

¹G.S. Bedelova , ²R.O. Sadykova 

¹Candidate of historical sciences, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: gulzhanbedelova@gmail.com

²Candidate of historical sciences, al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: raikhan.sadykova@gmail.com

FEATURES OF THE ASSESSMENT OF THE MONGOLIAN RELIGIOUS POLICY BY RUSSIAN RESEARCHERS

Abstract. Authors of the article conditionally divided the historiography into two groups: survey studies; special works devoted to the study of sources. Based on the analysis, the researchers determined the features of the assessment of the Mongolian religious policy. They defined the researcher's approach to this problem. In the article it was characterized the conceptual approach and was carried out a comparative analysis of the religious policy of the Mongols in the modern period. It is shown that the conclusions of the authors became the foundation for subsequent works in this direction. It was made an attempt to show the continuity of scientific views and those aspects of this problem that have yet to be revealed. Despite the small number of works and their specificity, we can say that pre-revolutionary historians managed to solve a number of complex problems: it was formulated a more or less objective view of the religious policy of the Mongol khans; at the result of the introduction of a large number of different sources into scientific circulation, it was formed a critical view of the problem; there was an understanding that the relationship of the Mongol khans with the conquered peoples was not unambiguous; methods of studying history (positivism) appeared; a calmer view of the activities of the Mongol rulers, including in the field of religious policy, has taken shape.

Key words: religious policy, religious tolerance, Mongol Empire, historiography, denominations, oriental studies.

¹Г.С. Беделова, ²Р.О. Садықова

¹тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: gulzhanbedelova@gmail.com

²тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің қауымдастырылған профессоры, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: raikhan.sadykova@gmail.com

Орыс зерттеушілерінің моңғолдардың діни саясатына баға беруіндегі ерекшеліктері

Аңдатпа: зерттеушілер мақалада тарихнаманы шартты түрде екіге бөліп қарастырды: шолу зерттеулер; деректерді зерттеуге арналған арнайы еңбектер. Сараптама жасау негізінде моңғолдардың діни саясатына баға берудің ерекшеліктері белгіленді. Осы мәселеге революцияға дейінгі ғалымдардың көзқарастары талданды. Революцияға дейінгі концептуалды тәсілдерге сипаттама жасалынды және моңғолдардың қазіргі кезеңдегі діни саясатына салыстырмалы талдау жасалынды. Революцияға дейінгі авторлардың ой-тұжырымдары осы бағыттағы кейінгі еңбектерге бағдар, негіз болғандығы көрсетілді. Ғылыми көзқарастардың сабақтастығын және осы мәселенің әлі де ашылу керек аспектілерін көрсетуге талпыныстар жасалды. Еңбектердің аздығы мен спецификалығына қарамастан, революцияға дейінгі тарихшылар бірқатар мәселелерді шеше алды: моңғол хандарының діни саясатына деген азды-көпті объективті көзқарас қалыптасты; Ғылыми айналымға әртүрлі, көптеген деректердің енуімен, мәселеге сыни көзқарас қалыптасты; моңғол хандарының жаулап алған халықтармен қарым-қатынастары біржақты болмағандығы туралы түсінік орнады; тарихты зерттеудің жаңа тәсілдері пайда болды (позитивизм); моңғол билеушілерінің іс-әрекеттеріне, соның ішінде діни саясатқа да сабырлы көзқарас қалыптасты. Сонымен қатар, осы ғалымдардың жинақталған тәжірибелерін жалпылай және зерделей келе, авторлар тек мәселенің зерттелу деңгейін ғана емес, оның әлсіз зерттелген жақтарын да байқай алды.

Түйін сөздер: діни саясат, діни шыдамдылық, моңғол империясы, тарихнама, конфессиялар, шығыстану.

Беделова Г.С.¹, Садыкова Р.О.²

¹кандидат исторических наук, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: gulzhanbedelova@gmail.com

²кандидат исторических наук, ассоциированный профессор,
Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: raikhan.sadykova@gmail.com

Особенности оценки монгольской религиозной политики русскими исследователями

Аннотация. В статье историография авторами условно разделена на две группы: обзорные исследования; специальные труды, посвященные изучению источников. Исследователями на основе анализа определены особенности оценки монгольской религиозной политики. Выявлен подход ученых к данной проблеме. Охарактеризован концептуальный подход и проведен сравнительный анализ религиозной политики монголов в современный период. Показано, что умозаключения авторов стали фундаментом для последующих трудов в этом направлении. Сделана попытка показать преэминентность научных воззрений и те аспекты данной проблемы, которые предстоит еще раскрыть. Невзирая на немногочисленность трудов и их специфичность можно сказать, что дореволюционным историкам удалось решить ряд сложных задач: сформировался более или менее объективный взгляд на религиозную политику монгольских ханов; в связи с внедрением в научный оборот большого количества разных источников сформировался критический взгляд на проблему; возникло понимание того, что взаимоотношения монгольских ханов с покорёнными народами не были однозначными; появились методы изучения истории (позитивизм); сложился более спокойный взгляд на деятельность монгольских правителей, в том числе в области религиозной политики.

Ключевые слова: религиозная политика, веротерпимость, монгольская империя, историография, конфессии, востоковедение.

Introduction

The Mongol Empire was a multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state. The religious tolerance of the Mongols is a rare phenomenon in medieval society, and that is why it is unique. Therefore, this issue today engages the minds of many experts: historians, orientalists, political scientists, etc. But interest to this problem did not arise only now, it was considered before by pre-revolutionary Russian researchers. They took the first steps of analysis, evaluation of the religious policy of the Mongols, the interpretation and use of sources. Conceptual approach of these researchers to this problem is interesting. Summarizing and comprehending the experience gained by these excellent researchers, we can not only find out the degree of development, but also find out the unexplored aspects of this problem.

Methodology

The principle of historicism was applied in solving research problems, which allows us to make an objective, comprehensive analysis of pre-revolutionary historiography. The implementation of the principle of historicism makes it possible to consider changes in the views of pre-revolutionary authors, that is, when the increment of knowledge, the discovery of new sources, changes in the socio-polit-

ical environment, philosophical systems prompted historians to change their minds and correct previous ideas.

All of the above implies the use of other methods in their totality and relationship: problem-chronological, system-structural, historical-logical, comparative-historical. These methods serve as the key on highlighting important aspects of the historiography of the religious policy of the Mongol empire.

Discussion and results

In this matter, pre-revolutionary historiography is diverse; it does not constitute a single whole. We considered it conditionally dividing into two groups: major review studies (Karamzin, 1816; Solovyev, 1993; Klyuchevsky, 1904); special works devoted to the study and translation of sources (Fisher, 1755; Grigoryev, 1842; Berezin, 1850; Veselovsky, 1916; Tizengauzen, 1884; Bartold, 1918; Gomboev, 1859). The works of pre-revolutionary authors became the foundation for subsequent works, the opinions and hypotheses of many modern authors are also subject to their influence. But, in the science of the Soviet period, there was an opinion about the opposite of before and post-revolutionary historiography, when it was assumed that "noble-bourgeois" researchers were not able to understand the essence

of the liberation wars of peoples against oppressors and, moreover, to evaluate the contribution of ordinary people to this struggle. It was also believed that Russian pre-revolutionary historiography, “which was unable to overcome the limitations, formalism, and methodological weakness characteristic of bourgeois historical thought, was not able to master such an important task” (Petrushevsky, 1952: 12). And this was a limited view, not taking into account the high contribution of previous generations of historians to this problem.

We had to mention that there is a tendency of the recent intensification of research in this direction. This is a monograph by K.A. Solovyev (Solovyev, 2001), the works of such modern historians as O.V. Lushnikov, F.F. Mukhametov, E.O. Borisova, R.Yu. Pochekaev et al. (Lushnikov, 2009: 330-338; Mukhametov, 2006; Borisova, 2012; Pochekaev, 2009: 106-113). But, paying an attention the importance of this topic, we can say that now there is no comprehensive, generalizing historiographic work covering the history of the religious policy of the Mongolian states, including the issues of religious tolerance of the Mongol rulers.

In the pre-revolutionary period, the beginning of the scientific study of Mongolian problems is considered to be the turn of the XVIII-XIX centuries, that is, the time of the formation of Russian historical science. In pre-revolutionary historiography, it can be mentioned major review studies by M.M. Shcherbatov, N.I. Karamzin, S.M. Solovyov, V.O. Klyuchevsky. Even then, Russian historians emphasized the noticeable religious tolerance of the Mongol conquerors. The first Russian historian N.M. Karamzin, in his book, conveys the words of Plano Karpini “As for their Law, they believe in God, the Creator of the Universe, rewarding people according to their dignity; but offer sacrifices to idols made of felt or silk, considering them the patrons of cattle; they adore the sun, fire, moon, calling it the great queen, and kneel, facing the South; They are famous for their tolerance and do not preach their Faith; however, sometimes Christians are forced to follow the Mongol customs” (Karamzin, 1816). Further, telling about the exemption by the Mongols of the Russian clergy from paying taxes during the census of North-Eastern Russia in 1257, he calls such an act “cunning worthy of comment” and explains the reasons for this action: “having learned the power of the clergy over the conscience of people who are generally zealous for faith, the Mongols tried to appease him so that it would not excite the Russians to confront the Tatar yoke and so that the khan could command us more calmly” (Karamzin, 1993: 198).

Another classic of Russian historical science, S. M. Solovyov, based on a detailed analysis and comparison of the evidence of the Catholic monks Plano Karpini and Wilhelm Rubruk with eastern sources, wrote about “extraordinary tolerance ... regarding foreign religions” of the Mongol great khan. “This tolerance was prescribed by law: there were Christians in the khan’s family too; on his own support, he kept Christian spiritual Greek confessions, who openly sent their services in the church, which was placed in front of his large tent,” the historian wrote. The author further writes: “... first the Christian Nestorian spiritual, then the Mohammedan mullahs, and finally the pagan priests performed the service before the Khan Mengu” (Solovyev, 1993a). The researcher pointed out the legislative nature of the religious condescension of the conquerors – the “charter” of Genghis Khan, that is, “Yasa”. As S.M. Solovyev mentions “According to the charter of Genghis Khan and Oktay (Ogedei), the servants of all religions were exempted from paying tribute” (Solovyev, 1993b).

The authors of these works did not consider it necessary to study the minor circumstances as they considered. In the works of the historian V.O. Klyuchevsky the assessments of the Mongol period did not differ at all from his predecessors (Klyuchevsky, 1904).

In pre-revolutionary historiography there are also special works which devoted to study the sources, as well as the history of the Golden Horde and the states that arose on its basis (Fisher, 1755: 421-450). This period is not distinguished by a special variety of historical approaches to the study of the Horde. Nevertheless, by the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries, due to the introduction of a significant number of sources into the general scientific circulation and the formation of historical research methods, it was understood that the history of the Mongol conquests, the Golden Horde, the Turkic world, and their foreign policy are much more extensive than before it was supposed to.

The problem studied by us can be found its significant place in the works of the brilliant Russian orientalist, the first head of the Department of Oriental History at V.V. Grigoryev St. Petersburg University. The researcher substantiated the deep significance to study the history of the relationship between the Golden Horde and Russia of such an original source as the labels of the Golden Horde khans to the Russian clergy. Analyzing the contents of the labels, Grigoryev wrote that they gave the Russian clergy rights and advantages, exempted them from duties, tributes and duties, the metropoli-

tans were guaranteed the right to trial and reprisal against all clergy and subordinate people, the right to dispose of church and monastery property. Considering about the policy of the rulers of the Golden Horde towards the enslaved peoples and their religions, he focused on the complete tolerance of the conquerors. He states that for all the above advantages granted to the clergy, khans only asked to offer a prayer for themselves and the well-being of their own family and tribe, the researcher states (Grigoryev, 1842a: 27).

Defining for the causes of tolerance of the Mongols V.V. Grigoryev asked himself about how the rulers of the Golden Horde, professing Islam, patronized Christianity, moreover, he emphasized, all this was done not only without profit, but also to the detriment of the khan's treasury. The researcher compares their attitude to faith with the oppression of Christians in general in Asia by Muslims, cites the Russian chronicles as an example, which says about the dying of Russian princes at the hands of the same khans, for their firmness in their faith. The researcher questions the content of the labels. Talking about the goals of such a policy, he doubts the works of labels during the Mongol rule, saying that they could appear at a later time, to encourage his own kings to the same high favor that the khans provided. But including his sober and objective look, the orientalist researcher answers "no" to himself, proving this by the fact that over the many years of its existence, on the whole, the clergy of Russia have shown their honesty (Grigoryev, 1842b: 30-31).

In Russia, labels were also used later, after the decline of Mongol rule. This is also mentioned by V.V. Grigoryev, who confirms his words with other sources. Karamzin and other researchers in their works tried to interpret such a religious policy of the Mongol khans, but as Grigoryev points out, "instead of looking for his reasons, they were invented, instead of thoroughly penetrating the essence of the matter, they were limited by assumptions without evidence, and contradicted themselves" (Grigoryev, 1842c: 31-32).

The researcher suggests that the reasons for the patronage, religious tolerance of the Mongols are political, that is, given the influence of the clergy, the church on the people, they preferred to be friends with them, turning them into their intercessors. But further doubting the mental abilities of the Golden Horde khans, Grigoryev entertains this thought and comes to the conclusion that such a smart, but at the same time simple policy could not come to their mind. According to Grigoryev, from the history of the rule of the Mongols by Russia it is clear that they

were not cunning, far-sighted, because they made elementary mistakes: they allowed Moscow princes to strengthen, contributed to the unification of Russia when it was fragmented. He believes the real reason is different: "the absence of religion in them, and as a result of all religious jealousy, the greatest tolerance, and at the same time unlimited superstition" (Grigoryev, 1842d: 32-33).

He believes that the real reason is different: "there is no religion in them, and the researcher emphasizes that the Mongols did not have a national religion, and they worshiped the "Supreme Being (which, like heaven, they meant the word Tangri)" - and further Grigoryev continues - "... they had the kind of religion that once existed among all the Middle and North-East Asian peoples, and is now called shamanism, which is still held by all the savages of northern Asia ..." (Grigoryev, 1842e: 34). It must be said here that the author of these lines underestimated the "Black Religion" of the Mongols, which served as a political and religious ideology for them. This is also mentioned by modern scholars: "Sky (Tengri) - "beginningless, uncreated, creator of all things, the ruler of the world; it determines the fate of a person, sanctioning state power" (Neklyudov, 1992: 171). Another researcher T.D. Skrynnikova wrote too that the fact that the most important component of the life of the Mongols, their understanding of the world was an unconditional belief in the sacredness inherent in this world, that is, the impregnation of it with a certain divine spirit (Skrynnikova, 1997).

Orientalist historian Grigoryev draws attention to the personality of Genghis Khan too, he calls him "something like a prophet" for fellow tribesmen. According to the researcher, his orders and words were the holiest, almost religious dogmas. Underestimating the situation with shamanism or Tengrianism, the researcher nevertheless points out that all the instructions of Genghis Khan, based mostly on the ancient customs and superstitions of the Mongols were collected in one book (meaning Yasa). He also mentions, in accordance with these laws, all the successors of Genghis Khan patronized exactly all religions. Citing the testimonies of travelers both western and eastern, Grigoryev wrote about the disputes that the Mongol khans arranged, as they adhered to one religion and patronized another. Carefully analyzing this whole situation, Grigoryev concludes that the adoption of religion was for them a political measure, and not a matter of conviction (Grigoryev, 1842f: 41). Based on a comparative analysis of various sources, the historian reveals the following points: Religion served them only as a means to fulfill the ambitions of ambition. The laws of Geng-

his Khan (regarding faith, too) were too respected to violate them (Grigoryev, 1842g: 46). Thus, the researcher comes to the conclusion that the reason for the tolerance of the Mongol rulers is political, but not in the sense that they are visionary politicians, but because they had a legislative basis (Yasa) for tolerance. The legislative basis for the religious tolerance of the Mongol conquerors is emphasized, as we have already emphasized by S.M. Solovyev, but Grigoryev did it more deeply.

The historian claimed that the khans of the Golden Horde were not ardent adherents of Islam, the labels given to the Russian clergy were not something unusual, exceptional, but this was a manifestation of the general law of tolerance in the faith, the patronage of all faiths. In this point of view, he notes that this order of Genghis Khan was observed everywhere by his descendants (Grigoryev, 1842h: 53).

In this regard, according to Grigoryev, we can conclude that the ruler of the Mongols, in the particular case of Genghis Khan (though Grigoryev does not directly point out this), is the key factor for understanding these processes, and all his other successors are simply executors of his will, word, law. And he is also the main driving force of various processes, including the far-sighted, cunning religious policy. A similar opinion is supported by the modern historian T.D. Skrynnikova, who tells about the charisma of Genghis Khan (Skrynnikova, 1997).

The researcher in his book reveals another side of the problem, that is, the death of Russian princes for faith, with a high tolerance of the Mongols. He explains it this way: "... the death penalty was imposed there as punishment for the swearing of all religions, and not for one Christian, and therefore for the Mohammedan swearing. What is the example of torturing Roman Orgovich Ryazansky in the Horde? For swearing the Muhammad law, the annals say; according to the concepts of the Mongols, punishmentswearing of one faith was not at all that of adherence to another. There is a big difference "(Grigoryev, 1842i: 55-56). Thus, the historian concludes that the princes in the Horde were killed not for their adherence to Christianity, not because of Muslim fanaticism, but because they disobeyed the law (not to belittle and scold other religions), executed them for political crimes, like traitors and rebels. But at the same time, he also notes that the sacrifices of the princes were noble, were caused by great love for the homeland. Regarding the robberies of churches and monasteries by the Mongols, he wrote: "This took place in wartime, in the possessions of disobedient princes, and when the disobedient were to be punished, then, according to the Chingis laws, the

Mongols should not spare anything" (Grigoryev, 1842j: 57).

In the proof of the reliability of labels, acts, as sources, contribution of V.V. Grigoryev is huge. He was first researcher who showed the importance of studying these sources for exploring different aspects of the Mongolian Middle Ages, including the religious policy of the Mongols. Because such studies are devoted to specific problems, their historical views turned out to be more thorough and implied a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of a large number of trifles that did not in any way attract the interest of researchers. These works make it clear the reasons for certain actions of the Mongol rulers.

Together with the works of V.V. Grigoryev, the most prominent are the special works of I.N. Berezin, which belong to the device of the Ulus Jochi (Berezin, 1850a). Having studied and published a number of labels of the Golden Horde khans, marking them "as excellent sources for the History of the Golden Horde", Berezin demonstrated excellent knowledge of this topic, analyzed the internal structure of the state and emphasized the nomadic nature of the Golden Horde. Regarding religion, he wrote in his notes: "Gkazy Mufti-Larigga Mshaikhhk Sufi-Larigga". These spiritual Muslim titles are mentioned for the first time in the Uzbek label, where they are translated (both by the scribe, statutory holder and educational people), apparently with some changes. Despite the fact that the Muslim Khans of the Golden Horde tried to maintain tolerance, in accordance with the ancient doctrine of the Mongols, the Muslim clergy apparently enjoyed some special rights in the Horde, because the spiritual Muslims are, and moreover, in a place of honor, between the posts and ranks of the Golden Hordes. Since the Horde had its own administration, the translation of the title "Kazi", meaning a spiritual judge, with the word "scribe" should be correct in the Uzbek label, and the title of Kazi in the Golden Horde gave the right only to resolve spiritual matters, since the Mufti should only take care about the spiritual instruction of his flock: interference in social and political events is not visible and not allowed" (Berezin, 1851: 27).

Exploring the history of the Golden Horde, Berezin approached this issue in accordance with the idealistic principles of the methodology of that time. The historian considered initially the structure of the state mechanism, the system of ranks. The scientific insight of the researcher allowed him to make several valuable generalizations that had high scientific attention.

Thus, describing the general table of the Horde ranks and taxes, based on the translation of the Tarkhan labels given by the Khans to the Clergy, Berezin wrote: "The custom to give different privileges for services existed in all Chingizid estates and all European travelers who visited Mongolian emperors told about the Tarkhans, calling them barons. For exemption from taxes and taxes, special labels were given, generally similar in form: first, the calculation of ranks is carried out, to which the Khan addresses his commandment, and then the Tarkhan privileges are calculated. The Russian Clergy constantly received from the Horde Khans the Tarkhan labels, which originals were lost, and only translations survived." Further, telling about the consequences of Mongolian influence, the historian wrote: "The custom of Tarkhan privileges has also passed to Russia: as a sample of the Russian Tarkhan diploma can be pointed out the letter of Vasily Ioannovich to the clergy and church servants of the Volokolamsk Resurrection Cathedral, in which various Russian taxes and taxes are calculated ... The beginning of the destruction of Tarkhan benefits in Russia was made about in 1549; under Fedor Ioannovich there was ordered the temporary destruction. Alexei Mikhailovich abolished Tarkhanism in 1672; finally, the Tarkhan privilege was destroyed in Russia by Peter the Great" (Berezin, 1850b: 5-6).

The historian expected that for the most in-depth presentation of the Golden Horde history, revealing the essence, revealing the features of the relationship of nomadic and sedentary culture is necessary a subsequent, detailed study of this topic. The work of Berezin, despite some points related to the methodology, plays an important role in the development of this issue. A huge amount of factual material collected and studied by the researcher testifies to his important contribution to science in the pre-revolutionary period.

Veselovsky N.I. made a significant contribution to this problem exploring the problem of Mongolian influence. A famous researcher working at St. Petersburg University, developed a course of lectures on the Mongol conquests. He wrote articles on the religion of the Mongol, for this aim he used sources, in particular Russian chronicles (Veselovsky, 1916: 81-101; 1917). In these works he comparing chronicles and eastern sources interpreted Mongolian polytheism. The researcher interpreted the religious policy of the Mongolian khans as follows: "the liberation of the Russian clergy, like any other, from taxes and duties, proceeded from the Mongol khans out of fear of witchcraft, which, according to the

Mongols, all clergymen possessed, which is why it was necessary to appease them. All ceremonies at the court of khans, obligatory for Russian princes, were based on shamanistic beliefs" (Veselovsky, 2010: 99). These works are solid, quite justified, practically relying on primary sources, but because they were devoted to narrow-profile topics, for some time they were not so widely known.

A huge contribution to the study of the history of the Golden Horde was made by the largest orientalist, archaeologist, numismatist V.G. Tiesenhausen. The "Collection of Materials Relating to the History of the Golden Horde", compiled by the researchers, remains today the most striking and complete publication of written sources (Tiesenhausen, 1884a).

Not wanting to be limited only to Arab authors, Tiesenhausen prepared a selection of extracts from Persian authors of the medieval period, but this work, having lain for a long time in the archives, was published only in 1941. The work of an outstanding researcher is exceptional in that previously such works were simply not published. Understanding the need to search and identify even more sources on the history of the Golden Horde, Tiesenhausen did not agree with the opinion of V.V. Grigoryev that there is no hope of success in the further search for new materials in this area, and only the Golden Horde numismatics can shed light on these studies (Tizengauzen, 1884b: XIII). The collections of V.G. Tizengauzen today are the platform on which any research of Mongolian, Golden Horde history is based, both in our country and abroad. Motivating modern scholars to study this topic in depth, to search for and include more new sources in the scientific circulation, the two-volume work of the researcher again proves his uniqueness.

The period noted by us includes the fundamental works of V.V. Bartold, who studied a large array of Arab, Persian sources. Among the works of the famous orientalist, whose work dates back to the pre and post-revolutionary period, a number of studies on our topic can be distinguished. Bartold approached the consideration of history in the context of global processes, made very deep comparative analyzes, wrote his works in an impartial and conscientious manner. In the works of the researcher, the issue of the collision of Islamic civilization with the Mongolian factor is raised. Several articles by V.V. Bartold is dedicated to the Mongol Empire in the Middle Ages and its khans: Sartaq, Berke, Batu, however, he made a significant emphasis on the confessional peculiarity of these rulers (Bartold, 1918). In his post-revolutionary

studies, the researcher systematically dealt with the issue of the confessional life of the Horde and some other Mongolian states (Bartold, 1963).

Significant achievements in the study of the topic of religion were achieved by a talented orientalist, ethnographer D. Banzarov. He wrote a voluminous work on Mongolian shamanism (Banzarov, 1955). The works of Banzarov are still relevant. Many of his theoretical formulations were highly appreciated. Researchers cite his works now. For a certain chronological period, the scientist's research was not delimited and, nevertheless, the use of his conclusions regarding the religion of the Mongols of the XIII-XIV centuries is quite acceptable. The data that the researcher used in his works are diverse. Manuscripts, ethnographic observations, written sources and others are included there.

Banzarov expressed interesting thoughts about the origin of shamanism: "The black faith of the Mongols came from the same source from which many ancient religious systems were formed; the outer world is nature, the inner world is the spirit of man, and the manifestations of both were the source of the black faith" (Banzarov, 1955a: 52). According to the researcher, the essence of the black faith is the worship of heaven, earth, fire, ongons, the souls of dead people. And the function of the shaman in all this is to be "a priest, a doctor, and a magician or fortuneteller" (Banzarov, 1955b).

An ethnographer, a great connoisseur of the life and life of the Mongolian peoples, Galsan Gomboev, explaining the information of the Italian Franciscan Plano Karpini about some Mongol customs and beliefs, in turn, compared them with the customs of modern Buryats and Mongols (Gomboev, 1859). Galsan Gomboev became a famous researcher, in one of the key areas of the development of Mongolian studies as the study and translation of sources. The work with sources allowed him to consider various aspects of Mongolian history, which was characteristic of Orientalism in the first half of the 19th century.

Despite the small number of works and their specificity, we can say that pre-revolutionary

historians managed to solve a number of complex problems: a more or less objective view of the religious policy of the Mongol khans was formed; in connection with the introduction of a large number of different sources into scientific circulation, a critical view of the problem has formed; there was an understanding that the relationship of the Mongol khans with the conquered peoples was not unambiguous; methods of studying history (positivism) appeared; a calmer view of the activities of the Mongol rulers, including in the field of religious policy, has taken shape. But, nevertheless, there are still no comprehensive answers to some issues of this problem: the origins and reasons for the attitude of the Mongol conquerors to the denominations of the conquered peoples, the reasons for religious tolerance, the role of Yasa in this issue as a legislative base, the influence of the religion of medieval Mongols on the state policy of the Mongol Empire in relation to various faiths, etc.

Conclusion

Thus, as we have already noted, pre-revolutionary historiography is diverse, does not constitute a single whole. We considered it conditionally divided into two groups: review studies; special works devoted to research, translation of sources. After analyzing these works, we determined the characteristics of the assessment of the Mongolian religious policy by researchers. We clarified the approach of pre-revolutionary scientists to the problem. They described the pre-revolutionary conceptual approach and conducted a comparative analysis of the religious policy of the Mongols in the modern period. The conclusions of pre-revolutionary authors became the foundation for subsequent works in this direction, the opinions and hypotheses of many modern authors are also affected by these works. Therefore, we tried to show the continuity of scientific views and those aspects of this problem that have yet to be revealed.

Литература

- Петрушевский И.П. (1952). Рашид ад-Дин. Сборник летописей. Т. 1. Москва- Ленинград, 12 с.
 Архив РАН – Архив Российской академии наук. Ф. 1547. Оп. 1. Д. 92. Тезисы к диссертации А.Н. Насонова «Монголы и Русь. История татарской политики на Руси».
 Якубовский А.Ю. (1953). Из истории изучения монголов периода X-XIII вв. Москва, 95с.
 Каргалов В.В. (1967). Внешнеполитические факторы развития Феодалной Руси. Москва, 266 с.
 Борисов Н.С. (1976). Отечественная историография о влиянии татаро-монгольского нашествия на русскую культуру // Проблемы истории СССР. Москва, 1976. Вып. V. С. 129-130.

- Соловьев К.А. (2001). Дело власти: отечественные историки о властных отношениях в Древней и Средневековой Руси (IX- перв. пол. XV вв.). Москва.
- Лушников О.В. (2009). Монгольская империя в историографии XVIII–XX вв. Казань, 116 с.
- Мухаметов Ф.Ф. (2006). Отечественная историография монгольских завоеваний и Золотой Орды (XIII–XIV вв.). Челябинск, 180 с.
- Борисова Э.О. (2012). Культ обоо в трудах отечественных исследователей // Современные научные исследования: электронный научный журнал. 2012. №10.
- Почекаев Р.Ю. (2009). Вторая империя Монголов: притязания и действительность. // Монгольская и Российская историография Великой Монгольской империи. Улан-Батор. С. 106-113.
- Карамзин Н.М. (1816). История государства Российского. Т.4. Гл. 1. Санкт-Петербург, 498 с.
- Карамзин, – Карамзин Н.М. (1993). История государства Российского. Москва, 198 с.
- Соловьев С.М. (1993). История России с древнейших времен. Т.3. Гл.2. Москва, 768 с.
- Ключевский В.О. (1904). Курс русской истории. Санкт-Петербург, 1146 с.
- Фишер И.(1755) О народе и имени татарском, также о древних Могольцах и их языке// Ежемесячные сочинения к пользе и увеселению служащие. Санкт-Петербург, 1755. С. 421-450.
- Григорьев В.В. (1842).О достоверности ярлыков, данных ханами Золотой Орды русскому духовенству. Историко-филологическоеисследования. Москва, 132 с.
- Неклюдов С.Ю. (1992). Монгольских народов мифология // Мифы народов мира: энциклопедия. Т. 2.Москва.
- Скринникова Т.Д. (1997).Харизма и власть в эпоху Чингис-хана. Москва, 216 с.
- Березин И.Н. (1850).Внутреннее устройство Золотой Орды: (по ханским ярлыкам). Санкт-Петербург, 24с.
- Березин И.Н. (1851).Тарханные ярлыки Тохтамыша, Тимур-Кутлука и Салдет-Гирея. Казань, 56 с.
- Веселовский Н.И. (2010).О религии татар по русским летописям // Веселовский Н.И. Труды по истории Золотой Орды. Казань, 191 с.
- Веселовский Н.И. (1916). Рецензия на книгу М.Д. Приселкова «Ханские ярлыки русским митрополитам» // Журнал Министерства народного просвещения. Петроград, 1917. № 3-4.
- Тизенгаузен В.Г. (1884). Сборник материалов, относящихся к истории Золотой Орды. Извлечения из сочинений арабских. Т.1. XVI. Санкт-Петербург, 564 с.
- Бартольд В.В. (1918).Культура мусульманства. Общий очерк. Петроград, 113 с.
- Бартольд В.В. (1963).Туркестан в эпоху монгольского нашествия // Writings. Т.1. Москва. С. 452-568.
- Банзаров Д. (1955). Черная вера или шаманство у монголов // Банзаров Д. Собрание сочинений. Москва, 376 с.
- Гомбоев Г. (1859). О древних монгольских обычаях и суевериях, описанных у Плано-Карпини // Труды Восточного отделения Ими. Археологического общества. Санкт-Петербург, 1859. Ч. 4. Вып.1. С. 236-256.

References

- Petrushevsky I.P. (1952). Rashid ad-Din. Sbornik letopisei. [Rashid ad-Din. Collection of chronicles]. Т. 1. Moskva-Leningrad, 12 s.
- Arkhiv RAN – Arkhiv Rossiiskoi akademii nauk. [Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences].F.1547. Op. 1. D. 92. Abstracts for the thesis of A.N. Nasonov «Mongols and Rus. The history of the Tatar policy in Russia».
- Yakubovskii A.Yu. (1953). Iz istorii izucheniya mongolov perioda X-XIII vv. [From the history of the study of the Mongols of the period X-XIII centuries].Moskva, 95 s.
- Kargalov V.V. (1967). Vneshnepoliticheskie faktory razvitiya Feodal'noi Rusi. [Foreign policy factors of development of Feudal Russia].Moskva, 266 s.
- Boriso N.S. (1976). Otechestvennaya istoriografiya o vliyaniitataro-mongol'skogo nashestviya na russkuyu kul'turu [Domestic historiography on the influence of the Tatar-Mongol invasion on Russian culture]. Problems of the USSR History. Moskva, 1976. Iss. V. pp. 129-130.
- Solovyev K.A. (2001). Delo vlasti: otechestvennye istoriki o vlastnykh otnosheniyakh v Drevnei i Srednevekovoi Rusi (IX- perv. pol. XV vv.). [The case of power: Russian historians about power relations in Ancient and Medieval Russia (9th-first half of the 15th centuries)]. Moskva.
- Lushnikov O.V. (2009). Mongol'skaya imperiya v istoriografii XVIII–XX vv. [Mongolian empire in historiography of the XVIII – XX centuries]. Kazan', 116 s.
- Mukhametov F.F. (2006). Otechestvennaya istoriografiya mongol'skikh zavoevanii i Zolotoi Ordy (XIII-XIV vv.). [Domestic historiography of the Mongol conquests and the Golden Horde (XIII-XIV centuries)]. Chelyabinsk, 180 s.
- Borisova E.O. (2012). Kul't oboo v trudakh otechestvennykh issledovatelei [Cult obo in the writings of domestic researchers]. Modern scientific research: electronic scientific journal. №10.
- Pochekaev R.Yu. (2009).Vtoraya imperiya Mongolov: prityazaniya i deistvitel'nost'. [The Second Empire of the Mongols: Claims and Reality].Mongolian and Russian historiography of the Great Mongolian Empire.Ulan-Bator. S. 106-113.
- Karamzin N.M. (1816). Istoriya gosudarstva Rossiiskogo. [History of Russian Government]. Т.4. Gl. 1. Sankt-Peterburg, 498 s.
- Karamzin N.M. (1993). Istoriya gosudarstva Rossiiskogo. [History of Russian Government]. Moskva, 198 s.
- Solovyev S.M. (1993). Istoriya Rossii s drevneishikh vremen. [History of Russia since ancient times]. Т.3. Gl.2. Moskva, 768 s.
- Klyuchevskii V.O. (1904). Kursrusskoiiistorii. [Russian history course].Sankt-Peterburg, 1146 s.

Fisher I. (1755). Onarodeiimenitatarskom,takzheodrevnikhMogol'tsakiikhazyke [On the people and the name of the Tatar, as well as the ancient Mogolians and their language]. Monthly writings for the benefit and amusement of the servants. Sankt-Peterburg. S. 421-450.

Grigoryev V.V. (1842). O dostovernosti yarlykov, dannykhkhanami Zolotoi Ordy russkomu dukhovenstvu. Istoriko-filologicheskiesledovaniya. [On the credibility of the labels given by the khans of the Golden Horde to the Russian clergy. Historical and philological studies]. Moskva, 132 s.

Neklyudov S.Yu. (1992). Mongol'skikh narodov mifologiya [Mongolian peoples mythology]. Myths of the peoples of the world: encyclopedia. T. 2. Moskva.

Skrynnikova T.D. Kharizma i vlast' v epokhu Chingis-khana. [Charisma and power in the era of Genghis Khan]. Moskva, 216 s.

Berezin I.N. (1850). Vnutrennee ustroystvo Zolotoi Ordy: (pokhanskimyarkam). [The internal structure of the Golden Horde: (according to Khan labels)]. SPb., 24 s.

Berezin I.N. (1851). Tarkhannye yarlyki Tokhtamysha, Timur-Kutluka i Saldet-Gireya. [Tarkhan labels of Tokhtamysh, Timur-Kutluk and Saldet-Giray]. Kazan', 56 s.

Veselovsky N.I. (2010). O religii tatar po russkim letopisyam [On the religion of the Tatars in the Russian chronicles]. Veselovsky N.I. Works on the history of the Golden Horde. Kazan', 191 s.

Veselovsky N.I. (1917). Retenziya na knigu M.D. Priselkova «Khanskie yarlyki russkim mitropolitam» [Book review of Priselkova "Khan labels to Russian metropolitans"]. Journal of the Ministry of Education. Petrograd, № 3-4.

Tizengauzen V.G. (1884). Sbornik materialov, odnosyashchikhsya k istorii Zolotoi Ordy. Izvlecheniya iz sochinenii arabskikh. [Collection of materials relating to the history of the Golden Horde. Extracts from Arab writings]. T.I. XVI. SPb., 564 s.

Bartold V.V. (1918). Kul'tura musul'manstva. Obshchii ocherk. [Culture of Islam. General essay].Petrograd, 113 s.

Bartold V.V. (1963). Turkestan v epokhu mongol'skogo nashestviya [Turkestan in the era of the Mongol invasion]. Sochineniya. T.I. Moskva, 452-568 s.

Banzarov D. (1955). Chernaya vera ili shamanstvo u mongolov [Black faith or shamanism among the Mongols].Banzarov D. Collected Works. Moskva,376 s.

Gomboev G. (1859). O drevnikh mongol'skikh obyayakh i sueveriyakh, opisannykh u Plano-Karpini [About the ancient Mongol customs and superstitions described in Plano-Carpini]. Proceedings of the Eastern branch of Them. Archaeological Society. Spb. Ch. 4. Vyp.1. S. 236-256.