

The study of religious destruction in pre-revolution Russia: formation of methodology

¹Vitaly Medvedev, ²Dmitryi Mikhailov, ³Viktoriya Osmakova,
⁴Vitaly Pensko, ⁵Roman Shilishpanov

Abstract. The article deals with the history of the study of the phenomenon of "religious destruction" in the pre-revolutionary period. The very process of studying this phenomenon dates back to the XVI century. Initially, many researchers did not pay much attention to the active growth of followers of religious sectarianism in the Russian Empire, believing that it will not affect the strong Foundation of the Orthodox state. Also, the main purpose of the presented work is to identify the methodology that arose and existed in the pre-revolutionary period. This goal implies the following tasks: to analyze the currently available works published in pre-revolutionary Russia and devoted to the study of religious destruction, as well as to determine the methods of its study through their modern interpretation. The article deals with many aspects of the study of sects in the Russian Empire: for example, the objectivity of the views of many researchers who were engaged in the study of the phenomenon of "religious destruction". Also, this article addresses the issue of the prevalence of qualitative methods over quantitative methods in the study of sectarianism.

¹ 308015 Belgorod National Research University, Russia

² 308015 Belgorod National Research University, Russia

³ 308015 Belgorod National Research University, Russia

⁴ 308015 Belgorod National Research University, Russia

⁵ 308015 Belgorod National Research University, Russia

The article deals with the history of the study of the phenomenon of "religious destruction" in the pre-revolutionary period. The very process of studying this phenomenon dates back to the XVI century. Initially, many researchers did not pay much attention to the active growth of followers of religious sectarianism in the Russian Empire, believing that it will not affect the strong Foundation of the Orthodox state. Also, the main purpose of the presented work is to identify the methodology that arose and existed in the pre-revolutionary period. This goal implies the following tasks: to analyze the currently available works published in pre-revolutionary Russia and devoted to the study of religious destruction, as well as to determine the methods of its study through their modern interpretation. The article deals with many aspects of the study of sects in the Russian Empire: for example, the objectivity of the views of many researchers who were engaged in the study of the phenomenon of "religious destruction". Also, this article addresses the issue of the prevalence of qualitative methods over quantitative methods in the study of sectarianism. This is due to the fact that in the modern world there are often disputes that the existing science in many studies is based on quantitative methods, without affecting the quality in full. This also includes domestic scientific thought devoted to the study of the current state of the phenomenon of "religious destruction".

Keywords: methodology, paradigm, research methods, religious destruction, pre-revolutionary period, Russian Empire.

I. Introduction

In the modern Russian scientific paradigm of the post-Soviet period, its own methodology of religious destruction understanding was formed. It was mainly founded on the experience of the Soviet religious studies. Many approaches to the study of religious destruction existing in the field of religious studies today are a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. The works of such modern authors as V. V. Semenova, A. Strauss, E. M. Kovalev are devoted to them. The methodology of philosophy and religion studies is considered in the works by V. M. Rozina, G. I. Ruzavina, A. N. Krasnikova.

Moreover, if modern philosophical and religious studies are based on Soviet and post-Soviet approaches which were formed about 100 years after the revolution, it is worth

noting that the methodology for the study of religious destruction in the domestic secular and confessional paradigm has deeper roots.

The Study of Religion in Pre-revolutionary Russia: the First Experience.

The study of religion as an element of culture in domestic science began in the second part of the XVIII century. During this period, the first domestic work of the Russian philosopher and publicist D. S. Anichkov was published. It was devoted to the origin of religion and religious worldviews (Anichkov, 1769). The work in question reflected the secular process of religion understanding which catalyzed the state and society to the study of ethno-religious picture of the Russian state.

The Study of Religious Destruction in Pre-Revolutionary Russia: Genesis of Methodology.

The study of religious destruction in Russia began in the 16th century, much earlier than public interest to religion in the second part of the 18th century. During this period, Rev. Joseph Volotsky paid his attention to the active growth of religious difference of opinions. He composed the work “The Enlightener or Denunciation of the Heresy of the Judaizers” (Volotsky, 1896). The work was of apologetic nature in relation to the religious dissent of that time. The basic principle of the original version of the author's work was the dogmatic method. The aim of the work was to fight against the spread of heresy and to protect Orthodoxy.

After “The Enlightener” and up to the first part of the XIX century, the study of various manifestations of religious destruction was mainly reflected in the reports of government and church departments to which the clergy presented data on the state of their parishes affected by heresy and sects. Also, a partial reflection of certain aspects of religious destruction existed in the dictionaries and legislative acts. And only by the middle of the XIX century, in connection with the active dissemination of “the spadonic heresy”, the well-known Russian researcher V. I. Dal was instructed to study it by the order of the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Empire in 1844. As a result, the work was composed

(Dal, 1844) and was rewritten by N. I. Nadezhdin under the instruction of Nicholas I because of the confessional affiliation of the author. Nadezhdin contributed all Dal's materials to his work (Melnikov, 1903). Then, in 1845, the book was published with a similar name and a set of methods such as analysis, synthesis, generalization and a hermeneutical method contained in the original. Thus, the work by V. I. Dal - N. I. Nadezhdin became the starting point in the matter of the subsequent study of religious destruction in the national scientific paradigm.

The Study of Religious Destruction in Pre-revolutionary Russia: Evolution of the Methodology.

Further development of the study of heresies and sects in the pre-revolutionary period was reflected in the works of many researchers. They should be divided into confessional and secular paradigms. Also, the works of pre-revolutionary researchers within the above mentioned paradigms should be considered in the chronological order of their publication.

Within the confessional paradigm we will consider the following groups: "Orthodox missionary public activists", "protective Orthodox clergy".

The first group includes V. M. Skvortsov, D. I. Bogolyubov, A. N. Kotovich, M. A. Kalnev, N. Yu. Varzhansky. These authors graduated from theological schools and academies and related to missionary activity.

One of the first researchers who composed numerous works devoted to the study of religion and religious destruction in the Russian Empire was V.M. Skvortsov. He used a typological method, a method of generalization, methods of analysis and synthesis in one of his works (Skvortsov, 1896). Further, a method of questioning, structural-functional, hermeneutic, and dogmatic methods were used in the work by D. I. Bogolyubov (Bogolyubov, 1904). A. N. Kotovich's next work (Kotovich, 1909) was written from the position of anti-sectarian missionary activity and contained such methods as analysis, synthesis, generalization, method of analyzing historical sources. M. A. Kalnev was the author of numerous works on the study of sects. One of his missionary works (Kalnev, 1911) was based on the methods of generalization, typology, field research, as well as the dogmatic method and the method of deductive analysis. Also, one of the works, which is

still recognized as “a reference book” among Orthodox clergy, is the work by N. Yu. Varzhansky, the Orthodox missionary (Varzhansky, 1912), who used methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization and dogmatism.

Thus, having considered the works of the researchers of presented group, it seems possible to determine the predominance of qualitative methods. The most common were the methods of dogmatism and typology. Also, the key method of missionary activity was the field research method.

The second group includes such researchers as priest S. N. Bogdanovich, Archpriest A. P. Vvedensky, Archimandrite Arseny (Chegovets), who were clergymen of the Russian Orthodox Church.

For the study of religious destruction S. N. Bogdanovich used the structural-functional method, the method of deductive analysis, the dogmatic method, the method of historicism, the method of objectivity in his work (Bogdanovich, 1911). The next representative of this group is A.P. Vvedensky. In drawing up the legal support and the position of sects, he used the methods of generalization and typology in his work (Vvedensky, 1912). Then, Archimandrite Arseny (Chegovets), describing the position of the church in relation to religious destruction in his article (Chegovets, 1913), relied on the methods of inductive and deductive analysis, synthesis, dogmatism, method of analyzing historical sources.

Accordingly, in the works of the protective orthodox clergy, as well as in the works of missionary public activists, qualitative research methods prevailed. Methods of dogmatism and typology aimed at similar needs of their use are also found among them. It should be noted that field research method is not used.

The following, secular paradigm, represented by a wider spectrum of groups, included: “secular protective researchers, Orthodox by religion”; “non-confessional protective secular civil servants”; “secular liberal researchers - civil servants and representatives of non-confessional scientific thought.”

The first group of researchers included I. M. Dobrotvorsky, A. M. Ivantsov-Platonov, V. I. Yatskevich, N. I. Ivanovsky, S. V. Bulgakov. They were not clergymen, but represented interests of Orthodoxy and the Church.

The first of the representatives of this group was I. M. Dobrotvorsky. In his work (Dobrotvorsky, 1869), the author described religious destruction using the dogmatic method, the method of historicism, the method of analyzing historical sources, the method of deductive analysis, as well as the hermeneutical method and the method of generalization. A. M. Ivantsov-Platonov was another author studying the history of sectarianism formation in the Christian church in the pre-revolutionary period. The author used the method of historicism, the method of analyzing historical sources and the method of generalization in his study (Ivantsov-Platonov, 1877). Also, the work by V. I. Yatskevich (Yatskevich, 1900) was published devoting to the analyses of the schism and sects. The author used the methods of deductive analysis, synthesis, generalization, dogmatism, typology. N. I. Ivanovsky examined the mystical and rationalistic sectarianism, its formation and development in the territory of the Russian Empire (Ivanovsky, 1905). He used methods of inductive analysis, synthesis, generalization, typology and the method of analyzing historical sources. The work by S. V. Bulgakov (Bulgakov, 1994) occupies a particular place in this group. It was republished in 1994. It is a compilation of the early pre-revolutionary work (Bulgakov, 1913), published in 1913. In the early work S. V. Bulgakov used methods of historicism, historical literature analysis, dogmatism, generalization. At the same time, a separate part was devoted directly to the study of religious destruction, entitled "Handbook of Heresies, Sects, and Schisms". It contained methods of generalization and typology.

Thus, it is worth noting that within the considered group qualitative and quantitative methods were used equally as often. Among them, the most common methods were the hermeneutic method, methods of typologization and statistical analysis.

The second group includes D. V. Chichinadze, I. P. Liprandi. They were non-confessional researchers or employees of the Ministry of the Interior of the Russian Empire.

I.P. Liprandi used the methods of statistical analysis and analyzing historical sources, as well as methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization and typology (Liprandi, 1883). A different view on religious destruction is reflected in the work by D. V. Chichinadze (Chichinadze, 1899). It is the analysis of the legal support and the position of sects within the Russian state with the use of the methods of analysis, synthesis and typology.

Having analyzed the methodology of the presented group, it seems possible to stress the predominance of quantitative methods. Also, it is worth noting that many methods are similar to each other. The methods of analysis, synthesis, and typology are identical among them.

The third group within the confessional paradigm included such researchers as Yu. Yuzov (I. I. Kablitz), A. S. Pruhavin, A. K. Borozdin. This group included secular, academic researchers who were not public servants or Orthodox and non-Orthodox confession representatives.

The first representative of the group Yu. Yuzov (I. I. Kablitz) analyzed religious destruction using methods of deductive and inductive analysis, generalization, typology, historicism, and statistical analysis in one of his works (Yuzov, 1881). A significant contribution to the study of religious destruction was made by the Russian historian and publicist A. S. Pruhavin. Many works (Pruhavin, 1880, 1882, 1904) are the comprehensive analysis of the sects existing in the Russian Empire, criticism of statistics on the study of sectarianism, the classification of religious destruction and an attempt to combine studies previously obtained into a single methodological system. A.S. Pruhavin used the methods of historicism, analysis, synthesis, generalization, typology, statistical analysis in his works. The study of A. K. Borozdin (Borozdin, 1905) was published in the late period. He used methods of analysis, field research, historicism and statistical analysis.

Thus, having considered the researchers of this group, it is worth noting that the liberal study was significantly different from the state and church study of religious destruction. It equally included both qualitative and quantitative methods, such as historicism, analysis, synthesis, generalization, typology, statistical analysis, which, according to the researchers, were the most effective for the study of religious destruction.

II. Conclusion

The results obtained in the course of the study show that the most practical methodology for the study of religious destruction was reflected in the works by A. S. Pruhavin, M. A. Kalnev, A. N. Kotovich, N. Yu. Varzhansky. One should note that the methods used in the works were not always suitable for a particular study. For example, methods of typologization in the works by Yu. Yuzov, V. I. Yatskevich, N. I. Ivanovsky, S.

V. Bulgakov had a primitive character without considering the evolution of religious destruction. Also, the dogmatic method in the works by S. N. Bogdanovich, Arseny (Chegovets) was of apologetic nature and did not reflect a comprehensive consideration of religious destruction. Then, the method of statistical analysis in the late period did not give a sense of the numerical and confessional composition of the Russian Empire.

Thus, having analyzed various studies, it is possible to correlate qualitative and quantitative methods. Analysis, synthesis, generalization, typology and classification, historicism, comparative historical analysis, structural-functional analysis, induction and deduction, hermeneutical method, method of analyzing historical sources, method of objectivity and dogmatic method were used among the qualitative methods. The quantitative methods included the method of statistical analysis and the method of field research. This allows us to conclude that quantitative methods prevailed over quantitative methods in the pre-revolutionary research system.

III. REFERENCES

1. Anichikov, D.S. (1769) Razsuzhdeniye iz natural'noy bogoslovii o nachale i proisshествii natural'nogo bogopochitaniya [Discourse from natural theology about the beginning and occurrence of natural worship]. Moscow. (in Russian)
2. Bogdanovich, S.N. (1911) Na istinnom puti. (Bozhestvennyye i svyatootecheskiye svidetel'stva protiv raskol'nikov i sektantov) [On the True Path. (Divine and patristic evidence against dissenters and sectarians)]. St. Petersburg: Otechestvennaya tipografiya. (in Russian)
3. Bogolyubov, D.I. (1904) Pravoslavnyy protivosektantskiy katekhizis [Orthodox anti-sectarian catechism]. St. Petersburg: tipo-litografiya M.P. Frolovoy. (in Russian)
4. Borozdin, A.K. (1905) Ocherki russkogo religioznogo raznomysliya [Essays on Russian religious dissent]. St. Petersburg: Literatura i nauka. (in Russian)
5. Bulgakov, S.V. (1994) Spravochnik po yeresyam, sektam i raskolam [Handbook of heresies, sects, and schisms]. Moscow: Sovremennik. (in Russian)
6. Bulgakov, S.V. (1913). Nastol'naya kniga dlya svyashchenno-tserkovno-sluzhiteley: sbornik svedeniy, kasayushchikhsya preimushchestvenno prakticheskoy deyatelnosti otechestvennogo dukhovenstva. [Handbook for priests: a collection of information

- relating mainly to the practical activities of the national clergy]. Edition 3, revised and updated. Kiev: tipografiya Kiyev-Pecherskoy Uspenskoy Lavry. (in Russian)
7. Varzhansky, N.Yu. (1912) Dobroye ispovedaniye. Pravoslavnyy protivosektantskiy katekhizis [Good Confession. Orthodox anti-sectarian catechism]. Moscow. (in Russian)
 8. Vvedensky, A.P. (1912) Deystvuyushchiye zakonopolozheniya kasatel'no staroobryadtsev i sektantov [Legislation in force regarding Old Believers and sectarians]. Odessa: tipografiya Odesskikh Novostey. (in Russian)
 9. Volotsky, I. (1896) Prosvetitel' ili Oblicheniye Yeresi Zhidovstvuyushchikh [The Enlightener or Denunciation of the Heresy of the Judaizers]. Kazan: Tipo-lithography of the Imperial University. (in Russian)
 10. Dal', V.I. (1844) Issledovaniye o skopcheskoy yeresi [Study on the Spadonic Heresy]. St. Petersburg, po prikazaniyu g. Ministra Vnutrennikh Del. (in Russian)
 11. Dobrotvorsky, I.M. (1869) Lyudi bozhii. Russkaya sekta tak nazyvayemykh dukhovnykh khristian [People of God. Russian sect of the so-called spiritual Christians]. Kazan: Universitetskaya tipografiya. (in Russian)
 12. Ivanovsky, N.I. (1905) Rukovodstvo po istorii i oblicheniyu staroobryadcheskogo raskola s prisovokupleniyem svedeniy o sektakh ratsionalisticheskikh i misticheskikh [Guide to the history and denunciation of the Old Believers split with the addition of information about the rationalistic and mystical sects]. Kazan: tipografiya Imp. Un-ta. (in Russian)
 13. Ivantsov-Platonov, A.M. (1877) Yeresi i raskoly pervykh trekh vekov khristianstva [Heresies and schisms of the first three centuries of Christianity]. Moscow: Universitetskaya tipografiya (M. Katkov). (in Russian)
 14. Kal'nev, M.A. (1911) Russkiye sektanty, ikh ucheniye, kul't i sposoby propagandy [Russian sectarians, their doctrine, cult and methods of propaganda]. Odessa: tipografiya Ye. I. Fesenko. (in Russian)
 15. Kotovich, A.N. (1909) Dukhovnaya tsenzura v Rossii (1799-1855 gg.) [Spiritual censorship in Russia (1799-1855)]. St. Petersburg: tipografiya "Rodnik". (in Russian)
 16. Liprandi, I.P. (1883) Kratkoye obozreniye sushchestvuyushchikh v Rossii raskolov, yeresey i sekt, kak v religioznom, tak i v politicheskom ikh znachenii [Brief review of the schisms existing in Russia, heresies and sects, both in their religious and political significance]. Leipzig. (in Russian)

17. Mel'nikov, P.I. (1903) Vladimir Ivanovich Dal'. Yego zhizn' i literaturnaya deyatel'nost' [Vladimir Ivanovich Dal. His life and literary activity]. St. Petersburg; Moscow: izdaniye tovarishchestva M.O. Vol'f. (in Russian)
18. Prugavin, A.S. (1880) O neobkhodimosti i sposobakh vsestoronnego izucheniya russkogo sektantstva [On the need and methods for the comprehensive study of Russian sectarianism]. St. Petersburg: tipografiya V. Bezobrazova i Kompanii. (in Russian)
19. Prugavin, A.S. (1882) Raskol vnizu i raskol vverkh. Ocherki sovremennogo sektantstva [A schism below and a schism above. Essays on modern sectarianism]. St. Petersburg: izdaniye A.S. Suvorina. (in Russian)
20. Prugavin, A.S. (1904) Religioznyye otshchepentsy (ocherki sovremennogo sektantstva) [Religious renegades (essays of modern sectarianism)]. St. Petersburg: izdaniye tovarishchestva "Obshchestvennaya palata". (in Russian)
21. Skvortsov, V.M. (1896) Sushchestvennyye priznaki i stepen' vrednosti misticheskikh i ratsionalisticheskikh sekt [Essential features and degree of harmfulness of mystical and rationalistic sects]. Kiev: tipografiya S.V. Kul'zhenko. (in Russian)
22. Chegovets, A. (1913) Sektanty i tserkovnaya politika [Sectarians and church politics]. Kharkov: Yeparkhial'naya tipografiya. (in Russian)
23. Chichinadze, D.V. (1899) Sbornik zakonov o raskole i sektantakh, raz'yasnennykh resheniyami Pravitel'stvuyushchego Senata i Svyateyshego Sinoda [The collection of laws on schism and sectarians, explained by the decisions of the Governing Senate and the Holy Synod]. Edition II. St. Petersburg: tipografiya Chichinadze. (in Russian)
24. Yuzov, Yu. (1881) Russkiye dissidenty: starovery i dukhovnyye khristiane [Russian dissidents: Old Believers and spiritual Christians]. St. Petersburg: tipografiya A.M. Kotomina. (in Russian)
25. Yatskevich, V.I. (1900) Kratkiye svedeniya o staroobryadcheskom raskole i sektakh v russkoy tserkvi, s izlozheniyem deystvuyushchego o nikh zakonodatel'stva [Brief information about the Old Believers schism and sects in the Russian Church, outlining the legislation in force about them]. Moscow: tovarishchestvo I.D. Sytina. (in Russian)