

THE MOSLEM WORLD: THEORETICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS

ELMIRA SADYKOVA, TEYMUR GALIMOV. THE PLACE AND
ROLE OF INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN THE FORMATION
OF THE RUSSIAN CENTRALIZED STATE

*Keywords: Muscovite State; Ancient
Rus; Golden Horde; Orthodox Church;
Islam; interreligious dialogue; unified
centralized Russian state.*

Elmira Sadykova,

PhD (Political Science),

Executive Director of the Foundation for the Promotion
of Strategic Dialogue and Partnership,

Head of the Center for Interreligious Dialogue,
Bolgar Islamic Academy

e-mail: richone@rambler.ru

Teymur Galimov,

PhD (Hist.), Independent Researcher, Secretary,

IPO "Association of Researchers of the Golden Horde"

email: galimov_t_r@mail.ru DPI

© E. Sadykova, T. Galimov 2023

Citation: Sadykova E., Galimov T. The Place and Role of
Interreligious Dialogue in the Formation of the Russian
Centralized State // Russia and the Moslem World : Science-
Information Journal, 2023, № 2 (320), P. 94-122. DOI:
10.31249/rmw/2023.02.08

Abstract. This study, based on a wide range of historical sources, as well as a range of research literature on relevant topics, is designed to clarify the place and role of interreligious dialogue in the historical process of the formation of the Ancient Russian centralized state. The study raises the issue of the importance of the factor of interreligious dialogue in the development of statehood, both in foreign policy and domestic aspects. The authors set themselves the task of considering the most important, in our opinion range of historical subjects that took place in the 10–16 centuries in the context of the formation of the civilizational identity of the Ancient Russian centralized state.

Introduction

New geopolitical challenges and threats to Russia's security actualize the study of conceptual approaches to the issues of a strong statehood capable of ensuring its sovereignty. When considering these issues, the civilizational paradigm of the genesis of Russian statehood becomes important. The role of interreligious interaction, given in the domestic and foreign policy of our state, attaches particular importance to scientific research in this direction. Russian President Vladimir Putin in his speech at the meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club in 2022 noted: "In Russia, for a thousand years, we have developed a unique culture of interaction between all world religions. There is no need to cancel anything: neither Christian values, nor Islamic, nor Jewish values."¹

The increasing role of Russia in world political processes is due to the past historical experience of uniting peoples representing different nationalities and faiths. In the process of historical development in the Eurasian space, there was a synthesis of customs, spiritual values, cultures that retain their significance in the modern life of Russian society. The objective of this study is to identify in numerous historical events in all their diversity the key factors that influenced the formation of the experience of a culture of dialogue and consent as an alternative

to confrontational crisis trends in the political system of the state. The dialectic of the formation of statehood in the context of creating prerequisites for the possession of political power in a certain territory is conditioned by the definition of its cultural and civilizational basis, the search for values and ideals. Historically, the cultural ties of the Russian lands, preserved in ethnic memory, created only certain favorable prerequisites for this, which still had to be realized. At the same time, the unification into a single centralized state was a difficult and contradictory process, which was associated with the inter-princely wars of the 12th–13th centuries and a change in the way of local life, a change in the identity of the population.²

Within the framework of a systematic approach, we have attempted to form a holistic view of the history of the formation of traditional value components, such as intercultural and interreligious dialogue, common interrelations and relationships that were formed during the formation and development of the ancient Russian state, which was also noted by Vladimir Putin, President of the Russian Federation.³

The question of the cultural and civilizational paradigm of the formation and development of Russian statehood involves considering the place and role of the medieval Russian state's interreligious dialogue, both external and internal contacts, in this process. The theme of Byzantinism occupies a special place in scientific research devoted to the foundations of the formation of the civilizational identity of the ancient Russian state. During the formation of the Slavic states, Byzantium was the most highly developed civilization in the world, which absorbed the heritage of Ancient Greece and Rome, the Middle East and Egypt. Byzantium created this universal civilizational phenomenon, to the formation of which the Slavs also contributed⁴. On the other hand, it is impossible not to note the role of the East, the Turkic world and Islam, one of the main monotheistic religions that contributed to the formation of the system of spiritual and value coordinates of a whole galaxy of peoples of Russia. Throughout

the millennial history of Russia, there have been processes of unification of various ethnic groups and cultures, which, regardless of internal and external factors, dissolving obstacles and overcoming them, preserved their identity and brought their own values and traditions to the common cultural denominator.

The active information propaganda of Western ideologists is aimed at spreading distorted facts about the past of the peoples that make up Russia and destroying the unity of the Russian people and deforming historical memory.

Religious aspects of the formation of a centralized Russian state

The Baptism of Ancient Rus took place at a time when Byzantium, which inherited the traditions of ancient culture, became not only the center of the Christian religion, but also reached the highest flourishing in the development of art, especially icon painting⁵. Byzantium was also a model of high culture, which attracted the attention of the Russian princes, who actively carried out contacts with Byzantium.

The Byzantine Empire remained a major center of Christian culture until the middle of the 10th century, and after the adoption of Orthodox Christianity by Ancient Rus, their ties strengthened through cooperation in political, cultural, and commercial spheres. At the same time, Russian proto-states were entering world politics and culture through Byzantium⁶. Historical circumstances created favorable conditions for the preservation of close Russian-Byzantine allied relations until 1453, when Constantinople was captured by the Ottoman Turks, while maintaining ties between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Russian Church. Byzantium as a center for the development of world culture, including architecture, various genres of art: mosaics, icon painting, book miniatures and other forms, also had a wide influence on Russian culture.

It is worth noting that initially there were conflicts in the relations between Byzantium and the East Slavic, and later Russian principalities. Thus, in the well-known chronicle sources, military campaigns of Russian princes to Byzantium in the 9th–10th centuries are mentioned. The goals of the noted invasions were, first of all, military booty. However, along with the trophies, the development of cultural values also took place. Subsequent contacts were made for the sake of the diplomatic interests of Byzantium, which found in this the only right solution in the fight against the Slavic hordes. The issues of spreading their own culture, the planting of Christianity were not at all missionary for Byzantium and were of an expansionist nature. There is evidence of contemporaries of this period, confirming the hostile attitude towards the Slavs in general. Thanks to historical chronicles, information about the raids on Constantinople by Princes Oleg, Igor, Svyatoslav and Vladimir has been preserved. The Byzantine writer Mikhail Pselle writes about the Russians that “this barbaric tribe has always harbored a fierce and furious hatred against the Greek *hegemony*; at every opportunity, inventing this or that accusation, they created from it a pretext for war with us⁷.” Military campaigns sometimes ended with the conclusion of peace treaties, but different religious beliefs led to the fact that the parties did not refrain from violating them. Despite all the above circumstances, trade contacts and relations between Byzantium and the Russian principalities developed.

The ideological and consolidating role of religion in the period of the emergence of Russian statehood is confirmed by the historical experience of the creation of the Orthodox state by Vladimir, the Baptist of Russia⁸. Academician G. Vernadsky wrote: “according to the chronicler, in 986 Vladimir was visited by religious missions from various faiths and churches: Moslems from the Volga Bulgarians, Roman Catholics from Germany, Khazars who preached Judaism, and, finally, a preacher of the Greek Orthodox faith⁹.” In his opinion, “the adoption of one or

the other of these creeds inevitably had to become decisive for the future cultural and political development of Russia¹⁰." After meetings of Prince Vladimir with religious missions of Moslems, Catholics, Orthodox, Jews from the territories neighboring Kievan Rus, he, according to the Tale of Bygone Years, in 987 sent a group of trusted worthy men to check each of the beliefs and, as a result, received advice on the introduction of Orthodox Christianity as an official religion in Russia. According to the TBY, following the capture of Korsun (Crimea) in 988 a number of events occurred that influenced Vladimir's final choice in favor of Orthodoxy¹¹.

As already mentioned, the Byzantine Empire regarded Russia as a "barbaric" people and, following the conversion to Christianity, assumed the adoption in Russia of a church structure similar to and subordinate to the Byzantine patriarch, headed either by a supplied metropolitan or a Greek bishop¹². It is worth mentioning the historical fact, which testifies, for example, that Anastas Korsunyanin, having become the confessor of the prince, is mentioned in the TBY as a teacher and a possessor of Vladimir's passions. However, at the time of baptism, Russia had already begun to form its own organization of princely power in a certain territory, which meant the obligation to share the powers of a bishop or metropolitan with local princes. The very principles of Christian Roman law of Byzantium demanded recognition of the prince's authority both in civil and, to some extent, in ecclesiastical terms. Under these circumstances, "the Empire sought to introduce the prince himself into the Byzantine official hierarchy, and to make the Russian land a province of Byzantium, under the administration of metropolitans sent from Byzantium¹³." According to D.S. Likhachev, such a statement of the question, of course, created a danger to the preservation of the political independence of Russia and essentially meant depriving it of the right to an independent church organization.

And indeed, with all the activity and pastoral ministry of the local priesthood, with the substantial help of the ministers of Bulgaria and the Balkans as a whole, in essence the metropolitan court performed an exclusively diplomatic function, and the missionary work of the high priests was limited to the Ancient Russian elite¹⁴. The bishops of some principalities actively acted as negotiators in the most complex intricacies of inter-princely feuds, repeatedly persecuted and humiliated, fulfilled their pastoral duty¹⁵, unlike the metropolitans who rarely traveled outside of Kiev¹⁶. Such an attitude caused some discontent and set them up to bring their own natives and ministers to the metropolitan throne.

These circumstances during the reign of Yaroslav the Wise led to an acute struggle between the Ancient Russian state and Byzantium. Despite the fact that Yaroslav failed to achieve significant military successes in this confrontation, certain conditions were achieved for strengthening the political power of Russia in relations with the outside world and prerequisites for some independence of the Russian Church were created. Thus, Illarion Rusin became the first metropolitan of Slavic origin only with the substantial support and pressure of Yaroslav the Wise and served in this capacity until the death of his own donator in 1054. It was Yaroslav, who became, after more than half a century of Orthodoxy in Russia, the pioneer who issued the "Charter on Ecclesiastical Courts", bringing the metropolis to a new level, and securing a number of essential rights for the church¹⁷. However, according to researchers, even in these conditions, the church was not able to build its own full-fledged institution, it was largely dependent on representatives of the princely authorities, who were the founders of most cathedrals, curators and contributors to monasteries¹⁸. It is reasonable to believe that in this way the Ancient Russian princes defended their right to an equal position with Byzantium.

The common religion contributed to the processes of consolidation of the East Slavic society and the formation of a

single nationality. During this important historical period, as L. Gumilev noted, “the Russian state had few friends and many enemies¹⁹.” The study of the relations of the nascent Russian state with neighboring countries is of interest not only in the historical context, but also to a certain extent for understanding the process of accumulation of spiritual potential, traditions and cultural experience of multifaceted human relations and assessing the importance of their preservation in modern Russian society.

The 11th century completes a special stage in the development of the Russian lands, when with the adoption of Christianity and the creation of their statehood there comes a sense of self-sufficiency, which had, in fact, become a new round of development of statehood, expressed during the period of feudal fragmentation. The Lubech Congress of 1097 led to the formation of a number of sovereign principalities that assumed the obligation to “keep their ancestral lands.”

At the same time, in the 11th century, the foundations of the modern state of interethnic relations of peoples whose ancestors lived in the neighborhood hundreds, thousands of years ago also took place. For example, in 2022 an important historical event was celebrated – the 1100th anniversary of the adoption of Islam by Volgian Bulgaria. The study of the cultural ties between Rus and Volgian Bulgaria is of interest for understanding the unique unity of the peoples of Russia connected by a common historical destiny. In Russian historical science, the issues of the relationship between Ancient Rus and Volgian Bulgaria were considered by such pre-revolutionary scientists as V.N. Karamzin, V.O. Klyuchevsky, S.M. Solovyov, V.N. Tatishchev, etc.

In the period of its existence before the Mongol conquest, Volgian Bulgaria had economic, political and cultural partnerships with Ancient Rus, despite the fact that military clashes also took place. L.N. Gumilev in his work “From Rus to Russia” notes: “the difference between the two ethnoses was not anthropological, not racial, and not even economic, because the economic systems in Volgian Bulgaria and Northeastern Rus

were very similar. These differences were religious. But religious Moslem fanaticism has not yet triumphed in Volgian Bulgaria, and faith served only as an indicator of the differences between the Volgian Bulgars and the Slavs²⁰."

Russian scientific research notes that "the oldest known peace treaty between Volgian Bulgaria and Kievan Rus dates back to 985, which was the result of the campaign of Grand Duke Vladimir I against Volgian Bulgaria. After the first contact with a detachment of Bulgarian scouts, the prince decided that peace with these neighbors would bring more benefits than war²¹." Then "made peace Volodimer with the Bulgarians, if there is no peace between us, the stone will begin to float, and the hops will sink²²." After that, the Bulgars made an offer to the Kiev prince to convert to Islam. In addition to contractual relations, according to sources, there were also examples of humanitarian support. Timely assistance was provided during the famine in the Russian lands in 1024. Something similar happened in 1229, when "Bulgarians, making peace, carried spring rye along the Volga and the Oka to all Russian cities and sold, and thus did a great help²³." The Bulgarian prince made a necessary gift in this lean year, sending Yuri Vsevolodovich 30 boats of grain. This truly "generous gift", as an expression of goodwill, was appreciated: "... the great prince accepted with gratitude, and sent him cloth, brocades with gold and silver, fish bones and other elegant things²⁴." Scientists cite examples from chronicle sources about the existence of "numerous colonies of Russians in Volgian Bulgaria and Bulgars on Russian territory²⁵." Similar processes of mutual settlement of the Russian peoples and Bulgars continued during the Mongol rule, which influenced the emergence of similarities in culture and everyday life.

No less interesting are the Russian-Polovtsian relations. Beginning with a serious confrontation, they ended in union marriages between the Polovtsian khans and princes who used the power of the Polovtsian (Kipchak / steppe) troops in the conflagration of inter-princely feuds. As some proof, it is worth

noting that Mstislav Mstislavovich Udatny married the daughter of the Polovtsian Khan Kotyan Maria, who gave birth to Rostislava Mstislavovna, the future wife of Yaroslav Vsevolodovich, the future mother of Alexander Yaroslavovich Nevsky.

In the history of the development of the territory of the ancient Russian lands, there was a difficult period associated with the reconnaissance invasion of Genghis Khan's hordes in 1223 and the subsequent large-scale invasion of Batu's hordes during his western campaign of 1237-1242. There is no single point of view among scientists on the nature and consequences of the relationship between Rus and the empire of Genghis Khan, and subsequently its part – the Golden Horde. However, recent research provides a completely different understanding²⁶ than the myth of exclusively negative influence planted by Soviet historiography²⁷. It is worth noting that pre-revolutionary Russian scientists have repeatedly pointed out the benign contacts and processes that were launched as a result of the invasion itself and the further domination of the horde in Russia²⁸. The subject of this study does not include a specific analysis of historical aspects and facts of mutual influence related to Russian-Horde relations – a traditional theme of Russian historiography. It is important for us to highlight the cultural and civilizational issues of intercultural and interreligious dialogue, its place and role in the development of Russia in the Golden Horde period.

The peoples who formed the basis of the empire of Genghis Khan, and later the Golden Horde, in the initial period represented a fairly wide ethno-religious spectrum, including Nestorians, pagans and Moslems. There were also conquered peoples which included followers of Judaism. The Catholic missions, which came of their own free will during their own intelligence mission and permanent representation in the Imperial capital, were small, but still took place. Even under Khan Berk, the Golden Horde elite was largely Moslemized. A little later, under the Uzbek Khan, the Golden Horde converted

to Islam. "The spread of Islam in the territory of the Golden Horde is associated with the names of sheikhs – adherents of the Sufi brotherhoods yasaviya and kubraviya. Their spiritual work within the framework of the traditional religiosity of the region has led to a positive attitude towards them by the state elite of the Golden Horde²⁹."

The first contacts with the empire of Genghis Khan took place in the era of inter-princely feuds and, as a result, ended lamentably for many Ancient Russian princes. The main reason was the refusal to accept the terms of the peace treaty and the preference to provide military assistance to the Polovtsian Khan Kotyan against the hordes of Subede and Jebe, who invaded the Polovtsian lands by order of Genghis Khan and persecuted the Polovtsian Khan, as already noted above, to a related set of princely families. In one of the works of that time, "The Word about the destruction of the Russian land," although it does not have a full text, it is said about the contemporaries' understanding of the fullness of the existing threat and the results of the invasion of 1237–1240³⁰.

During the invasion of Genghis Khan's hordes on the territory of the Russian lands, Orthodoxy played an important unifying ideological and political role. During the siege and capture of Vladimir, Bishop Mitrofan assumed a special role of comforter and spiritual salvation. He perished together with those who took refuge in the Assumption Cathedral, the last refuge of the surviving citizens. Somewhat later, and finding it necessary to emphasize the lack of authority among the princely elites, Serapion of Vladimir in his Speech expressed general indignation at the disunity of the princes in the face of the threat of complete destruction³¹. The result of the invasion was, on the one hand, political dependence on the will of the khan's power of the golden Genghis Khan family, on the other hand, the introduction of a coherent system of inheritance of princely rights.

It is worth emphasizing that this period was quite difficult, from the point of view of the security of Russian lands. Thus,

historical facts are known about the ban on Catholic states to trade with Russian cities, announced by Popes Honorius III and Gregory IX. The Livonian Order, which aimed to advance to Russia, created a real threat almost at the borders of Novgorod. As a result, the Orthodox faith in Rus was really threatened by Western Catholicism. In this regard, the correspondence of Yaroslav Vsevolodovich and Alexander Yaroslavich Nevsky with papal Rome, containing not so much the existing real desires to accept Catholicism, but rather political cunning and pragmatism in the event of violation of existing agreements on princely rights that had yet to be obtained in Karakorum, the capital of the Mongolian Empire³². The victory on Lake Peipsi did not stop Rome's plans, and in 1256 a "crusade" was declared against the Orthodox and Tatars, implying Orthodox Rus and the Horde. In this regard, it is necessary to note the role of Alexander Nevsky, who, unlike Daniel Galitsky, made a choice in favor of an alliance with the Mongols, in order to resist the Crusaders. And in this regard, the turn towards the search for military protection from the Horde was the salvation from the Western threat that Northeastern Russia took advantage of. One of the historical consequences of this turn to the East was the division of Rus as a result of the policy of Daniil Romanovich Galitsky, who finally adopted the Latin faith and, as a result, whose family was unable to resist the onslaught from the West, and thus marked the subsequent entry of Southern Russia into the Lithuanian state and so on.

The Mongol-Tatar invasion of the 13th century, as the researchers note, despite the military devastation, was not accompanied by religious oppression³³. The Church made full use of the opportunities as a powerful political and ideological institution during the period of the Horde rule, which allowed it to significantly strengthen its spiritual authority³⁴. The researchers cite documentary evidence of the toleration of the Golden Horde khans: "The Khans under death penalty forbade their subjects to rob, disturb monasteries³⁵." It is clear that the

rhetoric of religious tolerance and real political practice did not always coincide, but the axiology of Russian statehood was formed in difficult conditions of the struggle for existence, and the Golden Horde period is part of Russian history, which does not exclude cultural mutual influence and Christian-Moslem dialogue.

Indeed, despite the results of the invasion, Orthodox monasteries and churches continued to be preserved in the cities of Vladimir and Kievan Rus. The fact is that according to the Yassa of Genghis Khan, the basic law of the Mongol Empire and the basis for subsequent legislative acts of the Golden Horde, religious tolerance was declared throughout the Empire with the condition of a positive attitude of religions to the khan's power. The first in the new era of the Horde rule in Rus, the Russian metropolitan, of Slavic origin, Kirill II (III), being a protege of Daniel Romanovich Galitsky, realizing the hopelessness of his staying in Kiev, directed his ministry to the court of the Vladimir princes, which gained him the opportunity to further strengthen his own authority. Most likely, he did not receive the proper blessing and installation in Nicaea (due to the impossibility in 1251 to make such a journey through the territory of Byzantium, conquered by the Latins), only the khan's edict confirmed the latter's right to the metropolitan cathedra.

Also of particular interest is the influence the church-Horde contacts had on Byzantium. "In 1263 [1261 - *author's note*] under Khan Berk (ruled in 1257-1266), the first Moslem khan, a new Orthodox bishopric was opened in Sarai, the capital of the Horde, called Sarskaya³⁶." It was the Sarai Bishopric that became, on the one hand, the diplomatic representation of Byzantium, which was on the verge of death after the Latin strike, on the other hand, the representation of the Old Russian metropolitans in the khan's headquarters³⁷ and another confirmation of the tolerant policy of the Golden Horde. For Byzantium, the results of the opening and possible negotiations were confidence in the security of the eastern borders and the possibility of the return of

the previously abandoned territories by Byzantium by military means and restoration to the former borders, which was done in the same 1261³⁸.

The first of a number of surviving khan edicts given to Russian metropolitans dates back to 1267, although, apparently, edicts were issued to them earlier³⁹. Unfortunately, only a few khan edicts have been preserved in the entire history of Russian-Horde relations, which granted the church special privileges and protection from encroachment by both the Horde and representatives of the princely family. Of course, this brought the Old Russian church to a new higher level, equal to the princely house. The subsequent growth of both the influence of the Orthodox Church and its economic power did not take long to wait. Even in the 14th century, one can note the active unprecedented monastic construction (about 200 monasteries were founded), while aiming deep into the territories, sometimes occupying the best princely lands, becoming trading and inns on important strategic roads, including at the entrance to the cities of Northeastern Rus⁴⁰.

The adoption of Islam by the Golden Horde did not affect the previous agreements and the khans continued to issue preferential and protective edicts for the first hierarchs of Rus. Rather, it is also a consequence of the presence in the Islamic canons of the principles of a benevolent attitude towards the people of Scripture, to which Christians also belonged. "The Holy Quran specifically identifies Christians as "people of Scripture" and even as "the closest in spirit to Moslems."⁴¹ Many Russian researchers note the strengthening of Orthodoxy in Rus during the period of the Golden Horde's power. The famous Russian scientist N.M. Karamzin, noting the negative factors of the Golden Horde period, at the same time sees the positive sides of the Yoke for Russia: "One of the memorable consequences of the Tatar domination over Rus was the rise of our Clergy, the growth of the number of Monks and church estates⁴²," the historian notes. Eurasian scientists Vernadsky G.V., Savitsky P.N., Trubetskoy N.S.

adhered to the position of the significant influence of the Golden Horde on the formation and development of the Moscow state.

L.N. Gumilev in the book "Ancient Rus and the Great Steppe" formulated the following point of view: "No, of course, the Mongols were not good-natured! They could not do otherwise, because on all three fronts – the Chinese, the Near-Asian and the Cuman-Russian – they were opposed by forces that significantly exceeded them in numbers and armament. Another thing is important: the collision of different fields of attitude always generates a violent reaction – excessive passionaries, bearers of different traditions⁴³."

In the subsequent 15th century, when Russian lands united around the Moscow Principality, the destinies of Moslem rulers intersected with service in the cavalry regiments of the Russian army, marriages, kinship and family relations. An important historical conclusion is that despite the long Golden Horde period in the history of Russia, the Russian Church has not only survived, but due to the Horde patronage has strengthened its position and authority among its own flock, and thanks to a kind of missionary activity designed mainly for the elite, it has also spread spiritual and cultural influence on certain groups of the weakening Golden Horde, namely, parts of the military-serving Tatars who joined the service of the Moscow sovereign. In the process of creating a Russian centralized state (the second half of the 14th century – the first half of the 16th century), not only the unification of lands took place, but also the state cultural and civilizational foundations were formed, which absorbed the best achievements of western and eastern cultures.

Despite the ongoing princely internecine strife during this period, nevertheless, the Russian Orthodox Church personified and supported the unity of the world. During this period there occurred a weakening and then the fall of Constantinople, which meant the end of Byzantine rule and the strengthening of the Roman Church. In 1439, the Florentine Union was signed – an agreement between representatives of the Catholic and Orthodox

Churches on the terms of recognition of the supremacy of the Pope over all Christians in exchange for promised assistance in repelling the Ottoman aggression against Byzantium. The Union did not come into force either in Byzantium or in Russia, although Metropolitan Isidore of Moscow put his signature under it⁴⁴. In another literary monument – “The Tale of the Capture of Constantinople” there is already a hint about the future liberation of Constantinople by the Russian people and about the transition of the historical greatness of Byzantium to Rus⁴⁵. The idea of helping Constantinople was developed by various Greek and other Orthodox theologians. This, in particular, was written by Maxim the Greek⁴⁶, who, like many Orthodox figures of the Balkans, found his permanent residence in Russia. Historical events have created prerequisites for the interpenetration of various cultural spaces. The Ferraro-Florentine union with the Catholic world was eventually rejected by Rus, which became the only independent state where Orthodoxy was recognized as the official religion.

Evidence of the strengthening of the power of the Moscow Grand Principality in the 16th century was that the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch appealed to the Russian tsar for support. “At the beginning of 1509, monks arrived in the Moscow Principality with a message from all the Athos monasteries, in which there were calls to defeat “foreign languages”, namely, Moslems. Envoys from Serbia also came.⁴⁷”

Historically, the Moscow Grand Prince has become the only pillar in the defense of Orthodoxy and Rome is moving to Russia as a country of true Orthodox Christianity. During this period, the idea of the Byzantine inheritance exerted an increasing influence on the ideological foundations of the political elites. The legend about the cultural and religious nature of the origin of the Rurik dynasty dates back to about this time. According to the researchers, this fictional fact “allowed to raise the status of the Rurik dynasty in the international arena, which Ivan the Terrible needed in the conditions of an acute struggle with the

separatists for the centralization and strengthening of Russia's international authority⁴⁸." The symbolic act of confirming the origin of the Russian princes from the Byzantine emperors and their monarchical power, since the 15th century, was the "Monomakh cap" as the royal crown⁴⁹.

Strengthening of the political independence of the Moscow Principality influenced the fact that the Russian Church received the status of its own patriarchate independent from the Ecumenical See of Constantinople. "At the stage of origin (the end of the 15th century), the theory of "Moscow - the third Rome" had a religious content. Metropolitan Zosima in the "Presentation of the Paschal", speaking about the end of the world and calling on compatriots to become true Christians, called Moscow "the new Jerusalem"⁵⁰.

The religious circles of Moscow began to compare the Grand Prince of Moscow with the Byzantine Emperor Constantine. Subsequently, Moscow was compared with the "new Rome"⁵¹, which was quite in line with the old myth about the origin of one of the founders of Russian statehood - Rurik from the Roman Augustus-Caesar⁵². In turn, the dynastic marriage of Ivan III with the Byzantine Princess Sophia Palaiologos and the offer of Rome to become the heir to the Byzantine throne, as well as the constant financial support of the Patriarchal Court of Constantinople gave every reason for the development of political ideas of an ecumenical and messianic nature. At the beginning of the 16th century Vasily III, the son of Sophia Palaiologos, by carrying out direct contacts with the Greeks, supported their hope of liberation from Ottoman rule with the help of Moscow⁵³.

It seems that this doctrine goes beyond only the religious aspect. The establishment of the patriarchate in Moscow had an important foreign policy significance (it also brought the Moscow state closer to the status of the Byzantine World Empire), as well as in general to strengthen the centralized power of the Moscow Principality. Since that historical moment Russian tsar's

legitimacy has been sanctified not by the ecumenical church hierarchy, but by the Russian patriarch I. In addition, it violated Poland's plans to approve its own patriarch in Kiev. It should be borne in mind that during this period church and political relations were closely intertwined, influencing each other⁵⁴." In the 14th–16th centuries, Russian Orthodoxy asserted itself in a dispute with the See of Constantinople, claiming to universal nature and to the highest hierarchy in the East. This has become a tradition that persists to this day.

The expansion of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East and in the Black Sea basin gave new cultural features to the Russian identity. The Russian Orthodox Church, which has already entered into direct competition with Rome, trying to keep up with it, tried to give its activities the character of a "holy struggle" against the infidel "Hagarites⁵⁵" and Islam and in defense of all Eastern Christians. In particular, it was also a reaction to the mass and violent conversion of Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, Georgians and others to Islam carried out by the Ottoman Empire. This testified that the Russian Church sought to take a leading place not only in the Moscow state, but also in the Orthodox world.

Establishment of the Patriarchate in Moscow at the end of the 16th century inspired religious philosophers and political publicists even more. They began to develop the idea of "moving" Byzantium and the "holy land" to the territory of Russia, at the same time pursuing the idea that Russia has now become the main concentration of ecumenical Orthodoxy. Finally, at the beginning of the 17th century the theological and ideological idea, cultivated for several centuries in the Russian national consciousness, gets into a government document⁵⁶, that is, it was the beginning of its transformation into an official foreign policy ideology. This happened during the reign of Boris Godunov and not without his participation. His uncle Dmitry Godunov sent to the monasteries church books, where it was said that they were made "in the God-forsaken and pre-venerated

and in the reigning city of Moscow - in the third Rome, blooming with piety⁵⁷." The political and religious doctrine "Moscow - the Third Rome", which arose in Russia in the 16th century, is of growing interest among historians to the present time.

The material "transfer" of Byzantium to Russian soil also continued. The well-known religious and political figure Patriarch Nikon not only began the process of returning the Russian Orthodox Church to its "pure" origins - he rewrote religious texts, comparing them with the Greek originals. He literally began to build a New Jerusalem near Moscow, repeating in detail the famous Temple over the "Holy Sepulchre" in the Holy Land of Jerusalem⁵⁸. It was then that Moscow abandoned the myth of the Caesar (that is, the Roman Caesars. - A. Z.) origin of Rurik. A new mythological version was developed about the lineage of the Russian princes directly from the biblical heroes. As a result, national identity involves more than just rivalry with the Empire. Now we are talking about claims to the very origins of human civilization in the Christian interpretation.

Conclusion

The religious foundations of the formation of the Russian centralized state are an important component of the national identification of Russian society. For the Russian state, the question of civilizational identity has a deep meaning in conditions when representatives of the "collective West" openly declare their goals to destroy Russia as a competitor. Despite the objective process of changes in socio-cultural dynamics, especially during periods of acute world upheavals leading to the violation of the historical foundations of the unity of peoples, the axiological basis of civilizational identity remains and is an important bond of the unity of society. In this regard, it is very important to develop an understanding of the role and place of dialogue in the historical process of forming a multinational Russian state.

Notes

1. *Putin V.V.* Speech at the meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club // <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/69695>
2. *Zadokhin A.G.* The national idea of Russia in the historical aspect // <http://viperson.ru/wind.php?ID=238291&soch=1>
3. Speech of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin at the XVIII meeting of the International Discussion Club “Valdai”, 2022 // <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/66975>
4. *Sadykova E.L.* Intercivilizational dialogue in modern international relations: theoretical and practical aspects. Thesis DS (Politology): 23.00.04 // <http://dlib.rsl.ru>
5. In the 10th–11th centuries, the gold-sparkling, porphyry-bearing Byzantium was the cultural metropolis of the world, in relation to which Western Europe, the product of the assimilation by the barbarians of the fragments of the Roman Empire, was the backyard. This circumstance has been repeatedly reflected in the works, see: Orthodox Palestinian Collection. 31st (94th) issue. Publication of the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society. Moscow, 1992. P. 64; *Le Goff Jacques.* The civilization of the medieval West. M., 1992. P. 27, 35, 140.
6. See: *Petrukhin V.Ya.* The beginning of the ethnocultural history of Russia. Smolensk, 1995. P. 49–50, 69.
7. Cit. by: *Likhachev D.S.* National self-consciousness of Ancient Rus. M., 1945. P. 19.
8. It is not surprising that these historical circumstances aroused particular interest in the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin, who noted the high role of the baptism of Rus in the creation of a centralized state and the subsequent interreligious unity and harmony established at the 1000th anniversary. See: Speech of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin at a reception in the Kremlin in honor of the feast of the Baptism of Rus and the Day of memory on the occasion of the 1000th anniversary of the repose of Grand Prince Vladimir // <https://www.tvc.ru/news/show/id/73343>
9. *Vernadsky G.V.* Russian History. Textbook. – “Agraf”, 1997. P. 41.
10. The above mentioned work. P. 42.
11. Full Collection of Russian Chronicles. V.1. Col.109–116; *Tolochko P.P.* The place and time of the baptism and canonization of Vladimir Svyatoslavich // VV. M., 2011. 70(95). P. 92–93.
12. History of diplomacy. In 3 vols. / edited by V.P. Potemkin. M., 1941. Vol. 1. P. 120.
13. *Likhachev D.S.* National identity of Ancient Rus // <https://statehistory.ru/books/Natsionalnoe-samosoznanie-Drevney-Rusi/3>
14. *Gaidenko P.I.* The place of the Metropolitan of Kiev in the system of political relations of Kievan Rus (988–1037): dissertation Candidate of Historical

- Sciences Kazan, 2005. P. 145–151; *Galimov T.R.* Kiev Metropolitans between Russia and the Horde (the second half of the 13th century) / *T.R. Galimov*; Institute of History named after Sh. Marjani of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan. – Kazan: Institute of History named after Sh. Marjani of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 2019. P. 91–93.
15. *Teronovsky F.A.* Participation of Ancient Russian bishops in public affairs (during the apanage-veche). Kiev, 1870.
 16. *Gaidenko P.I.* Episcopal trips in Pre-Mongol Russia: more on the mechanisms of church governance. ... P. 43–44.
 17. *Shchapov Ya.N.* Princely charters and the Church in Ancient Rus 11th–14th centuries. M., 1972; *Shchapov Ya.N.* Old Russian princely charters 11th–15th centuries M., 1976.
 18. *Peter (Gaidenko), hieromonk.* Were the episcopate and clergy of Kievan Rus feudal lords? // *Orthodoxy in the fate of the Urals and Russia: History and modernity: materials of the All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference (Yekaterinburg, April 18–20, 2010)* / ed. V.V. Alekseev. Yekaterinburg, 2010. P. 85–89.
 19. *Gumilev L.N.* Ancient Rus and the Great Steppe. – Moscow: Iris-Press, 2011. P. 140.
 20. *Gumilev L.* From Rus to Russia // <https://knjky.ru/books/ot-rusi-k-rossii>
 21. *Mukhamadiev A.R.* Volgian Bulgaria and Russia: legal support of interests. (10th – beginning of 13th) // *History of State and Law*. 2012. No. 15. P. 40.
 22. *Ibid.* P. 40.
 23. *Ibid.* P. 41.
 24. *Tatishchev V.N.* Russian History. Vol. 3. P. 225 // https://librebook.me/istoriia_rossiiskaia_chast_2/vol37/1
 25. *Fakhrutdinov R.G.* Essays on the history of Volgian Bulgaria: Moscow: Nauka, 1984. P. 91.
 26. *Trepavlov V.V.* “Russian ulus” of the Golden Horde / *V.V. Trepavlov* // *Russian History*. – 2021. – No. 1. – P. 3–15; *Trepavlov V.V.* Russia and nomadic steppes: the problem of Eastern borrowings in Russian Statehood // *East*. 1994. No. 2. P. 49–62; *Pochekaev R.Y.* The Kings of the Horde. Biographies of Khans and rulers of the Golden Horde. SPb., 2010; *Trepavlov V.V.* The Golden Horde in the 14th century. Moscow, 2010; *Enikeev G.R.* Shihab Kitapchy. Tartar Heritage. M., 2012; *Gorsky A.A.* “The Russian land is full of all kinds of things...”: Personality and mentality of the Russian Middle Ages: Essays. M., 2001; *Danilevsky I.N.* Russian lands through the eyes of contemporaries and descendants (12th–14th centuries). M., 2001; *Danilevsky I.N.* Ancient Rus through the eyes of contemporaries and descendants (9th–12th centuries). M., 1998; *Podskalsky G.* Christianity and theological

- literature in Kievan Rus (988–1237). St. Petersburg, 1996. Vol. 1; *Rudakov V.N.* Mongol-Tatars through the eyes of Ancient Russian scribes of the middle of the 13th–15th centuries, Moscow, 2009; *Sochnev Yu.V.* The Orthodox Church in the system of relations between Russia and the Golden Horde // *History in detail*, 2013. No. 8 (38). P. 72–79; *Seleznev Yu.V.* Russian princes as part of the ruling elite of Juchi Ulus in the 13th–15th centuries. Voronezh, 2013; *Kamalov I.H.* The Golden Horde and the Russian Ulus (Tatar influence on Russia). Kazan, 2016.
27. Such myth-making follows from the unconditional following of quoting the works of K. Marx. Alas, in his essay “Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century” Marx touched upon the issues of Russian-Horde relations and the legacy of the Horde, which eventually became the main leitmotif of all fundamental Soviet research on the subject. It is worth noting that the text of the essay itself is far from the norms of scientific research, it has rather a journalistic character, for example, “The cradle of Muscovy was the bloody swamp of Mongol slavery, and not the harsh glory of the Norman era. And modern Russia is nothing but a transformed Muscovy.” (Marx K. *Revelations of the diplomatic history of the 18th century* // *Questions of History*. No. 4. 1989. P. 5; Marx Karl. *Secret diplomatic history of 18th century*. London, 1899. P. 77). Surprisingly, even in 1989, during the era of perestroika, this essay was published for the first time, but in the editorial office of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism with additional explanations, for example, “Marx meant...”: Marx K. *Revelations of the diplomatic history of the 18th century* // *Questions of history*. No. 1–4 for 1989. 68 p. Wed.: Marx Karl. *Secret diplomatic history of eighteen century*. London, 1899. 96 p.
 28. *Karamzin N.M.* History of the Russian state ... Book 2. Vol. 4. P. 80; *Tatishchev V.N.* Russian History. Vol. 2. P. 331.
 29. *Sayfedinova E.G.* Sufi traditions in the spiritual culture of the Golden Horde // *Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie*. – 2014. – No. 1. – P. 75–78.
 30. *Soloviev A.V.* Notes to “The Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land” // *WARDL. M.; L.*, 1958. Vol. 15. P. 78–115; *Tikhomirov M.N.* Where and when “The Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land” was written // *WARDL. M.; L.*, 1951. Vol. 8. P. 235–244; *Hudziy N.K.* About “The Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land” // *WARDL. M.; L.*, 1956. Vol. 12. P. 527–545; *Danilov V.V.* About “The Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land” as an artistic work // *WARDL. M.; L.*, 1960. Vol. 16. P. 132–142; *Kolobanov V.A.* More on participation of Serapion of Vladimir in the cathedral “acts” of 1274 // *WARDL. L.* Vol. 16. M.; L., 1960. P. 442–445; *Likhachev D.S.* Russian-European literary relations. M., L., 1966. P. 92–96; *Gorsky A.A.* Problems of studying “The Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land”: to the 750th anniversary of the time of writing // *WARDL. L.*, 1990. Vol. 43. P. 18–38.

31. *Galimov T.R.* Church hierarchy and Church-Horde relations during the Tatar-Mongol invasion of 1237–1240. In the assessments of contemporaries / T.R. Galimov // *Golden Horde Review*. – 2017. – Vol. 5. – No. 1. – P. 29–55. – DOI 10.22378/2313-6197.2017-5-1.29-55
32. *Galimov T.R.* “They want to have Mr. Pope as their primary master and father”: the problem of the emergence of the Church union in the Southern Russian lands (middle of the 13th century) / T.R. Galimov // *Church. Theology. History: Materials of the III International Scientific and Theological Conference dedicated to the 130th anniversary of the Yekaterinburg Diocese and the memory of the Cathedral of the New Martyrs and Confessors of the Russian Church, Yekaterinburg, 06–07 February 2015 / Yekaterinburg Metropolia, Yekaterinburg Theological Seminary Missionary Institute Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, Institute of Humanities and Arts, Laboratory of Archeographic Research*. – Yekaterinburg: Yekaterinburg Theological Seminary, 2015. – P. 95–100.
33. *Frolov A.S.* Philosophical and religious foundations of Russian culture.
34. *Sadykova E.L.* Intercivilizational dialogue in modern international relations: theoretical and practical aspects: dissertation.polit.sciences // <http://dlib.rsl.ru>
35. *Asadullin F.A.* Moslem Moscow / V.A. Asadullin. – M., 2004. – P. 15.
36. *Mukhetdinov D.* Interreligious dialogue – the basis of stable prosperity of Russia // *Dialogue and partnership of civilizations: interfaith and cross-cultural dimensions*. M. – Beirut. – N. Novgorod: Publishing House “Medina”, 2010. P. 43.
37. *Soloviev N.A.*, Archpriest. Saray and Krutits diocese // *Solovyov N.A.*, Archpriest. Saray and Krutitsk diocese // *Imperial Society readings on history and Russian antiquities*. M., 1894. Book 3. P. 91–95; *Makary (Bulgakov)*. The History of the Russian Church. Book 3. P. 18, 78; *Golubinsky E.E.* History of the Russian Church. Vol. 2. Part 1. P. 41, 60–61.
38. *Galimov T.R.* Once again to the question of the Christian mission of the Sarai Bishopric (13th – early 14th centuries) // *Paleo Russia*. 2015. No. 4. P. 138–158.
39. *Grigoriev A.P.* Collection of Khan edicts to Russian metropolitans ... P. 41–42; *Pochekaev R.Yu.* The Right of the Golden Horde. Kazan, 2009. P. 72–73; *Pochekaev R.Yu.* The legal culture of the Golden Horde... P. 186–187; *Makary (Bulgakov)*. The History of the Russian Church. Book 3. M., 1995. P. 18; *Sochnev Yu.V.* Formation and transformation of the Golden Horde policy towards the Russian Church (13th–14th centuries), P. 141.
40. *Galimov T.R.* Canonical and legal status of Old Russian monasticism in the first decades of Mongol domination in Russia (statement of the problem) / T.R. Galimov // *Ancient Rus: in time, in personalities, in ideas*. – 2017. – No. 8. – P. 111–122; *Galimov T.R.* Once again to the question of the Christian

- mission of the Sarai Bishopric (13th – early 14th centuries) // *Paleo Russia*. 2015. No. 4. P. 138–158.
41. Mukhetdinov D. Interreligious dialogue – the basis of stable prosperity of Russia.
 42. *Karamzin N.M.* History of the Russian state. St. Petersburg., 1616–1829. P. 309.
 43. *Gumilev L.N.* Ancient Rus and the Great Steppe. M., 1997. Part 4. Chapter XX.
 44. *Orlov A.S., Georgieva N.G., Georgiev V.A.* Historical Dictionary. 2nd ed. M., 45. 2012. P. 538.
 45. Cit. by *Zadokhin A.G.* The national idea in the historical aspect. // https://i-sng.ru/observer/observer/N8_2004/8_04.HTM
 46. The writings of Maxim the Greek. Kazan, 1860, part 2. P. 318–319.
 47. Cit. by: *Zadokhin A.G.* The national idea in the historical aspect.
 48. *Plotnikova O.A.* The story of a myth. Legend of the Rurik dynasty. Current research No. 2(18). 2015. P. 50.
 49. *Trepalov V.V.* Russia and nomadic steppes: the problem of Eastern borrowings in Russian Statehood // *East*. 1994. No. 2. P. 49–62; *Lavrentiev A.V.* Kazan hat and Kazan tsars // *Anthologion. Slavs and their neighbors. Power, society, culture in the Slavic world in the Middle Ages*. Issue No. 12. Moscow, 2008. P. 99–117.
 50. *Bauer E.A.* The idea of “Moscow – the third Rome” in Russian public thought of the late 15th – early 16th century.
 51. *Skrynnikov R.G.* The State and the Church..., P. 150.
 52. *Dmitrieva R.P.* The Legend of the Princes of Vladimir. M.; L., 1955. P. 80–81.
 53. *Zimin A.A.* Russia on the threshold of a new time. Essays on the Political History of Russia in the first Third of the 17th century. M., 1972. P. 81.
 54. *Zadokhin A.G.* The Russian Orthodox Church in the Political processes of Russia: historical and ideological context. *World and Politics* No. 8(35). 2009. P. 67.
 55. *Skrynnikov R.G.* Russian History. 9th–17th centuries. P. 247.
 56. See: *Questions of medieval culture*. L., 1974. P. 274.
 57. Cit. by: *Skrynnikov R.G.* Boris Godunov. M., 1983. P. 59.
 58. *Lyubimov L.D.* The Art of Ancient Rus. M., 1981. P. 323.

References

1. *Asadullin F.A.* Moslem Moscow // *V.A. Asadullin – M.*, 2004. – P. 15.
2. *Bauer E.A.* The idea of “Moscow – the third Rome” in Russian public thought of the late 15th – early 17th century: domestic historiography of the twentieth century: Monograph. – Nizhnevartovsk: Publishing house of Nizhnevartovsk Humanities University, 2011. P. 127.
3. *Vernadsky G.V.* Russian history. Textbook. – “Agraf”, 1997. P. 41.

4. The Speech of the President of the Russian Federation.V. Putin at the XVIII meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club, 2022 // <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/66975>
5. *Gaidenko P.I.* Episcopal trips in pre-Mongol Russia: More on the mechanisms of Church governance // *Gaidenko P.I. Moskaleva L.A., Fomina T.Y.* The Church of Pre-Mongol Russia: hierarchy, ministry, morals: monograph. – M.: University Book, 2013. – P. 43–54.
6. *Gaidenko P.I.* The place of the Kiev Metropolitan in the system of political relations of Kievan Rus (988–1037): dissertation Candidate of I.N. – Kazan, 2005. 239 p.
7. *Galimov T.R.* Once again revisiting the Christian mission of the Sarai Bishopric (13th – early 14th centuries) // *Paleorussia*. 2015. No. 4. P. 138–158.
8. *Galimov T.R.* “They want to have Mr. Pope as their primary master and father”: regarding the emergence of the Church union in the Southern Russian lands (in the middle of the 13th century) / T.R. Galimov // Church. Theology. History: Materials of the III International Scientific and Theological Conference dedicated to the 130th anniversary of the Yekaterinburg Diocese and the memory of the Cathedral of the New Martyrs and Confessors of the Russian Church, Yekaterinburg, 06–07 February 2015 / Yekaterinburg Metropolia, Yekaterinburg Theological Seminary Missionary Institute Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, Institute of Humanities and Arts. Laboratory of Archaeographic Research – Yekaterinburg: Yekaterinburg Theological Seminary, 2015. – P. 95–100.
9. *Galimov T.R.* Canonical and legal status of Old Russian monasticism in the first decades of Mongol domination in Russia (statement of the problem) / T.R. Galimov // *Ancient Rus: in time, in personalities, in ideas*. – 2017. – No. 8. – P. 111–122.
10. *Galimov T.R.* Kiev metropolitans between Russia and the Horde (. the second half of the 13th century) / T.R. Galimov; Institute of History named after Sh. Marjani of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan. – Kazan: Shigabutdin Marjani Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 2019. P. 256.
11. *Galimov T.R.* Church hierarchy and Church-Horde relations during the Tatar-Mongol invasion of 1237–1240. The assessments of contemporaries / T.R. Galimov // *Golden Horde Review*. – 2017. – Vol. 5. – No. 1. – P. 29–55.
12. *Golubinsky E.E.* History of the Russian Church. Vol. 2. The first period, Kiev or pre-Mongol: Part 1. – Moscow: Moscow University, 1900. – P. 919.

13. *Gorsky A.A.* "The Russian land is full of all kinds of things...": Personality and mentality of the Russian Middle Ages: Essays. – M.: publishing house "Languages of Slavic culture", 2001. – P. 176.
14. *Gorsky A.A.* Problems of studying the "A Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land": to the 750th anniversary of the time of writing // *WARLD*. L., 1990. Vol. 43. P. 18–38.
15. *Grigoriev A.P.* Collection of Khan edicts to Russian Metropolitans: source analysis of Golden Horde documents. – St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University, 2004. – P. 276.
16. *Gudziy N.K.* About "A Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land" // *WARLD*. M.; L., 1956. Vol. 12. P. 527–545.
17. *Gumilev L.* From Rus to Russia // <https://knijky.ru/books/ot-rusi-k-rossii>
18. *Gumilev L.N.* Ancient Rus and the Great Steppe. M., 1997. P. 508.
19. *Gumilev L.N.* Ancient Rus and the great steppe. – M.: Iris-Press, 2011. 839 p.
20. *Danilevsky I.N.* Ancient Rus through the eyes of contemporaries and descendants (9th–12th centuries). – M.: Aspect Press, 1998. P. 339.
21. *Danilevsky I.N.* Russian lands through the eyes of contemporaries and descendants (12th–14th centuries). – M.: Aspect Press, 2001. P. 389.
22. *Danilov V.V.* "A Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land" as an artistic work // *WARLD*. L. M.; L., 1960. Vol. 16. P. 132–142.
23. *Dmitrieva R.P.* The Legend of the Princes of Vladimir. M.; L., 1955. P. 80–81.
24. *Enikeev G.R.* Shihab Kitapchy. Heritage of the Tatars. – M.: Algorithm, 2012. P. 256.
25. *Zadokhin A.G.* The national idea in the historical aspect // https://i-sng.ru/observer/observer/N8_2004/8_04.HTM
26. *Zadokhin A.G.* The national idea of Russia in the historical aspect // <http://viperson.ru/wind.php?ID=238291&soch=1>
27. *Zadokhin A.G.* The Russian Orthodox Church in the political processes of Russia: historical and ideological context // *World and Politics* No. 8 (35). 2009. P. 68–76.
28. *Zimin A.A.* Russia on the threshold of a new time. Essays on the political history of Russia in the first third of the 17th century. M., 1972. P. 452.
29. History of diplomacy. In 3 vols. / edited by V.P. Potemkin. M., 1941. Vol. 1. 567 p.
30. *Kamalov I.H.* The Golden Horde and the Russian Ulus (Tatar influence on Russia) / trans. from Turkish by I.M. Mirgaleev; ed. A.V. Aksanov. – Kazan: Sh. Marjani Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 2016. – 304 p.
31. *Karamzin N.M.* History of the Russian state. St. Petersburg, 1816–1829. P. 828.
32. *Karamzin N.M.* History of the Russian state: 12 volumes in 4 books. Book 2. Vol. 4–6. – M.: – RIPOL CLASSIC, 1997. – P. 656.

33. Kolobanov V.A. More on the participation of Serapion of Vladimir in the Cathedral "acts" of 1274 // *WARLD*. Vol. 16. M.; L., 1960. P. 442–445.
34. Lavrentiev A.V. Kazan cap and Kazan tsars // *Anthologion*. Slavs and their neighbors. Power, society, culture in the Slavic world in the Middle Ages. Issue No. 12. M., 2008. P. 99–117.
35. Le Goff Jacques. The civilization of the medieval West. M., 1992. P. 376.
36. Likhachev D.S. National consciousness of Ancient Rus. M., 1945. P. 119.
37. Likhachev D.S. A Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land and the "hexaemeron" of John the Exarch of Bulgaria // *Russian-European literary relations*. M.; L., 1966. P. 92–96.
38. Likhachev D.S. National identity of Ancient Russia // <https://statehistory.ru/books/Natsionalnoe-samosoznanie-Drevney-Rusi/339>.
39. Lyubimov L.D. The Art of Ancient Russia. M., 1981. 336 p.
40. Makarii (Bulgakov), metr. The History of the Russian Church. The history of the Russian Church in the period of its gradual transition to independence (1240–1589). Part one. The state of the Russian Church from Metropolitan Kirill II to Metropolitan St. Jonah, or in the Mongol period (1240–1448). – Moscow: Publishing House of Valaam Transfiguration Monastery, 1996. – Book 3. P. 704.
41. Marx K. Revelations of the diplomatic history of the 18th century // *Questions of history*. No. 1–4 for 1989. P. 68.
42. Mukhamadiev A.R. Volgian Bulgaria and Russia: legal support of interests. (10th – beginning of 13th century) // *History of state and law*. 2012. No. 15. P. 39–43.
43. Mukhetdinov D. Interreligious dialogue – the basis of stable prosperity of Russia // *Dialogue and partnership of civilizations: interfaith and cross-cultural dimensions*. M. – Beirut. – N.Novgorod: Publishing House "Medina", 2010. P. 41–47.
44. Orlov A.S., Georgieva N.G., Georgiev V.A. *Historical Dictionary*. 2nd ed. M., 2012. P. 966.
45. Peter (Gaidenko), hieromonk. Were the episcopate and clergy of Kievan Rus feudal lords? // *Orthodoxy in the fate of the Urals and Russia: History and modernity: materials of the All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference (Yekaterinburg, April 18–20, 2010)* / ed. by V.V. Alekseev. Yekaterinburg, 2010. P. 85–89.
46. Petrukhin V.Ya. The beginning of the ethnocultural history of Russia. Smolensk, 1995. P. 320.
47. Plotnikova O.A. The history of a myth. Legend of the Rurik dynasty // *Actual research No. 2(18)*. 2015. P. 47–54.
48. Podskalski G. Christianity and theological literature in Kievan Rus (988–1237). – St. Petersburg: Byzantinorossika, 1996. Vol. 1. P. 572.

49. *Pochekaev R.Yu.* The Right of the Golden Horde / ed. by I.M. Mirgaleev. – Kazan: Publishing house “Fan” of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 2009. P. 260.
50. *Pochekaev R.Yu.* The legal culture of the Golden Horde (historical and legal essays). – M.: Yurlitinform, 2015. P. 312.
51. *Pochekaev R.Y.* The Kings of the Horde. Biographies of khans and rulers of the Golden Horde. – St. Petersburg: EURASIA, 2010. P. 408.
52. *The Orthodox Palestinian Collection.* 31st (94th) issue. Publication of the Imperial Orthodox Palestinian Society. Moscow, 1992. P. 160.
53. The complete collection of Russian Chronicles. Vol. 1: The Laurentian Chronicle. – M.: Languages of Russian culture, 2001. P. 496.
54. *Putin V.V.* Speech at the meeting of the International Discussion Club “Valdai” // <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/69695>
55. Speech of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin at a reception in the Kremlin in honor of the feast of the Baptism of Rus and Memorial Day on the occasion of the 1000th anniversary of the repose of Grand Duke Vladimir // <https://www.tvc.ru/news/show/id/73343>
56. *Rudakov V.N.* Mongol-Tatars through the eyes of ancient Russian scribes of the middle of the 13th–15th centuries. – M.: Quadriga. 2009. 248 p.
57. *E. Sadykova.L.* Intercivilizational dialogue in modern international relations: theoretical and practical aspects: Thesis. Polit. sciences // <http://dlib.rsl.ru>
58. *Sayfettinova E.G.* Sufi traditions in the spiritual culture of the Golden Horde // *Golden Horde Review.* – 2014. – No. 1. – P. 75–78.
59. *Seleznov Yu.V.* Russian princes as part of the ruling elite of the Juchi Ulus in the 13th–15th centuries. – Voronezh: Central Black Earth Region Book Publishing House, 2013. P. 472.
60. *Skrynnikov R.G.* Boris Godunov. M., 1983. P. 192.
61. *Skrynnikov R.G.* The state and the church in Russia of the 14th–16th centuries. Ascetics of the Russian Church. Novosibirsk: Nauka. Siberian Branch, 1991. P. 397.
62. *Skrynnikov R.G.* Russian History. 9th–17th centuries – Moscow: Publishing house “The Whole World”, 1997. P. 496.
63. *Solovyov A.V.* Notes to “A Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land” // *WARDL. M.; L., 1958. Vol. 15. P. 78–115.*
64. *Solovyov N.A.,* Archpriest. Saray and Krutitsk diocese // *Imperial Society readings on history and Russian antiquities. M., 1894. Book 3. P. 91–95.*
65. The writings of Maxim the Greek. Kazan, 1860, part 2.
66. *Sochnev Yu.V.* Formation and transformation of the Golden Horde policy towards the Russian Church (13th–14th centuries) // *Golden Horde heritage. Materials of the second International Scientific Conference “Political and socio-economic history of the Golden Horde”. Kazan, March 7,*

- 2009 / comp., ed. by I.M. Mirgaleev. Issue 1. – Kazan: Publishing House “Fan” of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, 2009. – P. 137–150.
67. *Sochnev Yu.V.* The Orthodox Church in the system of relations between Russia and the Golden Horde // *History in detail*, 2013. No. 8 (38). P. 72–79.
68. *Tatishchev V.N.* Russian History in 3 volumes. Vol. 2. – Moscow: AST, 2003. P. 723.
69. *Tatishchev V.N.* Russian History. Vol. 3. P. 225 // https://librebook.me/history_Russian_part_2/volume_37/1
70. *Teronovsky F.A.* Participation of Ancient Russian bishops in public affairs (during the apanage-veche period). Kiev, 1870. P. 38.
71. *Tikhomirov M.N.* Where and when was written “A Tale about the Destruction of the Russian Land” // *WARDL. M.; L.*, 1951. Vol. 8. P. 235–244.
72. *Tolochko P.P.* About the place and time of baptism and canonization of Vladimir Svyatoslavich // *VV. M.*, 2011. 70(95). P. 92–93.
73. *Trepavlov V.V.* The Golden Horde in the 15th century. – Moscow: Quadriga, 2010. P. 72.
74. *Trepavlov V.V.* Russia and nomadic steppes: the problem of Eastern borrowings in Russian statehood // *East*. 1994. No. 2. P. 49–62.
75. *Trepavlov V.V.* “Russian ulus” of the Golden Horde / *V.V. Trepavlov* // *Russian History*. – 2021. – No. 1. P. 3–15.
76. *Fakhrutdinov R.G.* Essays on the history of Volga Bulgaria: Moscow: Nauka, 1984. 216 p.
77. *Frolov A.S.* Philosophical and religious foundations of Russian culture. Thesis abstract for DS (Philosophy). P. 42.
78. *Shchapov Ya.N.* Old Russian princely charters of the 11th–15th centuries – M.: Nauka, 1976. P. 240.
79. *Shchapov Ya.N.* Princely charters and the church in Ancient Rus of the 11th–14th centuries. – M.: Nauka, 1972. P. 340.
80. *Karl Marx.* A secret diplomatic history of the eighteenth century. London, 1899. P. 96.

Received: 15.12.2022.

Accepted for publication: 16.01.2023.