**УДК 930.2:281.93(470)"18/19"**

***H. J. Coleman***

# MEMOIRS OF A MISSIONARY: D.I. BOGOLIUBOV AND THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH'S INTERNAL MISSION IN THE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURIES

*Стаття досліджує історію так званої внутрішньої місії Російської православної церкви в пізній імперській Росії крізь призму спогадів одного з її провідних анти-сектантських місіонерів – Д.І. Боголюбова. Внутрішня місія була надзвичайно спірна, часто зображена як поліцейська рука церкви. Все ж мемуари Боголюбова безпосередньо виявляють спонуки і боротьбу місіонерів, засвідчивши, що вони бачили своє призначення, як щось подібне до слов'янофільського руху "ходіння в народ", відмінне від соціального контролю. Оскільки Боголюбов прагнув втілити своє богословське вчення на практиці, він несподівано зіткнувся з глибокими питаннями про природу російської душі і ролі церкви в російському суспільстві.*

***Ключові слова:*** *Д.І. Боголюбов, спогади, Російська православна церква.*

When the Revolution of 1905 ushered in an era of greater religious toleration in Imperial Russia, the Orthodox Church was suddenly forced to confront a new pluralism and to reassess its relationship with Russian society and state. As the 1905-07 report of the Over-Procurator of the Holy Synod, the lay head of the Church, reported with alarm:

Since 1905, [sectarianism] has raised its head. Sectarian congresses began to be held, individual congregations were quickly organized, and missionaries flooded in from abroad, openly travelling around Russia and preaching. The trusting simple people, deeply believing and thirsting for religious teaching, fall into the cleverly set sectarian nets [1].

The Russian Orthodox Church may have remained the state church and retained a legal monopoly on making converts, but a sense of invasion, of the illegitimacy of non-Orthodox preaching on Russian soil, and of the helplessness and ignorance of the Orthodox flock permeated official responses to increased pluralism. The Church felt challenged to renew its pastoral work in order to compete for the Russian (and Ukrainian and Belarusian) souls that it considered canonically – indeed naturally, essentially – its own.

The Church's "internal" mission stood at the forefront of this response. Its task was to return to the Church converts to Old Belief and non-Orthodox faiths. This mission was highly controversial, and would remain so right up to the 1917 revolution. It was identified with Konstantin Pobedonostsev, the famous reactionary and a defender of the close unity of the state and its Orthodox Church, who exercised great influence as the Over-Procurator of the Holy Synod and key advisor to Alexander III and his son, Nicholas II. Under his watch, religion became highly politicized and the state was mobilized to defend the legal prohibition against preaching non-Orthodox faiths or leaving the Orthodox church [2]. The liberal press at the time focused on tales of missionaries resorting to the police to force Old Believers and sectarians to publicly debate them, and, in a few sensational cases, to remove the children of sectarians from their parents, to be raised and educated in Orthodox monasteries [3]. Criticism echoed inside the Church too. For instance, in his memoirs, written in exile many years later, Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) would write that, "[i]n the dioceses, in Church circles, [the missionaries] were feared, but they were not loved nor were they trusted" [4]. Such a public perception of the arm of the Church most directly engaged in Christian education could not help in the challenge ahead.

Who were these missionaries and how did they understand their task? These questions have received only limited attention in the scholarly literature [5]. Moreover, what we know about the missionaries comes primarily from the writings by and about the dissidents – who, needless to say, were not fond of these missionaries. There has been very little study of the internal missionaries themselves, of their ideals and their understandings of their role in the Russian state and society. Yet the church's so-called "internal" mission was, in fact, the setting for much of the renewed attention to pastoral work that new studies of late imperial Russian religious life are uncovering. And when we read the pages of the missionary press in this period, we discover a more complicated picture of missionary work, one in which the missionaries were not so much confident instruments of the state as desperate to prove their utility to the government, not so much triumphant as anxiously searching for the best means to convert the Russian people.

A particularly good example can be found in the memoirs of Dmitri I. Bogoliubov, who served as a diocesan anti-sectarian missionary in Tambov, Khar'kiv, and St. Petersburg dioceses between 1894 and 1913. During his summer holidays in 1914, Bogoliubov sat down with a stack of his diaries and began to pen his recollections of his first steps as a missionary twenty years earlier. Back in 1894, he remembered, he was fresh out of Moscow Theological Academy. "At that time, I burned with a religious-populist [*narodnicheskoe*] mood," wrote Bogoliubov. "And I tried in every possible way to organize my life in order to be closer to the people – in order to see [the people's] true life, its joys and sorrow." "How could I," he wondered, "... not yet tied up with the worries of daily life, be useful to my native Church, my native people, and the parish clergy in the battle against sects...?" [6]. Driven by this passion to serve, Bogoliubov had signed on as a diocesan missionary in Tambov diocese, an area known for its large population of religious sectarians [7]. He left the Academy, he recalled, full of ambition but with no formal training in missionary work and no real preconception of what experiences lay ahead.

In a series of articles from 1914 to 1917, Bogoliubov recounted for readers of the Riazan'-based journal, *Missionerskii sbornik*, how his encounters with the sectarians in the first year of his ministry had transformed his understanding of mission and his understanding of the village. The kind of thoughtful, evolving, passionately spiritual encounter that Bogoliubov described bears no resemblance to the public image of the Orthodox anti-sectarian missionary in the 1890s. Bogoliubov's memoir serves as an example of the potential of the missionaries' narratives of their work among sectarians for exploring a form of religious "going to the people", one that was coloured by conservative nationalist views but not limited by them. Like other missionaries, Bogoliubov's story had a strong didactic quality: a central goal was to provide models of how to engage in religious disputes with followers of various non-Orthodox faiths. But as they explored how best to correct sectarians' "errors," they also became studies of the psychology of the religious dissident and the character of village life. Through the story of his early mission, Bogoliubov made a series of arguments about the place of Orthodox faith in Russian society, about the nature of the challenge presented by sectarianism, and about the best methods for meeting that challenge.

When Bogoliubov began his career as a evangelist, the anti-sectarian mission of the Orthodox Church was still in its infancy. Indeed, a few years later, when Nikolai Ivanovich Ivanovskii, a renowned specialist on work with Old Believers, welcomed delegates to the Third All-Russian Missionary Congress in Kazan' in July 1897, he was hardly exaggerating when he observed that, "Some 15-20 years ago there was nothing like this, there was not even a thought of any conventions at all, because there was no one to convene" [8]. As a sympathetic commentator in the right-wing journal *Russkii Viestnik* [Russian Herald] pointed out, until the Kazan' meeting, the word missionary was associated in the Russian public mind with those who worked among non-Christians both in and beyond the Russian empire. But the conference demonstrated that "before our eyes" a new kind of mission was being born, aimed at protecting the "church and fatherland from internal, more evil enemies than paganism – Old Believers and sectarians" [9].

Certainly, proselytization among the various non-Orthodox ethnic groups living under the sceptre of the Russian tsar had gone hand in hand with imperial expansion since the sixteenth century; since 1869, a semi-official lay association, The Imperial Orthodox Missionary Society, had worked to raise awareness about and money for such missions [10]. The internal mission, by contrast, served as the Orthodox Church's instrument against religious dissidence among the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian populations that the church considered naturally its own. Of course, missionary work in this sense had always been among the duties of the parish priest. The emergence of a more formal structure for the internal mission had its roots in the rising concern, from the 1820s onwards, that the schismatic Old Believers might actually be recruiting Orthodox parishioners to their fold. A major inquiry on religious education launched by the Synod in 1818 revealed local bishops' concern about such influence. At the same time, new statistical data seemed to confirm this threat by demonstrating a substantial increase in the numbers of dissenters, both among the Old Believers and the various sects. In response, the Synod launched measures to improve the Orthodox population's knowledge of its faith and thus its ability to counter the arguments of dissenters [11].

Progress in developing sustained Christian education and anti-schismatic programmes was halting. However, under Nicholas I, the groundwork for an anti-Old Believer mission, focussed both on returning Old Believers to the Orthodox church and on preserving the Orthodox from Old Believer influence, was laid. In 1828, at the time of the formation of the first formal anti-Old Believer mission in Perm' diocese, the Synod issued a general set of instructions on missionary work with schismatics. Thereafter, local diocesan missionary committees made up of two or more clerics appeared in a few dioceses. It was only from 1853, however, that special missionary departments in seminaries and theological academies began to train professional missionaries [12]. By 1886, the Synod ordered all seminaries to establish, within three years, such departments to focus on the history and criticism of Old Belief and of the sects existing in each diocese [13]. And in 1887 and 1891, the first two congresses of the internal mission took place in Moscow. As a result of the first of these, in 1888, the Synod published a new set of rules for internal mission, which addressed not only the challenge of the Old Believers but also that of the new sects that were emerging in the post-emancipation period [14].

By the mid 1890s, the message that these missionaries had been developing about the political significance of the battle against sectarianism was beginning to be heard in government circles. Indeed, just before Bogoliubov set out on his first missionary tour of Tambov in the fall of 1894, the Council of Ministers had issued a resolution declaring the new sect of shtundists (a catch-all term for Ukrainian and Russian evangelicals) to be very harmful and banning their meetings – thereby fulfilling one of the requests of the 1891 missionary congress. Also in 1894, the Holy Synod appointed Vasilii Mikhailovich Skvortsov, a Kiev area seminary instructor and anti-sectarian missionary who had served as secretary of the 1891 missionary congress, as its first special advisor on non-Orthodox religious movements. Two years later, in 1896, he would found the official journal of the internal mission, *Missionerskoe Obozrienie*, based in Kiev [15]. Skvortsov would remain at the helm of the journal and the mission right up to 1917. He would be celebrated in some circles and reviled in others for his fierce advocacy of reactionary political views and of the responsibility of state institutions, including the police, to defend and preserve Orthodoxy.

But when Bogoliubov set out, in the autumn of 1894, much of this was in the future. He knew the Synod's instructions on missionary work and he had read various books on religious sectarianism and missions, but he had never actually tried out any of this knowledge on real dissenters. After filing the required itinerary with the board of the local Missionary Brotherhood that oversaw his work, he headed out in a springless carriage across bumpy and muddy roads to meet them.

What did he hope to find? In short, to reconcile his book learning about the Russian people's Orthodox mission with the reality of sectarianism. As he recalled, "I was almost ill with worry about the question of how it was that in various corners of our motherland the Russian people, a god-bearing people, revealed a tendency towards sectarianism. Why were our holy, Orthodox beliefs not treasured everywhere, as in the past, by Russian people?"

In his diaries, Bogoliubov finds his young self struggling to make sense of his theological education. Perhaps reflecting educated society's renewed populist sense of its need to serve the people on the heels of the famine of 1891-92, Bogoliubov repeatedly used the term "narodnicheskoe" to describe his outlook in 1894, evoking the radical populist movement. But mostly, he remembered being inspired by Slavophilism, and the conservative nationalist *pochvenniki* or enthusiasts of the soil, such as Fedor Dostoevskii and Nikolai Danilevskii. With some irony, he wrote of how, on his first trip to the village, "I felt myself to be a Slavophile among the people, the herald of profound and enlightened scholarly knowledge of Orthodox Christian truths. At the time, I imagined myself... literally as a 'walking theological academy' for priests" [16]. What he would soon find out, was that he didn't know much.

One of the central themes of Bogoliubov's account is the city boy's encounter with the village. "I knew the peasant and village life from my earliest childhood," he wrote, but now he "began to look at [the Russian village] not with the eyes of a 'cottager' [*dachnika*] and 'outsider,' but with the eyes of a Christian, himself experiencing the joys and sorrows of our village" [17]. Bogoliubov's life as a missionary was one of mud, bumpy roads, bedbugs, food poisoning, and sore throats from long hours of talking in cramped, smoky peasant huts. It was also a journey into an alien world, where local knowledge was often more important than an academy diploma. He set out with a map and an itinerary, only to discover that villages were called one thing on the map and another in the local dialect (*govor*). He thought he had waited until the worst of the peasants' harvest work was over before heading out, yet found out they were still horribly busy in early October. As he discovered, "in work in sectarian parishes, far from everything depends on the diligence and good will of the missionary. "Life conditions ... carry a huge and sometimes decisive significance. And above all – the season of the year" [18]. Time and again, he met peasants who seemed eager to discuss spiritual matters but told him that he should come back and spend the winter in their village, when they had time [19]. And one of the central messages of his autobiography was that all the book learning in the world could not replace getting to know the villagers as people. Throughout his account, he is hosted by various village worthies, who provide an entrée for him into the local community. He relies on the local schoolteacher for advice and inside knowledge – and to lend him authority [20]. Most importantly, the man who had fancied himself a "pioneer among the clergy" learned that the missionary's crucial ally was the local priest. Parish priests had usually not enjoyed the higher education of many missionaries, and they tended to regard them as inspectors, sent to judge them. But what he learned was that they were a fountain of local knowledge. Their reports to "the city" were full of what they thought their superiors wanted to hear – but in person, they were "exceptional experts on popular life." While they might lack knowledge and training, respecting them as friends and helpers could also arouse their excitement and motivation to improve their pastoral work [21].

Now of course many missionaries were themselves parish priests who took on additional leadership in this area. And the vast majority of diocesan missionaries, unlike Bogoliubov, were themselves ordained clergymen. Still, as a group, the missionaries had a difficult position in the Church. The 1888 mission rules had envisioned a corps of diocesan missionaries composed of priests with theological academy or seminary diplomas, paid out of diocesan funds. They would be assisted by parish priests appointed as local missionaries and by enthusiastic and knowledgeable lay volunteers [22]. In fact, although three quarters of the diocesan missionaries at the 1897 missionary congress in Kazan' were priests, a significant minority, including Bogoliubov, who represented Tambov diocese, were lay people who had chosen to become full-time missionaries. And unlike the overwhelming majority of priests, almost forty percent of them – and every single non-ordained diocesan missionary – held higher degrees [23]. In their discussion of the methods of their work at the congress, and in *Missionerskoe Obozrienie* in the previous months, they would emphasize themes Bogoliubov addressed in his memoir: the ill-defined nature of their positions in their various dioceses, the fact that they often were employed by church brotherhoods that made decisions about their work without ever consulting them, that they lacked pension funds, and that they were often resented by local priests [24]. And, as did Bogoliubov, they added their voice to the campaign for improved conditions for parish priests, in the belief that this was essential to improving the atmosphere in Orthodox parishes across the country and giving priests the time and peace of mind they needed for religious education measures [25].

Bogoliubov's initial encounters with the village also forced him to re-think broader cultural assumptions he had gleaned from his academic education. He had not understood, he realized, "the intense struggle that was taking place in the depths of the people around our religious beliefs." His seminary education had prepared him to think in terms of the ideas of N.Ia. Danilevskii. In his famous book, *Russia and Europe*, once described as the "catechism or codex of Slavophilism," Danilevskii had contrasted the materialist, corrupt, and factionalized Romano-Germanic civilization with the organic, Slavic-Orthodox culture of Russia, and predicted that the latter would one day come to dominate – or rather save – civilization. Bogoliubov had expected that Orthodoxy would be essential, native, and inalienable for the Russian peasant. Yet how was it, he wondered, "that many Russian people were leaving their natural element [stikhiia] and consciously and with conviction accepting a religious faith in the form of shtundism – the Baptist and Molokan faiths, where precisely personal, individual interests, [and] the personal, individual conscience are placed at the forefront, and where that which is called "the conciliar consciousness" [*sobornoe soznanie* – in the sense of community with God and fellow worshippers] is devalued?" But his own observations and, especially, his conversations with priests and other members of the "village intelligentsia" showed him,

instead, that "our people does not hold to the Church mystically or essentially." The peasants turned out to be touched by individualism and materialism. Moreover, his Christian faith led him to question such broad cultural generalizations: was not every soul made new and equal by the Creator? He started to think about his historical studies at the Academy, about how the great historian V.O. Kliuchevskii (who taught at Moscow Theological Academy at the time) had shown Russia's place in the universal patterns of the historical process. And he came to realize that the Baptists and other new sects reflected the changes in the village. There was an historical process at work and he could play a role through a long-term project of cultural work to preserve and strengthen important Orthodox values – not by simply "winning" debates with sectarians [26].

And this was one of the central goals of Bogoliubov's writing project: to argue in favour of an approach to missions that focused as much, if not more, on those who remained within Orthodoxy as on those who abandoned it for the sects. As Eugene Clay has suggested, like churchmen elsewhere in Europe in the modern period, Russian missionaries sought to convey the rationalized Orthodoxy of the theological academy in a popular milieu that was heterodox, susceptible to charisma, and, from the perspective of the missionaries, rife with superstition [27]. In the early 1890s, missionary practice was organized around formal debates and discussions with dissenters on points of theology. The missionary's goal was to win these public debates and expose the sectarian leaders as self-willed, mistaken, and ignorant. Bogoliubov did not deny that direct work with sectarians was important: indeed, he met one inspiring priest in a parish with many sectarians who had energized his flock with a mass of activities, yet had not converted a single sectarian because he feared entering into any sort of discussion with them. Bogoliubov learned from his time in that parish that success required both good parish work and active outreach to dissenters [28]. But he emphasized that these labours had as much to do with listening as with debating, with understanding the sectarians' perspective before countering it. Most importantly, his encounters with the Baptists, the evidence of the sense of community and purpose that they seemed to engender, made him come to a crucial realization about missionary work: that "in the first instance, [anti-sectarian missionaries] needed to do the boring, unnoticed, samely work known as *Orthodox-church education of the people* and forming among them lively and active missionary brotherhoods." At that time, he wrote, if a diocesan missionary had reported that he had spent his time working among the Orthodox rather than sectarians on his tours, he would have been disciplined. Yet this was precisely where the future of missionary work lay [29]. An obsession with theological "disputes" would not address the core of the problem.

Bogoliubov, perhaps not surprisingly, had self-serving motives in using his missionary experiences to prove his point about missionary debates. He had, in fact, lost his job in 1913 as the St. Petersburg diocesan missionary, where he had worked to develop precisely this approach. Indeed, his successor Ivan G. Aivazov, appointed by a conservative new metropolitan, had publicly attacked him for promoting sectarianism through the missionary brotherhood he had formed in the capital. According to Aivazov, Bogoliubov's methods did not recognize the need to launch an "offensive" against dissent [30].

This brief review of some aspects of Bogoliubov's memoir opens up for us the experiences of one of the new type of professional, lay missionaries that was emerging in the 1890s. In some ways, Bogoliubov's perspective on missions, as he looked back during the First World War, was not typical. Bogoliubov by 1914 was a controversial figure in the missionary movement, widely admired, but also regarded as a liberal and "soft" on dissent by his often right-wing colleagues. Moreover, his account differs in tone and style from the numerous descriptions that Bogoliubov and his colleagues wrote for missionary magazines as they sought to make sense of their encounters and provide one another with ideas of how best to counter sectarianism. Bogoliubov's memoir had the reflective quality of hindsight, as he sought to justify the approach to mission with which he had become associated. But his story of his struggle to reconcile the Slavophile image of the Russian people with the realities of the village surely conveys an important reality of missionary work: the internal missionaries shared with their fellow educated Russians an obsession with defining the nature of the Russian soul [31]. Their accounts of their visits to the village were part of this process of defining Russianness and the range of spiritual and political options appropriate to that people.

The Orthodox Church's struggle with Old Belief and sectarianism must be understood in the context of the broader re-Christianization campaigns of the nineteenth century across Europe [32]. We recognize familiar patterns of the encounter of rationalized "official" religion with the reality of religion as it was lived in real communities. Tensions between different levels of clergy and between church and state were also not unique to Russia.

The association of religious and national identity with which Bogoliubov struggled is a more complicated story, and an on-going one, for it takes us into the history of Russian ideas of the nation but also broader Orthodox understandings of ecclesiology and mission. Historians of religion and nationalism have recently challenged earlier views that saw modern nationalism gradually replacing outdated religious sources of identity, arguing instead that religion has often served as a constitutive part of modern national identity [33]. On the one hand, Bogoliubov expresses the sort of primordial, essentialist notion that nations are "natural" organic communities with certain shared cultural and/or biological characteristics [34]. On the other hand, he was operating in the context of Orthodoxy, where the church is organized into autocephalous churches of particular nations. And, as Joel A. Nichols points out, this shapes a vision of mission that aims "to establish eucharistic communities in every place, each within their own context, culture, and language" [35]. This Orthodox connection between space, ethnicity, and faith is crucial to understanding the anxiety Bogoliubov felt about religious dissent and the broader assumption that underlay the late imperial Russian Orthodox Church's division of its mission within the empire into one branch aimed at non-Christian peoples of the east and another directed at "returning" all "Russians" to the Orthodox fold.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, a journal called *Missionerskoe obozrenie* has appeared again in Russia, many pre-revolutionary spiritual guides and anti-sectarian pamphlets have been republished, several missionary congresses have been held, and the Russian Orthodox Church has made numerous statements about mission and missionary doctrine [36]. In its preface, one missionary textbook argues that the works of the Kazan Theological Academy (famous for training missionaries to work with "eastern" peoples of the empire), the journal, *Missionerskoe obozrienie*, and other publications attest to the "serious attention" of the pre-revolutionary church to mission [37]. In fact, however, the internal mission always felt marginalized in the church and remained controversial throughout its pre-revolutionary life. Bogoliubov's memoirs and his later career illuminate how missionaries in late imperial Russia sought to come to terms with the fact of religious dissent in what they perceived to be "naturally" Orthodox communities, their search for effective methods to combat such dissent or indifference, and their quest to persuade the government and educated society of the importance of their task.

**Sources and literature**

1. Vsepoddannieishii otchet Ober-prokurora Sviatieishago Sinoda po viedomstvu Pravoslavnago ispoviedaniia za 1905-1907 gody (St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1910), 160. In fact, the great majority of these sectarian missionaries were Russian subjects.
2. Iu. Polunov, Pod vlast'iu ober-prokurora: Gosudarstvo i tserkov' v epokhu Aleksandra III (Moscow: AIRO-XX, 1996), ch. 4.
3. Russkiia viedomosti, no. 221, 12 August 1897, 2; for complaints about this article and press coverage of the 1897 congress in general, see: I. M. Gromoglasov, Tretii Vserossiiskii missionerskii s"iezd (fakty i vpechatleniia) (Sergiev Posad, 1898), 3-9.
4. Quoted in: I. K. Smolich, Istoriia russkoi tserkvi 1700-1917. Part 2 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Spaso-Preobrazhenskogo Valaamskogo monastyria, 1997), 190.
5. Daniel Beer, "The Medicalization of Religious Deviance in the Russian Orthodox Church (1880-1905)," Kritika 5, no. 3 (Summer 2004): 451-82; J. Eugene Clay, "Orthodox Missionaries and 'Orthodox Heretics' in Russia, 1886-1917," in Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia, eds. Robert P. Geraci and Michael Khodarkovsky (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 38-69; Heather J. Coleman, "Defining Heresy: The Fourth Missionary Congress and the Problem of Cultural Power after 1905 in Russia," Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas 52, no. 1 (2004): 70-91; T. N. Guseinova, Missionerskaia deiatel'nost' russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi sredi staroobriadtsev v Zabaikal'e (Ulan-Ude, 2006); N. A. Smirnov, "Missionerskaia deiatel'nost' tserkvi (Vtoraia polovina XIX v. – 1917)," in Tserkov' v istorii Rossii (IX v. – 1917). Kriticheskie ocherki, ed. N. A. Smirnov (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1967), 279-97.
6. D. Bogoliubov, "V bor'bie s sektantstvom (Iz zapisok eparkhial'nago missionera)," Missionerskii sbornik, no. 8 (1914): 572.
7. I. Klibanov, Sovremennoe sektantstvo i ego preodolenie po materialam ekspeditsii v Tambovskuiu oblast' v 1959 g. (Moscow: Izd. Akademii nauk, 1961).
8. V. M. Skvortsov, Dieianiia 3-go Vserossiiskago Missionerskago S"iezda v Kazani, po voprosam vnutrennei missii i raskolosektantstva. Izdanie vtoroe, peresmotriennoe i znachitel'no dopolnennoe (Kiev: Tipografiia I. I. Chokolova, 1898), 20.
9. Po povodu tret'iago missionerskago s"iezda," Russkii Viestnik no 11 (November 1897): 433.
10. Robert P. Geraci, "Going Abroad or Going to Russia? Orthodox Missionaries in the Kazakh Steppe, 1881-1917," in Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia, ed. Robert P. Geraci and Michael Khodarkovsky (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 276-79.
11. Gregory L. Freeze, "The Rechristianization of Russia: The Church and Popular Religion, 1750-1850," Studia Slavic Finlandensia 7 (1990): 107-08.
12. "Missionerstvo, sekty i raskol. (Khronika)," Missionerskoe Obozrienie no. 7-8 (July-August 1896): 61-2.
13. Vsepoddannieishii Otchet ober-prokurora sviatieishago Sinoda K. Pobedonostseva po viedomstvu Pravoslavnago Ispoviedaniia za 1887 god (St. Petersburg: Sinodskaia tipografiia, 1889), 195.
14. "Pravila ob ustroistvie missii i o sposobie dieistvii missionerov i pastyrei tserkvi po otnosheniiu k raskol'nikam i sektantam," Tserkovnyia Viedomosti no. 28 (9 July 1888): 175-82.
15. Vl. A. Maevskii, Vnutrenniaia Missiia i ee Osnovopolozhnik (Buenos Aires, 1954), 51-74, 87. In 1899, Missionerskoe Obozrienie absorbed the anti-Old Believer journal, Bratskoe Slovo, which had struggled since 1881 beginning publication in Moscow in 1881. See: V. S., "Po povodu prekrashcheniia izdaniia zhurnala 'Bratskoe Slovo,'" Missionerskoe Obozrienie no. 9 (September 1899): 159-165.
16. Bogoliubov, "V bor'be s sektantstvom," Missionerskii sbornik no. 3-4 (1916): 115. See Clay in Geraci and Khodarkovsky.
17. Bogoliubov, "V borb'e s sektantstvom," Missionerskii sbornik no. 5 (1916): 288.
18. Bogoliubov, "V bor'be s sektanstvom," Missionerskii sbornik no. 3-4 (1915): 199.
19. Bogoliubov, "V bor'be s sektantstvom," Missionerskii sbornik, no. 12 (1914): 911; no. 1-2 (1915): 55; no. 7-8 (1915): 526.
20. Bogoliubov, "V bor'be s sektantstvom," Missionerskii sbornik, no. 5 (1916): 290; no. 9-10 (1915): 670.
21. Bogoliubov, "V bor'be," Missionerskii sbornik, no. 12 (December 1914): 908; no. 5 (1916): 290-91.
22. "Pravila ob ustroistvie...", 175-6.
23. Skvortsov, Dieianiia, 43, 313-19.
24. Ibid., 269-74. Lay missionaries suffered from the lack of prospects for advancement and identity, but the ordained missionaries often suffered financially. Although the latter were usually appointed to "good" parishes, their extended absences affected their ability to make a living. See: Mikhail Kal'nev, "K voprosu o polozhenii missionerov," Missionerskoe Obozrienie no. 6 (June 1897), 479-82.
25. Ibid, 274; G. L. Freeze, "Handmaiden of the State? The Church in Imperial Russia Reconsidered," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36, no. 1 (January 1985): 101.
26. Bogoliubov, "V bor'be," Missionerskii sbornik, no. 5 (1916): 293-98. The term, sobornoe, is notoriously difficult to translate. See: Judith Deutsch Kornblatt and Richard F. Gustafson, Russian Religious Thought (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 20.

27. Clay, “Orthodox Missionaries,” 41-42.
28. Bogoliubov, “V bor’be,” Missionerskii sbornik, no. 12 (1916): 773-87.
29. Bogoliubov, “V bor’be,” Missionerskii sbornik, no. 7-8 (1915): 526-27.
30. Bogoliubov, “V bor’be,”Missionerskii sbornik, no. 12 (1915); 933-40; no. 10-11-12 (1917): 408.
31. Cathy Frierson, Peasant Icons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 9.
32. There is a vast literature on this. For a useful summary, see: Hugh McLeod, Religion and the People of Western Europe 1789-1989. New Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), chapters 3 and 4.
33. Peter van der Veer and Hartmut Lehmann, eds., Nation and Religion: Perspectives on Europe and Asia (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).
34. Anthony D. Smith, Nationalism (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), 49-51.
35. Joel A. Nichols, “Mission, Evangelism, and Proselytism in Christianity: Mainline Conceptions as Reflected in Church Documents,” Emory International Law Review 12, no. 1 (Winter 1998): 569, 627.
36. Some of these are collected in a missionary textbook published by the Orthodox Research Institute of Missiology, Ecumenicism, and New Religious Movements. Prot. Vladimir Fedorov, ed., Pravoslavnaia missiia segodnia (St. Petersburg: N. P. Mezhtserkovnaia obrazovatel’no-prosvetitel’skaia organizatsiia ‘Apostol’skii gorod – Nevskaia perspektiva,” 1999).
37. Ibid. Note that they go on to say that while it is important to study these materials, most of them are out of date or unsuitable to the needs of today’s church.

***Колман Х. Дж. Воспоминания миссионера: Д.И. Боголюбов и внутренняя миссия Русской православной церкви в XIX – в начале XX вв.***
*Эта статья исследует историю так называемой внутренней миссии Русской православной церкви в поздней имперской России сквозь призму воспоминаний одного из ее ведущих анти-сектантских миссионеров – Д.И. Боголюбова. Внутренняя миссия была чрезвычайно спорна, часто изображена как полицейская рука церкви. Все же мемуары Боголюбова непосредственно обнаруживают побуждения и борьбу миссионеров, засвидетельствов, что они видели свое назначение, как что-то вроде славянофильского движения “хождения в народ”, отличное от социального контроля. Поскольку Боголюбов стремился воплотить свое богословское учение на практике, он неожиданно столкнулся с глубокими вопросами о природе русской душы и роли церкви в российском обществе.*

***Ключевые слова:*** *Д.И. Боголюбов, воспоминания, Русская православная церковь.*

***Coleman H. J. Memoirs of a Missionary: D.I. Bogoliubov and the Russian Orthodox Church’s Internal Mission in the 19th and early 20th Centuries***
*This article examines the history of the so-called “internal” mission of the Russian Orthodox Church in late imperial Russia through the lens of the memoirs of one of its leading anti-sectarian missionaries, D.I. Bogoliubov. The internal mission was highly controversial, often reviled as the police arm of the church. Yet Bogoliubov’s memoirs reveal the motivations and struggles of the missionaries themselves, suggesting that they saw their enterprise as a sort of Slavophile “going to the people” movement, rather than an exercise in social control. As Bogoliubov sought to put his theological training into practical practice, he unexpectedly confronted deep questions about the nature of the Russian soul and the role of the Church in Russian society.*

***Key words:*** *D.I. Bogoliubov, memoirs, Russian Orthodox Church.*

**УДК 329.12:323.39(477)“19”**

***С. Г. Іваницька***

# УКРАЇНСЬКА ЛІБЕРАЛЬНО-ДЕМОКРАТИЧНА ПАРТІЙНА ЕЛІТА В КОНТЕКСТІ НАЦІЄТВОРЕННЯ НА ПОЧАТКУ XX СТ.: АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ*

*Стаття присвячена концептуальним проблемам дослідження української ліберальної демократичної еліти в контексті процесів «національного будівництва» в умовах пізньої імперської Росії.*

***Ключові слова:*** *ліберальна демократія, партійно-політична еліта, Українська демократично-радикальна партія, «український проект», націєтворення.*

У останні десятиліття у сфері гуманітаристики активізувалася увага до проблеми політичних еліт і політичного лідерства. Ця тенденція простежується і в сучасній українській історіографії. В межах цієї досить широко окресленої теми вивчається комплекс взаємозв’язаних питань: суспільно-політичні течії, партійні асоціації, їхня ідеологія і програма; власне партійно-політична еліта як продуцент, медіатор і носій соціалістичних, консервативних, ліберальних і націоналістичних ідей; індивідуальний життєвий шлях, професійний досвід і творча спадщина найбільш видатних її представників (насамперед, «людей першого

* *Підготовку даної статті уможливлено завдяки дослідчій дотації Канадського інституту українських студій Альбертського університету (із Вічного фонду з українознавства ім. д-ра І. Іванцева й д-ра М. Мисько-Іванців)*