P. 26.

needs at this moment for the further growth of his own culture. It would be a great naivety to believe that the Greek clergy taught the Russian people to think and build their own culture"²⁶⁹. At the same time, Christianization among the people proceeded slowly, which resulted in the formation of a specific, syncretic religion - the original Russian Orthodoxy with its saints and holidays.

As a result, the work of B. D. Grekov is an organic product of his era, preaching patriotism and respect for the historical and cultural past of his homeland. A special and respectful place is given to "The Tale of Bygone Years" as an important and reliable, according to the author, historical source. When evaluating rhetoric, it should be noted that the Soviet classic and recognized leader of historical science uses frequent references to pre-revolutionary historians, such as E. E. Golubinsky and V. O. Klyuchevsky.

Together with the "Culture of Kievan Rus", one can briefly consider another small book by B. D. Grekov "The Struggle of Russia for the Creation of its State", the first edition of which was published in 1942, and the second in 1945. This work is also devoid of atheistic propaganda narratives and imbued with the spirit of patriotism: "Today it is useful to recall how our distant ancestors fought for their political existence among other peoples of Europe, how they laid the foundation of the very state that our grandfathers and fathers bequeathed to us to defend and which with such brilliance in Our times have endured great trials"²⁷⁰.

However, the study is essentially different in that it contains theoretical provisions on socio-economic formations. The ancient slave-owning civilization is a "decrepit and doomed world", but there is another one - "growing, full of hope for the future, able to breathe new life into the old dying society"²⁷¹. The "barbarian" world did not know slavery, and from the communal-clan system stepped immediately into the feudal formation through the intermediate pre-feudal system (the transitional period of "military democracy"). For Rome, the barbarians are Germanic tribes, and for Byzantium, they are

²⁶⁹ Ibid. P. 42-43.

²⁷⁰ Grekov B. D. The struggle of Rus' for the creation of its state. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1945. P. 3.

²⁷¹ Ibid. P. 12.

Slavs. So, the Slavs (Antes) left the primitive communal-clan structure already in the 6th century.

It seems that the "Struggle of Rus' for the creation of its own state" and "Culture of Kievan Rus" should be considered as a whole. The author uses the same sources, for example, the information of the Byzantine historian Procopius of Caesarea, "The Tale of Bygone Years", complimentary references, for example, to V. O. Klyuchevsky. The narrative of both works is built around the recognition of the high cultural and political development of the Slavs already in the 6th-8th centuries, i.e. even before the calling of the Varangians or, for example, before the baptism of Rus'. The feudal concept, which unfolds on the pages of the "Struggle of Rus' for the creation of its own state", can be organically compared with the passages about the regularity and progressiveness of the adoption of Christianity, which are described in the "Culture of Kievan Rus"; Thus, the textological interweaving of plots shows the reader the textbook theory of B. D. Grekov.

It can be noted that works of the war period are characterized by patriotic rhetoric. As already noted, in the pre-war years the state used the ideology of patriotism to mobilize and consolidate society around the ruling party. The trend naturally continued during the Great Patriotic War and in the first years after. Thus, there was a request to glorify the country's historical past.

As an example of post-war works, one can use the article by M. N. Tikhomirov, a prominent specialist in source studies, "Moscow and the cultural development of the Russian people in the 14th–17th centuries" published in the ninth issue of the journal *Problems of History* in 1947. M. N. Tikhomirov writes about Moscow, the center of Russian culture since the 14th century, "which absorbed all the best that the Russian creative genius gave rise to"²⁷². For the author, signs and signs of the cultural development of the city is the presence of a large number of churches and monasteries - "the usual cultural centers of the Russian Middle Ages". M. N. Tikhomirov, like B. D. Grekov, sees

²⁷² Tikhomirova M. N. Moscow and the cultural development of the Russian people in the XIV-XVII centuries // *Problems of History*. 1947. No. 9. P. 9.

in the final consolidation of Orthodoxy the spread of "Byzantine" education and enlightenment, the centers of which were monasteries with their rich libraries²⁷³.

Also in 1947, B. A. Romanov's landmark work "People and Customs of Ancient Rus'" was published, which is the first attempt at an anthropological study of the ancient Russian culture of everyday life. The religious component was an integral part of the life and environment of the inhabitants of ancient Rus'. It is noteworthy that the author uses chronicle sources not as a "newspaper chronicle" that fixes facts, but as a literary work of a particular era. Those. for B. A. Romanov, only a "silhouette display" of a historical fact is manifested through the chronicle text, respectively, which should be treated with caution. Romanov's source study is focused on the "Word of Daniil the Sharpener". Historical context - the life of the feudal society of the XII-XIII centuries. In the chapter "Spiritual Fathers", B. A. Romanov draws "the physiognomies of the brethren who sat down at a common meal", i.e. personal and social portraits of monasticism, as well as white clergy. Using the method of microhistorical analysis, the author chose a number of characters and, using the example of their stories and written sources, demonstrated everyday sketches of everyday life: monastic discipline, rules and routine, vices and temptations for the clergy, etc. It is important that B. A. Romanov considers the topic of feudal preferences for the clergy. At the time of the first publication of the book, Soviet historiography was not yet characterized by criticism of the church in harsh anti-feudal rhetoric, the author talks about this more in passing than it is the object of his close attention. The clergy, who have power over their flock, use psychological control more than socio-economic oppression: "The method of influence indicated here - penance - testifies that that in the second half of the twelfth century the churchman freely operated both "sacraments", which were part of the disciplinary triad: repentance - penance - communion. But this matter was so new and delicate that the tactics recommended to the churchman from above in relation to "spiritual children" were very cautious"²⁷⁴. In the chapter "Life of Man" it is demonstrated that religious influence with the corresponding

²⁷³ About monastic libraries, see, for example: D. D. Pyzikov, A. O. Blinkova, and T. I. Khizhaya, Libraries of Orthodox Theological Educational Institutions of the Russian Empire // *Bylyye Gody*. 2022. No. 17 (4). P. 1666-1674.

²⁷⁴ Romanov B. A. People and customs of ancient Rus': Historical and everyday essays of the XI-XIII centuries. / Foreword. N. E. Nosova. 2nd ed. M.; L.: Nauka, 1966. P. 175.

church rituals (primarily initiation rites) and controlling rules accompanied the medieval layman at all stages of his life. B. A. Romanov in his work showed the division of society into the masses and the class ruling over them, which is characteristic of the already established feudal formation. In addition, the author demonstrated that the clergy not only belonged to the ruling class in itself, but also had "spiritual" and psychological power over its other representatives, having the absolute ability to observe and control the most intimate aspects of a layman's life, whether it be a peasant or prince.

In 1951, a fundamental two-volume work was published under the general editorship of B. D. Grekov and M. I. Artamonova "The History of the Culture of Ancient Rus". Such prominent Soviet scientists as V. V. Mavrodin, B. A. Rybakov, B. A. Romanov, N. N. Voronin, A. V. Artsikhovskiy, N. F. Lavrov, D. S. Likhachev et al. In the preface to the first volume, it is noted that the work of the team of authors began as early as 1940-1941, but the outbreak of the war postponed the release. According to the editors, the publication differs from previous attempts to show the history of Russian culture in that it demonstrates not only highly specialized issues of the superstructural side of culture, but also provides "systematic coverage of all aspects of both material and spiritual culture - from agriculture and crafts to fine arts and music"²⁷⁵.

Religious issues are touched upon to some extent in almost all chapters, but the main attention is paid to it in the third chapter ("Religion and the Church"), which was written by N. F. Lavrov even before the start of the Great Patriotic War. Thus, Christianity was known in Rus' long before it was accepted as an official religion. It was widespread among the social elites of Kyiv society, but did not penetrate into the masses of the urban and rural population. Princess Olga in her baptism pursued the motives that subsequently guided Vladimir: strengthening the power of the Kyiv prince over the Slavic tribes, strengthening the international position, expanding economic, political and cultural ties with European Christian states. "Therefore, it is likely that one of the tasks of Olga's double trip to Constantinople in 957 and 959 there were negotiations about the baptism

²⁷⁵ History of the culture of ancient Rus' / Under the general. ed. acad. B. D. Grekova and prof. M. I. Artamonova. T. 1. Material culture. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. P. 5.

of Rus' and the organization of the Russian church. However, these negotiations did not lead to a positive result. It can be assumed that the Greeks too clearly and straightforwardly connected the issue of baptism with the political dependence of Rus' on the Empire. Nevertheless, Olga personally accepted baptism, but, upon returning to Rus', she did not dare not only to proclaim Christianity as the official religion, but also to baptize her son"²⁷⁶. The emerging Russian feudal nobility saw in the general Christianization of the Slavs a new force of their class domination. The baptism of Vladimir and the marriage to Anna, the sister of the Byzantine emperor, is marked by a major success in the international policy of the Kievan prince: "The Kievan state, which the Greeks had always treated as "barbaric," was now on the same level as the Christian states of Europe"²⁷⁷.

The planting of Christianity in Kyiv and throughout the state proceeded in an imperative and often violent way, the process itself dragged on for a long time. Using the doctrine of the "King of Heaven" and the related doctrine of "unconditional obedience to the power of earthly kings and princes", and the "teaching" of Marx and Engels on the social principles of Christianity, N. F. Lavrov interprets Orthodoxy as "the best ideological weapon in the struggle for approval of the emerging feudal system and the strengthening of the emerging state power of the ruling class"²⁷⁸. For the first time in post-war Soviet historiography, the rhetoric about the "ideological weapon" that the ruling class uses to oppress the working masses is clearly articulated. Given that the text was written back in the pre-war period of atheistic propaganda, its publication ten years later does not raise questions, because. towards the end of the 1940s - the beginning of the 1950s. Church-state relations in the USSR are clearly cooling off on the eve of the period of scientific-atheistic propaganda. N. F. Lavrov also notes that "conditional" Christian monotheism with many saints, angels, prophets, veneration of icons, etc. was

²⁷⁶ History of the culture of ancient Rus' / Under the general. ed. acad. B. D. Grekova and prof. M. I. Artamonova. T. 2. Social system and spiritual culture. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. P. 83.

²⁷⁷ Ibid. P. 86.

²⁷⁸ Ibid. P. 88.

appropriately transferred to pagan polytheism, which was the manifestation of Russian Orthodox syncretism or dual faith.

In fairness, it is worth noting that the progressive significance of the baptism of Rus' is not ignored either: "From the very first steps of its activity, the Church also acted as the strongest instrument for strengthening the feudal class society, entering into a struggle with paganism and all remnants of pre-feudal antiquity. She took a monogamous family under her protection, fought against the custom of blood feud, contributed to the strengthening of new, more progressive in comparison with slavery, feudal forms of domination and subordination <...> At the same time, along with liturgical literature, translated works "generally - educational "character, acquainting the reader with the questions of the universe and history, providing information about nature and its phenomena. All this material was presented, of course, from the point of view of the "expediency" of the universe and the "wisdom" of the creator, and the phenomena of nature were considered in the theological and symbolic terms. However, even these distorted information about the life of nature and the history of peoples broadened the reader's horizons and awakened his thoughts. The works of translated fiction contributed to the rapid development of independent Russian literature. Of particular note is the development of Russian chronicle writing, which had a great influence on the formation of Russian national identity, on the development of ideas about the unity of the Russian people" The works of translated fiction contributed to the rapid development of independent Russian literature. Of particular note is the development of Russian chronicle writing, which had a great influence on the formation of Russian national identity, on the development of ideas about the unity of the Russian people" The works of translated fiction contributed to the rapid development of independent Russian literature. Of particular note is the development of Russian chronicle writing, which had a great influence on the formation of Russian national identity, on the development of ideas about the unity of the Russian people"²⁷⁹. Along with the spread of Christianity in Rus', there was a development of monumental construction and art. Of course, including author, this

²⁷⁹ Ibid. P. 89-90.

art served the same ideological purposes as the church itself, and "served" the needs of the ruling class. However, at the same time, "Russian architects and artists created works of outstanding strength and originality, managed to embody the vital ideas of their time"²⁸⁰.

The chapter written by N. F. Lavrov, like the entire two-volume edition, is still of scientific interest. The rich factual and historical saturation of the material prevails over the ideological postulates of Marxism-Leninism.

It is significant that in the fundamental work "Kievan Rus" (1949 - 1st ed., 1953 - 2nd ed.) B. D. Grekov uses the more classical language of Soviet historical science, speaking about the ideology and religion of the class society, as well as noting that the process of feudalization in the ancient Russian state created the basis for the establishment of Christianity as the dominant religion: "The adoption of the Christian religion indicates a great shift in the ideology of Kiev society. The pagan religion, created in the tribal system, is not like the religion of a class society. The religion of the tribal system does not know classes and does not require the subordination of one person to another, does not sanctify the domination of one person over another; class religion has a different character <...> Vladimir wanted to create such a religion, which could more strongly unite his entire state <...> If Christianity nevertheless became the dominant religion, then this means that the ruling class was strong and numerous enough, that it had strong power in its hands. If only a few were interested here, then the adoption of Christianity on a nationwide scale would become impossible <...> The entire previous history of classes and the process of feudalization in the Old Russian state created the basis for recognizing Christianity as the dominant religion"²⁸¹. The main theme is the emergence and development of feudalism in Rus' in the 9th–11th centuries. Other topics covered in his work are the agriculture of Ancient Rus, the political system and social relations of Kievan Rus, the origins of Russian culture, etc. Such consequences of the adoption of Christianity as political rapprochement with Europe, the formation of the church as a new

²⁸⁰ Ibid. P. 90.

²⁸¹ Grekov B. D. Kievan Rus. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1953. P. 476-478.

and powerful tool for influencing the masses in for the purpose of their further subordination to the state, the strengthening of ties between parts of the state, the development of the culture of Russia under the influence of Byzantine culture.

In the collection of works of different years "Russian culture of the X-XVIII centuries". M. N. Tikhomirov published the article "Philosophy in Ancient Russia" for the first time, in which the author shared the point of view that Christianity in Russia was not established immediately, but the protracted process eventually resulted in syncretism / dual faith, when pagan holidays and gods were transformed into Christian ones. saints: "All this only indicates that the paganism of the Eastern Slavs did not at all so quickly give way to solemn Christianity and for a long time retained its significance as a worldview persecuted, but loved by popular circles"²⁸². Tikhomirov also notes the progressive significance of the adoption of Christianity in the spread of book enlightenment in Rus': "There is something amazing and fascinating in the history of the culture of Kievan Rus' Back in the X century Ancient Rus' wanders timidly along the path of enlightenment, and in less than one century its own literature and art already appear in it, wonderful writers of the "Rusyns" like Illarion appear"²⁸³. In the collection "Historical Relations of Russia with the Slavic Countries and Byzantium"²⁸⁴ M. N. Tikhomirov, relying on acts and chronicles, expanded the theme of the cultural influence of Byzantium on the newly baptized Rus'. This work was a significant contribution to the development of the problems of not only Russian-Byzantine relations, but also the history of Russian culture.

Thus, research on the history of ancient Russian culture is, to one degree or another, generalizing for a number of highly specialized topics. Soviet historians laid the foundations for future research into the history of the Christianization of Rus', the cultural influence of Byzantium, church-state relations in the era of feudalism, etc. The commonality of theoretical positions is manifested in the recognition of the following facts: Russian culture was at a high level even before the baptism of Rus'; the process of

²⁸² Tikhomirov M. N. Russian culture of the X-XVIII centuries. M.: Nauka, 1968. P. 95.

²⁸³ Ibid. P. 98.

²⁸⁴ Tikhomirov M. N. Historical ties between Russia and the Slavic countries and Byzantium. M.: Nauka, 1969. 374 p.

Christianization itself was a natural political progressive step, which corresponded to and mutually determined the transition of the state into a feudal socio-economic formation; progressiveness also lies in political and cultural ties with Byzantium and the spread of education; the protracted process gave rise to the phenomenon of dual faith or "Orthodox" syncretism of Orthodoxy; Orthodoxy was an effective "ideological weapon" in further strengthening the power of the ruling classes.

2.3.1. The Baptism of Rus'

One of the most important and debatable topics in Soviet studies of the history of Orthodoxy was the topic of the baptism of Rus'. It is necessary to slightly go beyond the time frames of the study and say that after many years of "vulgar sociologism" of the school of M. N. Pokrovsky, the first attempt to take a different look at the problem was made by the famous historian S. V. Bakhrushin in *Istorik-Marxist* (from which the journal "Problems of History" will be published in 8 years) published an article "On the Question of the Baptism of Kievan Rus"²⁸⁵. S. V. Bakhrushin tried to show that the adoption of Christianity was due to the processes of the country's internal development and became possible due to favorable social conditions. However, the process itself took more than one decade. The author openly declares the great progressive significance of this event, since the adoption of Christianity contributed to the elimination of the remnants of the tribal system and the development of the feudal mode of production. Subsequently, all authors will, to one degree or another, accept the thesis of S. V. Bakhrushin about the progressive significance of the Christianization of Rus'. According to the author's rhetoric, at its historical moment from the adoption of Christianity (according to Marxism, at a certain historical stage, feudalism and even capitalism were progressive epochs of human history) there were more pluses than minuses.

²⁸⁵ Bakhrushin S. V. On the issue of the baptism of Kievan Rus // *Historian-Marxist*. 1937. No. 2. P. 40-77.

I. U. Budovnits in his article "On the Question of the Baptism of Rus'"²⁸⁶ generally agreeing with S. V. Bakhrushin, he criticized his desire to exaggerate the progressive nature of the adoption of Christianity and believed that he overestimated the role of Byzantium and at the same time underestimated the pre-Christian Slavic culture. JU Budovnits emphasizes the reactionary role of the new religion, which "stupefied" the minds of the masses and muffled class contradictions. In his opinion, the process of feudalization and Christianization was not interdependent, and the second followed from the first, thus the elimination and transformation of the old basis required the elimination of the old superstructure: "The old religion has lost its significance. The new, feudal basis in Rus' created a superstructure corresponding to it. Together with new political, legal views and institutions corresponding to them (the Old Russian state headed by the Kyiv prince, judicial institutions"²⁸⁷. Summing up, the author draws attention to the fact that the process of Christianization began even before the activity of Vladimir Svyatoslavovich and did not end there, under him Orthodoxy became only de jure the state religion. It is striking that the author has brought to naught the foreign policy significance of the baptism of Rus'.

In the first in the USSR consolidated textbook on the basics of scientific atheism²⁸⁸ the chapter on the history of Orthodoxy was written by N. N. Rozental and E. G. Filimonov. The very first lines postulate that "Orthodoxy has developed as a religious expression of the peculiarities of the development of the feudal social system of Byzantium, in comparison with the countries of Western Europe"²⁸⁹, i.e. as a superstructure of the feudal basis. In Rus', however, a ruling class of feudal lords arose, who needed religion in order to illuminate their new exploitative order and accustom the people to obedience. The authors stipulate that Christianity contributed to the development of feudal relations, which were a more progressive form of social life than the patriarchal-communal system. In addition, as N. N. Rozental and E. G. Filimonov

²⁸⁶ Budovnits I. U. On the issue of the baptism of Rus' // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 402-434.

²⁸⁷ Ibid. P. 408.

²⁸⁸ Tsameryan I. P., Dolgikh F. I., Kolonitsky P. F., Sheinman M. M. Fundamentals of scientific atheism. M.: Gospolizdat, 1961. 456 p.

²⁸⁹ Ibid. P. 196.

write, church literature penetrated Rus', which contributed to the spread of literacy and writing. Here, the authors are already going against B. D. Grekov, who noted that writing in Rus' was even before the adoption of Christianity²⁹⁰, and especially insisted that under Vladimir, not literacy, which already existed before, but Byzantine education and enlightenment came to Rus'.

In 1967, under the auspices of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the first generalized work since the time of N. M. Nikolsky on the history of the Orthodox Church in Russia was published - "The Church in the History of Russia (IX century - 1917). Critical Essays. The section devoted to the history of the adoption of Christianity in Rus' was written by A. M. Sakharov. The author writes that in order to strengthen the Kievan state, a single religion was needed, "which would deify not so much and not only the forces of nature, but above all a new social system with its private property, divided into rich and poor, masters and exploited"²⁹¹. Also, the new religion was supposed to contribute to the political and cultural rapprochement of Rus' with other countries and to strengthen the international authority of the young state. The author emphasizes that the penetration of Orthodoxy into the Old Russian state went through the upper strata of society, because Christian ideology corresponded to their interests in holding power. It is interesting to note that A. M. Sakharov calls "The Tale of Bygone Years", so respected by Soviet historians and philologists, "the manifesto of Christianity" and "a weapon in the struggle for its final approval". The author criticizes the chronicle episode about the "test of faith" by Vladimir. The historian writes: "The imperious Roman Catholic politicians resorted to a variety of means in order to completely subjugate the peoples and countries into which the Catholic Church penetrated"²⁹². This thesis combined both the Soviet historiographical tendency to link the adoption of Byzantine-type Christianity (in view of its subordination to secular power) and the anti-Catholic

²⁹⁰ Grekov B. D. Culture of Kievan Rus. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1944. P. 31.

²⁹¹ Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917). M.: Nauka, 1967. P. 38.

²⁹² Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917). M.: Nauka, 1967. P. 42.

(anti-Western) rhetoric of the Cold War²⁹³. An important position is that the Christianization of the population of ancient Rus' was forced and violent, and the stubborn resistance to this can be considered one of the early manifestations of the class struggle. As a result, the spread of Christianity was an important means of strengthening the early feudal order, this was the internal socio-economic background of the event²⁹⁴. However, for the sake of objectivity, at the end of the chapter, the author reports that "in the conditions of the early Middle Ages, the adoption of Christianity had a generally positive value for the growth of culture in Rus'"²⁹⁵: writing developed and bookishness spread, which gave impetus to the development of ancient Russian literature, and the influence of Byzantine material culture contributed to the emergence of outstanding works of art. The controversial role of the Orthodox Church in the history of Russia is displayed, which is a kind of concession and compromise for researchers and propagandists.

The issue of the baptism of Rus' returned to the current agenda with the approach of the celebration of the millennium of the adoption of Christianity. Accordingly, the 1980s are fruitful for research on this topic. During this period, several works were published under the authorship of the famous propagandist N. S. Gordienko²⁹⁶. All of them are united by the desire to show that the baptism of Rus' was not a quick event, but a long process (it dragged on for centuries), which was of a violent nature and met with stubborn resistance among the people; that the consequences of the adoption of Christianity, although they were progressive, should not be exaggerated, because, even before baptism, there was a developed and rich culture in Rus', and also that there are anti-communist and clerical sentiments in the Russian emigrant environment, which spread slander about freedom of conscience and religion in the USSR and falsify the historical significance of Orthodoxy in Rus'. Of scientific interest, perhaps, is only the

²⁹³ Shakhnovich M. M. The Cold War and the Ideological Struggle on the «Religious Front»: On Some Models of Soviet Propaganda // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2017. No. 1. P. 164-184.

²⁹⁴ Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917). M.: Nauka, 1967. P. 46.

²⁹⁵ Ibid. P. 49.

²⁹⁶ Gordienko N. S. Worldview assessment of the process of Christianization of Ancient Rus'. Moscow: Knowledge, 1984. 40 p.; Gordienko N. S. «Baptism of Rus'»: facts against legends and myths: Polemic notes. L.: Lenizdat, 1984. 287 p.; Gordienko N. S. The introduction of Christianity in Rus': conjectures of bourgeois-clerical propaganda. Moscow: Knowledge, 1987. 62 p.

monograph "The Baptism of Rus': facts against legends and myths. Polemic Notes" (1984 - 1st ed., 1986 - 2nd ed.).

In his work, N. S. Gordienko notes the erroneous connotation of the phrase "baptism of Rus'", which implies a one-time event. In fact, it was a long process. The author argues with the ideologists of modern Russian Orthodoxy, who seek to link the processes of Christianization and the emergence of Old Russian statehood: "Thus, Christianity enters the social life of Kievan Rus as a powerful ideological factor not in the pre-state period of its history, but only when the Old Russian state had existed for more than century, politically strengthened and declared itself to the whole world as a powerful force, which had to be reckoned with neighboring states, up to imperial Byzantium. Therefore, the statement of the ideologues of the church that Russian statehood begins with the adoption of Christianity by Prince Vladimir and his subjects"²⁹⁷. Consequently, with a high level of statehood before the official adoption of Christianity in Rus', there was also a high level of development of spiritual culture, incl. writing. N. S. Gordienko also makes a "critical" comparison of Slavic paganism and Christianity: "In fact, Christianity in cognitive terms is by no means more perfect than paganism. Of course, the first one has a wider object of reflection than the second one (not only nature, but also society, class relations, the state, etc.), dogmatics is more complicated, rituals are more diverse, there are more inclusions of non-religious components, etc. But from the truth they are equally distant, since they are a fantastic reflection of reality, they are various modifications of belief in the supernatural <...> They differ only ideologically"²⁹⁸. The author criticizes the legends and tales about the visit of the Apostle Andrew to the territories of Kievan Rus and about the "test of faith". He confirms his reasoning with references to pre-revolutionary theologians and historians. Explaining the choice of Byzantine Orthodoxy, N. S. Gordienko appeals to the tradition of the "symphony of the authorities", which was used to advantage by the ruling classes. In turn, when the Pope demanded complete subjugation of kings and emperors, "Vladimir and his entourage opted for the Byzantine variety of Christianity quite consciously, guided primarily by

²⁹⁷ Gordienko N. S. «Baptism of Rus'»: facts against legends and myths: Polemic notes. L.: Lenizdat, 1986. P. 33.

²⁹⁸ Ibid. P. 45-46.

political considerations..."²⁹⁹. The assimilation of Byzantine Orthodoxy on Slavic land occurred due to the many pagan elements that were preserved and transformed in Christianity, for example, in the cult of saints, icons, church holidays, etc. The author states about the peculiarity of the perception of Orthodoxy in Russia, which lies in the external side of the faith, while the dogmas remained unknown to the majority until the beginning of the 20th century: - the absolutization of the cult side of religion, the transformation of the rite from a means of propaganda of the dogma into an independent, and, moreover, central, object of faith and worship"³⁰⁰.

In the final part of his work, moving on to the current situation of the Orthodox Church in the USSR, N. S. Gordienko once again builds his argument through the search for external enemies - emigrants of anti-communist clerics who spread "malicious slander" about the repressed state of the Orthodox Church in the Soviet state and predicts a quick end to Russian Orthodoxy: "The facts cited testify that an essential feature of the religious and church life of pre-revolutionary, revolutionary and post-revolutionary Russia was the successive crises of Russian Orthodoxy as a feudal-serf ideology, anti-people in its social essence, and the splits of the church as a feudal institution, defending interests hostile to the people. The duration and severity, the depth and scope that distinguished these crises and splits, shaking the church at a turning point in Russian history, eloquently say that the tenth century of Russian Orthodoxy is the century of the ideological degradation of this denomination and its organizational decline, the century of the loss of the status of this religion as the dominant form of spiritual life and state ideology and its transition to the category of a relic of the past, the possessions of the few. This century portends Russian Orthodoxy, perhaps not very close, but inevitable and inevitable end"³⁰¹.

The important historiographical work by L. I. Emelyakh and Y. Y. Kozhurin "Soviet historical science about the baptism of Rus" (1986), which has already been discussed above, draws a common line in the history of the study of the issue in Soviet

²⁹⁹ Ibid. P. 73.

³⁰⁰ Ibid. P. 118.

³⁰¹ Ibid. P. 224.

science. The use of references to pre-revolutionary historians, such as N. M. Karamzin, E. E. Golubinsky, V. O. Klyuchevsky, testifies to the final inclusion of their research in the scientific Soviet discourse and historiographic narrative. The authors simultaneously recognize as justified the thesis of S. V. Bakhrushin about the progressive significance of baptism in the history of Russia, but with the acceptance of criticism from I. U. Budovnits about its exaggerated nature and incorrect assessment of the influence of Byzantium on the development of national culture. L. I. Emelyakh and Y. Y. Kozhurin confirm the conclusions that that the adoption of Christianity by the Eastern Slavs was ultimately caused by the formation of feudal relations, and that Christianity was imposed by force, and its spread was delayed for several centuries. It is interesting to pay attention to the difference in rhetoric and sharpness of assessments in the introduction and subsequent chapters, when only on the first pages there are standard atheistic clichés about "oppressed, enslaved masses", "illusory compensatory function of the Christian religion", cruel exploitation of the masses, support of the exploiters in struggle against the working people", etc. It can be assumed that at the end of Soviet history and the history of Soviet atheism, framing the works with quotations from the classics of Marxism-Leninism or memorized ideological formulas, some of which refer to the times of militant atheism.

A. G. Kuzmin in the introductory article³⁰² to the collection of the textbook format "The Baptism of Rus' in the Works of Russian and Soviet Historians" also sums up the study of this topic in Soviet science and outlines the range of problems that remained relevant by 1988. He recognizes the value of pre-revolutionary bourgeois historiography for introducing a large number of sources. But what is more characteristic and important, the author also openly admits the state's post-October excesses in the fight against religion and the Orthodox Church.

Also in the anniversary year of 1988, a small work was published by A. I. Klibanov and L. N. Mitrokhin "The Baptism of Rus': History and Modernity". It is interesting that the work was handed over to the set on June 7, 1988, i.e. in the midst of a nationwide

³⁰² Kuzmin A. G. «Baptism of Rus'»: concepts and problems // «Baptism of Rus'» in the works of Russian and Soviet historians. M.: Thought, 1988. P. 3-56.

celebration. In the preface, the authors, arguing the relevance of the issues that are stimulated by the anniversary date, among others, name the shaky assertion about the USSR as a country of victorious atheism and rhetorically ask, can "religious preaching really contain moral values that do not decrease with time?"³⁰³. These questions were first voiced "aloud" by Soviet religious scholars. Perhaps this should be taken as an admission of the defeat of "scientific atheism. By historical irony, this is how the popular science series of the Znaniye publishing house was still called, under the cover of which this work was published. Also, the criticism of some published contemporaries is interesting: "And if a modern author or lecturer (and, unfortunately, there are enough examples of this kind) criticizes the theological view of the role of the church in history on the principle of "everything is reversed": Orthodoxy has always and in everything played a reactionary role, it invariably "slowed down", "restrained", "dead", etc. - this will be an example of not a scientific-atheistic, but a theoretically untenable approach that contradicts the principle of historicism ..." ³⁰⁴. A. I. Klibanov and L. N. Mitrokhin do not name names, but there is a hint of some of the most active and famous popularizers, whose texts are also cited in this study due to their significance as a common type of post-war religious scholar who took on the role of propagandist of atheism.

Speaking about the year 988, the authors shift the emphasis a little differently than their predecessors and declare that the Christianization of Rus' was not the cause, but the result of the fact that Ancient Rus' was already in the 10th century. could be attributed to European civilization: "It was not Christianity that "connected" Rus' to European civilization, but the spread of Christianity in Ancient Rus' and its adoption as the state religion ideologically completed the belonging of Ancient Rus' to European civilization"³⁰⁵. Also, although the very process of Christianization of the whole state was complex, conflicting and non-simultaneous, its violent nature should not be exaggerated: "The spread of Christianity in Rus' under Vladimir ... was not a religious war of the holders of the Kiev table against their own population"³⁰⁶. Conflicts, according to the

³⁰³ Klibanov A. I., Mitrokhin L. N. Baptism of Rus': history and modernity. M.: Knowledge, 1988. P. 4.

³⁰⁴ Ibid. P. 8-9.

³⁰⁵ Ibid. P. 25.

³⁰⁶ Ibid. P. 28.

relevant situation, took place not only in Rus', but "this was also the case in the countries of Western Europe". This small work summarizes the previous experience of researching the topic. One can notice not only a compromise softened rhetoric, but also a conscious smoothing of corners behind their predecessors on especially debatable issues.

Thus, the topic of the baptism of Rus' is one of the central ones in Soviet historical science in the context of the study of Orthodoxy. The first attempt at a new look at the Christianization of Rus' belongs to the famous Soviet historian S. V. Bakhrushin. In the future, various aspects of this issue will be revealed in the works of N. F. Lavrov, B. D. Grekov, M. N. Tikhomirov, I. U. Budovnitsa, A. M. Sakharov, N. S. Gordienko, L. I. Emelyakh, A. I. Klibanova, L. N. Mitrokhina, etc. Depending on the time of writing and the socio-political situation in the country, studies differ both in rhetoric and writing style, and in the system of argumentation. However, they all agree on one thing: the fact of the adoption of Christianity was influenced by a number of natural reasons and prerequisites that had developed in the ancient Russian state by the 10th century.

2.3.2. Old Russian writing

One of the first topics to be returned to scientific discourse after the period of militant atheism in the 1920s and 1930s there was ancient Russian bookishness. The heroic past of the country and the corresponding military figures, primarily Alexander Nevsky and Dmitry Donskoy, were subject to rehabilitation. Popular science literature dedicated to ancient Russian princes is being published. That is, within the framework of the study of ancient Russian literature, the first large group studied was the hagiography of outstanding historical figures. The second group to which scientific interest extends were chronicle sources, such as "The Tale of Bygone Years", "The Tale of Igor's Campaign", "The Prayer of Daniil the Zatochnik", "Zadonshchina". The third group of studies was associated with the study of historical, anthropological and philosophical

ancient Russian thought³⁰⁷, to which you can add folklore. Finally, studies began to appear that were devoted to various medieval church sources.

In the same period, quite a lot of works were published in periodicals, some of which were directly devoted to Old Russian literature, for example, "Proceedings of the Department of Old Russian Literature" of the Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House) of the Academy of Sciences. Relevant articles are beginning to be published in "Problems of Philosophy" and "Vizantiyskiy Vremennik".

The Great Patriotic War became the catalyst for formalizing the official Soviet discourse on collective identity. The military narrative integrated images that were characteristic of the ideology of pre-war Soviet patriotism and served the purpose of uniting society on the basis of the great and heroic past of the country. Similar ideologemes remained relevant in the post-war period. One of the symbols was the image of Alexander Nevsky. Articles in the Proceedings of the Department of Old Russian Literature are devoted to the analysis of various editions of the text of the life of A. Nevsky. These works are philological works on the history of the creation of various editions of the life, as well as their introduction into scientific circulation. The religious aspect remains outside the main focus of research, but still represents a concomitant background that had to be taken into account. So, for example, D.S. Likhachev³⁰⁸. V. I. Malyshev in his article provides an archival description of the document and the publication of the source itself³⁰⁹. S. N. Azbelev demonstrates a textual comparison and editorial continuity between the Nikon Chronicle and the Pogodin Chronicle (XVI or XVII centuries), emphasizing the military (i.e., secular) prowess of Alexander Nevsky. The characterization of A. Nevsky in it only as a commander and statesman prompted the author to conclude that this is a redaction of one of the earliest sources, because. hagiographic layers about "holiness" appeared in the process of evolution of the monument³¹⁰. The works of Y. K. Begunov are written on various topics: a brief

³⁰⁷ Chumakova T. V. Soviet historiography of ancient Russian philosophical thought // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 6. 2004. no. 2. P. 13-17.

³⁰⁸ Likhachev D. S. Galician literary tradition in the life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1947. No. 5. P. 36-56.

³⁰⁹ Malyshev V. I. Life of Alexander Nevsky according to the manuscript of the middle of the 17th century // TODRL. 1947. No. 5. P. 185-193.

³¹⁰ Azbelev S. N. Secular processing of the Life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1958. No. 14. P. 147-153.

historiography of the study of various editions of the life and the publication of the edition of the third quarter of the 16th century³¹¹; analysis of iconographic images of the prince in the form of a schemnik after canonization in 1547, the ratio of iconographic images and plot content of the life with the possibility of dating icons through knowledge of literary sources³¹²; publication of excerpts from a new secular revision of the first edition of the life³¹³; message about the editorial office related to the transformation of the cult of A. Nevsky from a Vladimir saint into a spiritual patron of St. Petersburg³¹⁴; study of the origin of the third type of the second edition and its comparison with others³¹⁵.

Along with the study of various editions of the life of A. Nevsky, Soviet philologists and historians were also interested in the life of another Russian national hero, Dmitry Donskoy. V. P. Adrianova-Peretz notes the general trend of changing the hagiographic style: lose their predominantly historical-journalistic character, and hagiographical elements begin to come to the fore in them. Panegyrics to national historical heroes quickly turn into stories about Christian ascetics. Elements of hagiographical style push the historical narrative aside. Probably, this process was due to various reasons. First of all, those political tendencies lost their sharpness, which at one time served as the basis for the exaltation of certain historical figures. On the other hand, the regulation of the church became stricter and, perhaps, the church authorities for canonization or at least local glorification as a holy secular person demanded from him not only social and state exploits, but also outstanding Christian virtues. For these reasons, the later editions of the princely lives of the XI-XIII centuries. seek to fit their heroes to the general type of "saint" - a Christian ascetic, using the usual patterns of hagiographic style for this, in the absence of real biographical material" for canonization or at least local glorification as a holy secular person, the church authorities demanded from him not only social and state exploits, but also outstanding Christian virtues. For these reasons,

³¹¹ Begunov Y. K. On the study of the Life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1961. No. 17. P. 348-357.

³¹² Begunov Y. K. Life of Alexander Nevsky in easel painting of the early 17th century. // TODRL. 1966. No. 22. P. 311-326.

³¹³ Begunov Y. K. Kirillo-Belozero excerpts from the Life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1969. No. 24. P. 105-107.

³¹⁴ Begunov Y. K. Old Russian traditions in the works of the first quarter of the 18th century about Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1971. No. 26. P. 72-84.

³¹⁵ Begunov Y. K. Life of Alexander Nevsky in a collection from the collection of N. P. Likhachev // TODRL. 1976. No. 30. P. 60-72.

the later editions of the princely lives of the XI-XIII centuries. seek to fit their heroes to the general type of "saint" - a Christian ascetic, using the usual patterns of hagiographic style for this, in the absence of real biographical material "for canonization or at least local glorification as a holy secular person, the church authorities demanded from him not only social and state exploits, but also outstanding Christian virtues. For these reasons, the later editions of the princely lives of the XI-XIII centuries. seek to fit their heroes to the general type of "saint" - a Christian ascetic, using the usual patterns of hagiographic style for this, in the absence of real biographical material"³¹⁶. This remark about the loss of the relevance of the historical context and strict intra-church regulation for canonization is true for the hagiographic tradition of both A. Nevsky (XIII-XV centuries - the image of a warrior / XVI-XVII centuries - the image of a saint), and D. Donskoy. One has only to say that D. Donskoy, unlike A. Nevsky, at the time of the formation of his life, was not yet canonized by the church. The main question about the life of D. Donskoy, which worried researchers, was its attribution and authorship. So, A. V. Solovyov develops the ideas of V. P. Adrianova-Peretz about the authorship of the life and suggested that the life of D. Donskoy was written not by an imitator of Epiphanius the Wise, but by the author of the life of Sergius of Radonezh³¹⁷. M. A. Salmina builds a diagram of the relationship between various lists and editions of the life³¹⁸. M. F. Antonova critically analyzes the theory of A. V. Solovyov about the authorship of the life and analyzes the genre nature of the work³¹⁹. G. M. Prokhorov wrote about foreign philosophical inserts in the text of his life, which complement the theory of A. V. Solovyov³²⁰.

Behind the authorship of the already mentioned V. P. Adrianova-Peretz there are a number of important works on the history of ancient Russian literature and folklore,

³¹⁶Adrianova-Peretz V. P. A word about the life and death of Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia // TODRL. 1947. No. 5. P. 73.

³¹⁷ Solovyov A. V. Epiphanius the Wise as the author of the «Word on the Life and Repose of the Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia» // TODRL. 1961. No. 17. P. 85-106.

³¹⁸ Salmina M. A. «A word about the life and death of the Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia» // TODRL. 1970. No. 25. P. 81-104.

³¹⁹ Antonova M. F. «A word about the life and death of the Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia» (Issues of attribution and genre) // TODRL. 1974. No. 28. P. 140-154.

³²⁰ Prokhorov G. M. Misunderstood text and a letter to the customer in the «Word about the life and death of Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar Ruskago» // TODRL. 1985. No. 40. P. 229-247.

which are of interest for the study of the Russian history of the study of Orthodoxy. "Essays on the Poetic Style of Ancient Rus"³²¹ (1947), is her first post-war work. The main thesis of the author is that the culture of the Russian Middle Ages creatively used the assimilated cultural experience of neighboring peoples and there can be no question of the dependent, imitative nature of the Russian fine arts, literature and literary language of the 11th-17th centuries. The author's goal is to consistently restore the system of artistic means by which the Old Russian writer solved the problems facing him, and to theoretically fixate on their original rootedness in Old Russian culture, when the ground for the assimilation of what was brought from outside (Biblical-Byzantine metaphorical style) was prepared by the centuries-old history of oral Russian poetry.

It is worth adding that in the 1970–1980s edited by Academician D. S. Likhachev, a 12-volume anthology "Monuments of Literature of Ancient Rus" was published (since 1997, republished under the name "Library of Literature of Ancient Rus").

Thus, the main subject of research on ancient Russian literature was chronicles and hagiographic literature. The main form of such research was the publication of various editions of historical monuments. Primary attention was paid to national military heroes of the past: Alexander Nevsky and Dmitry Donskoy. Source analysis of hagiographic literature about the commanders showed a temporary transformation of the literary style from a historical narrative about a national hero into a hagiographic form of glorifying an Orthodox saint.

2.3.3. Problems of feudalism and monastic land ownership

The cornerstone for Soviet historiography were the issues of feudalism and church (monastic) land tenure. Soviet authors perceived the Orthodox Church in the history of Russia as one of the main feudal lords, which, in alliance with the autocracy, oppressed the peasant working masses.

³²¹ Adrianova-Peretz V. P. *Essays on the poetic style of Ancient Rus*. M.; L.: Academy of Science of the USSR, 1947. 188 p.

In 1947 S. B. Veselovsky, relying on a huge number of sources, publishes a scrupulous and detailed study of the feudal estates of the metropolitan house in medieval Rus'³²². The author writes that until the middle of the XIV century. metropolitans and bishops were the main representatives of non-secular landownership, received funding and land ownership from the princes. The monasteries did not have such support. Only from the second half of the XIV century. monasteries begin to enrich themselves and in the future will bypass the hierarchs of the church. The main bulk of the monastic possessions was formed in the XV-XVI centuries. The possessions of the metropolitan court grew in the process of moving the metropolitan chair along the route Kyiv - Vladimir - Moscow.

After the death of Metropolitan Alexei (1378), the "symphony" of church and secular power in the country was broken, because. the principality of Lithuania and Constantinople tried to put their candidate on the vacant chair. Starting with Ivan III, S. B. Veselovsky characterizes the policy of the Moscow sovereigns as follows: "By honors and all sorts of material benefits, but by no means land grants, the Moscow sovereigns attracted to their side the metropolitans that were malleable and pleasing to them, deposed the unyielding and objectionable ... to in general, they relegated the metropolitan see, and at the same time the entire Orthodox Church, to the position of one of the organs of state administration"³²³. From the 15th century the metropolitans turned into "ordinary estates", whose privileges did not differ from the privileges of monasteries or service people.

L. V. Cherepnin's source work "Russian feudal archives. XIV-XV centuries" is an ideologically verified, according to the era, work, with appropriate conclusions and conclusions. The main archival source used by the author is church and monastic copies of books - "a source with a pronounced class character", because they were created in the main stages of the history of the legal registration of the feudal dependence of the peasants. In the same way, L. V. Cherepnin refers to the formularies of the Moscow metropolitan department. Through the analysis of sources, the author shows that the

³²² Veselovsky P. B. Feudal land tenure in northeastern Rus'. T. 1. Part 1: Private land ownership; Part 2: Land tenure of the metropolitan house. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. 496 p.

³²³ Ibid. P. 346.

church tried to protect its possessions, using documents justifying the consolidation of its rights: "At the same time, church and monastic collections of lists of land acts were a flexible tool ... the monastery tried, with the help of a legal document, to close its wealth from the encroachments of state power <...> was a response on the part of the church feudal lords of the Osiflyan camp not only to the attacks of non-possessors against church and monastic land ownership, but also to journalistic works directed against the exploitation of peasants in church estates"³²⁴. The speeches of the boyar opposition, which defended the views of non-possessors, for example, Vassian Patrikeev, were dictated "not by protecting direct producers from the exploitation of spiritual feudal lords" but by protecting boyar estates and peasants from a potential transition to the monastic landholdings. Cherepnin sees the main meaning of spiritual copies of books in a reference to the ancient foundation of the way of life, when the peasants worked on church lands: "The reference to the "old times" in relations between spiritual feudal lords and direct producers should have drowned out the voice of the opposition"³²⁵.

In the context of the creation of the Russian centralized state, the Novgorod Republic occupied a special position. The work of V. N. Bernadsky "Novgorod and Novgorod land in the XV century"³²⁶ (1958) is devoted to the social and economic history of Novgorod in the 14th–15th centuries. The main sources addressed by the author are chronicles and Novgorod scribe books. The church in the work is one of the socio-economic factors behind the backlog of feudal relations in the Novgorod Republic. The archaism consisted in the use of pre-feudal and early feudal forms of exploitation. In the historical context of overcoming feudal fragmentation and creating a centralized state, the Novgorod "boyar oligarchy" and "church magnates" advocated the preservation of the old position. V. N. Bernadsky confirms the idea of S. B. Veselovsky about the growth of monastic land ownership in the XIV-XV centuries. in the northeastern districts. Accordingly, it was a universal process that also affected independent Novgorod. The

³²⁴ Cherepnin L. V. Russian feudal archives. XIV-XV centuries Part II. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. P. 50.

³²⁵ Ibid. P. 51.

³²⁶ Bernadsky V. N. Novgorod and the Novgorod land in the 15th century. L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 246 p.

author showed that following the boyar landholdings, the monastic ones also expanded. The decline of the Novgorod Republic and the annexation of its territories to the Principality of Moscow was a natural result of a long and multilateral process of changes in the "base and superstructure of feudal Rus". The fall of the Novgorod Republic, according to V. N. Bernadsky, was associated with the reverse side of the feudal type of economic development - the intensification of the class struggle of the peasantry and spontaneous anti-boyar movements of the masses. This happened largely due to the inability of the boyar and monastic households to reorganize to a more progressive type of feudal economy. The decline of the Novgorod Republic and the annexation of its territories to the Principality of Moscow was a natural result of a long and multilateral process of changes in the "base and superstructure of feudal Rus". The fall of the Novgorod Republic, according to V. N. Bernadsky, was associated with the reverse side of the feudal type of economic development - the intensification of the class struggle of the peasantry and spontaneous anti-boyar movements of the masses. This happened largely due to the inability of the boyar and monastic households to reorganize to a more progressive type of feudal economy.

In 1959, L. S. Prokofieva published a microhistorical study of the monastic patrimony, characteristic of the Russian state of the 17th century, on the example of the Spaso-Prilutsky Monastery³²⁷. The study is based on archival materials, primarily on income-expenditure books, which reflected the trading activities of the monastery: sowing grain, collecting money from peasants, hiring labor, usurious activities, etc. The author also included scribe and census books, act materials of the monastery itself and peasant petitions to the list of main sources. L. S. Prokofieva built a complete picture of the socio-economic activity of the monastery, typical of the 17th century. The book is a detailed statistical description of the economic life of the patrimony and the monastery, including a general picture of the feudal exploitation of the peasants. Thus, it was shown that in the XVII century. there is a replacement of a part of working-out duties with a cash quitrent, which is a consequence of the penetration of commodity-money relations into

³²⁷ Prokofieva L. P. Estate farming in the 17th century: Based on the materials of the Spaso-Prilutsky Monastery. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. 177 p.

the monastic patrimonial economy in the conditions of the emerging all-Russian market. Of greatest "ideological" interest could be the fourth chapter ("Peasants"), which describes the taxation of the peasants of the Spaso-Prilutsky monastery with various duties and data on their debts and subsequent punishments. However, the work is rather a source of statistical and factual material, without ideological conclusions of an atheistic nature and focusing on them. The works of N. A. Gorskaya can be added to the format of statistical research which describes the taxation of the peasants of the Spaso-Prilutsky Monastery with duties of various kinds and data on their debts and subsequent punishments. However, the work is rather a source of statistical and factual material, without ideological conclusions of an atheistic nature and focusing on them. The works of N. A. Gorskaya can be added to the format of statistical research which describes the taxation of the peasants of the Spaso-Prilutsky Monastery with duties of various kinds and data on their debts and subsequent punishments. However, the work is rather a source of statistical and factual material, without ideological conclusions of an atheistic nature and focusing on them. The works of N. A. Gorskaya can be added to the format of statistical research³²⁸ and I. A. Bulygin³²⁹.

However, N. A. Gorskaya, unlike L. S. Prokofieva, in addition to the above statistical and factual material, contains conclusions of an ideological nature. In the period of the final registration of serfdom in the late XVI - early XVII centuries corvee in the monastic estates was harder than on privately owned land. Consequently, strict corvee, as one of the components of the final formalization of serfdom at the national level, according to the author, testified to the leading role of the church in the enslavement of the peasants.

The work of I. A. Bulygin demonstrates the number and geographical distribution of peasants and monasteries, the types of state duties of monastic peasants before and after Peter's transformations, and the internal economic life of monasteries is analyzed in detail. Particular attention is paid to the reforms of Peter I, as a result of which a

³²⁸ Gorskaya N. A. Monastic peasants of Central Russia in the 17th century. (On the essence and forms of feudal-serf relations). M.: Nauka, 1977. 365 p.

³²⁹ Bulygin I. A. Monastic peasants of Russia in the first quarter of the 18th century. M.: Nauka, 1977. 327 p.

significant part of the church lands became the property of the state. According to the author's conclusions, the secularization of spiritual estates undermined the foundations of the feudal serf system, facilitating the position of the peasants, and contributed to the establishment of more progressive capitalist relations.

In addition to the patrimonial land holdings of the spiritual feudal lords, as well as the secular ones, in the XIV-XV centuries. appear in the possessions of the so-called "courtyards" in cities that were used as centers of commercial and industrial activity. L. V. Cherepnin in 1960 writes: "The emergence of church and monastery courtyards was associated with the development of crafts and trade in the possessions of spiritual feudal lords"³³⁰. In this way, according to the author, the "spiritual feudal lords" spread and increased their influence not only in the countryside, but also penetrating into the city, which generally contributed to the strengthening of feudal-serf relations there. But, no matter how paradoxical it may be, such steps on the part of the church had a progressive significance and led, among other things, to the economic development of the country, which ultimately contributed to political centralization: "Assessing the socio-economic and political consequences of the development of monastic and church households in cities during the XIV-XV centuries, it must be said that they were complex and contradictory. I have already pointed out more than once that the urban courtyards of the spiritual landowners became, as a rule, the center of commercial and industrial activity, and since the latter proceeded with the support of the princes in rather favorable conditions, it contributed to the general economic progress in the country, the expansion of commodity circulation, trade relations. The commercial and industrial activities of the monasteries, which extended to a significant number of cities, regardless of their belonging to one or another political entity on the territory of feudally fragmented Rus', objectively contributed to the creation of the prerequisites for the state unification of the country. In the church and monastic possessions in the cities, the grand ducal power, which pursued a policy of centralization, found support. spread to a significant number of cities, regardless of their belonging to one or another political entity on the territory of

³³⁰ Cherepnin L. V. Formation of the Russian centralized state in the XIV-XV centuries. M.: Sotsekgiz, 1960. P. 356.

feudal fragmented Rus', objectively contributed to the creation of the prerequisites for the state unification of the country. In the church and monastic possessions in the cities, the grand ducal power, which pursued a policy of centralization, found support. spread to a significant number of cities, regardless of their belonging to one or another political entity on the territory of feudal fragmented Rus', objectively contributed to the creation of the prerequisites for the state unification of the country. In the church and monastic possessions in the cities, the grand ducal power, which pursued a policy of centralization, found support"³³¹.

The textbook "Fundamentals of Scientific Atheism" (1961) does not reflect or mention the contradictory relationships between secular and spiritual authorities during the period of feudal fragmentation and centralization of the Russian state. The position given by the authors of the textbook is clearly simplified, but ideologically verified and unambiguous: "Orthodoxy was established in Rus' solely thanks to the support from the state. Having spread in Kievan Rus as the religion of the ruling class of feudal lords, it diligently served this class throughout its entire historical existence. Unlike Western European medieval Catholicism, the Orthodox Church acted not as an independent political force, but as a subordinate body of secular power"³³².

The article by A. M. Sakharov is devoted to the relations between the princely power and the church during the formation of the Russian centralized state³³³. Referring to S. B. Veselovsky, the author repeats that in the first half of the XIV century. Moscow princes managed to win over the church by granting political and economic preferences. Thus, by the middle of the XIV century. the church was a powerful political and economic force. However, with the beginning of centralization, a sharp conflict arose between secular and church authorities. In addition, this coincided with the death of Metropolitan Alexei, whose significant role in the "symphony" was especially noted by S. B. Veselovsky. A. M. Sakharov analyzes in sufficient detail the actions of Grand Duke

³³¹ Ibid. P. 360.

³³² Tsameryan I. P., Dolgikh F. I., Kolonitsky P. F., Sheinman M. M. Fundamentals of scientific atheism. M.: Gospolitzdat, 1961. P. 206.

³³³ Sakharov A. M. The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State // Problems of History. 1966. No. 1. P. 49-65.

Vasily II in relation to Metropolitan Isidore in the context of the refusal of the Russian Church from the Union of Florence and finds in them the motive for subordinating the Church to the Grand Duke's secular power. The author obviously tries to show the ambiguity of the position of the church and its "throwing" between the opposing sides. As a result, the church chose a compromise, gaining, on the one hand, independence from Constantinople, on the other hand, submitting to a certain extent to the grand ducal authority of Basil II. The author also dwells in detail on the Russian and foreign policy of Ivan III, which directly related to the position of the church. A. M. Sakharov considers such an important church figure of the era as Joseph Volotsky a fighter for the privileges of the feudal church, who also came into conflict with the secular authorities because of this: "The literary works of Joseph Volotsky, this militant churchman, clearly indicate a hostile attitude certain circles of the church towards the centralization of state power and the unification of Russian lands"³³⁴. Here is shown one of the classic theses of Soviet historiography about the church as an opponent of the centralization of the Russian state, because the centralization of the state required the "curbing" of the independence of large feudal estates. But already at the beginning of the XVI century secular power "reconciled" with the church, and Joseph Volotsky now supported the Grand Duke. A. M. Sakharov believes that he continued to defend the feudal interests of the church, changing tactics: the clergy preached about the divine origin and nature of secular power. According to the author, it was this dogmatic "innovation" that subsequently had a strong influence on Ivan the Terrible. The secular authorities used the religious worldview that prevailed in the Middle Ages to strengthen their authority, and the church, in turn, received the patronage of its feudal economic interests. At the end of the article, A. M. Sakharov dwells on the history of the origin of the theory of Moscow as the "Third Rome". From the author's point of view, Elder Philotheus, being a Josephite, in his letters demanded from the secular authorities the protection of the monastery's landed property: force the state to reckon with the church, to protect its position and privileges. It is no coincidence that this concept was set forth in messages addressed to the Grand Duke: the churchmen wanted

³³⁴ Sakharov A. M. The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State // Problems of History. 1966. No. 1. P. 57.

to influence his mind, they wanted to inspire him with the idea of a special mission of the grand ducal power - to protect and support the "true" church, which should have flattered the grand ducal power itself, which appeared to be at least in your own imagination"³³⁵. In addition, as A. M. Sakharov writes further, the concept of "Moscow - the third Rome" served for the church to protect the old privileged position in the state, i.e. the author continues the tradition of Soviet historical science, which believed that with the beginning of the centralization of the state, the church used "references to antiquity" (be it copies of books or a developed historiosophical theory) to protect its possessions acquired in the previous period of feudal fragmentation.

In the collection "The Church in the History of Russia (IX century - 1917)" three chapters correspond to the declared topic: the third ("The Church in the period of feudal fragmentation"), the fourth ("The Church in the period of the Mongol-Tatar yoke and the unification of Russian lands into a single State") and the fifth ("The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State"). All of them were also written by A. M. Sakharov. The author believes that before receiving autocephaly, when the Russian Orthodox Church was headed by metropolitans appointed by Constantinople, the latter were "agents of the empire" and therefore actively interfered in the internal political affairs of the state, trying to support the reactionary forces oriented towards Byzantium. The power of the church, writes A. M. Sakharov, was based on an increase in its material resources: "The Church was not only generously endowed by princes and other feudal lords, who granted her lands and incomes in order to win her over to their side in the internecine struggle. She herself was an active money-grubber."³³⁶. The practice of princely support of the church was started from the moment of its foundation in Rus', when Vladimir decided to pay tithes. In addition, the author adds, the wealth of the church within it was unevenly distributed: "Metropolitans and bishops represented the richest church aristocracy, while parish priests in their property status often differed little from the mass of the urban and rural population"³³⁷. Among the ways to increase the economic

³³⁵ Ibid. P. 64.

³³⁶ Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917): Critical essays. M.: Nauka, 1967. P. 53.

³³⁷ Ibid. P. 54.

benefits of the church, the author also names judicial powers that were granted to her by special princely charters: "The Church profited from everything that was possible, and the concentration of a wide range of judicial cases in its hands was one of the important sources of its enrichment. The norms of church law had a pronounced class character and were very far from the idea of the equality of all people before God, which was officially preached by Christian doctrine"³³⁸. Church rites and sacraments also served the anti-people interests of the clergy and the entire ruling class: "With the help of compulsory confession, churchmen penetrated into the inner world of people, influenced their psyche and actions, and at the same time found out information about any plans directed against the church, the ruling class, and the existing social order"³³⁹. A. M. Sakharov describes the XIV-XV centuries as a time of growth in the number of monasteries and, accordingly, monastic land ownership, and the strengthening of the influence of the church in all spheres of public life. The fourth ("The Church in the period of the Mongol-Tatar yoke and the unification of Russian lands into a single state") and the fifth ("The Church and the formation of the Russian centralized state") chapters, in fact, are no different from A. M. Sakharov's own article a year earlier in "Problems of History"³⁴⁰, only for the generalized text, the factual material and the number of examples were expanded. In particular, passages about heretical medieval movements in Rus' were added, which, of course, are appropriate as a general historical description of the era.

The emphasis is slightly shifted, in comparison with the previous works of A. M. Sakharov, in the article of 1976³⁴¹. Instead of demonstrating the negative manifestations of the anti-popular and acquisitive policy of the church during the period of feudal fragmentation, secular princely power now acts as an active active subject, which, in the process of state centralization, tried to subjugate the church and use it "in its own class-political interests".

³³⁸ Ibid. P. 56.

³³⁹ Ibid. P. 57.

³⁴⁰ Sakharov A. M. The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State // Problems of History. 1966. No. 1. P. 49-65.

³⁴¹ Sakharov A. M. The formation of a unified Russian state and the ideological influence of the church on this process // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1976. No. 20. P. 170-189.

Until 1976, the presence of many articles or paragraphs in generalizing works on ancient Russian church history did not change the fact that until then not a single Soviet comprehensive monographic work had been published. Research by Y. N. Shchapov³⁴² declared as the first monograph on the study of the history of the ancient Russian church from the standpoint of Marxism. As sources, the author considers princely statutes and statutory letters of episcopal departments. The object of the study is the evolution of the church organization, its rights and jurisdiction in the context of the development of the ancient Russian state of the era of feudalism. Y. N. Shchapov first of all highlights the charter of Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavovich on tithes and church people and the charter of Prince Yaroslav the Wise on church courts. They arose in the first centuries of the existence of the church in Rus' and had a direct impact on later statutes and charters. With the passage of time and the development of church-state relations in Rus', these charters underwent changes, revisions and additions. Source research by Y. N. Shchapova allows us to determine the legal content and composition of the original monuments based on the texts of later editions. The author came to the conclusion that the charter of Vladimir is a document that reflects the agreement between the princely and church authorities on the division of feudal rent and the allocation of tithes to finance the church, and it dates back to the 12th century. The charter of Yaroslav was the next step in strengthening not so much the economic as the legal and social position of the church in the ancient Russian state: "Attention is drawn to the very large scope of the jurisdiction of the church in Rus', as it was reflected in princely charters and negatively in Russian Pravda. In terms of the number of cases, the church judicial department intruded into the life of the ancient Russian population no less often than the princely one³⁴³.

Another study of a microhistorical nature was published by A. A. Zimin in 1977³⁴⁴. The monograph is written on the history of land ownership and the social structure of the Joseph-Volokolamsk Monastery, which was named one of the largest church feudal lords in the 16th century. The feudal possession of the monastery is considered by A. A. Zimin

³⁴² Shchapov Y. N. Princely statutes and the church in ancient Rus'. XI-XIV centuries M.: Nauka, 1972. 338 p.

³⁴³ Ibid. P. 309.

³⁴⁴ Zimin A. A. Large feudal patrimony and socio-political struggle in Russia (end of the 15th-16th centuries). M.: Nauka, 1977. 356 p.

in the context of the politics and ideology of the Josephites. The author points out that in the middle of the XVI century more than a third of the populated lands of the country belonged to the spiritual feudal lords, thus, a large monastic estate played a significant role in the socio-political structure of the state. Considering the social structure of the Joseph-Volokolamsk Monastery, A. A. Zimin notes that the Josephites, through their political activities, supported the power of the Moscow princes and their own "corporate" interests. The ultimate goal of church money-grubbers was the creation of a state within a state³⁴⁵. A. A. Zimin in his work tried to demonstrate how the followers of the doctrine of Joseph Volotsky fought for the possession of all key positions among the highest church hierarchy. In turn, the struggle of the Josephites and non-possessors had a real impact on the current policy of the great princes. The author shows how, with the help of secular power, by the middle of the 16th century the most important church posts were in the hands of the Josephites. Separately, the activities of the Josephite Metropolitan of Moscow and All Rus' Macarius, which was aimed at strengthening the power of the Moscow sovereign and the church, were noted, which can be regarded as promoting the centralization and strengthening of the entire state. Thus, in Soviet studies, the question of the attitude to the doctrine of Joseph Volotsky and his followers was ambiguous: on the one hand, the Josephites could be regarded as reactionary feudal lords accumulating wealth; on the other hand, their support of the Moscow princes nevertheless led to the end of the process of centralization of the state around Moscow, which in Russian historiography was considered a progressive phenomenon after the era of feudal fragmentation.

Thus, the problem of church feudalism and monastic land ownership is one of the most developed topics in Soviet historiography of the history of Orthodoxy. Issues of socio-economic relations, which were cornerstone for Marxist ideology and methodology, are directly addressed. Over almost half a century, many works have been written on the economic history of monastic estates, metropolitan courts, and church estates. The authors used various sources, such as chronicles, scribal books, copy books,

³⁴⁵ Ibid. P. 281.

receipts and expenditure books, forms of episcopal departments, statutory charters of episcopal departments, princely statutes, etc.

2.3.4. The struggle of peasants against church land ownership

The logical continuation of the theme of feudalism is the questions of the peasant struggle against church land ownership. Uprisings, incl. under the leadership of I. I. Bolotnikov, S. T. Razin, E. I. Pugachev, Soviet historiography evaluated the class struggle of the oppressed against the oppressors as a progressive phenomenon.

In 1955, A. M. Samsonov's book "Anti-feudal popular uprisings in Russia and the church" was published in the popular science series by the publishing house of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The book was written under the influence of two well-known resolutions of the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1954. Thus, the tightening of ideological rhetoric in the field of religion "prompted" the necessary discourse to researchers. This was fully reflected in A. M. Samsonov. The author portrays the church in a accusatory tone as a "servant of the autocracy", obscuring the class consciousness of the masses: "The church and its ministers have always been closely associated with the exploiting classes, and the top part of the churchmen themselves belonged to large landowners and possessed significant capital. Therefore, the clergy, like the church as a whole, were zealous conductors of the policies of the exploiting classes³⁴⁶. The Orthodox Church that came to Rus' acted in the interests of the feudal lords, and itself became a major landowner. A. M. Samsonov contradicts S. B. Veselovsky, declaring an increase in wealth and feudal estates in monasteries from the 11th century. The author, apparently, connects this with the beginning of the first popular anti-feudal movements, which had a religious connotation. In the XI century social protest was used by the Magi during the uprising of peasants in the Suzdal land in 1024. The author notes the colonial activity of the monasteries in the XIV–XV centuries. In the 1950s Soviet historical science has

³⁴⁶ Samsonov A. M. Anti-feudal popular uprisings in Russia and the church. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. P. 5.

already formed an opinion about the positive side of the autocracy's colonial policy. A. M. Samsonov has to "sew" small "positive" paragraphs into almost every chapter, but they appear in isolation from the main logic and anti-clerical mood of the narrative and look like artificial inserts: "The intensified colonization carried out by the monasteries greatly contributed to the economic and cultural development of the country, the development writing and primary education among the indigenous population of the developed lands"³⁴⁷. Another example of the author's ambiguous assessment is the role of the church in the centralization of lands and the strengthening of autocracy: "The Church objectively played a progressive role in the process of eliminating feudal disunity and forming a centralized state, helping to strengthen autocratic power. The unification of the Russian lands under the rule of the Moscow princes also met the interests of the church itself, which needed a strong government capable of protecting its large land holdings and keeping the masses of peasants dependent on it in obedience"³⁴⁸. In contrast to the activities of non-possessors, who advocated the interests of the boyars in the fight against church land ownership, A. M. Samsonov highlights the progressive role of the heresies of Theodosius Kosoy and Matvey Bashkin. In a "peculiar religious form" they expressed the class protest of the enslaved masses. The peasantry responded to the establishment of serfdom with spontaneous indignation. Growing unrest, general social tension and famine in the first years of the 17th century. became the reasons for the uprising of I. I. Bolotnikov, which A. M. Samsonov calls the first large-scale anti-serf war against the boyars, landowners and spiritual feudal lords. The next major manifestation of the class struggle in the XVII century. there was an uprising by S. T. Razin, in the struggle against which the church took an active part. However, the author gave a rather modest number of examples about the role of the church. Besides, noticeably condescending-neutral attitude and a brief mention of the fact of the destruction of churches by the "Razintsy" in the captured cities and the execution of representatives of the clergy. A similar mood is also accompanied by a description of the events during the uprising led by E. I. Pugachev: "The anti-serfdom movement led by Pugachev was in many cases of a

³⁴⁷ Ibid. P. 18.

³⁴⁸ Ibid. P. 24.

pronounced anti-church character. Peasants besieged monasteries, ruined churches, destroyed icons, killed priests. Anti-church sentiments among the rebels were manifested, in particular, in attempts to create new forms of life, freed from church guardianship. <...> Along with the estates of the landowners, churches often burned. The forced spread of Christianity among non-Russian peoples, the persecution of the Old Believers"³⁴⁹. Having a fairly wide chronological framework of research, A. M. Samsonov focuses mainly on the uprisings of I. I. Bolotnikov, S. T. Razin and E. I. Pugachev. When listing the events of the three peasant uprisings, one can trace the obvious and undisguised author's sympathy for them. The popular science presentation of the material does not allow the author to reveal the topic, limiting himself to a number of disparate examples. The church is mentioned only indirectly and because of the necessity of the stated topic, but definitely does not act as the main object of study. But particular examples of the "reactionary policy of the clergy" are presented by A. M. Samsonov as a general trend.

In the collection "The Church in the History of Russia (IX century - 1917)" in the eighth chapter ("The Peasant War of the Beginning of the 17th Century and the Church"), V. I. Koretsky believes that the spark that ignited the peasant uprisings of the 17th century. there was a famine at the beginning of the century, as well as epidemics of plague and cholera, when "the suffering of the masses reached unprecedented proportions". However, the author notes, secular feudal lords, merchants, wealthy peasants and monasteries had grain reserves in the country. Speculation on the sale of bread by "spiritual patrimonials", according to V. I. Koretsky, was used to strengthen feudal exploitation. The author emphasizes the role of Kirillo-Belozersky and Joseph-Volokolamsky monasteries in this. Such social injustice became the catalyst for the beginning of peasant unrest. The aggravation of class contradictions led to the uprising of Cotton in 1603"³⁵⁰. Further, V. I. Koretsky writes that the church approved the anti-Polish conspiracy of Prince V. I. Shuisky, supporting him. At this time, the uprising of I. I. Bolotnikov was born - "the climax of the peasant war". "In the fierce struggle that

³⁴⁹ Ibid. P. 152-153.

³⁵⁰ Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917): Critical essays. M.: Nauka, 1967. P. 130.

began, the church placed at the disposal of the Shuisky government all its means - ideological and material, in order to achieve victory over the people"³⁵¹. Especially, according to the author, Patriarch Hermogenes, who was "an implacable enemy of the rebellious peasants", persisted in this. The "hostility" of the Orthodox clergy to the Bolotnikov uprising is explained by the author by the fact that the popular movement was directed against the feudal order. In this way, it dealt a blow to the Orthodox Church, one of the representatives of the class of oppressors. The negative attitude towards the church as a large owner, as a force that acted on the side of the government of the feudal lords, manifested itself quite clearly during the uprising, the author believes.

The first study in Soviet historiography, which, on the basis of hagiographic literature, reveals the history of monasteries and their role in the socio-economic and political processes in the history of the country was the work of I. U. Budovnits "Monasteries in Rus' and the struggle of peasants against them in the XIV-XVI centuries". The sources for the monograph are the lives of the saints. Through the source analysis of hagiographic literature, the author extracts material from the hagiographies, which testifies to the struggle of the peasants with the monastic land ownership. Since the text was ready as early as 1960, and the book itself was published posthumously, the author's introduction contains an "ideological frame" that was characteristic of the works of the era of the Khrushchev anti-religious campaign. Such emotionally colored epithets of a negative nature are used, such as "shameful nickname of money-grubbers", "immeasurably greedy and greedy people".

I. U. Budovnits explores the upheaval in monastic life in the second half of the 14th century, when monasteries turned into independent feudal estates. The author's periodization corresponds to the conclusions of S. B. Veselovsky. I. U. Budovnits gives a detailed historiographical review and analysis of pre-revolutionary studies of hagiographic literature, incl. highly appreciates the research of V. O. Klyuchevsky. The author writes: "In Soviet historical literature, the "lives of the saints" as a historical source did not attract much attention. They were not subjected to detailed analysis and were not

³⁵¹ Ibid. P. 136.

used even in anti-religious literature, although the "lives" contain extensive material characterizing the cruel feudal oppression on the part of the monasteries ..."³⁵². From the point of view of I. U. Budovnitsa, the lives: 1) provide rich material on the history of the emergence of a new type of patrimonial monasteries, the mass distribution of which occurred in the second half of the 14th century; 2) act as sources on the history of the class struggle between the feudal monasteries and the peasantry, as well as on the history of the life of monasteries and the organization of their farms.

The author used literature only about those saints who were the founders of new monasteries in the XIV-XVI centuries. I. U. Budovnits aims to rehabilitate the lives of the saints as a reliable historical source and "to reconsider the view of V. O. Klyuchevsky, established in historiographic practice, on "lives" as literary works, poor in content"³⁵³. Until the XIV century. monasteries were built and maintained by princes, archbishops and prominent boyars, and did not have large land holdings. Such conclusions are also true for women's monasteries: "Even to a lesser extent, women's monasteries can be called feudal landowners. Both at the time of interest to us, and throughout the entire subsequent history of Russian monasticism, nunneries, with rare exceptions (for example, Novodevichy), did not possess significant land wealth"³⁵⁴. The type of feudal monastery, which began to take shape in the second half of the 14th century, was built on the charter of a hostel, which turned it into a collective feudal estate, whose branched economy was based mainly on the labor of feudally dependent peasants. In the XV century. most of the monasteries were already like that. The revolution that took place in the monastic life of Rus' is associated with the names of Sergius of Radonezh and Metropolitan Alexei. The most valuable source on the history of this event is the life of Sergius, written by Epiphanius the Wise. Trinity Monastery was the first of its kind a new type of monastery. According to the characterization of I. U. Budovnit's, Sergius is not a humble saint, a stranger to everything worldly, as life depicts him, but an imperious and enterprising

³⁵² Budovnits I. U. Monasteries in Rus' and the struggle of peasants against them in the XIV-XVI centuries. (According to the «lives» of the saints). M.: Nauka, 1966. P. 42.

³⁵³ Ibid. P. 45.

³⁵⁴ Ibid. P. 55.

abbot who had close ties with the grand ducal authorities and an influential metropolitan³⁵⁵.

The author comes to the conclusion that monasteries of a new type appeared in territories where feudal relations were poorly developed and there was no competition with local secular landownership. But, at the same time, I. U. Budovnits separately emphasizes that the image of a monastery founded in an uninhabited desert is a myth. The founders of the monasteries principally settled close to towns and villages along the path of colonial advancement of state power. The colonial activity of the monasteries themselves was expressed in the appropriation of land with peasants in open areas. In the outlying areas, patrimonial monasteries were the backbone of the centralizing feudal state. According to the author's conclusions, the history of the new type of monasteries in Rus' is the history of the exploitation of the peasants and their struggle against a new kind of feudal enslavement.

"Monasteries in Rus' and the struggle of the peasants against them in the XIV-XVI centuries" is a fundamental study on the history of the creation of monasteries and the inner way of monastic life in Rus'. The source analysis of hagiographic literature conducted by I. U. Budovnits allowed the author to divide the material into historically reliable and fictional layers. We can say that this is one of the examples of high-quality historical work of the Soviet period, where the scientific value that has not lost its relevance is hidden behind the actual politicized title on the cover and the tendentious ideologized introductory word.

Thus, the struggle of peasants against monastic land ownership attracted the attention of Soviet researchers no less than the description of church feudal estates. Attention was especially concentrated on the manifestations of the class struggle in the uprisings of I. I. Bolotnikov, S. T. Razin, E. I. Pugachev. Soviet historiography assessed peasants, incl. anti-clerical, speeches as a phenomenon of a progressive nature.

³⁵⁵ Ibid. P. 92.

2.3.5. Anti-feudal religious movements

Among the anti-feudal actions in the history of Russia, Soviet historiography singled out religious anti-feudal movements, which they called reformation-humanistic. They were also evaluated through the prism of the class struggle. The authors saw in them a progressive phenomenon, but still hidden under the "religious veil".

In 1947, the first work devoted to the history of Russian journalism, and, more broadly, to the social thought of the 16th century, was published, authored by I. U. Budovnits³⁵⁶. The literary monuments considered by the author are mainly the works of clerics. I. U. Budovnits sets himself the task of "revealing the religious shell" of their views and showing "real public interests", i.e. the class struggle that the authors wanted to express. The historian begins with the heresy of the Strigolniks and the Judaizers, speaking of them as the first social religious movements of an anti-feudal nature. The main source of knowledge about the essence of the teachings of the Strigolniks is the teaching against them of the Bishop of Perm Stefan, because the heretics' own literature has not survived. The heresy of the "Judaizers" is known from the words of their accusers: the archbishop of Novgorod Gennady and the famous abbot I. Volotsky. I. U. Budovnits notes that I. Volotsky depicts the teaching of the "Jewish" not as a heresy, but as a complete apostasy from Christianity, which was punished in medieval Rus' much more severely. According to the author, it was precisely the fact that the Jews referred mainly to the books of the Old Testament that prompted Archbishop Gennady to undertake the translation of the Bible into Slavonic, and to check the already existing translations of individual books with the original, correct and supplement. As a result, I. U. Budovnits characterizes the heresies of the Strigolniks and the "Judaizers" as reformist movements. In his opinion, the heresies of medieval Rus' were influenced by similar social movements in Western Europe and European freethinkers, but, in turn, anticipated some Protestant ideas, such as the rejection of icons and the institution of monasticism. The anti-feudal

³⁵⁶ Budovnits I. U. Russian journalism of the 16th century. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. 308 p.

sentiments of the heretics also influenced a number of church leaders, who also began to oppose the money-grubbing of monasteries. In the second half of the XV century. the struggle for church lands intensifies - the boyars and the central grand ducal power begin to claim them. Within the clergy itself, a group of supporters of the non-possessive way of life of monks stands out, headed by the elder Nil Sorsky. I. U. Budovnits writes that the supporters of the secularization of the monastic lands were closely connected with the boyars. The author expounds in detail the teachings of Nil Sorsky in all its many aspects, which creates the impression of the author's sympathy for the person being described. "In the teachings of Nil Sorsky there is one point that touches on the burning issue of modernity. This clause - about the inadmissibility for monasteries to own land with peasants - touched upon the vital interests of a powerful church and responded to the aspirations of a number of influential social groups and the central government, had to sooner or later turn the whole teaching of Nil Sorsky into a military weapon of political struggle. And so it happened, and Nil Sorsky himself was drawn into the struggle"³⁵⁷. This happened, according to the researcher, under the influence of his own student, Vassian Patrikeyev. The former prince wanted to break out of "involuntary monasticism" and return to the usual sphere of political activity. "Vassian Kosoy managed - and this exposes an experienced politician in him - to adapt the amorphous teaching of Nil Sorsky to the political needs of another class, to make this teaching an instrument of boyar policy and with its help to fight the dominant church on such an important issue as the question of monastic land ownership"³⁵⁸.

One of the most important works on the subject of the history of reformation-humanist movements is the monograph by N. A. Kazakova and Y. S. Lurie³⁵⁹ (1955). For the first time in Russian historiography, on the basis of a deep study of sources, the history of the two main heretical movements of Rus' in the 14th - early 16th centuries is comprehensively studied: Strigolnik's and "Judaizers". In the traditions of Soviet historiography, the authors consider these heretical movements as anti-feudal and

³⁵⁷ Ibid. P. 79.

³⁵⁸ Ibid. P. 80.

³⁵⁹ Kazakova N. A., Lurie Y. S. Anti-feudal heretical movements in Rus' in the XIV - early XVI centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 544 p.

reformation-humanistic³⁶⁰. The authors of this work see the methodological basis in the "Peasant War in Germany" by F. Engels, where it is indicated that heresies were one of the forms of opposition struggle. And the protest took on a religious guise due to the ideological conditions of the era of feudalism and the exceptional economic position of the official church. Such a view and views are transferred to the field of Russian history. The authors compare both heresies with the movement of Jan Hus.

The first part of the book, dedicated to the Novgorod-Pskov heresy of the Strigolnikov, was written by N. A. Kazakova. The second part, written by Y. S. Lurie, is devoted to the Novgorod-Moscow heresy of the "Judaizers". The publication is also accompanied by historical sources introduced for the first time into circulation, prepared for publication by A. A. Zimin, A. I. Klibanov, Y. S. Lurie and N. A. Sokolov.

The Strigolnik's heresy, the first large-scale heretical movement in Rus', arose in Novgorod in the middle of the 14th century, and then spread to Pskov, where it reached its peak and was suppressed. Novgorod and Pskov were developed centers of crafts and commodity-money relations, and the level of class struggle between the townspeople and feudal lords was higher there. Thus, strigolism is a heresy of the township, which expressed protest in the religious shell of all sections of the township population against the feudal system and the dominant church. The progressiveness of the socio-religious movement consisted in the fact that in the fight against the feudal lord, it cleared the way for the next level of social and production relations. N. A. Kazakova sees spontaneous materialistic and pantheistic motives in the "reactionary religious shell" of the Strigolnikov heresy. According to the author, the movement was defeated due to the fact that conditions had not yet been created in Rus' for the fall of the feudal system. In addition, the most massive and oppressed class, the peasantry, was not involved in the movement.

³⁶⁰ Kazakova N. A. The ideology of strigolism - the first heretical movement in Rus' // TODRL. 1955. No. 11. P. 103-117; Lurie Y. P. The origins of a great tradition (Russian free thought of the 14th-17th centuries) // Science and Religion. 1961. No. 7. P. 41-45.

The Novgorod-Moscow heresy, the largest heretical movement in ancient Rus', arose at the end of the 15th century. and was destroyed at the beginning of the 16th century. The sharp aggravation of the class struggle during the formation of a centralized state determined the territorial breadth and duration of the existence of heresy. Information about heresy is drawn from the most diverse accusatory literature, one of the most active authors was I. Volotsky. The Novgorod part of the heresy was ideologically close to its predecessor, Strigolism, and, most likely, as Y. S. Lurie suggests, came out of it. The "Jewish" denied the dogma of the Trinity and icons, criticized the "fathers of the church", the institution of monasticism and the church hierarchy. The author insists on the special role of "Jews" in the development of Russian culture. Y. S. Lurie notes that representatives of heresy contributed to the development of writing, literature, history, mathematics and astronomy, i.e. paved the way for the development of science. The author also sees a progressive role in influencing the development of "secret" free-thinking in Rus', for example, in the emergence of the heresies of Matvey Bashkin and Theodosius Kosoy.

A number of works by the well-known Soviet historian A. A. Zimin are devoted to the study of reformation-humanistic ideologies. In his monograph "Peresvetov and His Contemporaries", the author singles out freethinkers and leaders of reform movements among the key contemporaries of the famous publicist. In addition to M. Bashkin³⁶¹ and F. Kosoy, the author also calls the elder Artemy³⁶². The latter is of interest to A. A. Zimin as a successor to the ideology of the nonpossessors Nil Sorsky and Vassian Patrikeev. For a short time, Artemy enjoyed the favor of Archpriest Sylvester and Ivan IV. One of the students of Artemy was precisely Theodosius Kosoy. According to the "testimony" of M. Bashkin at the Church Council in 1553, Artemy denied the traditions of the "holy fathers" and criticized the practice of worshiping icons. However, A. A. Zimin considers these words of Bashkin to be inconsistent with the real position of Artemy and the result of deliberate slander. The "hereticity" of Artemy's views, in the opinion of his accusers, was

³⁶¹ Zimin A. A. M. Bashkin - a freethinker of the 16th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 230-245.

³⁶² Zimin A. A. The case of the «heretic» Artemy // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 213-232.

related to non-possessive views and criticism of the practical activities of the church in the spirit of the Josephite doctrines. As the author concludes: "Thus, the religious views of Artemy, although in many respects they corresponded to the Russian Orthodoxy of the 16th century, at the same time, they prepared the ground for the emergence of radical reformist doctrines, the representative of which was Theodosius Kosoy. A speech against monastic landownership, demands for the moral transformation of human nature, a call for everyday teaching and appeals to the "commandments" and the gospel as the basis of Christian doctrine - these are some of the provisions of Artemy, reflecting and developing the views of the early non-possessors. In these provisions, there is already some influence of reform ideas, due to the fact that certain circles of non-possessors, whose ideologist was Artemy, in the context of the growth of the reform movement, were forced to reckon with this movement and use its individual slogans. demands for the moral transformation of human nature, a call for everyday teaching and appeals to the "commandments" and the gospel as the basis of Christian doctrine - these are some of the provisions of Artemy, reflecting and developing the views of the early non-possessors. In these provisions, there is already some influence of reform ideas, due to the fact that certain circles of non-possessors, whose ideologist was Artemy, in the context of the growth of the reform movement, were forced to reckon with this movement and use its individual slogans. demands for the moral transformation of human nature, a call for everyday teaching and appeals to the "commandments" and the gospel as the basis of Christian doctrine - these are some of the provisions of Artemy, reflecting and developing the views of the early non-possessors. In these provisions, there is already some influence of reform ideas, due to the fact that certain circles of non-possessors, whose ideologist was Artemy, in the context of the growth of the reform movement, were forced to reckon with this movement and use its individual slogans."

The nobility also took part in the reform movement in Russia along with the peasantry and the townspeople. One of the most prominent representatives of the nobility was the freethinker Matvey Bashkin. It was in the "heresy" of M. Bashkin that the

³⁶³ Zimin A. A. I. S. Peresvetov and his contemporaries: Essays on the history of Russian society and politics. thoughts of the mid-16th century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. P. 166-167.

Josephites accused the elder Artemy. Zimin compares and correlates different sources by which one can judge the religious and dogmatic aspects of the teachings of M. Bashkin and comes to the following characterization of his "heretical" views: the denial of the official church as an institution, the denial of icon veneration and the sacrament of repentance, the denial of patristic literature and the "perverted interpretation" gospel.

Theodosius Kosoy is the brightest representative of the "plebeian" heresy, reflecting the social interests of the urban lower classes and the peasant poor. According to A. A. Zimin, F. Kosoy was "an implacable fighter against social inequality" and "a consistent opponent of the feudal church". Kosoy opposed the basic dogmas of Orthodoxy: he denied the dogma of the trinity (as Zimin notes, incomprehensible to the general public), recognized the person of Christ as a simple person, rejected patristic literature, rationalistically interpreted Scripture, denied all the sacraments and rituals as "human traditions". According to the teachings of Theodosius Kosoy, everything created on earth is original and not created by someone, and the human soul is not immortal, thus "bold materialistic conjectures" lie in these views. The social grain in his "heresy" was the denial of not only monastic land ownership, but also the institution of monasticism in general. In addition, the existence of the entire church hierarchy was denied: "Priests and bishops were accused by Theodosius Kosoy of acquiring wealth and an idle life"³⁶⁴. The historian notes that F. Kosoy, in his non-possessive views, directly referred to V. Patrikeev. The author sums up: "The "Slave Teaching" of Theodosius Kosoy was the pinnacle of the development of the progressive socio-political thought of Rus' in the middle of the 16th century. Reflecting the rise of the class struggle in the country, marked by urban uprisings and movements among the peasantry, it expressed the ideology of the emerging plebeian opposition to feudalism and was the most radical manifestation of the reform movement in Russia in the middle of the 16th century"³⁶⁵.

³⁶⁴ Ibid. P. 206.

³⁶⁵ Ibid. P. 212.

Considerable attention is paid to the textological study of the literary work of Vassian Patrikeev in the work of N. A. Kazakova³⁶⁶. V. Patrikeyev is one of the representatives of the "brilliant galaxy of Russian publicists of the 16th century". According to N. A. Kazakova, the anti-feudal reformation-humanist movements, which acquired the character of heresies, were the starting point and impetus for the emergence of two currents within the church itself: non-possessors and Josephites: "Their emergence was associated with widespread criticism of the vices of the Orthodox Church in society - attacks by heretics on the feudal church organization as a whole and a protest against monastic land ownership..."³⁶⁷ V. Patrikeyev is considered by the author as the most prominent ideologist of non-possessiveness. During the reign of Vasily III, the struggle between the Josephites and non-possessors intensified, when V. Patrikeev was already at the head of the latter. The main content of the journalistic activity of V. Patrikeev was the struggle against the patrimonial rights of monasteries. Also, one of the important topics of Patrikeev's journalism was the situation of the monastic peasants. N. A. Kazakova does not fully agree with the point of view of V. I. Koretsky, who believed that the position of non-possessors on the peasant issue was dictated by "irritation and discontent in society"³⁶⁸, i.e. caused by the growth of peasant unrest in the monastic estates. As N. A. Kazakova explains, for V. Patrikeev, the reference to the "inhuman exploitation of the peasants" is due not to humanism and concern for the peasants as such, but to the denunciation of monks for breaking vows: "But Vassian limits his objections to the exploitation of peasants by monasteries by referring to the Gospel, without giving that detailed religious-theoretical, historical and canonical argumentation on which he based his speeches against monastic land tenure"³⁶⁹. The researcher also brings together the views of V. Patrikeev with heretics: Strigolniks, "Judaizers" and F. Kosoy. Conducts a connection between them on the issues of church acquisition, the system of argumentation

³⁶⁶ Kazakova N. A. Vassian Patrikeev and his writings. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 363 p.

³⁶⁷ Ibid. P. 25.

³⁶⁸ Koretsky V. I. The struggle of peasants with monasteries in Russia in the 16th - early 17th centuries. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 6. P. 215.

³⁶⁹ Kazakova N. A. Vassian Patrikeev and his writings. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. P. 87.

through the Gospel, a critical attitude to canonical literature, the dual nature of Christ. It is important that this convergence does not lead to identification, since for the historian, and all Soviet historiography, the heresy of the XIV-XVI centuries - this is a social protest against the feudal system, which meant, among other things, the denial of the entire "official" church. The teaching of V. Patrikeev, although it contained criticism of the patrimonial rights of monasteries, was aimed at "purifying" the church and, consequently, raising its authority.

A. I. Klibanov in the monograph "Reformation movements in Russia in the XIV - the first half of the XVI century"³⁷⁰ aims to demonstrate that the reform movements in Rus' had a humanistic orientation and an original and autonomous character, the emergence of which was not stimulated by foreign influence. In the source part of the work. A. I. Klibanov examines the monuments of Russian Reformation literature, essentially heretical and anti-church, and demonstrates that their ideological roots go back to the end of the 13th century. Also, the author gives the history and characteristics of the reform movements of the XIV-XVI centuries. The importance of A. I. Klibanov's work lies in the fact that the author provides data on the emergence of anti-church and anti-feudal reform movements as early as the end of the 13th century, i.e. even before the heresy of the Strigolniks; as well as about the anti-church reform movements in Tver in the 14th century. The author comes to the conclusion that the foundations of Russian reform movements are humanistic ideas. Thus, the general ways of development of culture and social thought in Rus' and in Western Europe are demonstrated. According to A. I. Klibanov, there were common sources of humanistic ideas in Russia and European countries (for example, the ideas of P. della Mirandola and M. Ficino in Italy). The sources of this lie in the Neoplatonic ideas from the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and in the doctrine of the moral freedom of man in the Church Fathers. In his original study, A. I. Klibanov showed why religious movements are precisely reformation-humanistic. there were common sources of humanistic ideas in Russia and European countries (for example, the ideas of P. della Mirandola and M. Ficino in Italy).

³⁷⁰ Klibanov A. I. Reform movements in Russia in the XIV - the first half of the XVI century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 411 p.

The sources of this lie in the Neoplatonic ideas from the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and in the doctrine of the moral freedom of man in the Church Fathers. In his original study, A. I. Klibanov showed why religious movements are precisely reformation-humanistic. there were common sources of humanistic ideas in Russia and European countries (for example, the ideas of P. della Mirandola and M. Ficino in Italy). The sources of this lie in the Neoplatonic ideas from the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and in the doctrine of the moral freedom of man in the Church Fathers. In his original study, A. I. Klibanov showed why religious movements are precisely reformation-humanistic.

In one of his subsequent works, A. I. Klibanov writes: "The ideological struggle of the masses of Russia during the period of feudalism was clothed in religious forms, just as it was at the stage of feudal development in the countries of the West and East"³⁷¹. One of the speculative utopias for A. I. Klibanov is the heresy of F. Kosoy. In the teachings of F. Kosoy, the author sees the result of "the achievements of advanced ideological movements in Russia, starting with the heretical movements of the late 15th - early 16th centuries" and enters it into the context of the pan-European reformation-humanistic thought.

Thus, Soviet researchers of Orthodoxy identified a separate direction of anti-feudal movements, which had a religious overtones, often of a heretical nature. Anti-feudal religious (heretical) movements in Soviet historiography were called reformation-humanistic due to their progressive nature. The main objects of the study were the heresies of the Strigolniks and "Judaizersv, the views of non-acquisitive people, primarily Vassian Patrikeev, and the activities of the heretical freethinkers Matvey Bashkin and Theodosius Kosoy. Soviet historians and religious scholars agreed that in medieval Rus' there were not "adventurous" heretical ideas, but original movements within Orthodoxy itself, and they reflected the class struggle.

³⁷¹ Klibanov A. I. People's social utopia in Russia: The period of feudalism. M.: Nauka, 1977. P. 3.

2.3.6. Church as a social institution in the history of Russia

A large block of works is devoted to the attitude of Soviet researchers to the church in the history of Russia as a social institution. In this context, we can mention works about the relationship between the Orthodox Church and the autocracy in Russian history; struggle of the church with science³⁷², where the church has traditionally been characterized as “a persecutor of the enlightenment of the masses and a hotbed of ignorance,” such a harsh tone of statements and characteristics can be regarded as a product of its era, namely the peak of Khrushchev’s anti-religious campaign.

The authors of *The Foundations of Scientific Atheism* hold the idea that the Orthodox Church as an institution throughout its history in Russia served the oppressors of the people, and not only princes, tsars, landowners and the bourgeoisie, but also the Tatar khans during the yoke. The establishment of the patriarchate in 1589 met the mutual interests of church and state. "The leaders of the Russian Church have always emphasized their constant loyalty to the autocracy"³⁷³. According to the logic of the authors, every year the union of the autocracy and the Orthodox Church was strengthened, the official role of the latter was strengthened. In accordance with the requirements of the state system, a more centralized system of church government was created. Being the largest landowner, the church "consecrated" the feudal exploitation of the peasants and "actively supported tsarism". The tsarist authorities suppressed the representatives of the schism with repressions its deep roots contained the expression of class contradictions and the struggle against feudal oppression. The complete subordination of the church to the state was carried out by Peter I, creating a collective departmental body with a civil official at

³⁷² Emelyakh L. I., Shakhnovich M. I. The Case of the Excommunication of Academician A.A. Markov // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1954. No. 2. P. 397-411; Ryndzyunsky P. G. The struggle to overcome religious influences in the Soviet school (1917-1919) // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 3. P. 47-86; Budilova E. A. The struggle of the church against the reflex theory of Sechenov // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 3. P. 152-183; Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of religion and church by I. A. Khudyakov // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 3. P. 184-213; Kravets I. N. The struggle of T. F. Osipovsky against idealism and religion // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 3. P. 237-246; Shakhnovich M. I. Space Storm // *Science and Religion*. 1959. No. 2. P. 23-27; Kryvelev I. A. *Modern theology and science*. M.: Gospolizdat, 1959. 206 p.

³⁷³ Tsameryan I. P., Dolgikh F. I., Kolonitsky P. F., Sheinman M. M. *Fundamentals of scientific atheism*. M.: Gospolizdat, 1961. P. 208.

the head. The Church continued to play the role of "servant of the autocracy", especially in ideological speeches in defense of the ruling system from popular uprisings. With the growth of the revolutionary labor movement, the Orthodox Church initially had a negative attitude towards its ideology, which the authors call "scientific socialism", which for them is identical to Marxism. Separately, it is stipulated that after the October Revolution, the clergy were subjected to "deserved repression not for their religious beliefs, but for anti-Soviet political activities"³⁷⁴. The conclusion that "the spirit of modern Orthodoxy, like that of other religions, is fundamentally hostile to communist ideals" fully corresponds to the ideological climate of the late 1950s and early 1960s.

The sharp tone of statements and assessments, as a product of its era, is also characteristic of the work of E. F. Grekulov in 1962³⁷⁵. Narrating the period of the 19th - early 20th centuries, the author tries to reveal the idea of "the union of autocracy and Orthodoxy against enlightenment." The topics of imposition of spiritual censorship and its struggle with science, the role of religion in primary, secondary and higher education are touched upon.

The phrase "Orthodox Inquisition" began to be popularized, which is an unofficial definition of the violent actions of representatives and institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church in relation to heresies, schism and free thought. Thus, for E. F. Grekulov, the "Inquisition" is a kind of symbol of the Catholic Church, associated with pictures of burning fires and the monastic order of the Dominicans, accessible to the mass consciousness. His book³⁷⁶ he devoted to comparing and searching for parallels of this image in the Orthodox Church. For example, E. F. Grekulov finds in the history of Russia examples of "Vedic trials", when, after the official establishment of Orthodoxy in Rus', sorcerers, "sorcerers" and "sorceresses" were persecuted.

The author gives various examples of the executions of heretics, primarily representatives of the Strigolniks and the Novgorod-Moscow heresy, as well as M.

³⁷⁴ Ibid. P. 217.

³⁷⁵ Grekulov E. F. The Orthodox Church is the enemy of enlightenment. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962. 192 p.

³⁷⁶ Grekulov E. F. Orthodox Inquisition in Russia. M.: Nauka, 1964. 168 p.

Bashkin; references to the monasteries of M. Grek, Abbot of the Trinity Monastery Artemy, etc. According to the legislation of that time, "religious" criminals ("church rebels") were equated with state criminals, and the fight against heresies was carried out by secular authorities. E. F. Grekulov explains this by the fact that the repressed were the main representatives of the anti-feudal movements.

The author also cites scattered examples of torture, executions and persecution of adherents of the "old faith", which intensified the mass exodus of peasants and residents of suburbs. "One of the consequences of the bloody terror against the schismatics was their self-immolation, which took on large proportions in the 17th-18th centuries. Self-immolation is often explained by reasons of a mystical nature, preaching that "the world lies in evil", faith in the coming of the kingdom of Antichrist, the desire to cleanse itself of the traces of the evil kingdom, to make a redemptive sacrifice by fire ... This, however, is wrong. Self-immolation, especially at the beginning of its spread, was not the dogma of any sect, it manifested the extreme desperation of people hunted down by merciless persecution by the government and the church"³⁷⁷. However, this is not such an unambiguous statement. So, for example, other Soviet researchers did not deny that voluntary participation in "burning" could be the result of religious exaltation and a manifestation of an extreme form of fanaticism. The main motive, characteristic of the poorest sections of the peasantry, was the desire to break out of the oppressed state in an extremely radical way³⁷⁸.

When describing the church's persecution of education and science, E. F. Grekulov uses an abridged version of his book *The Orthodox Church is the Enemy of Education* (1962) and supplements it with examples up to the 19th century.

The collection "The Church in the History of Russia (IX century – 1917)" had important ideological and methodological significance. Considering various particular

³⁷⁷ Ibid. P. 58.

³⁷⁸ Muller R. B. From the history of the split in the north of Russia (Self-immolation in Paleostrov) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1958. No. 2. P. 172-182.

issues, the collective monograph was primarily devoted to the history of church-state relations throughout all centuries of the official existence of Orthodoxy in Russia.

The tenth chapter ("The Church and Russian absolutism in the 18th century"; authors: Y. Y. Kogan, E. F. Grekulov, V. F. Milovidov) describes how the "stateization" of the church was completely completed and the religious ideology and religious cult according to the functions of the absolutist state: "The reform of church administration and economic transformations created the basic prerequisites for the activities of the church as the ideological support of the feudal-serf orders under absolutism"³⁷⁹. In the XVIII century the church became a government department, i.e. royal decrees could fully control its activities. The authors, in particular, focus on, for example, the fact that the sacrament of confession was subordinated to the goals of political investigation. The book presents a fairly detailed retelling of the course of the church reform, begun by Peter I, and which ended with the complete secularization of church and monastery lands.

In the eleventh chapter ("The Church in the Service of Autocracy and Serfdom in the First Half of the 19th Century"; Authors: S. S. Dmitriev, V. F. Milovidov), the focus of research attention is shifted from general historical issues of the relationship between church and state to the transformation of Orthodox ideology in connection with with the indicated changes: "The idea was introduced into the people's consciousness that since the power of the tsar was established by God, then obedience to such power is pleasing to God <...> socio-political system as guarded by God"³⁸⁰. Separately, the roles of Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) as the unofficial leader of the church, and the Minister of Public Education S. S. Uvarov with his new official state ideology are singled out.

The twelfth ("Strengthening the ideological influence of the Church in the post-reform period"), the thirteenth ("The Revolution of 1905–1907 and the Church") and the fourteenth ("Strengthening Russian clericalism") chapters were written by E.F. Grekulov

³⁷⁹ Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev P. A. Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917): Critical essays. M.: Nauka, 1967. P. 189.

³⁸⁰ Ibid. P. 206-207.

and formed the basis of his book "The Church, autocracy, people: (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th centuries) ", which will be discussed further.

Of particular interest is the sixteenth chapter ("Spiritual censorship in Russia in the 19th - early 20th centuries"), written by G. S. Lyalina. The structure of the spiritual censorship department, the scope of responsibility and consistent interaction with civil censorship are considered. The author lists examples of books and articles that were withdrawn from print. The influence of spiritual censorship on university education is demonstrated.

As already mentioned above, "The Church, the autocracy, the people: (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th century)" is an expanded edition of chapters from the collective monograph "The Church in the History of Russia (9th century - 1917)", written by E. F. Grekulov. The book uses a lot of factual and statistical material, for example, on the quantitative composition of the clergy, as well as its material support, the number of churches and monasteries and their economic situation in the second half of the 19th century.

The author sees one of the main problems of the era in the system of religious education in seminaries and theological academies, where "dead scholasticism and routine prevailed": "The seminary sought to kill the will of students, filling their brains with scholastic pseudoscience <...> In them [theological academies - P. D.], as in the seminaries, the police regime dominated"³⁸¹. From the second half of the XIX century in the field of spiritual education, certain processes took place related to the tightening of spiritual censorship and control over ideology: the teaching of philosophy, history and other secular sciences disappeared from the program, control over the freedom of scientific research was tightened³⁸². In addition, the caste type of the clergy class remained a problem. According to the author's understandable logic, all these factors led

³⁸¹ Grekulov E. F. Church, autocracy, people. (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th centuries). M.: Nauka, 1969. P. 4.

³⁸² Chumakova T. V. Infosphere of theological educational institutions of the Russian Empire in the 19th - early 20th centuries. // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Philosophy and Conflictology. 2022. No. 2. P. 264-274; Pyzikov D. D., Blinkova A. O., Khizhaya T. I. Libraries of Orthodox Theological Educational Institutions of the Russian Empire // Bylye Gody. 2022. No. 17 (4). P. 1666-1674.

to the fact that in the second half of the 19th - early 20th centuries. a certain historical type of Orthodox cleric appeared, who was criticized and caricatured ridiculed by his contemporaries. E. F. Grekulov finds the perpetrators in the person of the Chief Prosecutors of the Synod D. A. Tolstoy and K. P. Pobedonostsev.

In the second half of the XIX century. there was an active growth in the number of church schools, education in which took place in the spirit of devotion to the autocracy, and Orthodox schools were also spreading in areas of the country with a predominantly non-Russian population. In the secular high school, the teaching of science was reduced. Literature promoting materialistic and atheistic views was banned and confiscated everywhere. E.F. Grekulov sees this as a struggle against the revolutionary movement growing in the country: "The churchmen saw the evil of modern life, hostile to Christianity, in the union of three forces: socialism, materialism and atheism"³⁸³.

After the revolution of 1905, in addition to the external political activation of the church in the form of ideological influence on the masses of the population, the struggle of various sentiments within the church itself intensified: "There was a split in the church ranks, there was a struggle between church hierarchs and the white clergy"³⁸⁴. E. F. Grekulov, although rather briefly, touches on important issues and problems of internal church life.

The position of the church in 1917, the author evaluates unambiguously. In his opinion, at first the church met the February Revolution with hostility, and then the clergy "repainted" and began to "depict themselves as victims of the autocracy". E. F. Grekulov sees in this the selfish interests of the clergy and the desire to maintain a privileged position in public life. The author does not reflect all the complex and contradictory processes that took place both within the church and in relations with the state between the two revolutions.

By the 1980s softens the rhetoric in his works and I. A. Kryvelev. So he writes: "In our days, the Russian Orthodox Church takes a completely loyal position in relation to

³⁸³ Grekulov E. F. Church, autocracy, people. (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th centuries). M.: Nauka, 1969. P. 56.

³⁸⁴ Ibid. P. 109.

the socialist state and actively participates in the struggle of all progressive and democratic forces for the preservation of peace. There was, however, a time when her positions were neither democratic nor progressive. In the church "jubilee" literature, this is silent, and the motives for such tactics can be understood. But this does not mean that it can be accepted. We need to know the actual history - not "improved" or worse. This applies especially to the history of religion and the church."³⁸⁵ The main theme of the author's book is the union of the church and the autocracy at the beginning of the 20th century: "[on the eve of the First World War - P. D.] a wide preaching campaign was launched in the country, aimed at instilling loyal monarchical feelings into the consciousness of the masses of the people"³⁸⁶. I. A. Kryvelev shows the political evolution of the church from its "militantly irreconcilable position" of the church after the October Revolution to the 1927 declaration of Metropolitan Sergius of loyalty to the Soviet government.

In the framework of research on the history of church-state relations in the history of Russia, for Soviet scientists, the topic of the position of the church and its attitude to the revolutionary events at the beginning of the 20th century stood apart. In 1960, in the Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism, the former Metropolitan of Leningrad N. F. Platonov presented an extensive research article³⁸⁷. The main thesis, which will continue to go through Soviet historiography, is that the majority of the clergy in the revolutionary years were united in their desire to preserve the autocracy. The conclusions are confirmed by bringing numerous facts. The author demonstrates the exaggerated nature of the role of the internal church opposition and shows that the liberal clergy were a minority in the church hierarchy. N. F. Platonov outlines three main currents in the clergy: the Black Hundreds, the conservative-traditionalist and the renovationist.

³⁸⁵ Kryvelev I. A. Russian Orthodox Church in the first quarter of the XX century. M.: Knowledge, 1982. P. 3.

³⁸⁶ Ibid. P. 11.

³⁸⁷ Platonov N. F. The Orthodox Church in the fight against the revolutionary movement in Russia (1900–1917) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 103-209.

Important is a series of articles by L. I. Emelyakh about the anti-clericalism of the peasants during the first Russian revolution: "The anti-church movement of the peasants during the years of the first revolution"³⁸⁸, "From the history of anti-clericalism and atheism of Russian peasants in 1905-1907"³⁸⁹, "Secret reports of the bishops of the Orthodox Church on the anti-clericalism and atheism of the peasants during the first Russian revolution"³⁹⁰ and "Peasants and the Church in the First Russian Revolution"³⁹¹. The "secret reports" of the bishops to the Holy Governing Synod were first published by the researcher. It is logical to consider all articles as a single narrative, which, on the basis of a large number of archival documents first introduced into scientific circulation, paints a picture of indifference and a massive decline in religiosity among the peasants in 1905-1907. Such reasons are given as increased fees for the fulfillment of the requirements, class privileges of the clergy, remnants of the serf system in the church and monastic landholdings. The anti-clerical movement of the peasants is characterized by a desire to confiscate church and monastery lands and refuse to financially support the clergy. In 1962, L. I. Emelyakh defended her Ph.D. thesis on the topic "Anti-clerical movements of the peasants in the revolution of 1905–1907" in 1965³⁹², which included the above articles.

Only in 1984 was one of the first studies published on internal church issues and problems in the revolutionary period of Russian history³⁹³. The author P. N. Zyryanov sets himself the task of showing the counter-revolutionary activity of the church in alliance with the autocracy during the period of the first Russian revolution. The value of the work lies in paying serious attention to the issues of the internal history of the church, and not just a description of the church-state relations of a given period. In solving the

³⁸⁸ Emelyakh L. I. Anti-church movement of the peasants during the first revolution // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 3. P. 459-478.

³⁸⁹ Emelyakh L. I. From the history of anti-clericalism and atheism of Russian peasants in 1905-1907. // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1959. No. 3. P. 265-286.

³⁹⁰ Emelyakh L. I. Secret reports of the bishops of the Orthodox Church on anti-clericalism and atheism of the peasants during the first Russian revolution // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 320-338.

³⁹¹ Emelyakh L. I. Peasants and the Church in the First Russian Revolution // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1963. No. 7. P. 70-93.

³⁹² Emelyakh L. I. *Anti-clerical movement of peasants during the first Russian revolution*. M.; Leningrad: Nauka, 1965. 201 p.

³⁹³ Zyryanov P. N. *The Orthodox Church in the fight against the revolution of 1905-1907*. M.: Nauka, 1984. 224 p.

problem, the author uses a large number of published and archival sources: legislative acts, general civil and church, synodal decrees, reports of the chief prosecutor, memoirs of church hierarchs and priests, church and secular periodicals, etc. P. N. Zyryanov showed that the Orthodox Church in Russia was connected with the state by strong economic, political and ideological ties. As a result, the church acted as an active fighter against the revolutionary movement. The foundations of the counter-revolutionary teaching of the church were formed under the influence of Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) and Chief Prosecutor K. P. Pobedonostsev. However, the union of the church and the autocracy was not of an equal nature and was not free from contradictions. Unfortunately, the last important aspect of the internal church situation was often ignored by previous Soviet researchers. According to P. N. Zyryanov, a special area of activity of the official church hierarchy was the struggle against the democrat priests in the Second Duma, symbolizing the internal contradictions of the church in its counter-revolutionary activities. The main reason for the crisis of church ideology at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, the author sees in the discrepancy between its structure and the external conditions of the existing capitalist relations.

In a collective monograph of 1967 (in the seventeenth chapter "The Provisional Government and the Church"), E. S. Osipova expressed the idea, quite original for Soviet historiography, that the church tried to use the February Revolution in its own interests, so she supported the Provisional Government. The rapid reorientation is connected with the fear of the development of the revolution, the fear of losing their land holdings as a result of the solution of the land issue and the unwillingness to lose contact with the masses who opposed tsarism. There was also a "certain purge" among the higher hierarchy, which primarily affected Rasputin's henchmen: Metropolitan Pitirim of Petrograd, Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow, Bishops Barnabas and Isidore were removed.

Numerous archival materials cited by L. I. Emelyakh testify that the anti-clericalism and atheism of the peasants on the eve of the October Revolution had deep

social roots and historical background³⁹⁴. The catalyst for the crisis of the religious consciousness of the peasants, according to the author, was the First World War. The disasters and difficulties of wartime, on the one hand, could produce a short-term surge of religiosity, but for the most part gave rise to complete indifference to the church and its rites, as evidenced by the reports of the bishops on the state of the dioceses. According to the author, the war, with all the disasters associated with it, "opened the eyes" of all working people to the true culprits of their troubles - tsarism and the clergy supporting it. The fall of the autocracy in February 1917 intensified the process of the peasants' departure from religion and caused anti-clerical movements. There is a growth of anti-clerical and indifferent to religion sentiments among the soldiers. There are a number of reasons for what is happening: 1) The significant role of Bolshevik propaganda and agitation, both among soldiers, so among the peasants; 2) Even after the February Revolution, the Black Hundred parish clergy continued to conduct monarchist propaganda, which caused popular indignation and protest; 3) Dissatisfaction with the extortion of peasants by the clergy, incl. conflicts over requirements; 4) Protection by the clergy of the interests of the landowners. Thus, the author concludes, an analysis of the attitudes of the masses to religion and the church in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century. demonstrated that all the grounds were ripe and all the prerequisites were created for the separation of the church from the state, and the schools from the church the author concludes, an analysis of the attitudes of the masses to religion and the church in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century. demonstrated that all the grounds were ripe and all the prerequisites were created for the separation of the church from the state, and the schools from the church the author concludes, an analysis of the attitudes of the masses to religion and the church in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century. demonstrated that all the grounds were ripe and all the prerequisites were created for the separation of the church from the state, and the schools from the church³⁹⁵.

³⁹⁴ Emelyakh L. I. Peasants and the Church on the Eve of October. L.: Nauka, 1976. 182 p.

³⁹⁵ Persits M. M. Separation of the Church from the State and the School from the Church in the USSR (1917-1919). M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 198 p.

Thus, works covering the history of the Orthodox Church as a social institution in Russia are of the most general nature. Many of them bear the imprint of Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign with harsh atheistic rhetoric. The researchers were especially interested in the topic of the struggle of the church with education and science in the history of Russia, which was acutely perceived by the ideology of scientific-atheistic propaganda and education. Separately, we can highlight the direction of research on church-state relations during the revolutions of 1905 and 1917.

2.3.7. The evolution of Orthodoxy and the "modernization" of Orthodox theology

A separate area of research on the history of Orthodoxy appears during the Khrushchev campaign, it is devoted to the "modernization" of Orthodox theology, or, in general, the position of "modern" Orthodoxy. As the future director of the Institute of Scientific Atheism of the AON under the Central Committee of the CPSU, P. K. Kurochkin, explained, the concepts of "adaptation" and "modernization" imply an active aspect of the activities of the institution of the church and clergy. "Adjustment" is a simple kind of change in religious ideology, "opening the way for modernization". "Modernization" is the rejection of some and the promotion of others, more consonant with the times, aspects of dogma and practice; modernization involves innovation and an appeal to the provisions of modern science³⁹⁶. Just an important sign of the era is that most of these studies are devoted to the moral values that are, on the one hand, Orthodoxy, on the other hand, the communist ideology. One of the first works is an article by the famous religious scholar L. N. Mitrokhin "Modern Orthodoxy"³⁹⁷, in which he writes that 40 years after the October Revolution, despite the "outer shell" of the acceptance of socialist reality and the absence of protests against socialist transformations and against communism on the part of the clergy in the USSR, the ideology of Orthodoxy in its essential points remained unchanged. In the same year, I. A. Kryvelev's book "Modern

³⁹⁶ Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1971. P. 12-13.

³⁹⁷ Mitrokhin L. N. Modern Orthodoxy // Science and Religion. 1959. No. 1. P. 25-31.

Theology and Science" was published, where there is militant atheistic rhetoric: "You need to know the enemy - this is a very important rule of any struggle, including ideological struggle"³⁹⁸.

Many works on the current state of Russian Orthodoxy were published by M. P. Novikov³⁹⁹, N. S. Gordienko⁴⁰⁰, P. K. Kurochkina⁴⁰¹ (and jointly⁴⁰²) and etc.⁴⁰³, - they are written in a popular science style, with echoes of militant atheism.

In the context of the XXII Congress of the CPSU and the issues of "scientific and atheistic education", in order to overcome religious prejudices, a candidate's dissertation was written, and then a book by P.K. Kurochkin "Orthodoxy and Humanism" (1962). The work is based on an analysis of current church literature, and the work itself appears to be philosophical and ethical. For the author, communist humanism is the highest form of humanism, because proceeds from the need to eliminate all forms of human exploitation.

P. K. Kurochkin criticizes the church's view of the purpose and meaning of human life, noting: "But the dialectic of history is such that, having established itself on the basis of social oppression of the masses, the transcendent religious concept of the meaning of life strengthens the orders that gave rise to it, strengthens the enslavement of workers, dooms them to passivity, humility and patience"⁴⁰⁴. The "mystical" Orthodox ideology under socialism prevents the working people from taking an active part in building

³⁹⁸ Kryvelev I. A. Modern theology and science. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1959. P. 3.

³⁹⁹ Novikov M. P. Orthodoxy and modernity. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1965. 253 p.; Novikov M. P. Dead Ends of Orthodox Modernism: (A Critical Analysis of the Theology of the 20th Century). M.: Politizdat, 1979. 167 p.

⁴⁰⁰ Gordienko N. S. Modern Orthodox falsifiers // Science and Religion. 1962. No. 10. P. 28-31; Gordienko N. S. Modern Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1968. 143 p.; Gordienko N. S. Modern ecumenism: Movement for the unity of Christian churches. M.: Nauka, 1972. 200 p.; Gordienko N. S. Criticism of new trends in modern Orthodoxy. Leningrad: Knowledge, 1974. 32 p.; Gordienko N. S., Novikov M. P. Modern ideological struggle and religion. Moscow: Knowledge, 1980. 40 p.; Gordienko N. S. Mysticism in the service of modern Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1981. 63 p.; Gordienko N. S. The evolution of Russian Orthodoxy (20-80s of the XX century). Moscow: Knowledge, 1984. 64 p.; Gordienko N. S. Modern Russian Orthodoxy. L.: Lenizdat, 1987. 302 p.

⁴⁰¹ Kurochkin P. K. Orthodoxy and humanism. M.: Publishing House of HPS and AON, 1962. 167 p.; Kurochkin P. K. The ideology of modern Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1965. 31 p.; Kurochkin P. K. The social position of Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1969. 45 p.; Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1971. 270 p.

⁴⁰² Gordienko N. S., Kurochkin P. K. Features of the modernization of modern Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1978. 64 p.; Gordienko N. S., Novikov M. P. Modern ideological struggle and religion. Moscow: Knowledge, 1980. 40 p.

⁴⁰³ Krasnikov N. P. On the adaptability of the Orthodox clergy to modern conditions // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 107-112; Pritykin Y. M. Modern Orthodox «moralists» and historical reality // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 155-168.

⁴⁰⁴ Kurochkin P. K. Orthodoxy and humanism. M.: Publishing House of HPS and AON, 1962. P. 18.

communism. And since for the author communism is humanism, i.e. implicitly anti-humanistic Orthodox ideology, in addition to everything else, also hinders the path to true humanism.

The anti-humanism of Orthodoxy also lies in the doctrine of the ideal of man. Detachment from the world and asceticism is something opposite to the true ideal. The Orthodox "cult of suffering" is especially anti-humanistic. It is necessary to note the biased interpretation of all aspects of the Orthodox dogma by the author: one-sided and tendentious.

Another work that was "inspired" by the XXII Congress of the CPSU was the monograph "Orthodoxy and Modernity" by M. P. Novikov. According to M. P. Novikov, Orthodoxy does not change its theistic worldview, which is false in its essence and contradicts science, its position on human morality and morality, and continues to promote dogma that is anti-humanistic in its essence. The dogmas are also unchanging: it is precisely in their conservative immutability that lies, in the author's opinion, one of the main problems of the modernization of Orthodoxy, although their formulations can be interpreted by theologians in the most appropriate way according to the conditions of the time. In Orthodoxy, however, the social assessment of reality is changing; external form and interpretation of the internal unchanging content. The purpose of the work of M. P. Novikov is a demonstration of these "camouflage" actions to modernize various aspects of dogma and worship. The study does not clearly define and distinguish between the concepts of "adaptation", "update" and "modernization", the author uses them alternately or together.

In liturgical practice, innovations occupy a prominent place: "The Christian cult is closely connected with dogma, is its continuation, its external form. But it looks more accessible to understanding and clarification. That is why the church strives to involve as many believers as possible in worship and, through worship, to form the main religious ideas. In addition, rituals are easier to become a habit, more difficult to overcome. They are able to revive beliefs, attract people, even those who do not have clear religious beliefs. That is why the church is currently paying special attention to the adaptation of

liturgical practice to the needs and ideas of believers"⁴⁰⁵. As examples, the author cites the easing of fasts and restrictions on religious holidays, the refusal to recognize "new" miracles and the consecration of new icons, the holding of two liturgies in churches with a difference in time, etc.

According to M. P. Novikov, after the "triumph of Marxism-Leninism", theologians began to assert that religion does not interfere with scientific knowledge, and the scientific data obtained are in agreement with the truths of faith. Theologians also began to identify the commandments with the moral code of the builder of communism. But in itself, Christian morality, according to the author, is inhumane and hypocritical - it is a world of illusions of desperate and helpless people.

A number of works by N. S. Gordienko touch upon various aspects of the general theme of the history of Orthodoxy in the 20th century. Also, the author's works differ markedly at the "scientific" level and represent a wide range: from propaganda pamphlets from the series "to help the lecturer-agitator" to monographs. Further, the author's works, which are, first of all, of scientific value, will be considered.

For example, in one of the first serious works⁴⁰⁶ N. P. Gordienko describes the history of Orthodoxy in the first years of Soviet power through the prism of its renovationist tendencies. Separately, it is worth noting new motives for Soviet historiography of the history of modern Orthodoxy: in addition to considering the "group of 32" or, for example, the "Living Church", the author traces the continuity of the ideas of the supporters of renewal with the ideas of the Slavophiles, F. M. Dostoevsky, V. S. Solovyov etc. Representatives of the Renovationist schism recognized Soviet power and the socialist revolution, which, in turn, was supported by the "overwhelming majority of believers" and "the bulk of the clergy." Only reformist plans to radically "renew" Orthodoxy did not find support, which led to the victory of Patriarch Tikhon and his camp. In the post-war period, the church takes measures to intensify its activities: religious educational institutions are being recreated, publishing activity is expanding (most

⁴⁰⁵ Novikov M. P. Orthodoxy and modernity. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1965. P. 44.

⁴⁰⁶ Gordienko N. S. Modern Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1968. 143 p.

importantly, the publication of the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate has been resumed), preaching activity is intensifying. N. S. Gordienko, following M. P. Novikov, notes the "church" revision and adaptation of rituals to the new conditions of socialist life.

P. K. Kurochkin devoted the main part of his works to explaining the essence of the "adaptation" and "modernization" of Orthodoxy. So, in 1969, he described the beginning of the adaptation of the Orthodox Church to historical changes through the transition to loyal positions to the Soviet state. This was followed by a socio-ideological activation, which consisted in a "social" interpretation of religion. The central place is occupied by the idea of "communist Christianity" - the key point of the modernization of Orthodoxy. The author highlights attempts from theological positions to bring together the ideological foundations and socio-moral principles of communism and religion⁴⁰⁷.

In 1971, P. K. Kurochkin published one of his central works. "The Evolution of Modern Russian Orthodoxy" was the result of the defense of the doctoral dissertation by the author. If his work "Orthodoxy and Humanism" is an experience of philosophical and ethical research, then this one is a philosophical and sociological one. Kurochkin shows the features of the adaptation and modernization of Orthodoxy to the conditions of socialism: the scale, pace and direction of this process. As well as a Marxist assessment of the ideological and political aspects of the evolution of Orthodoxy: "However, the fact that one of the reasons for the greater conservatism of Orthodoxy in comparison with other main Christian denominations is rooted in the union of the church and autocracy <...> After the liquidation of the old political system and the separation of church and state Orthodoxy fell into the conditions of natural development"⁴⁰⁸.

The author justifies the need to study the evolution of Orthodoxy by the fact that, changing and modernizing, it complicates the tasks of atheistic education. Ignoring theological modernization leads to abstract, superficial and irrelevant criticism. In the ideology of Orthodoxy were revised and "adapted": the political course, social position,

⁴⁰⁷ Kurochkin P. K. The social position of Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1969. 45 p.

⁴⁰⁸ Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1971. P. 90.

moral concept, doctrinal foundations, liturgy, canons. The first two components are especially important, which the author reveals in detail in the relevant chapters.

The first political decisive step of the church towards socialist reality was Metropolitan Sergiy's "Message to Pastors and Flock" on July 29, 1927, when transformational processes began within the church and in the position of relations with the state. After this event, P. K. Kurochkin singles out the period of the 1930s–1940s as a stage of "adaptation" in the field of church ideology and cult. Since the 1950s the stage of "modernization" has already begun.

P. K. Kurochkin, following N. S. Gordienko, sees the Slavophiles as the harbingers of the Orthodox Church renewal, whom he calls "pioneers of a critical attitude to church reality". The author dwells on the analysis of F. M. Dostoevsky's pochvenism and V. S. Solovyov's idealism, as well as the "neo-Christian" new religious consciousness of N. A. Berdyaev, S. N. Bulgakov, D. S. Merezhkovsky, V. V. Rozanov and other "Intrachurch" supporters of renewal are the participants in the "Religious-Philosophical Meetings" of 1901-1903. For example, Protopresbyter I. L. Yanyshchikov, Bishop Antonin (Granovsky), Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky), and others. Importantly, about all the above names, with reservations, but P. K. Kurochkin speaks as representatives of a progressive view of the situation in Russian Orthodox Church. "Program requirements of the liberal-renovation movement of the early 20th century. First of all, they boiled down, therefore, to a change in the socio-political orientation of the church, corresponding to the new, capitalist stage in the development of the country. Getting out of the tutelage of the autocracy, the rejection of the deification of tsarist power, which compromises Orthodoxy, the granting independence to the church—all these demands of church progressives reflected the interests of the liberal bourgeoisie, which was interested in greater dynamism and adaptability of Russian Orthodoxy to the spirit of the times. The main core of the liberal-renovation movement was on the side of the constitutional monarchy, proclaimed by the tsar's manifesto on October 17, 1905, and supported the political platform of the Octobrists and Cadets"⁴⁰⁹. As shown earlier, E. S. Osipova wrote about the support of the

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid. P. 60.

Cadets party by the liberal clergy in 1967, and P. N. Zyryanov will write more about the causes of the internal church crisis in 1984.

The change in the political platform of Orthodoxy affected all aspects of its ideology: "In the years since the publication of the Epistle to Pastors and Flock on July 29, 1927, the political orientation of Russian Orthodoxy has stood the test of time. With the implementation of the principle of political loyalty to the Soviet state, the breaking of the ties between the church and the exploiting classes was completed"⁴¹⁰. The church underwent a special "test" during the Great Patriotic War. And after it, the influence of the Russian Orthodox Church in the international movement for peace increased.

If the "adaptation" of Orthodoxy took place more in the plane of political loyalty, then "modernization" is already characterized by changes in its social position: "The social interpretation of Orthodoxy is currently the key point of its modernization. Rebuilding their ideology, the church theological circles of the Moscow Patriarchate are focusing on the religious interpretation of the problems of social development. It is she who now determines the ideological place of religion and is the most important factor in its strengthening"⁴¹¹.

Separately, the stage of "modernization" of Orthodoxy N. S. Gordienko and P. K. Kurochkin consider in their joint book "Features of the Modernization of Modern Russian Orthodoxy". The work was written "under the impression" of the Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1971. One can note the rather complimentary rhetoric of the authors regarding the fact that the church took into account the mistakes of previous experiences of the renovationist past. "During the years of the Great Patriotic War, the Russian Orthodox Church, which in general already had about a decade and a half of experience of a loyal attitude towards the Soviet state, showed itself patriotically, provided certain material assistance to our country in the fight against the Nazi invaders. Its Local Council, held in 1945, which elected Patriarch Alexy (Simansky), approved the

⁴¹⁰ Ibid. P. 136.

⁴¹¹ Ibid. P. 156.

already established political orientation"⁴¹². Also, the Local Council of 1971 condemned the leaders of ROCOR for anti-Soviet agitation, which could not but meet with the approval of the authors.

There has been a decrease in the intensity of Orthodox church reforms since the early 1970s, the process of modernization continues, but at a different pace and in a different vein, in contrast to the "radical modernism" of the 1960s. First of all, this is manifested in the foreign policy activities of the church through participation in various world conferences of a peacemaking nature and propaganda of the ideas of ecumenism, in which the chairman of the department for external church relations of the Moscow Patriarchate, Metropolitan Nikodim (Rotov) of Leningrad and Novgorod, played a special role. "In other words, the modernized Russian Orthodoxy has become more attractive to modern believers, who perceive this religion not as a historical anachronism, but as a teaching addressed to the current generations of Christians. At the same time, it has become less vulnerable to criticism"⁴¹³.

M. P. Novikov considered the problem of modernization of Orthodoxy from a slightly different angle. In his book *The Dead Ends of Orthodox Modernism*, the author paid more attention to modern theological developments in matters of dogma and set himself the task of revealing the "inconsistency" of new theological arguments. Novikov shows the apologetic transformation of Christian dogmas, for example, the modification of the concept of atonement from "retribution for past sins" into "feat in the name of freedom, equality and justice", which is more in tune with the worldview of modern man. "Moreover, declaring the original Christian concepts unshakable in their basis, theologians at the same time try to present all the inconsistency of these concepts as the result of the limitations of the human mind, which does not allow it to penetrate into the realm of the incomprehensible divine mysteries of being"⁴¹⁴. Novikov analyzes the exegetical ideas of religious philosophers and theologians, for example, P. A. Florensky's

⁴¹² Gordienko N. S., Kurochkin P. K. *Features of the modernization of modern Russian Orthodoxy*. M.: Knowledge, 1978. P. 7.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.* P. 23.

⁴¹⁴ Novikov M. P. *Dead Ends of Orthodox Modernism: (A Critical Analysis of the Theology of the 20th Century)*. M.: Politizdat, 1979. P. 23.

antinomy, attempts to reconcile the Bible and science through the "visionary theory" by A. P. Lopukhin, A. V. Kartashev's historical method of typological interpretation of biblical texts, V. F. Voyno-Yasenetsky. The author considers the modern eschatological teaching of the Russian Orthodox Church on the example of the concepts of S. N. Bulgakov, V. N. Lossky, N. A. Berdyaev, the influence of V. S. Solovyov's religious philosophy on modern Orthodoxy. Particular attention is paid to the relationship of Orthodox theology to the evolutionary monism of Teilhard de Chardin and the theocentric "dialectical theology" by K. Barth. Separately, the theme of modern theological approaches to environmental issues and the relationship of man to nature in the context of scientific and technological progress is singled out.

On the eve of the celebration of the millennium of the baptism of Rus', the first generalizing monograph on the history of the existence of modern Orthodoxy in the Soviet Union was presented⁴¹⁵. Its author N. S. Gordienko comprehensively explores the history of the evolution of Orthodoxy over the past seventy years, changes in the internal structure and organization, topical issues of dogma and worship. Few traces of scientific-atheistic rhetoric can be found in this work.

In the historical part, the author leads the history of modern Orthodoxy from the Renovatianist schism and the struggle against it by the "reactionary" Patriarch Tikhon to the intensification of the apologetic activities of the clergy in connection with the approaching celebration of the millennium of the baptism of Rus'. The author covers the topics of stabilization of church life under the locum tenens of the patriarchal throne, Metropolitan Sergius, the post-war transition of church ideology from the standpoint of traditionalism to modernism, "moderate dynamism" of ideology after the Local Council of 1971, peacemaking activity of the church, and political loyalty to the Soviet state.

In a separate part of the book, the author presents the demographic composition of believers in the USSR, describes the spiritual hierarchy of the clergy, explains the church territorial division and administrative divisions of the Moscow Patriarchate, talks about

⁴¹⁵ Gordienko N. S. *Modern Russian Orthodoxy*. L.: Lenizdat, 1987. 302 p.

Orthodox educational institutions and publishing activities of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Separately, N. S. Gordienko highlights the positive aspects of the activities of the Orthodox Church in the history of the USSR: "As has been shown, the Russian Orthodox Church, starting from the 40s of the current century and ending with the present, has carried out many public actions approved by the people: in the past it stigmatized fascism, helped financially the front and rear, now condemns the aggressors and warmongers, stands up for detente of international tension, calls for active support for the cause of peace. In a word, one can admit, without sinning against the truth, that now the Russian Orthodox Church is with the people in defending civic positions and solving socio-political problems"⁴¹⁶. It can be noted that for the first time the name of the "Russian Orthodox Church" was written with a capital letter by the author, which emphasizes the forced respectful attitude of the former propagandist towards it. It appears that the passage cited above can be viewed not simply as a recognition of a special role for the Russian Orthodox Church in the history and public life of the USSR, but also as an epitaph to official Soviet atheism.

Thus, Soviet researchers considered the reasons for the evolution of Orthodoxy to be a change in the economic base after the complete secularization and nationalization of church lands, a change in the social composition of parishioners, and the deprivation of the status of a state church. The direction of evolution was the search for new guidelines for functioning within the framework of Soviet legislation, support for the Russian and foreign policy of the USSR, the adoption of the social and ethical concept of "communist Christianity", a revision of attitudes towards scientific and technological progress, etc. Describing the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the 20th century, Soviet religious scholars singled out the special role of the Renovationist schism, which launched the mechanism of transformation. The concepts of "adaptation" and "modernization" of Orthodox theology to socialist reality were subjected to methodological development. "Adjustment" had a political plane and was seen as a

⁴¹⁶ Ibid. P. 136.

change in ideology under external pressure in the 1930s and 1940s. "Modernization" implied a social plane and was characterized by "screening out" or actualization of doctrinal aspects according to the era starting from the 1950s. Attention is drawn to the excellent knowledge of atheist researchers of the contemporary church press, in the first place, articles from the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. For almost half a century, one can definitely note the softening of the author's assessments and rhetoric in relation to the history of Orthodoxy. Attention is drawn to the excellent knowledge of atheist researchers of the contemporary church press, in the first place, articles from the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. For almost half a century, one can definitely note the softening of the author's assessments and rhetoric in relation to the history of Orthodoxy. Attention is drawn to the excellent knowledge of atheist researchers of the contemporary church press, in the first place, articles from the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. For almost half a century, one can definitely note the softening of the author's assessments and rhetoric in relation to the history of Orthodoxy.

In this chapter of this study, it was shown that in all thematic groups there were fundamental works (primarily monographs) that have not yet lost their scientific relevance; and "auxiliary" (most often, brochure type), which can be classified as popular science literature. For example, many landmark scientific works were based on a large number of archival documents and sources, which the authors analyzed or introduced into scientific circulation for the first time. The other part of the books reviewed did not claim to have heuristic potential, but contained a lot of factual material. Others did not have high academic significance at all. The most important feature of the Soviet historiography of Orthodoxy was the political aspect. The party's ideological policies directly influenced discourse and censorship of research. This is especially noticeable in the construction of introductions and conclusions of works with a predominance of so-called "ideological frames". Also, it should be noted that certain topics within the framework of the study of Russian Orthodoxy were to a greater extent revealed by representatives of other humanities: history, philosophy, source studies, folklore, literary studies, etc. On the one hand, they were of independent value for their own disciplines; on the other hand, they

had a strong impact on the development of Russian science of religion, enriching it. That certain topics within the framework of the study of Russian Orthodoxy were explored to a greater extent by representatives of other humanities: history, philosophy, source studies, folklore studies, literary studies, etc. On the one hand, they were of independent value for their own disciplines; on the other hand, they had a strong impact on the development of Russian study of religion, enriching it. That certain topics within the framework of the study of Russian Orthodoxy were explored to a greater extent by representatives of other humanities: history, philosophy, source studies, folklore studies, literary studies, etc. On the one hand, they were of independent value for their own disciplines; on the other hand, they had a strong impact on the development of Russian science of religion, enriching it.

Conclusion

The ideological policy of the party and state in the field of atheism directly and directly influenced the development of domestic religious studies in 1943–1988. The history of the study of Orthodoxy can be perceived as a kind of mirror of the state's attitude towards religion and the church. In the history of the USSR, several periods of church-state relations can be distinguished, each of which corresponds to a certain type of atheistic propaganda. The analysis of the sociocultural and political context carried out in the dissertation research showed that the change in these "eras" of anti-religious propaganda influenced the topics, objects, methodology, assessments, results and rhetoric of research.

The first stage within the given chronological framework was natural science and patriotic propaganda (late 1930s - 1953), when the rehabilitation of military and political figures of the past took place in public and scientific discourse. This chronological period is characterized by publication activity in the field of source studies. A fairly large number of historical monuments are being introduced into scientific circulation: first of all, various editions of the lives of A. Nevsky and D. Donskoy. The publications of the Department of Old Russian Literature and the Byzantine Time Book were especially noted for the publication of primary sources. Also, the authors of historical works avoided overt atheistic rhetoric. On the contrary, one can note complementary connotations in relation to the historical past of the country.

With the end of the Stalin era came scientific-atheist propaganda (1954–1961) as an integral element of education, culture and the Soviet way of life in general. This era of the Khrushchev Thaw and the subsequent anti-religious campaign began with two resolutions of the CPSU Central Committee dated July 7, 1954 "On major shortcomings in scientific-atheistic propaganda and measures for its improvement" and dated November 10, 1954 "On errors in carrying out scientific-atheistic propaganda among the population". After the beginning of criticism of the personality cult of J. V. Stalin, a shift in research emphasis is planned in the scientific field. Works on general problems of history are now becoming relevant. Although the thaw period was a short-term

phenomenon, it is still impossible to ignore the positive changes that managed to occur during this time. Science was nominally in a position of "sanctioned freedom" however, there were also qualitative changes: the imperative guidelines of the Stalin period were abandoned and the archives were "rediscovered". It is significant that it was during this period that the Bible was published for the first time in the USSR. Data from Soviet sociology also testified to the revival of citizens' interest in religion and Orthodox culture, as a result of which in 1958 the state launched a new offensive on the "religious front". In the scientific field, this resulted in the development of the theoretical and ideological concept of "scientific atheism" and the creation of departments of scientific atheism in higher educational institutions throughout the country. The publication of the popular science magazine "Science and Religion" also began. In 1960, G. G. Karpov was replaced as chairman of the SDRPTs by V. A. Kuroyedov, which indicated the dissatisfaction of the party leadership with the "soft" activities of the Council.

The stage of scientific-atheistic education (1961–1988) was articulated by the XXII Congress of the CPSU Central Committee at the height of Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign. Science is once again becoming a faithful weapon of party ideology. A striking example is the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism and its printed publication "Yearbook of the MIR". The change in the vector of state policy regarding religion influenced the activities of the Museum, which at that time was also removed from the subordination of the USSR Academy of Sciences and was subordinated to the Ministry of Culture, and therefore research work decreased and there was a shift towards propaganda. In turn, changes in the Museum entailed changes in the journal, thus the scientific publication ceased to exist in 1963, when the last seventh issue was published. After the dismissal of N. S. Khrushchev and the end of the anti-religious campaign, Believers again began to be considered patriotic Soviet citizens. State ideology in scientific and public discourse tried to shift attention to the predicate of "positivity" in the construct of "scientific atheism". The topic of socialist and communist morality and morality was updated. A new topic has appeared in the history of the study of Orthodoxy - the topic of adapting the church to modern conditions of life in a socialist society and the modernization of Orthodox theology. One of the main places in the work in this area

will be the comparison of Christian and communist moral values. In 1964, the Institute of Scientific Atheism was opened at the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, which was supposed to accumulate all organizational and scientific activities in the field of atheism. Thus, in 1964 The publication of "Problems of Religion and Atheism History" ceased, and in 1966 the publication of "Problems of Scientific Atheism" began as the main printed organ of the INA. 1980s were marked by a number of works devoted to the most pressing topic of the decade - the history of the baptism of Rus', which, which was a surprise for many researchers and propagandists, was officially celebrated at the national level in June 1988.

The history of the life and work of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич in the dissertation research is reconstructed based on the methodology of intellectual history. Thanks to his friendship with V. I. Lenin and active revolutionary activities, in which organizational work, as well as propaganda, played an important role (from the first years of the 20th century, he was an editor, publisher and employee of Social Democratic and Bolshevik newspapers and magazines), V. D. Bonch-Bruевич entered the nomenklatura elite of the new state and in 1917 took the position of manager of the Council of People's Commissars. But unlike many leaders of the revolutionary movement, who before the revolution of 1917 perceived representatives of various religious groups as "fellow travelers", he defended the right of believers to freedom of conscience both before and after the revolution. His human rights activities are especially eloquently demonstrated by documents from the Scientific-Historical Archives of the State Museum of the History of Religion. V. D. Bonch-Bruевич never abandoned scientific activity and continued to engage in it until his last days, combining organizational and research work. His enormous contribution to the study of Orthodox diversity in Russia and the formation of Soviet religious studies can hardly be overestimated. The study of the life and work of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич, as well as other researchers of the Soviet period, seems quite important, especially in the context of modern debates about Soviet humanities and its representatives. Bonch-Bruевич never abandoned scientific activity and continued to engage in it until his last days, combining organizational and research work. His enormous contribution to the study of Orthodox diversity in Russia and the formation of

Soviet religious studies can hardly be overestimated. The study of the life and work of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, as well as other researchers of the Soviet period, seems quite important, especially in the context of modern debates about Soviet humanities and its representatives. Bonch-Bruevich never abandoned scientific activity and continued to engage in it until his last days, combining organizational and research work. His enormous contribution to the study of Orthodox diversity in Russia and the formation of Soviet religious studies can hardly be overestimated. The study of the life and work of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, as well as other researchers of the Soviet period, seems quite important, especially in the context of modern debates about Soviet humanities and its representatives.

Within the framework of this dissertation research, the names of scientists who are usually correlated with other areas of humanities are used in the religious discourse. First of all, this concerns ancient Russian history and culture. Thus, the works by B. D. Grekov "Culture of Kievan Rus", "The Struggle of Rus' for the Creation of its State" and "Kievan Rus", works by M. N. Tikhomirov "Moscow and the cultural development of the Russian people in the XIV–XVII centuries" and "Philosophy in Ancient Rus", historical and anthropological study by B. A. Romanov "People and Customs of Ancient Rus", etc. These generalizing works contained a number of narrow topics that became the objects of separate studies. On the history of ancient Russian books, it is necessary to highlight the publications of literary scholars V. P. Adrianova-Peretz and D. S. Likhachev. A new look at the history and significance of the baptism of Russia was put forward by S. V. Bakhrushin in 1937. The famous historians S. B. Veselovsky, L. V. Cherepnin, V. N. Bernadsky, A. A. Zimin, A. M. Sakharov and others. In addition, A. A. Zimin fruitfully researched the history of reformation-humanistic movements.

In dissertation research the works were divided and classified into thematic groups. Thus, in the history of the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet science from 1943 to 1988. It is possible to identify a number of main topics that researchers most often addressed. Works on the history of ancient Russian culture demonstrated that Rus' was at a high level of development even before the adoption of Christianity. Research into ancient Russian literature mainly consisted of the publication of chronicles and hagiographic monuments.

For example, Soviet philologists showed the historical transformation processes of the hagiographic literary style. The study of the history of Christianization of Rus' confirmed that the very fact of baptism was a logical and progressive political step in view of the transition of the state to a feudal socio-economic formation. Issues of church and monastic land ownership in Soviet historiography directly affected the problems of socio-economic relations of the era of feudalism. Soviet scientists regarded the struggle of peasants against church land ownership and the peasant uprisings led by I. I. Bolotnikov, S. T. Razin and E. I. Pugachev as manifestations of the class struggle against the oppressors. A special type of anti-feudal struggle was the reformation-humanistic movements, which were progressive in nature, advocating for social justice from a religious standpoint. In themselves, these anti-feudal reformation-humanistic movements were a manifestation of Orthodox dissent. In the general problems of the history of the church in Russia as a social institution, researchers included issues of church-state relations, the struggle of the church with education and science in Russia, the attitude of the church to the revolution of 1905 and the revolutions of 1917, etc. Relevant for Soviet religious studies of the second half of the 20th century was the theme of "adaptation" and "modernization" of Orthodox theology, which implied the process of adaptation of Orthodoxy to new conditions of coexistence with the state in the economic, political, legal and social plane.

The dissertation research showed that the interdisciplinary and "peripheral" scientific segment of the history of the study of Orthodoxy in Soviet science included historians, philologists, ethnographers, anthropologists, and philosophers. It is important to note the special scientific contribution of such outstanding Soviet scientists as I. U. Budovnits, L. I. Emelyakh, A. I. Klibanov, N. A. Kazakova, Y. S. Lurie and others. Their works have not yet been lost its scientific relevance. Without detracting from the merits in the development of various theoretical concepts on the history of the Russian Orthodox Church, primarily in the 20th century, it is necessary to treat the works of some authors with caution. A certain ideological charge often does not allow an objective approach to

the works of, for example, P. K. Kurochkin, M. P. Novikova, N. S. Gordienko, E. F. Grekulov, I. A. Kryvelev and others⁴¹⁷.

After 1991, there was no clear attitude towards the legacy of Soviet science of religion. For more than thirty years, the historiography of the issue is still looking for ways to overcome its own subjectivity. The conducted research assumes the updating of Soviet works on the study of Orthodoxy in Russia, the return of these works to scientific circulation. Many of them not only cover hitherto little-studied topics in the history of Russian religious studies, but also have not lost their relevance for modern humanities.

⁴¹⁷ It is enough to compare the works of the same author, for example: N. S. Gordienko "Modern Orthodoxy" (1968) and "Modern Russian Orthodoxy" (1987); E. F. Grekulov "The Orthodox Church is the Enemy of Enlightenment" (1962) and "The Orthodox Inquisition in Russia" (1964) and "The Church, the Autocracy, the People: (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th century)" (1969); I. A. Kryvelev "Modern Theology and Science" (1959) and "The Russian Orthodox Church in the first quarter of the 20th century" (1982)

Bibliography

Archive sources:

Scientific and historical archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion

1. Correspondence on the allotment of land to the former nuns of the Serafimo-Diveevo Monastery. September 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 102.
2. Documents in the case of the arrest of I. G. Aivazov, ex. Orthodox missionary. November 1919 - February 1920 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 142.
3. Filippov A. Statement by the manager of the Council of People's Commissars. 1. Extracts from the letters of Hieromonk Sevastyan, who was sent to Siberia with a patriarchal appeal. July 20, 1920 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 115.
4. Galkin M., priest. 3 letters to V. Bonch-Bruevich. April 9 - May 5, 1918 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 106.
5. Letter to the 8th department of the PCJ. Addendum: Patriarch Tikhon's statement to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. November 26, 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 98.
6. Letter to the Civil Committee of the Council of the Kazan Fortified Region. Attachment: a copy of the application to the Administration of the Kazan Diocesan Council. 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 99.
7. Nuns of the Spassky Convent. Petition to the manager of the affairs of the Council of People's Commissars. October 1919 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 109.

8. Statement by the head of the CPC. September 1, 1920 // Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion. F. 2. Op. 4. D. 116.

Sources:

1. Adrianova-Peretz V. P. A word about the life and death of Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia // TODRL. 1947. No. 5. P. 73-96.
2. Adrianova-Peretz V. P. Essays on the poetic style of Ancient Rus'. M.; L.: Academy of Science of the USSR, 1947. 188 p.
3. Aleksandrov G. F. History of Western European Philosophy. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1946. 513 p.
4. Andreev G. L., Ladorenko V. E., Polyakova L. P. Social and moral principles of communism in the interpretation of modern Christian theologians // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1966. No. 2. P. 110-140.
5. Anisimov S. F. Moral progress and religion. M.: Thought, 1965. 183 p.
6. Antonova M. F. «A word about the life and death of the Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia» (Issues of attribution and genre) // TODRL. 1974. No. 28. P. 140-154.
7. Azbelev S. N. Secular processing of the Life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1958. No. 14. P. 147-153.
8. Baidin V. I. Old Believers of the Urals and autocracy. Late 18th - mid 19th centuries. Abstract of the thesis for the academic degree. Novosibirsk, 1983. 18 p.
9. Bakhrushin S. V. On the issue of the baptism of Kievan Rus // Historian-Marxist. 1937. No. 2. P. 40-77.
10. Bakhtinsky V. S., Moldavsky D. M. Old Believer folk legends about the beginning of the split, about tobacco and barbering // TODRL. 1958. No. 14. P. 421-422.
11. Begunov Y. K. Kirillo-Belozero excerpts from the Life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1969. No. 24. P. 105-107.
12. Begunov Y. K. Life of Alexander Nevsky in a collection from the collection of N.P. Likhachev // TODRL. 1976. No. 30. P. 60-72.

13. Begunov Y. K. Life of Alexander Nevsky in easel painting of the early 17th century. // TODRL. 1966. No. 22. P. 311-326.
14. Begunov Y. K. Old Russian traditions in the works of the first quarter of the 18th century. about Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1971. No. 26. P. 72-84.
15. Begunov Y. K. On the study of the Life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1961. No. 17. P. 348-357.
16. Belov A. V. Christmas. M.: Politizdat, 1965. 80 p.
17. Belov A. V. The truth about the Orthodox «saints». M.: Nauka, 1968. 168 p.
18. Bernadsky V. N. Novgorod and the Novgorod land in the 15th century. L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 246 p.
19. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Among sectarians // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 150-166.
20. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Concerning the letter of the below published // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 167-172.
21. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. First steps // Young Guard. 1927. No. 12.
22. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Freedom of conscience in the USSR // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 11-28.
23. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. From a letter to V. M. Velichkina // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected works. In 3 volumes. T. 2. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 471-472.
24. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. From a letter to V. M. Velichkina // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected works. In 3 volumes. T. 2. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 473-474.
25. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Gapon and Gaponism // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 15-47.
26. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. How the state farm «Forest Glades» was organized // Memories of Lenin. M.: Nauka, 1969. P. 398-402.
27. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. My study of the peasant question // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 263-280.

28. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Old Believers and autocracy // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected works. In 3 vols. T. 1. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 90-103.
29. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Schism and sectarianism in Russia. Report of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich to the Second Ordinary Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Party // Selected Atheistic Works. M.: Thought, 1973. P. 173-213.
30. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. The path traveled // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected works. In 3 volumes. T. 2. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 149-156.
31. Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Vladimir Ilyich and the religious question // Bonch-Bruevich V. D. Selected works. In 3 volumes. T. 1. M.: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 31-73.
32. Borisov A. M. The Church and the uprising under the leadership of S. Razin // Problems of History. 1965. No. 8. P. 74-83.
33. Borisov A. M. The economy of the Solovetsky monastery and the struggle of peasants with the northern monasteries in the XVI-XVII centuries. Petrozavodsk: Karel book publishing house, 1966. 284 p.
34. Borisova E. A., Kazhdan T. P. Russian architecture of the late XIX - early XX centuries. M.: Nauka, 1971. 239 p.
35. Boyarintsev V. I. New attempts to adapt religion to modern natural science // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 141-164.
36. Budilova E. A. The struggle of the church against the reflex theory of I. M. Sechenov // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 152-183.
37. Budovnits I. U. Monasteries in Rus' and the fight against them by peasants in the XIV-XVI centuries (According to the "Lives of the Saints"). M.: Nauka, 1966. 392 p.
38. Budovnits I. U. On the issue of the baptism of Rus' // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 402-434.
39. Budovnits I. U. Russian clergy in the first century of the Mongol yoke // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. No. 7. 1959. P. 284-302.

40. Budovnits I. U. Russian journalism of the 16th century. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. 308 p.
41. Budovnits I. U. The first Russian non-possessors // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 264-284.
42. Bulygin I. A. Monastic peasants of Russia in the first quarter of the 18th century. M.: Nauka, 1977. 327 p.
43. Bychkov V. V. Image as a category of Byzantine aesthetics // Vizantiyskiy Vremennik. 1973. No. 34. P. 151-168.
44. Cherepnin L. V. Formation of the Russian centralized state in the XIV—XV centuries. M.: Sotsekgiz, 1960. 899 p.
45. Cherepnin L. V. From the history of heretical movements in Rus' in the XIV-XV centuries // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 257-283.
46. Cherepnin L. V. Russian feudal archives. XIV-XV centuries Part II. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. 428 p.
47. Chertikhin V. E. The ideology of modern Orthodoxy M.: Nauka, 1965. 136 p.
48. Chubinsky V. V. Questions of religion in the works of M. A. Antonovich // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 137-158.
49. Dudzinskaya E. A. Slavophiles in the social struggle. M.: Mysl, 1983. 272 p.
50. Emelyakh L. I. Anti-church movement of the peasants during the first revolution // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 459-478.
51. Emelyakh L. I. Anti-clerical movement of peasants during the first Russian revolution. M.; Leningrad: Nauka, 1965. 201 p.
52. Emelyakh L. I. Atheism and anti-clericalism of the masses in 1917 // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 64-72.
53. Emelyakh L. I. Criticism of Orthodoxy by V. I. Lenin. Leningrad: Knowledge, 1971. 31 p.

54. Emelyakh L. I. From the history of anti-clericalism and atheism of Russian peasants in 1905-1907. // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1959. No. 3. P. 265-286.
55. Emelyakh L. I. Origin of Christian sacraments. M.: Sov. Russia, 1978. 125 p.
56. Emelyakh L. I. Origin of religious rituals. L.: Lenizdat, 1959. 78 p.
57. Emelyakh L. I. Origin of the Christian cult. L.: Lenizdat, 1971. 200 p.
58. Emelyakh L. I. Peasants and the Church in the First Russian Revolution // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 70-93.
59. Emelyakh L. I. Peasants and the Church on the Eve of October. L.: Nauka, 1976. 182 p.
60. Emelyakh L. I. Secret reports of the bishops of the Orthodox Church on anti-clericalism and atheism of the peasants during the first Russian revolution // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 320-338.
61. Emelyakh L. I., Kozhurin Y. Y. Soviet historical science about the baptism of Rus'. Leningrad: Knowledge, 1986. 31 p.
62. Emelyakh L. I., Shakhnovich M. I. The Case of Academician A.A. Markov's Excommunication from the Church // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 397-411.
63. Emelyanov B. V., Bushmileva I. "The Science of Man" by the Russian theologian V. Nesselov: Critical assessment // Scientific and technical progress and creativity: abstract. report scientific-theoret. conf. Izhevsk, 1987. pp. 139-141.
64. Emelyanov B. V., Knyazev V. M., Rusakov V. M. The problem of man in Russian religious-idealistic philosophy of the late XIX - early XX centuries: (Critical analysis) // Historical and philosophical studies. 1983. No. 7. P. 49-67.
65. Emelyanov B. V., Lyubutin K. M. Introduction to the history of philosophy: Textbook. manual for universities. M.: Higher School, 1987. 160 p.

66. Emelyanov B. V., Rusakov V. M. The problem of man: Russian origins of modern bourgeois human studies // *Worldview problems in the history of philosophy*. Novosibirsk, 1985. P. 79-88.
67. Fedorenko F. I. *Sects, their faith and deeds*. M.: Political literature, 1965. 360 p.
68. Galaktionov A. A., Nikandrov P. F. *History of Russian philosophy*. M.: Sotsekgiz, 1961. 459 p.
69. Galaktionov A. A., Nikandrov P. F. *Russian Philosophy*. L.: Nauka, 1970. 651 p.
70. Galaktionov A. A., Nikandrov P. F. Slavophilism, its national origins and place in the history of Russian thought // *Problems of history*. 1966. No. 6. P. 120-130.
71. Garkavenko D. A. The growth of atheistic and anti-religious sentiments in the army and navy in 1917 // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1960. No. 8. P. 193-218.
72. Gontsev N. M. *Church and feudalism in Rus'*. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 167 p.
73. Gordienko N. S. «Baptism of Rus'»: facts against legends and myths: Polemic notes. L.: Lenizdat, 1984. 287 p.
74. Gordienko N. S. «Baptism of Rus'»: facts against legends and myths: Polemic notes. L.: Lenizdat, 1986. 288 p.
75. Gordienko N. S. *Criticism of new trends in modern Orthodoxy*. Leningrad: Knowledge, 1974. 32 p.
76. Gordienko N. S. Criticism of the philosophical argumentation of modern Orthodoxy // *Problems of Philosophy*. 1962. No. 10. P. 48-56.
77. Gordienko N. S. Elements of modernism in the Orthodox dogma // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 2. P. 167-197.
78. Gordienko N. S. *Modern ecumenism: Movement for the unity of Christian churches*. M.: Nauka, 1972. 200 p.
79. Gordienko N. S. Modern Orthodox falsifiers // *Science and Religion*. 1962. No. 10. P. 28-31.
80. Gordienko N. S. *Modern Orthodoxy*. M.: Thought, 1968. 143 p.

81. Gordienko N. S. *Modern Russian Orthodoxy*. L.: Lenizdat, 1987. 302 p.
82. Gordienko N. S. *Mysticism in the service of modern Orthodoxy*. Moscow: Knowledge, 1981. 63 p.
83. Gordienko N. S. *New trends in Orthodox exegesis // Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1966. No. 1. P. 150-178.
84. Gordienko N. S. *The evolution of Russian Orthodoxy (20-80s of the XX century)*. Moscow: Knowledge, 1984. 64 p.
85. Gordienko N. S. *The ideology of modern Orthodoxy (a critical analysis of modernist tendencies in modern Orthodoxy)*. Minsk, 1969. 38 p.
86. Gordienko N. S. *The introduction of Christianity in Rus': conjectures of bourgeois-clerical propaganda*. Moscow: Knowledge, 1987. 62 p.
87. Gordienko N. S. *The moral code of the builders of communism against Christian morality // Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1963. No. 7. P. 8-24.
88. Gordienko N. S. *Worldview assessment of the process of Christianization of Ancient Rus'*. Moscow: Knowledge, 1984. 40 p.
89. Gordienko N. S., Kurochkin P. K. *Features of the modernization of modern Russian Orthodoxy*. Moscow: Knowledge, 1978. 64 p.
90. Gordienko N. S., Kurochkin P. K. *Liberal Renovation Movement in Russian Orthodoxy at the Beginning of the 20th Century. // Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1969. No. 7. P. 313-340.
91. Gordienko N. S., Nosovich V. I., Kharahorkin L. P. *Modern Orthodoxy and its ideology*. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963. 205 p.
92. Gordienko N. S., Novikov M. P. *Modern ideological struggle and religion*. Moscow: Knowledge, 1980. 40 p.
93. Gordienko N.S. *Biblical morality in the service of the ideologists of Orthodoxy // Problems of Philosophy*. 1963. No. 10. P. 80-90.
94. Gordienko N.S. *Orthodox clergy about morality // Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1962. No. 6. P. 102-120.

95. Gorfunkel A. K. Anti-church struggle of peasants in the 17th century. based on materials from the Belozersky Monastery // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 248-262.
96. Gorfunkel A. K. The patrimonial economy and the peasants of the Kirillo-Belozersky monastery. L., 1956. 16 p.
97. Gorskaya N. A. Monastic peasants of Central Russia in the 17th century. (On the essence and forms of feudal-serf relations). M.: Nauka, 1977. 365 p.
98. Grekov B. D. Culture of Kievan Rus. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1944. 76 p.
99. Grekov B. D. Essays on the history of the economy of the Novgorod Sophia House of the 16th-18th centuries. // Chronicle of the studies of the Archeographic Commission. Issue. 33. 1926. P. 201-332.
100. Grekov B. D. Kievan Rus. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1953. 568 p.
101. Grekov B. D. The struggle of Rus' for the creation of its state. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1945. 78 p.
102. Grekov B. D., Yakubovsky A. Y. The Golden Horde and its fall. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1950. 479 p.
103. Grekulov E. F. Church, autocracy, people (2nd half of the 19th - early 20th centuries). M.: Nauka, 1969. 184 p.
104. Grekulov E. F. Orthodox Inquisition in Russia. M.: Nauka, 1964. 168 p.
105. Grekulov E. F. The Church and the abolition of serfdom // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 76-112.
106. Grekulov E. F. The Orthodox Church is the enemy of enlightenment, M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1962. 192 p.
107. Grekulov E. F., Kurochkin P. K. The study of Orthodoxy in Soviet literature // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 287-325.
108. Grigoryan M. M. On the characterization of the religious and philosophical concept of Slavophilism // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1970. No. 10. P. 130-148.

109. Gromov M. N. Maxim Greek philosopher. M.: Nauka, 1984. 189 p.
110. History of the culture of ancient Rus' / Under the general. ed. acad. B. D. Grekova and prof. M. I. Artamonova. T. 1. Material culture. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. 484 p.
111. History of the culture of ancient Rus' / Under the general. ed. acad. B. D. Grekova and prof. M. I. Artamonova. T. 2. Social system and spiritual culture. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. 547 p.
112. Itenberg B. S. Revolutionary populists and questions of religion // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1963. No. 11. P. 293-305.
113. Ivanov I. G. Atheistic significance of the works of Soviet naturalists // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 205-242.
114. Kadson I. Z. Anti-church struggle of the masses in Russia in the works of Soviet historians // Problems of History. 1969. No. 3. P. 151-157.
115. Kadson I. Z. The Church is an active participant in the suppression of the peasant uprising under the leadership of E. Pugachev // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 291-304.
116. Kadson I. Z. The Church is an active participant in the suppression of the peasant uprising under the leadership of E. Pugachev // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 291-304.
117. Kadson I. Z. The Pugachev Rebellion and the Schism // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 222-238.
118. Kamensky Z. A. Moscow circle of wise men. M.: Mysl, 1980. 327 p.
119. Kartsov V. G. Religious schism as a form of anti-feudal protest in the history of Russia. Part 1. Kalinin: Kalinin. state Univ., 1971. 160 p.
120. Katunsky A. E. Old Believers. M.: Politizdat, 1972. 120 p.
121. Kaushansky P. L. Ideology and activities of Christian sects. Kemerovo: Book. publishing house, 1965. 108 p.
122. Kazakova N. A. The ideology of strigolism - the first heretical movement in Rus' // TODRL. 1955. No. 11. P. 103-117.

123. Kazakova N. A. The question of the reasons for the condemnation of Maxim the Greek // *Vizantiyskiy Vremennik*. 1968. No. 28. P. 109-126.
124. Kazakova N. A. The struggle against monastic land ownership in Rus' at the end of the XIV - early. 15th century // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1958. No. 2. P. 151-171.
125. Kazakova N. A. *Vassian Patrikeev and his writings*. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 363 p.
126. Kazakova N. A., Lurie Y. S. *Anti-feudal heretical movements in Rus' in the XIV - early XVI centuries*. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 544 p.
127. Kazhdan A. P., Sakharov A. M., Tokarev S. A. *Church in the history of Russia. (IX century - 1917)*. M.: Nauka, 1967. 336 p.
128. Kharahorkin L. R. From the history of the struggle of Darwinism with religion // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1959. No. 3. P. 222-248.
129. Kharahorkin L. R. *Modern Orthodoxy and Science // Problems of Philosophy*. 1969. No. 11. P. 117-123.
130. Kharahorkin L. R. On the attitude of modern Orthodoxy to science // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1962. No. 6. P. 60-78.
131. Kharahorkin L. R. *Russian Orthodoxy against science in the past and present // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1960. No. 4. P. 30-51.
132. Kirpotin V. Y. Criticism of religion in the works of M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 120-136.
133. Klibanov A. I. «Independent heresy». (From the history of Russian free-thinking at the end of the 15th - half of the 16th centuries) // *Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1956. No. 4. P. 203-229.
134. Klibanov A. I. *Freethinking in Tver in the 15th-16th centuries // Problems of Religion and Atheism History*. 1958. No. 6. P. 231-260.

135. Klibanov A. I. People's social utopia in Russia: The period of feudalism. M.: Nauka, 1977. 335 p.
136. Klibanov A. I. Reform movements in Russia in the XIV - the first half of the XVI century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 411 p.
137. Klibanov A. I. The history of religious sectarianism in Russia (60s of the 19th century - 1917). M.: Nauka, 1965. 348 p.
138. Klibanov A. I. To the study of the genesis of heretical movements in Russia // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 186-217.
139. Klibanov A. I., Mitrokhin L. N. Baptism of Rus': history and modernity. Moscow: Knowledge, 1988. 63 p.
140. Kogan D. M. On overcoming religious survivals among the Old Believers // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1964. No. 12. P. 37-43.
141. Kogan Y. Y. From the history of the distribution of anti-Christian pamphlets in Russia in the 18th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1955. No. 3. P. 253-277.
142. Kogan Y. Y. The persecution of Russian freethinkers in the 2nd half of the 18th century. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 182-202.
143. Kopanev A. I. History of land tenure in the Belozersk region in the 15th—16th centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1951. 255 p.
144. Koretsky V. I. Famine in 1601-1603. in Russia and the Church // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 218-256.
145. Koretsky V. I. Peasants' struggle with monasteries in Russia in the 16th - early 17th centuries. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 6. P. 169-215.
146. Koretsky V. I. To the question of the social essence of the new doctrine of F. Kosoy // Bulletin of the Moscow State University. 1957. No. 2. P. 105-124.

147. Koshelev V. A. Aesthetic and literary views of Russian Slavophiles (1840-1850s). L.: Nauka, 1984. 193 p.
148. Kovalev I. F. On the struggle of the church with L. N. Tolstoy // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1960. No. 8. P. 348-376.
149. Kovalev I. F. Persecution of the teachings of Charles Darwin by tsarist censorship // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 410-421.
150. Kovalev S. I. Orthodox theology and discoveries in the Dead Sea region (On the modernization of the Orthodox Church) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 3-9.
151. Kozachkova D. A. The origin and development of anti-church ideology in other Rus' // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 283-314.
152. Kozhinov V. V. About the main thing in the heritage of the Slavophiles // Russian literature. 1969. No. 10. P. 113-130.
153. Krasnikov N. P. In pursuit of the century (Reflection of social processes in theological works and preaching activities of Orthodox clergy). M.: Politizdat, 1968. 160 p.
154. Krasnikov N. P. On the adaptability of the Orthodox clergy to modern conditions // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 107-112.
155. Krasnikov N. P. The evolution of the social concept of Orthodoxy // Problems of History. 1970. No. 9. P. 16-33.
156. Kravets I. N. The struggle of T. F. Osipovsky against idealism and religion // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 237-246.
157. Krikunov V. P. Anti-church sentiments of peasants in post-reform Russia // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 128-142.
158. Kryvelev I. A. Lenin on religion. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 239 p.
159. Kryvelev I. A. Modern theology and science. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1959. 206 p.

160. Kryvelev I. A. Religious picture of the world and its theological modernization. M.: Nauka, 1968. 292 p.
161. Kryvelev I. A. Russian Orthodox Church in the first quarter of the XX century. Moscow: Knowledge, 1982. 64 p.
162. Kryvelev I. A. The latest methods of religious apologetics. Moscow: Knowledge, 1971. 63 p.
163. Kryvelev I. A. V. I. Lenin and some topical issues of atheistic propaganda // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1960. No. 8. P. 3-28.
164. Kuleshov V. I. Slavophiles and Russian literature. M.: Fiction, 1976. 288 p.
165. Kurochkin P. K. Criticism of modern Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1963. 48 p.
166. Kurochkin P. K. Orthodoxy and humanism. M.: Publishing House of VPSH and AON, 1962. 167 p.
167. Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. M., 1970. 44 p.
168. Kurochkin P. K. The evolution of modern Russian Orthodoxy. M.: Thought, 1971. 270 p.
169. Kurochkin P. K. The ideology of modern Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1965. 31 p.
170. Kurochkin P. K. The social position of Russian Orthodoxy. Moscow: Knowledge, 1969. 45 p.
171. Kurochkin P. K. To the assessment of the process of modernization of religion in modern conditions // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 5-40.
172. Kuroyedov V. A. Religion and law. Moscow: Knowledge, 1970. 61 p.
173. Kuvakin V. A. Religious philosophy in Russia: The beginning of the 20th century. M.: Mysl, 1980. 310 p.

174. Kuzmin A. G. «Baptism of Rus'»: concepts and problems // «Baptism of Rus'» in the works of Russian and Soviet historians. M.: Thought, 1988. P. 3-56.
175. Ladorenko V. E. On the issue of changing the political orientation of the Russian Orthodox Church (1917-1945) // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1964. No. 12. P. 106-123.
176. Lapshin R. G. Theodosius Kosoy - the ideologist of the peasantry of the 16th century. // TODRL. 1953. No. 9. P. 235-250.
177. Lazarev V. N. Moscow school of icon painting. Moscow: Art, 1971. 235 p.
178. Lebedev N. A. Anti-church and anti-religious sentiments among the peasants of the Nizhny Novgorod province at the beginning of the 20th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1959. No. 7. P. 116-127.
179. Leikina-Svirskaya V. R. Atheism of the Petrashevites // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 214-236.
180. Likhachev D. S. Galician literary tradition in the life of Alexander Nevsky // TODRL. 1947. No. 5. P. 36-56.
181. Likhachev D. S. Man in the literature of Ancient Rus'. M.: Nauka, 1970. 180 p.
182. Likhacheva V. D., Likhachev D. S. Artistic heritage of other Rus' and modernity. L.: Nauka, 1971. 120 p.
183. Limantov N. V. The cult of the reactionary Filaret in modern Orthodoxy // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 90-101.
184. Lurie Y. S. Ideological struggle in Russian journalism of the late 15th - early 16th centuries. L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. 532 p.
185. Lurie Y. S. The origins of a great tradition (Russian free thought of the 14th-17th centuries) // Science and Religion. 1961. No. 7. P. 41-45.
186. Lurie Y. S. The struggle of the church against the high society in the late 70s - the first half of the 80s of the XV century. // TODRL. 1958. No. 4. P. 209-218.

187. Malyshev V. I. Life of Alexander Nevsky according to the manuscript of the middle of the 17th century. // TODRL. 1947. No. 5. P. 185-193.
188. Materials for the history and study of Russian sectarianism and schism / Ed. [and with a preface] by Vladimir Bonch-Bruевич. St. Petersburg: type. B. M. Wolf, 1908-1916.
189. Melikova V. D. Some features of the relationship between art and religion (on the example of the fine arts of Ancient Rus') // Bulletin of Moscow State University. Philosophy. 1967. No. 2. P. 81-89.
190. Melikova V. D. Worldly problems in the religious painting of ancient Rus' // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1968. No. 5. P. 137-158.
191. Milovidov V. F. Old Believers and social progress // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 198-224.
192. Milovidov V. F. Old Believers in the past and present. M.: Thought, 1969. 112 p.
193. Mitrokhin L. N. Modern Orthodoxy // Science and Religion. 1959. No. 1. P. 25-31.
194. Mitrokhin L. N. On the «dialogue» of Marxists and Christians // Problems of Philosophy. 1971. No. 7. P. 48-58.
195. Moleva N. M. Music and religion in Russia in the 17th century // Problems of History. 1971. No. 11. P. 143-154.
196. Muller R. B. From the history of the split in the north of Russia (Self-immolation in Paleostrov) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1958. No. 2. P. 172-182.
197. Nikolsky N. M. History of the Russian Church. Moscow: Atheist, 1930. 248 p.
198. Nikolsky N. M. Religion as a subject of science. Minsk: Beltrestpechat, 1923. 47 p.
199. Nosovich V. I. The role of the cult in the Orthodox Church // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 74-89.

200. Novikov M. P. Dead Ends of Orthodox Modernism: (A Critical Analysis of the Theology of the 20th Century). M.: Politizdat, 1979. 167 p.
201. Novikov M. P. On the modernization of religious ideology. (Illumination of modern Orthodoxy in atheistic literature) // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 1. P. 415-425.
202. Novikov M. P. Orthodoxy and modernity. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1965. 253 p.
203. Okulov A. F. Social progress and religion // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 445-453.
204. Osipova E. S. Local Cathedral of the Orthodox Church in 1917-1918 // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 3. P. 204-226.
205. Osipova E. S. The Church and the Provisional Government // Problems of History. 1964. No. 6. P. 65-76.
206. Persits M. M. Atheism of the Russian worker. M.: Nauka, 1965. 257 p.
207. Persits M. M. From the history of popular free thought in Russia // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1950. No. 1. P. 137-154.
208. Persits M. M. Russian atheistic collections of the late 18th - early 19th centuries. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1969. No. 7. P. 361-409.
209. Persits M. M. The Great October Socialist Revolution and the creation of conditions for the spread of atheism among the masses // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 4. P. 15-37.
210. Persits M. M. The Great October Socialist Revolution and the Separation of the Church from the State // Problems of History. 1954. No. 11. P. 11-22.
211. Persits M. M. The separation of the church from the state and the school from the church in the USSR (1917-1919). M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 198 p.
212. Petrenko M. Z., Shidenko V. A. Kiev-Pechersk Lavra in the fight against the revolution // Problems of History. 1956. No. 3. P. 132-136.
213. Plaksin R. Y. Church counter-revolution in the days of October // Problems of History. 1964. No. 11. P. 45-53.

214. Plaksin R. Y. The collapse of the church counter-revolution of 1917-1923. M.: Nauka, 1968. 192 p.
215. Platonov N. F. The Orthodox Church in 1917-1935. // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1961. No. 5. P. 206-271.
216. Platonov N. F. The Orthodox Church in the fight against the revolutionary movement in Russia (1900–1917) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 103-209.
217. Pokrovsky N. N. Anti-feudal protest of the Ural-Siberian peasants - Old Believers in the 18th century. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1974. 394 p.
218. Pokrovsky N. N. Archaeographic research in the work of the Institute of History SB RAS (1965-2006) // Archaeographic Yearbook. 2011. T. 1. No. 1. P. 61-68.
219. Popova O. S. Light in Byzantine and Russian art of the XII-XVI centuries // Soviet art history. 1978. No. 1. P. 75-99.
220. Poyda D. P. The struggle of the peasants of the Right-Bank Ukraine against the clergy in the post-reform period // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1962. No. 10. P. 113-127.
221. Pritykin Y. M. Modern Orthodox “moralists” and historical reality (From the history of the struggle of the Orthodox Church against socialism and atheism) // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 8. P. 155-168.
222. Prokhorov G. M. Misunderstood text and a letter to the customer in the «Word about the life and death of Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar Ruskago» // TODRL. 1985. No. 40. P. 229-247.
223. Prokofieva L. S. Estate farming in the 17th century: Based on the materials of the Spaso-Prilutsky Monastery. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. 177 p.
224. Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of religion and church by I. A. Khudyakov // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 184-213.

225. Pushkarev L. N. Criticism of the Church and the Clergy in the Works of I. G. Pryzhov // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 128-153.
226. Ramm B. Y. Papacy and Rus' in the X-XV centuries. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. 283 p.
227. Rappoport P. A. Old Russian architecture. M.: Nauka, 1970. 147 p.
228. Romanov B. A. People and customs of ancient Rus': Historical and everyday essays of the XI-XIII centuries. / Foreword. N. E. Nosova. 2nd ed. M.; L.: Nauka, 1966. 240 p.
229. Rumyantseva V. S. Ognepalny Avvakum // Problems of History. 1972. No. 11. P. 111-125.
230. Russian Orthodox Church and the Great Patriotic War. Collection of church documents. Moscow: Moscow Patriarchy, 1943. 100 p.
231. Rutenberg S. G. Atheism in the work of Soviet artists // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1963. No. 7. P. 51-69.
232. Ryndzyunsky P. G. Anti-church movement in the Tambov region in the 60s. 18th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 154-193.
233. Ryndzyunsky P. G. Old Believer organization in the conditions of development of industrial capitalism // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1950. No. 1. P. 188-248.
234. Ryndzyunsky P. G. The struggle to overcome religious influences in the Soviet school (1917-1919) // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 3. P. 47-86.
235. Sakharov A. M. The Church and the Formation of the Russian Centralized State // Problems of History. 1966. No. 1. P. 49-65.
236. Sakharov A. M. The formation of a unified Russian state and the ideological influence of the church on this process // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1976. No. 20. P. 170-189.
237. Salmina M. A. «A word about the life and death of the Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia» // TODRL. 1970. No. 25. P. 81-104.

238. Samsonov A. M. Anti-feudal popular uprisings in Russia and the church. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1955. 184 p.
239. Sarafanova N. S. The idea of human equality in the writings of Archpriest Avvakum // TODRL. 1958. No. 14. P. 385-390.
240. Savich A. A. Solovetsky estate in the XV-XVII centuries. Perm: Perm State University, 1947. 280 p.
241. Schmidt S. O. On the history of monastic colonization in the 17th century // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1964. No. 12. P. 297-316.
242. Semenkin N. S. Apology of Christianity in Russian religious philosophy (Towards a critique of the ideas of Vl. Solovyov and his followers) // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1969. No. 7. P. 38-62.
243. Sergeenko A., prot. Essays from the history of the Old Catholic movement // Theological works. 1960. No. 1. P. 111-141.
244. Shakhnovich M. I. Criticism of the legend of the Russian God-bearing people // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 257-290.
245. Shakhnovich M. I. Lenin and the problems of atheism. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. 671 p.
246. Shakhnovich M. I. Lenin on the Orthodox Church // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 52-102.
247. Shakhnovich M. I. Lenin's atheistic heritage in the crooked mirror of the revisionists. Moscow: Knowledge, 1971. 40 p.
248. Shakhnovich M. I. Modern mysticism in the light of science. M.; L.: Nauka, 1965. 207 p.
249. Shakhnovich M. I. Mysticism before the court of science. Moscow: Knowledge, 1970. 62 p.
250. Shakhnovich M. I. Russian Church in the fight against science. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1939. 192 p.
251. Shakhnovich M. I. Soviet science against religion. L.: Lenizdat, 1958. 87 p.

252. Shakhnovich M. I. Space Storm // Science and Religion. 1959. No. 2. P. 23-27.
253. Shakhnovich M. I. Twenty-fifth anniversary of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism of the USSR Academy of Sciences // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. Vol. 5. M., 1958. P. 411-424.
254. Shalaev Y. M. Modern Orthodoxy and Science. M.: Thought, 1964. 87 p.
255. Shchapov Y. N. Old Russian state and its international significance. M.: Nauka, 1965. 476 p.
256. Shchapov Y. N. Princely statutes and churches in Ancient Rus' XI-XIV centuries. M.: Nauka, 1972. 338 p.
257. Shchapov Y. N. The Church and the Formation of Old Russian State // Problems of History. 1969. No. 11. P. 55-84.
258. Sheinman M. M. Renewal movement in the Russian Orthodox Church after October // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1966. No. 2. P. 41-64.
259. Shelestov D. K. Freethinking in the teachings of F. Kosoy // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1954. No. 2. P. 194-217.
260. Shishkin A. A. Essence and critical assessment of the "renovationist" schism of the Russian Orthodox Church. Kazan: Publishing House of Kazan University, 1970. 367 p.
261. Shunkov V. I. Essays on the history of the colonization of Siberia in the XVI—XVII centuries. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1946. 228 p.
262. Sinyutina K. S. Criticism of Christian sociology of P. N. Bulgakov // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1972. No. 13. P. 94-118.
263. Smirnov I. I. Bolotnikov's uprising of 1606-1607. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1951. 588 p.
264. Solovyov A. V. Epiphanius the Wise as the author of the «Word on the Life and Repose of the Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich, Tsar of Russia» // TODRL. 1961. No. 17. P. 85-106.

265. Suglobov G. A. The Union of the Cross and the Sword. (Church and war). M.: Military Publishing House, 1969. 145 p.
266. Sytenko L. T. On the moral image of the modern believer // Problems of Scientific Atheism. 1967. No. 3. P. 113-130.
267. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee (1898-1986). T. 8: 1946-1955. M.: Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the Central Committee of the CPSU, 1985. 542 p.
268. Tikhomirov M. N. Class struggle in Russia in the 17th century. M.: Nauka, 1961. 445 p.
269. Tikhomirov M. N. Historical ties between Russia and the Slavic countries and Byzantium. M.: Nauka, 1969. 374 p.
270. Tikhomirov M. N. Medieval Moscow in the XIV-XV centuries. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1957. 318 p.
271. Tikhomirov M. N. Monastery-patrimony in the 17th century // Historical notes. 1938. V. 3. P. 130-160.
272. Tikhomirov M. N. Russian culture of the X-XVIII centuries. M.: Nauka, 1968. 447 p.
273. Tikhomirova M. N. Moscow and the cultural development of the Russian people in the XIV-XVII centuries. // Problems of History. 1947. No. 9.
274. Trifonov I. Y. Rampant in the Russian Orthodox Church (1922-1925) // Problems of History. 1972. No. 5. P. 64-87.
275. Tsameryan I. P. Communism and religion. M.: Nauka, 1967. 200 p.
276. Tsameryan I. P. V. I. Lenin on religion. Moscow: Knowledge, 1959. 32 p.
277. Tsameryan I. P., Dolgikh F. I., Kolonitsky P. F., Sheinman M. M. Fundamentals of scientific atheism. M.: Gospolitzdat, 1961. 456 p.
278. Tsimbaev N. I. Slavophilism: from the history of Russian. social-political 19th century thoughts M.: Moscow State University Publishing House, 1986. 269 p.

279. Ustyugov N. V. Unrest of the peasants of the Simonov Monastery in the village. Ilyinsky, Yaroslavl district in 1682-1683. // Russian state in the XVII century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. P. 284-292.
280. V. I. Lenin on atheism, religion and the church / Sat. articles ed. Y. P. Frantseva. Compiled by: M. M. Persits et al. M.: Thought, 1969. 318 p.
281. Valentinov A. A., Kurochkin P. K., Tsameryan I. P. Building communism and overcoming religious remnants. M.: Nauka, 1966. 254 p.
282. Vershinskaya A. A., Ramm B. Y., Serdobolskaya L. A. Some questions of the history of the USSR in the coverage of the church press // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1960. No. 4. P. 10-20.
283. Veselovsky S. B. Feudal land tenure in northeastern Rus'. T. 1. Part 1: Private land ownership; Part 2: Land tenure of the metropolitan house. M.; L.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1947. 496 p.
284. Voronin N. N. Ancient Rus': history, art // Problems of History. 1967. No. 2. P. 44-58.
285. Voronin N. N., Kuzmin A. G. Spiritual culture of ancient Rus' // Problems of History. 1972. No. 9. P. 113-120.
286. Vorontsov V. G., Krasnikov N. P. XXII Congress of the CPSU and the tasks of atheistic education of workers // Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. 1962. No. 6. P. 3-17.
287. Voropaeva K. L. About Easter. M.: Gospolitizdat, 1959. 47 p.
288. Wagner G. K. On the fate of the Byzantine heritage in Vladimir-Suzdal plastic arts // Vizantiyskiy Vremennik. 1964. No. 24. P. 121-128.
289. Wagner G. K. The Byzantine temple as an image of the world // Vizantiyskiy Vremennik. 1986. No. 47. P. 163-181.
290. Yankova Z. Y. Modern Orthodoxy and the anti-social essence of its ideology // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1963. No. 11. P. 67-94.

291. Yanov A. L. Slavophiles and Konstantin Leontiev // Problems of Philosophy. 1969. No. 8. P. 97-106.
292. Zamaleev A. F., Zots V. A. Theologians are looking for God: Philosopher-atheist. essays on the history of Christians. theology. Kyiv: Molod, 1980. 166 p.
293. Zhegalova S. K. Russian wooden sculpture // Artist. 1965. No. 1. P. 52–57.
294. Zimin A. A. Bashkin M. - a freethinker of the 16th century. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 230-245.
295. Zimin A. A. I. S. Peresvetov and his contemporaries: Essays on the history of Russian society.-polit. thoughts of the mid-sixteenth century. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 498 p.
296. Zimin A. A. Large feudal patrimony and socio-political struggle in Russia (end of the 15th-16th centuries). M.: Nauka, 1977. 356 p.
297. Zimin A. A. M. Bashkin - a freethinker of the 16th century. // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1956. No. 4. P. 230-245.
298. Zimin A. A. Metropolitan Philip and Oprichnina // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1963. No. 11. P. 269-292.
299. Zimin A. A. Peresvetov and his contemporaries. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1958. 498 p.
300. Zimin A. A. The case of the «heretic» Artemy // Problems of Religion and Atheism History. 1958. No. 5. P. 213-232.
301. Zotov A. I. Russian art from ancient times to the beginning of the 20th century. Moscow: Art, 1971. 375 p.
302. Zyryanov P. N. The Orthodox Church in the fight against the revolution of 1905-1907. M.: Nauka, 1984. 224 p.

Literature:

1. Academy of Sciences in the Context of Historical and Scientific Research in the 18th-First Half of the 20th Centuries: Historical Essays / E. A. Ivanova, P. V. Ilyin, T. V. Chumakova et al. St. Petersburg: Rostock, 2016. 701 p.

2. Afanasiev Y. N. The phenomenon of Soviet historiography // Soviet historiography / ed. ed. Y. N. Afanasiev. M.: RSUH, 1996. P. 7-41.
3. Alekseev V. A. Church and power: lessons of history // Issues of religion and religious studies. Issue. 2: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2010. P. 155-159.
4. Alekseeva G. D. Historical science in Russia: Ideology. Politics: (60-80s of the XX century). M.: IRH of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2003. 246 p.
5. Alekseeva G. D. Historical science of Russia in search of new concepts // Russia in the XX century: Historians of the world argue / ed. ed. I. D. Kovalchenko. M.: Nauka, 1994. P. 635-642.
6. Alekseeva G. D. Some issues of the development of historical science in the 60-80s. // Historical science of Russia in the XX century / G. D. Alekseeva, A. A. Ovsyannikov, Tamas Kraus and others. M.: Scriptorium, 1997. P. 269-301.
7. Alpatov V. M. The history of one myth: Marr and Marrism. M.: Nauka, 1991. 240 p.
8. Antonov K. M., Vorontsova E. V., Kolkunova K. A. The Science of Religion, Scientific Atheism, Religious Studies: Actual Problems of the Scientific Study of Religion in Russia in the 20th - early 21st centuries: a collective monograph. M.: Publishing House of Saint Tikhon's Orthodox University, 2014. 261 p.
9. Arinin E. I. The question of the origin and modern development of Russian religious studies // Scientific notes of the Oryol State University. Science Magazine. 2011. No. 1. P. 93-97.
10. Ashnin F. D., Alpatov V. M. «The Case of the Slavists»: 30s. M.: Nasledie, 1994. 284 p.
11. Belyaev L. A. Christian antiquities: Introduction to comparative study. St. Petersburg: Aletheya, 2000. 574 p.
12. Berdyaev N. A. The origins and meaning of Russian communism. M.: Nauka, 1990. 220 p.

- 13.Bochkov P.V., priest. Theological periodicals of the higher school of the Russian Orthodox Church: domestic experience and an attempt at analysis // Ipatiev Bulletin. 2022. No. 1. P. 91-115.
- 14.Brandenberger D. National Bolshevism. Stalinist mass culture and the formation of Russian national identity (1931-1956). St. Petersburg: Academic project, 2009. 415 p.
- 15.Chernoskutova L. B. Basic ideas and directions of modern historiography of Russian philosophy. Thesis for the academic degree. St. Petersburg, 2010. 152 p.
- 16.Chumachenko T. A. State, Orthodox Church, believers: 1941-1961. M.: AIRO-XX, 1999. 246 p.
- 17.Chumakova T. Political propaganda and scholarly research in periodicals of the League of Militant Atheists (1925–1935) // Religiski-Filozofiski Raksti. 2017. V. 23. P. 25-36.
- 18.Chumakova T. V. «Map of Religions» for the Failed All-Union Census of 1937: A Forgotten Page of Soviet Religious Studies // State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad. 2012. No. 3-4. P. 106-133.
- 19.Chumakova T. V. Documents on the history of the renovation movement in the archive of V. N. Beneshevich // Proceedings of the State Museum of the History of Religion. 2018. No. 18. P. 187-194.
- 20.Chumakova T. V. Infosphere of theological educational institutions of the Russian Empire in the XIX - early XX century. // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Philosophy and conflictology. 2022. No. 2. P. 264-274.
- 21.Chumakova T. V. Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in the early 30s. 20th century // Issues of religion and religious studies. Issue. 4: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies: St. Petersburg School of Religious Studies. Book 2: State Museum of the History of Religion. Part I. 2010. P. 41-54.
- 22.Chumakova T. V. Soviet historiography of ancient Russian philosophical thought // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 6. 2004. no. 2. P. 13-17.

23. Chumakova T. V. Studying the history of Orthodoxy in Russia in the 19th - early 20th centuries // *History of Religious Studies and the Intellectual History of Russia in the 19th - first half of the 20th century. Archival materials and research.* St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 2018. P. 58-70.
24. Dashkovsky P. K. Some aspects of interdisciplinary research in domestic religious studies // *Worldview of the population of Southern Siberia and Central Asia in historical retrospect.* 2013. No. 6. P. 9-18.
25. David-Fox M. Religion, Science, and Political Religion in the Soviet Context // *Modern Intellectual History.* 2011 Vol. 8. No. 2. P. 471-484.
26. Demidenko G. G. The revolution has a lot to do: An essay on the life and work of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич. M.: Politizdat, 1976. 207 p.
27. Dmitriev L. A., Droblenkova N. F., Lurie Y. S. Natalya Aleksandrovna Kazakova (obituary) // *TODRL.* 1988. Vol. 41. P. 47-48.
28. Dmitriev M. V. The scientific heritage of A. I. Klibanov and the prospects for a comparative historical study of the history of Christianity in Russia // *Russian History.* 1997. No. 1. P. 77-93.
29. Dmitriev S. S. The approach should be concretely historical // *Russian literature.* 1969. No. 12. P. 76-77.
30. Dubrovsky A. M. Alexander Alexandrovich Zimin: a difficult path of searching // *Russian history.* 2005. No. 4. P. 140-151.
31. Dubrovsky A. M. Historian and power: historical science in the USSR and the concept of the history of feudal Russia in the context of politics and ideology, (1930-1950s). Bryansk: Publishing House of the Bryansk State University, 2005. 798 p.
32. Dubrovsky A. M. S. V. Bakhrushin and his time. M.: Publishing House of RUDN University, 1992. 165 p.
33. Elbakyan E. P. The phenomenon of Soviet religious studies // *Religious studies.* 2011. No. 3. P. 141-161.

34. Elbakyan E. The outline of religious studies in Russia: did soviet religious studies really exist? // Numen Book Series. 2015. V. 149. P. 276-314.
35. Ermichev A. A. An episode from the history of the “nomenclature” historiography of Russian philosophy // Bulletin of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy. 2023. No. 2. P. 98-110.
36. Fedotov A. A. Russian Orthodox Church in 1943-2000: intra-church life, relationships with the state and society (based on materials from Central Russia). Ivanovo: Institute of Management, 2009. 400 p.
37. Firsov S. L. The Orthodox Russian Church and the Civil War in the Reflection of the Soviet Anti-Religious Press (1920–1941) // Church and Time. 2018. No. 1. P. 229-272.
38. Formozov A. A. Russian archaeologists during the period of totalitarianism. Historiographical essays. M.: Znack, 2004. 320 p.
39. Genina E. S. The State and the Russian Orthodox Church in the mid-1940s - early 1950s (based on materials from the Kemerovo region) // Bulletin of the Kemerovo State University of Culture and Arts. 2010. No. 10. P. 105-111.
40. Gerasimenko G. A. On the mutual influence of totalitarianism and historical science in the USSR // Russia in the XX century: Historians of the world argue / ed. ed. I. D. Kovalchenko. M.: Nauka, 1994. P. 654-664.
41. Golubeva O. D. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich - publisher. Moscow: Book, 1972. 136 p.
42. Gorbatov A. V. State and religious organizations of Siberia in the 1940s - 1960s. Tomsk: Kemerovo State University, 2008. 406 p.
43. Gorbatov A.V. State and religious organizations of Siberia in the 1940s -1960s. Thesis for the academic degree. Kemerovo, 2009. 437 p.
44. Gorskaya N. A. Boris Dmitrievich Grekov. M.: IRI, 1999. 271 p.
45. Grossman J. D. Leadership of Antireligious Propaganda in the Soviet Union // Studies in Soviet Thought. 1972 Vol. 12. No. 3. P. 213-230.

46. Gruzinskaya V. S., Metel O. V. Institute of Red Professorship: Problems of Institutional Building (1921–1923) // Tomsk State University Bulletin. 2018. No. 426. P. 82-87.
47. Gusev E.I. Articles by S.S. Averintsev on Byzantine culture of the first half of the 80s of the XX century // Russian philology: scientific notes of Smolensk State University. 2018. No. 18. pp. 235-245.
48. History and Stalinism / comp. and ed. foreword A. N. Mertsalov. M.: Politizdat, 1991. 446 p.
49. Husband W. «Godless Communists»: Atheism and Society in Soviet Russia. Northern Illinois University Press, 2000. 241 p.
50. In memoriam. Collection in memory of Ya. S. Lurie. St. Petersburg, 1997. 428 p.
51. Ioannisyan O. M. P. A. Rappoport: life and creative credo of a scientist // Architecture of Medieval Rus'. Selected articles. To the 100th anniversary of his birth. St. Petersburg: Faces of Russia, 2013. P. 3-35.
52. Ivanov S. A. Byzantine studies and power in the USSR (1928-1948) // Totalitarianism. Historical experience of Eastern Europe: Sat. Art. M.: Institute of Slavic Studies, 1995. P. 244-254.
53. Kääriäinen K. Discussion on Scientific Atheism as a Soviet Science. 1960–1985 Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1989. 196 p.
54. Kalashnik V. V. Power and the Church in the USSR (1940-1950): towards the historiography of the problem // Bulletin of the Omsk Orthodox Theological Seminary. 2016. No. 1. P. 141-144.
55. Kamnev V. M. Historians of philosophy in transitional times: 1980-1990s in Russian philosophy // Bulletin of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy. 2017. No. 4. pp. 99-106.
56. Kappes O. «Militant» science: study of the past dictatorships in German and Russian historiography of the second half of the 20th century. M.: AIRO-XXI, 2015. 351 p.

57. Kasavin I. T. Metaphysics of progress and disciplinary structure of science // *Epistemology and Philosophy of Science*. 2023. V. 60. No. 2. P. 35-41.
58. Kasavin I. T. Science and modern humanism // *Problems of Philosophy*. 2022. No. 9. P. 47-58.
59. Kasavin I. T. Science as a political subject // *Sociological research*. 2020. No. 7. P. 3-14.
60. Kasyan A. A., Demicheva T. N., Kurevina P. V. Ideology and science: discussions of Soviet scientists in the middle of the 20th century. Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 2008. 286 p.
61. Khalyavin N. V. Russian historiography of modern times on the role of the church in the political history of Novgorod the Great // *Bulletin of the Udmurt University. Series History and Philology*. 2010. No. 3. P. 11-22.
62. Khrushcheva E. N. The concept of the Byzantine state in Russian Byzantine studies of the last quarter of the 19th-20th centuries. Abstract of the thesis for the academic degree. Ekaterinburg, 2003. 28 p.
63. Klein L. S. History of Russian archeology: teachings, schools and personalities. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Eurasia, 2014. 640 p.
64. Klein L. S. Voyevoda of Soviet archeology // *History of Russian archeology: teachings, schools and personalities. T. 2: Archaeologists of the Soviet era*. St. Petersburg: Eurasia, 2014. P. 192-201.
65. Klibanov A. I. From the memoirs of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич // *Problems of Scientific Atheism*. 1983. No. 31. P. 269-295.
66. Klibanov A. I. V. D. Bonch-Bruевич and the problems of religious and social movements // *Bonch-Bruевич V. D. Selected works. In 3 vols. T. 1*. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959. P. 7-28.
67. Klimova E. S. Restoration of parish life in the Kemerovo region in 1944-1947. // *Bulletin of Kemerovo State University*. 2015. No. 1-2. P. 53-56.
68. Kobrin V. B. To whom are you dangerous, historian? M.: Moskovsky Rabochiy, 1992. 223 p.

69. Kogan Y. A. Preface // Bonch-Bruевич V. D. Selected works. In 3 vols. T. 3. M.: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1963. P. 5-19.
70. Kolesnikov A. S. Historian of philosophy in search of meaning // Man and society in the context of modernity. Philosophical readings in memory of Professor P. K. Grechko: collection of materials of the All-Russian scientific conference with international participation: in 2 volumes. T. 1. M.: RUDN, 2017. P. 167-172.
71. Korzun V. P., Knysh N. A., Kolevatov D. M. Transformation of the image of Soviet historical science in the first post-war decade: the second half of the 1940s - the middle of the 1950s. M.: ROSSPEN, 2011. 470 p.
72. Koshkarov A. G. State influence on the Orthodox tradition in Soviet society of the 1940s - 1980s. (on the example of the south of Western Siberia) // Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art history. Questions of theory and practice. 2013. No. 11. Part 2. P. 81-84.
73. Krapivin M. Y., Leikin A. Y., Dalgatov A. G. The fate of Christian sectarianism in Soviet Russia (1917 - late 1930s). St. Petersburg.: St. Petersburg State University, 2003. 304 p.
74. Krikh S. B. The image of antiquity in Soviet historiography. M.: KRASAND, 2013. 319 p.
75. Krikh S. B. The language of Soviet historiography: main characteristics // Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta. 2014. V. 156. No. 3. P. 214-222.
76. Krikh S. B. The phenomenon of peripherality in Soviet historiography // Problems of History. 2017. No. 10. P. 164-169.
77. Krikh S. B. The system of Soviet historiography: the main actors and forces of influence // Problems of History. 2016. No. 7. P. 162-167.
78. Krikh S. B., Metel O. V. Soviet historiography of antiquity in the context of world historiographic thought: analysis of texts created in the Soviet period. Analysis of the «periphery of scientific discourse» (forewords, reviews, applications). Evaluation of the main achievements and problems of Soviet conceptual constructions in the field of ancient history. M.: LENAND, 2014. 249 p.

79. Krykh S. B. Being a Marxist: the Cross of a Soviet Historian // *Historiographic Studies in Ukraine*. 2012. No. 22. P. 153-176.
80. Kurbatov G. L. *History of Byzantium (historiography)*. L.: Leningrad State University Publishing House, 1975. 256 p.
81. Kuznetsov N. S. Separation of the Church from the state: how it happened in Soviet Russia // *Theological Bulletin*. 2019. No. 2. P. 226-238.
82. Ladynin I. A. Features of the landscape (how Marxist was “Soviet antiquity”?) // *Bulletin of Dmitry Pozharsky University*. 2016. No. 2. P. 9-32.
83. Lebedeva G. E., Piotrovskaya E. K., Slyadz A. N. Z. V. Udaltsova as the organizer of Soviet Byzantine studies (on the 100th anniversary of the corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Z. V. Udaltsova) // *Proslogion: Problems of social history and the cultures of the Middle Ages and early modern times*. 2018. No. 4. P. 9-27.
84. Levchenko M. V. Byzantine studies in the USSR // *Scientific Notes of Leningrad State University*. 1949. No. 112. P. 216-236.
85. List of works by N. A. Kazakova / Comp. A. L. Khoroshkevich, V. F. Andreev // *Novgorod historical collection*. 1989. No. 3(13). P. 239-244.
86. Litvin A. L. *Without the right to thought: Historians in the era of the Great Terror. Fate sketches*. Kazan: Tatar. book. publishing house, 1994. 189 p.
87. Luchshev E. M. *Russian god: at the origins of Soviet atheism*. St. Petersburg: Shareholder i K, 2003. 118 p.
88. Luehrmann S. Antagonistic Insights: Evolving Soviet Atheist Critiques of Religion and Why They Matter for Anthropology // *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Anthropology*. 2015. Vol. 59. P. 97-113.
89. Luehrmann S. *Religion in Secular Archives: Soviet Atheism and Historical Knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. 256 p.
90. Luukkanen A. *The Party of Unbelief: The Religious Policy of the Bolshevik Party 1917–1929*. Helsinki, 1994. 274 p.

91. Matkhanova N. P. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich and «academic work»: assistance to repressed historians // *Siberian link. Collection of scientific articles*. 2017. P. 519-535.
92. Medyntseva A. A. B. A. Rybakov - a historian-encyclopedist of our time // *Culture of the Slavs and Rus'*. M.: Nauka, 1998. P. 3-29.
93. Melnik A. G. *Cults of Russian saints in the late XIV-XVI centuries: social aspects and practices of veneration*. Thesis for the academic degree. M., 2023. 690 p.
94. Menshikova E. V. From the history of Russian religious studies: understanding the subject and methods in the 20-30s. 20th century // *Bulletin of the RSPR*. 2008. No. 1. P. 70-76.
95. Menshikova E. V., Yablokov I. N. On the periods in the history of Russian religious studies // *Bulletin of the Moscow State University. Series 7: Philosophy*. 2011. No. 5. P. 98-116.
96. Metel O. V. Development of historical research at the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU in the 1940-1960s. // In the collection: *Omsk Scientific Readings - 2020. Materials of the Fourth All-Russian Scientific Conference*. Omsk, 2020. P. 2218-2222.
97. Metel O. V. Institute of History of the Communist Academy (1929–1936) // *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta*. 2016. V. 158. No. 6. P. 1522-1532.
98. Metel O. V. The development of Soviet historical science in the second half of the 80s of the XX century: the challenges of perestroika // *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta*. 2021. V. 163. No. 6. P. 31-47.
99. Metel O. V. The Institute of Scientific Atheism and the Development of Religious Studies in the USSR in the 1960s-80s. // *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Story*. 2022. No. 2. P. 40-50.
100. Morozova A. V. Domestic art history (1964-1985) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Story*. 2014. No. 1. P. 124-137.

101. Nikitin S. S. Specifics of the relationship between the Finnish and Russian Orthodox Churches after the restoration of prayerful and Eucharistic communion (1957-1960) // *Theological Bulletin*. 2016. No. 3-4. P. 207-234.
102. Ovchinnikov V. A. On the issue of periodization of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in Siberia during the Soviet period (1917-1991) // *Bulletin of Kemerovo State University*. 2015. No. 1-1. P. 72-80.
103. Pechnikov M. V. Church and strigolniki in Pskov at the end of the 14th - first third of the 15th century. // *Ancient Rus'. Questions of medieval studies*. 2009. No. 3(37). P. 88-89.
104. Pechnikov M. V. Was Pskov one of the heretical centers at the end of the 15th century? // *Bulletin of Dmitry Pozharsky University*. 2019. No. 2(14). P. 118-128.
105. Peris D. *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless*. Cornell University Press, 1998. 237 p.
106. Pikhoya R. G. *Notes of an archeographer*. M.: Dmitry Pozharsky University, 2016. 496 p.
107. Pollock E. *Stalin and the Soviet Science Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006. 288 p.
108. Pospelovsky D. *A History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer*. In 3 vol. Palgrave Macmillan, 1987–1988. 325p.
109. Pospelovsky D. *A History of Marxist-Leninist Atheism and Soviet Antireligious Policies*. New York: St. Martin's, 1987. 189 p.
110. Protsenko V. V. Temple as a sociocultural phenomenon // *Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region*. 1999. No. 6. P. 423-427.
111. Pyzиков D. D. The archive of V. D. Bonch-Bruevich in the State Museum of the History of Religion as a source of information on the history of church-state relations after the revolution of 1917 // *Religious Studies*. 2019. No. 2. P. 138-143.

112. Pyzikov D. D. The history of Orthodoxy in the articles of the Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR // *Modern Studies of Social Problems*. 2021. No. 4. P. 196-213.
113. Pyzikov D. D. V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich: a «professional» revolutionary and one of the founders of Soviet religious studies // *Concept: philosophy, religion, culture*. 2020. No. 1. P. 95-104.
114. *Questions of Religion and Religious Studies. Vol. 4: Anthology of Russian religious studies: St. Petersburg school of religious studies. Book 2: State Museum of the History of Religion. Part I. M.: MediaProm Publishing House, 2010. 490 p.*
115. Repina L. P. Historical and historiographic research in the context of modern intellectual culture // *History and historians in the space of national and world culture of the XVIII-XXI centuries: collection of articles. Chelyabinsk: Encyclopedia, 2011. P. 21-36.*
116. Ryklin M. K. Communism as a religion: intellectuals and the October Revolution. M.: *New Literary Review*, 2009. 128 p.
117. Rykov A. V. Boris Vipper and the canon of Soviet art history // *Current problems of theory and history of art*. 2022. Vol. 12. P. 624-633.
118. Rykov A. V. Mikhail Alpatov and the canon of Soviet art history // *New art history. History, theory and philosophy of art*. 2021. No. 1. P. 142-147.
119. Sashanov V. V. "...Study Byzantium, it's a goldmine": all-Union sessions on Byzantine studies in 1944-1950. // *General history and historical science in the 20th - early 21st centuries: materials of the II International Scientific and Educational Conference: in 2 volumes. Vol. 1. Kazan: Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, 2020. P. 226-230.*
120. Sashanov V. V. Experience of defending dissertations by Byzantine historians in the 1940-1950s: to pose the question // *Dissertation on history in the context of Russian scientific culture of the 19th - mid-20th centuries: experience and prospects for studying: collection of articles based on the results of the*

- interregional scientific seminar. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk State University, 2016. P. 119-131.
121. Sashanov V. V. The formation of Soviet Byzantine studies in the 40-50s of the XX century: institutional aspect // *Scientific Notes of Kazan University. Series: Humanities*. 2016. No. 3. P. 840-850.
122. *Science, Religion and Communism in Cold War Europe* / Ed. by P. Betts, S. A. Smith. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 307 p.
123. Sentyabova M. V. Daily life of parishes of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Krasnoyarsk Territory in the 40s - 70s. XX century // *Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University*. 2012. No. 6. P. 239-245.
124. Serpeninov A. "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate" as a source for studying the history of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra (to the 75th anniversary of the opening of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra) // *Theological Bulletin*. 2021. No. 4. P. 180-191.
125. Shakhnovich M. «Scientific atheism» as an ideological construct and educational project (1950s-1980s) // *Religiski-Filozofiski Raksti*. 2021 Vol. 31. P. 8-25.
126. Shakhnovich M. Comparative Religion and Anti-Religious Museums of Soviet Russia in the 1920s // *Religions*. 2020 Vol. 11. Issue 2, 55. P. 1-12.
127. Shakhnovich M. I. V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich is a researcher of religious and social movements in Russia // *Yearbook of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*. 1963. No. 7. P. 293-300.
128. Shakhnovich M. M. «Funny Pictures»: from the history of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography and the Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1932–1933) // *Anthropological Forum*. 2020. No. 47. P. 139-153.
129. Shakhnovich M. M. Anthropological Religious Studies in Russian Academic Science in the First Quarter of the 20th Century // *St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences in the History of Academies of the World*. T. 4. St. Petersburg, 1999.

130. Shakhnovich M. M. Correspondence of V. D. Bonch-Bruевич and L. I. Emelyakh as a source on the history of the Manuscript Department (Scientific Archive) of the Museum of the History of Religion of the USSR Academy of Sciences // Auxiliary historical disciplines in modern scientific knowledge. Proceedings of the XXXII International Scientific Conference. M.: IVI RAN, 2019. P. 444-446.
131. Shakhnovich M. M. Cultural revolution in the USSR and the science of religion // Religious Studies. 2015. No. 3. P. 127-135.
132. Shakhnovich M. M. Discussions in the Communist Academy and the Science of Religion in the USSR (late 1920s - early 1930s) // Religious Studies. 2015. No. 4. P. 151-159.
133. Shakhnovich M. M. Ethos of the history of science: on the reconstruction of Russian religious studies of the Soviet period // State, religion, church in Russia and abroad. 2015. No. 1. P. 185-197.
134. Shakhnovich M. M. M. I. Shakhnovich as a researcher of Russian culture // Veche: almanac of Russian philosophy and culture. 2009. No. 20. P. 218-223.
135. Shakhnovich M. M. Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in the Kazan Cathedral: the struggle to save the building and preserve the Museum (1946–1951) // Issues of religion and religious studies. Issue. 4: Anthology of Russian Religious Studies: St. Petersburg School of Religious Studies. Book 2: State Museum of the History of Religion. Part I. 2010. P. 55-76.
136. Shakhnovich M. M. Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961) // Religious Studies. 2008. No. 4. P. 150-157.
137. Shakhnovich M. M. Petersburg School of Religious Studies: Origins and Traditions // Issues of Religion and Religious Studies. Issue. 4: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2010. P. 7-14.
138. Shakhnovich M. M. Presentation of the cult of Christian saints in anti-religious museum expositions of the era of the «Great Break» // Bulletin of St.

- Petersburg State University. *Philosophy and conflictology*. 2021. No. 4. P. 706-717.
139. Shakhnovich M. M. Return from non-existence: publications about N. M. Matorin (1898–1936) and his scientific and organizational activities // *Religious Studies*. 2020. No. 3. P. 112-119.
140. Shakhnovich M. M. Russian Religious Studies of the 1920-1980s. What legacy are we giving up? // *Essays on the history of religious studies*. St. Petersburg, 2006. P. 181-197.
141. Shakhnovich M. M. Scientific atheism of the era of «developed socialism» in the visual arts: about a series of decorative panels «Soviet Way of Life» (1983–1986) from the collection of the State Museum of the History of Religion // *Religious Studies*. 2019. No. 3. P. 100-109.
142. Shakhnovich M. M. Section for the study of religions of the peoples of the USSR at the Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1934) // *State, religion, Church in Russia and abroad*. 2013. No. 1. P. 202-219.
143. Shakhnovich M. M. The Cold War and the Ideological Struggle on the «Religious Front»: On Some Models of Soviet Propaganda // *State, Religion, Church in Russia and Abroad*. 2017. No. 1. P. 164-184.
144. Shakhnovich M. M. The concept of «scientific atheism»: the history of its construction and introduction into philosophy and political practice (1954–1964) // *Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Philosophy and conflictology*. 2022. No. 3. P. 436-448.
145. Shakhnovich M. M. The cult of saints in anti-religious propaganda and historical science in the USSR in the 1920s - early 1930s. // *State, religion, Church in Russia and abroad*. 2023. No. 1. P. 151-177.
146. Shakhnovich M. M. The study of the history of religion in the 1920s and the first anti-religious expositions in Leningrad // *Religious Studies*. 2018. No. 4. P. 152-157.

147. Shakhnovich M. M. V. D. Bonch-Bruevich, «Library of scientific and atheistic literature» and the struggle for the reconstruction of the sector of the history of religion of the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1953–1954) // *Religious Studies*. 2022. No. 2. P. 140-150.
148. Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Ideology and science: The study of religion in the era of the cultural revolution in the USSR*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016. 367 p.
149. Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Russian Religious Studies (1932-1961)*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2014. 457 p.
150. Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. N. M. Matorin and his program for the study of folk religiosity // *Religious Studies*. 2012. No. 4. P. 191-202.
151. Shakhnovich M. M., Teryukova E. A. *Scientific atheism: from science to utopia*. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2022. 242 p.
152. Shakhnovich M. Religious studies and anti-religious propaganda in the USSR in 1920-1930s // *European Researcher. Series A*. 2016. No. 8 (109). P. 456-461.
153. Shakhnovich M. The activity of the commission on the history of religion of the Communist academy (Moscow, 1928–1930) and the study of religiosity in the USSR // *Religiski-Filozofiski Raksti*. 2017. T. 23. P. 9-24.
154. Shakhnovich M. The Study of Religion in the Soviet Union // *Numen*. 40. 1993. P. 67-81.
155. Shenk F. B. *Alexander Nevsky in Russian cultural memory: saint, ruler, national hero (1263-2000)*. M.: New Literary Review, 2007. 589 p.
156. Shenk F. B. Political myth and collective identity. The myth of Alexander Nevsky in Russian history (1263-1998) // *Ab Imperio*. 2001. No. 1-2. P. 141-164.
157. Shipovalova L. V. Distributed cognition and its limits in the context of public scientific communication // *Sociology of Science and Technologies*. 2019. V. 10. No. 3. P. 56-71.

158. Shipovalova L. V. History and historians in politics // After postpositivism. Materials of the Third International Congress of the Russian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science. Moscow: Russian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science, 2022, P. 435-437.
159. Shipovalova L. V. Is science worth thinking historically? // Epistemology and philosophy of science. 2017. V. 51. No. 1. P. 18-28.
160. Shipovalova L. V. On the possibility of freedom of science from politics // Bulletin of the Tomsk State University. Philosophy. Sociology. Political science. 2020. No. 57. P. 128-140.
161. Shirokova M. A. The place and role of Slavophilism in Russian philosophy and social thought: historiography of the problem // News of the Altai State University. 2013. No. 2-2(78). P. 220-225.
162. Shkarovsky M. V. Russian Orthodox Church in the XX century. M.: Veche: Lepta, 2010. 478 p.
163. Shkarovsky M. V. Russian Orthodox Church under Stalin and Khrushchev (State-Church relations in the USSR in 1939-1964). M.: Krutitskoe Patriarchal Compound and others, 1999. 400 p.
164. Sidorova L. A. Soviet historical science of the middle of the XX century: a synthesis of three generations of historians. Moscow: Institute of Russian History, 2008. 292 p.
165. Sidorova L. A. Thaw in historical science. Mid 50's - mid 60's. // Historical science of Russia in the XX century / G. D. Alekseeva, A. A. Ovsyannikov, Tamas Kraus and others. M.: Scriptorium, 1997. P. 244-268.
166. Sidorova L. A. Thaw in historical science: Soviet historiography of the first post-Stalin decade. M.: Monuments of historical thought, 1997. 288 p.
167. Sizov S. G. Religious life of Omsk during the years of "post-war Stalinism (1945 - March 1953) // Intelligentsia and the diversity of culture of the Russian province. Materials VIII All-Russian. scientific conf. with international

participation in preparation for the 300th anniversary of Omsk and the celebration of anniversary events in Russian history. Omsk, 2012. P. 301-305.

168. Slezkin Y. L. Government House: The Saga of the Russian Revolution. M.: AST: Corpus, 2019. 969 p.
169. Smirnov M. Y. On Russian Religious Studies: Controversial Issues // Issues of Religion and Religious Studies. Issue. 2: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2010. P. 126-127.
170. Smirnov M. Y. Scientific atheism in Soviet higher education: periodization and content // Bulletin of the Leningrad State University. 2018. Philosophical Sciences. No. 3. P. 144-171.
171. Smolina I. V. Life of the Irkutsk diocese in the context of state-church relations in the second half of the 20th century. // News of Altai State University. 2009. No. 4-1. pp. 211-215.
172. Smolkin V. A sacred space is never empty: the history of Soviet atheism. M.: New Literary Review, 2021. 552 p.
173. Soskovets L.I. Religious confessions of Western Siberia in the 40-60s of the XX century. Tomsk: Vol. state Univ., 2003. 346 p.
174. Teryukova E. A. A cult object in a museum (from the history of museum business in Russia in the 20-30s of the XX century) // Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Series 17. Philosophy. Conflictology. Culturology. Religious studies. 2014. No. 3. P. 110-115.
175. Teryukova E. A. Central anti-religious museum in Moscow: historical landmarks (1929–1947) // Study of Religion. 2019. No. 4. P. 121-127.
176. Teryukova E. A. Museum of the History of Religion during the Great Patriotic War // Proceedings of the State Museum of the History of Religion. 2019. No. 19. P. 64-78.
177. Teryukova E. A. V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich – Researcher of Religious Minority Groups in Russia: Based on the Materials of the Scientific and Historical Archive

- of the State Museum of the History of Religion // History of Religious Studies and Intellectual History of Russia in the 19th – First Half of the 20th Century. Archival materials and research. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of St. Petersburg State University, 2018. P. 168-184.
178. The path of the scientist. Nikolai Semyonovich Gordienko / comp. M. Y. Smirnov. M.: Special book, 2013. 96 p.
179. Thrower J. Marxist-Leninist "Scientific Atheism" and the Study of Religion and Atheism in the USSR. De Gruyter, 1983. 529 p.
180. Tikhonov V. V. Ideological Campaigns of "Late Stalinism" and Soviet Historical Science (mid-1940s - 1953). M.; St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2016. 424 p.
181. Tikhonov V. V. Moscow historians of the first half of the 20th century: Y.V. Gauthier, P.B. Veselovsky, A.I. Yakovlev and P.V. Bakhrushin. Moscow: Publishing Center of the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2012. 387 p.
182. Tipsina A. N., Shakhnovich M. M. In memory of Mikhail Iosifovich Shakhnovich (life and career) // Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Ser.6. 1992. No. 20. Issue. 3.
183. Tumarkin N. Lenin is alive! The cult of Lenin in Soviet Russia. St. Petersburg: Acad. project, 1997. 285 p.
184. Udaltsova Z. V. Soviet Byzantine studies for 50 years. M.: Nauka, 1969. 362 p.
185. Uzlaner D. A. Soviet model of secularization // Sociological Studies. 2010. No. 6. P. 62-69.
186. Vainshtein O. L. History of Soviet medieval studies (1917-1966). L.: Nauka, 1968. 435 p.
187. van den Bercken W. Ideology and Atheism in the Soviet Union. De Gruyter, 1988. 199 p.

188. Vashchuk R. I. Soviet historiography of Byzantine hesychasm // *Clio*. 2021. No. 4. pp. 23-31.
189. Vasilyeva O. Y. «I am against the opposition of Soviet and Russian science of religion...» // *State, religion, church in Russia and abroad*. 2014. No. 3. P. 295-301.
190. Vasilyeva O. Y. Power and religion in Russia: the XX century // *Issues of religion and religious studies*. Issue. 2: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2010. P. 50-62.
191. Vasilyeva O. Y. Russian Orthodox Church in the politics of the Soviet state in 1943-1948. M.: IRI RAS, 1999. 212 p.
192. Veretennikov P. I. Church historian Professor Ivan Nikolaevich Shabatin // *Theological Bulletin*. 2010. No. 11-12. P. 537-547.
193. Yablokov I. N. Department of Philosophy of Religion and Religious Studies of Moscow State University: milestones of history // *Issues of religion and religious studies*. Issue. 2: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2010. P. 133-138.
194. Yablokov I. N. Religious studies and the history of religious studies. *Discussions in Russian Literature // Religious Studies*. 2011. No. 3. P. 127-140.
195. Yablokov I. N. To the discussion about the current state and history of Russian religious studies // *State, religion, Church in Russia and abroad*. 2011. No. 1. P. 165-173.
196. Yaroshevsky M. G. Stalinism and the fate of Soviet science // *Repressed science / comp. A. I. Melua, V. M. Orel*. Under total ed. M. G. Yaroshevsky. L.: Nauka, 1991. P. 9-33.
197. Yekelchik S. Stalinist Patriotism as Imperial Discourse: Reconciling the Ukrainian and Russian «Heroic Pasts», 1939-1945 // *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. 2002. No. 3.
198. Yusupova T. I., Chumakova T. V. «What should we do with this museum?» Museum of the History of Religion in the Soviet Academic Space of the 1930s. // *Dialogue with time*. 2020. No. 73. P. 360-375.

199. Zabayako A. P. S. A. Tokarev: traditions are a connecting thread // *Religious Studies*. 2002. No. 3. P. 151-152.
200. Zabayako A.P. Methodology of interpretation of rock carvings: the religious heritage of A.P. Okladnikov // *Religious Studies*. 2014. No. 3. P. 172-186.
201. Zuev Y. P. Institute of Scientific Atheism (1964–1991) // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 1: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2009. P. 9-34.
202. Zuev Y. P., Schmidt V. V. From the Institute of Scientific Atheism to the Department of State-Confessional Relations: The Formation of the School of Religion (1964–1991, 1992–2010) // *Issues of Religion and Religious Studies*. Issue. 2: Anthology of russian religious studies. 2010. P. 15-28.

Literature and sources published on the Internet:

1. Chumakova T. V., Pyzikov D. D. The Bible in the USSR // *Istoriya*. 2020. T. 11. Issue. 1. [Electronic resource]. Access for registered users. URL: <https://history.jes.su/s207987840007423-4-1/> (date of access: 08.16.2023).
2. Polishchuk E. S. “Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate” // *Orthodox Encyclopedia*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.pravenc.ru/text/182369.html> (Date of access: 09.21.2023).
3. Pyzikov D. D., Blinkova A. O., Khizhaya T. I. Libraries of Orthodox Theological Educational Institutions of the Russian Empire // *Bylye Gody*. 2022. No. 17 (4). P. 1666-1674. [Electronic resource] URL: https://bg.cherkasgu.press/journals_n/1669898969.pdf (date of access: 09.23.2023).
4. Redkina O. Y. People's Commissariat of Agriculture and the VIII Department of the People's Commissariat of Justice of the RSFSR: the problem of state cooperation with religious collective farms during the years of «war communism». [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://rusoir.ru/03print/03print-04/03print-04-13/> (accessed 09.22.2023).

5. Vasilyeva O. Y. State-church relations of the Soviet period: periodization and content. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.pravoslavie.ru/5206.html> (Date of access: 09.21.2023).
6. Zlobina D. A., Pyzikov D. D. Project of V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich: Community «Beginning of the Century» and State Farm «Forest Glades» // Bulletin of the SVGU. Story. Electronic international scientific journal. Volume 1. Issue 2. 2020. [Electronic resource] URL: http://vistory-svgu.ru/?page_id=264 (date of access: 08.22.2023).

Dictionaries, encyclopedias and reference books:

1. Averintsev S. S., Kurochkin P. K. Orthodoxy // Philosophical Encyclopedia. T. 4. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1967. P. 333-336.
2. Figures of the revolutionary movement in Russia: Bio-bibliographic dictionary: From the predecessors of the Decembrists to the fall of tsarism. In 5 vols. Vol. 5: Social Democrats. 1880-1904: No. 2, P. 746-749.
3. Grekulov E. F. Bibliographic index of literature on the study of Orthodoxy, Old Believers and sectarianism in Soviet historical science for 1922-1972. Moscow: Knowledge, 1974. 258 p.
4. Kazhdan A. P. Orthodox Church // Soviet Historical Encyclopedia. T. 2. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1968. P. 502-504.
5. Koretsky V. I., Buganov V. I. Orthodox Church // Soviet Historical Encyclopedia. T. 2. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1968. P. 504-510.