
HISTORY OF SIBERIA

© N. S. GRUZDEVA, V. YA. TEMPLING

nadezhda-gruzdeva@yandex.ru, tmp1@mail.ru

UDC 94:271.2 (571.12).07

POLEMICS OVER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDOSEYAN AND FILIPPIAN «SOGLASIYE» IN THE TYUMEN FILIPPOVTSY COMMUNITY (END OF THE XIXth CENTURY)

SUMMARY. The present article characterizes the internal state of communities of Old Believers on the basis of the analysis of original writings made by leaders of the Filippian strain of Old Believers in the late 19th century, V. Makarov and I. Kundyukov. Controversies between individual factions are revealed. Several mainly disputable topics are distinguished: presence of the cross on thuribles, the inscription on the cross, the attitude towards "starozheny". The range of the controversial topics is narrowed. They were limited to only small parts of ritual practices and lead not only to ideological disassociation in the communities of Tyumen and its nearest districts, which were once close to one another, but also to their internal separation and fragmentation. This phenomenon may indicate the existence of deep systemic changes in the communities of Old Believers, which reflect the state of the Russian society at the turn of the 20th century. The hypothesis is made that the situation in Moscow's "Bratskiy Dvor", the center of the Filippian confession, influenced the state of peripheral communities.

KEY WORDS. Old Believers, ideology, belief system, controversy, break of Old Believers.

As a result of the first major division among Old Believers in the late 17th century, two strains were formed: the Popovtsy (those who recognized the priesthood) and the Bezpopovtsy (those who rejected priests). The Vygovsky monastery became the spiritual center of the Bezpopovtsy. Shortly, as a result of disagreements on some issues of concern, Feodosiy Vasiliyev and then the "teacher" Filipp detached themselves from the Pomorian soglasiye (creed) of the Bezpopovtsy, thus forming new strains later called after them: Fedoseyans and Filippians. The doctrines of these confessions differed from the Pomorian soglasiye in their radicalism, which was manifested in an uncompromising attitude towards the institutions of the state [1; 26]. They also observed strict asceticism.

Despite the fact that the Fedoseyan and Filippian movements were considered related to each other, there were a number of significant differences and, as a result, disagreements concerning dogmatic questions and matters of ritual practice. These controversial points include: the inscription on the cross, the attitude towards goods purchased in the market, indulgence in the matter of marriage.

In our opinion, the relationship between confessions throughout the 18th — 19th centuries was determined by the positions of their leaders — if they were inclined to compromise and were willing to “turn a blind eye” to some of the differences in doctrine, then peace agreements were signed which, so to speak, verified the friendly intentions of the Old Believers towards each other. On the contrary, a radically-minded leader cut short any initiatives of peaceful coexistence of the confessions.

The problem of the relationship between confessions within the Bespopovtsy has been studied sporadically. Attention was given to the disunity of the Old Believers and their constant fragmentation was noted. Only the initial period of the controversy between Pomorians and Fedoseyans was thoroughly studied. The works by P.S. Smirnov are dedicated to disputes and disagreements among the Old Believers in general, including the questions that caused difference of opinions and controversy between Pomorians and Fedoseyans [2]. P.D. Iustinov focused on the history of the Fedoseyan soglasiye in comparison with the history of the Pomorian soglasiye [3]. These researchers were the first to notice the undulating nature of the relationship between Fedoseyans and Pomorians that was accompanied by divisions and reconciliations, but the Filippian soglasiye went unconsidered. However, P.D. Iustinov and P.S. Smirnov must be given credit for introducing a vast number of scholarly sources for the study of the Old Believers.

Further study of this issue was resumed only at the end of the 20th century. A.I. Maltsev studied in detail the relationship between the three closely related confessions, Pomorians, Filippians and Fedoseyans [4]. Referencing the works of the Old Believers, the scholar concluded that “periods of rapprochement between the confessions and attempts at making ecclesiastical peace alternated with deadly enmity and bitter controversy between representatives of the confessions from the 17th to the first half of the 19th centuries” [5].

One of the polemical writings of the Tyumen mentor V.I. Makarov was the subject of an article by N.S. Guryanova [6].

M.V. Pershina studies the ideology of the Filippian soglasiye of the 19th century [7]. She assumes that in Bratsky dvor Filippians comprised two groups opposed in their relationship towards Fedoseyans — loyal and radical. Makarov, according to the researcher, was inclined to the position of the former. This was perhaps the reason he became an outspoken advocate of the kinship of the two confessions and regarded the representatives of the Fedoseyan soglasiye as co-religionists.

The absence of peace between the confessions engendered ambivalence between their representatives. Disputes did not cease even at the end of the 19th century. The polemic between Varsofony Ivanovich Makarov, the mentor of the Filippian community of Tyumen, and Ivan Grigoryevich Kundukov, the leader of the Filippian group of

the village of Kuliga, demonstrates this clearly. Their discussion can be traced with the help of a series of works which deal with the controversy among Filippians concerning Fedoseyans, found among the collections of the Old Believers of sets of manuscript books of Novosibirsk and Tyumen* [8].

At the present time four works that reflect the controversy between Tyumen's Filippians and Fedoseyans are known: "Questions from the Tyumen to the Kuliga community" 1881 (14/74; folio 468v-490v); "Varsonofy's answers to Ivan's questions" August 12, 1885 (5/72; folio 1-69v); "Questions from Varsonofy Ivanov to Ivan Grigoryevich" 1886 (9201/2; folio 450-493v); "Questions from adherents of orthodoxy to the oppugnant and those who praise Fedosey" 1885** (2/77; folio 873-883v). Three of these belonged to V.I. Makarov and one to his opponent, I.G. Kundukov. In terms of chronology, all the works are from the 1880s. "Questions from the Tyumen to the Kuliga community" (1881) is addressed by Makarov to a group of old believers, including references to "Ivan Fedorovich, Grigory Gerasimovich, Ivan Grigoryevich and Vasily Grigoryevich". "Questions from adherents of orthodoxy to the oppugnant and those who praise Fedosiy" (1885) was written by Ivan Grigoryevich and directed to Varsonofy Ivanovich. "Varsonofy's answers to Ivan's questions" (1885) featured Makarov's answers to the questions found in "Questions from adherents of orthodoxy...". "Questions from Varsonofy Ivanov to Ivan Grigoryevich" (1886) complete the selection.

This paper considers "Questions from the Tyumen to the Kuliga community" and "Questions from Varsonofy Ivanov to Ivan Grigoryevich".

N.S. Guryanova, a researcher from Novosibirsk, believes that the last name of Makarov's opponent, Ivan Grigoryevich was "Kabanov". However, a more detailed study of texts of the collection showed that Ivan Grigoryevich's last name most likely was "Kundukov" [9; 130].

"Questions from the Tyumen to the Kuliga community" was written by Makarov from April 30 to May 6, 1881 (14/74; folio 468v; folio 490v). The work consisted of 28 questions. Every question was preceded by an "evidence" — a clearly formulated idea of the author, often with reliance on authoritative sources such as Gospels, tsvetniks (collections of extracts and references from articles written for polemic purposes), articles of old believers' convocations (of both pan-Russian and local scales), icons.

* The complex consists of four collections, three of which are stored in Novosibirsk in the Collection of manuscripts and early printed books of the Institute of History of the Siberian Department of the Russian Academy of Sciences (collections 13/74, 14/74, 2/77 and the continuation of the third collection — the manuscript 5/72, now an independent storage unit), the fourth collection is stored in the department of rare books in the Tyumen Museum of Local Lore (9201/2). All the collections have consecutive pagination. Further references to folios of the collections will be given in parentheses with cipher specification.

** In the "Description" the creation date is specified as 1887, but "answers" could not be written before "questions" written in 1885. Therefore, it is assumed to be an error and the actual date of the writing is 1885.

The core of the polemical writings was the disputes about the cross on the thurible and cross-shaped incense. Varsonofy Ivanovich sought to justify the presence of the cross on the thurible and cross-shaped incense. He supported his first "evidence" with a reference to images of icons: «na svjatyh ikonah, na mednolitnyh i na drevlepismennyh, obraz Uspenija Presvjatyja Bogorodicy kazhdenie...javno nam izobrazheno, jako krestoobrazno sut'» (Holy icons, both brass and wooden, displaying the image of the Assumption of the Holy Virgin, clearly show that the sign of the cross is made of incense) (14/74; folio 468v).

Makarov, noting that among the Old Believers "since the beginning of belief" cross-shaped incense and thuribles with crosses had been common, referred to the lack of information from authoritative sources about their banning. «I sie javno videti daet, ot samogo nachala hristianskija very i do nastojashhego vremeni v hristianeh takovyh prederzatelej ne bylo, chtoby kto s kadir'nic kresty ubiral. A kadir'nicy, viditsja, chto s nachala very s krestami, potomu chto eshhe i pri uspenii vladychicy takovaja byla so krestom kadir'nica» (This makes it plain to see that from the beginning of the Christian faith to the present day there was no such impudence among Christians to remove the cross from the thurible. And thuribles, in all likelihood, had crosses from the beginning of faith, because even in the time of the incense of the Holy Virgin there was such a thurible.) (14/74; folio 469v).

The content of the letter indicates that the representatives of the Tyumen and the Kuliga communities were amicable to each other until a group of Kuligians asked a question about the attitude towards Fedoseyans and began to demonstrate their uncompromising attitude towards the old believers who treated Fedoseyans as representatives of a related confession. We consider the strong denunciation of the position of loyal Filippians and detachment from recent co-religionists and accusing them of heresy as demonstrative behavior. Responding to the accusations, Makarov appealed to the recent peaceful relations between the communities of Tyumen and Kuliga, the prayer fellowship between the groups led by Ivan Grigoryevich with Filippians, a part of Old Believers. «Ashhe li vy sebja pochtite tako, chto do sego vremja byli ne hristiane, zatem chto vmeste s temi byli, u kogo kresty na kadir'nicah, to gde zhe do sih por vera byla. Pri tom zhe obshhestve imejushhihsja kadir'nic so krestami i kazhenija krestoobraznago, necii iz vas byvshii vo otstuplenii ot very i primirjalis' k tomu obshhestvu hristijanskomu, v kotorom imejutsja kresty na kadir'nicah i kotory primirjali vas v soedinenie ko hristianam i te pomerli bez razdelu, oni s nami vmeste, edina cerkov' i telo, ne razdelilis' za kresty, chto oni na kadir'nicah» (If you treated yourselves as if you were not Christians until now, because you had been with those who had crosses on thuribles, then where was the faith hitherto? In the same company of the existing thuribles with crosses and cross-shaped incense, those of you who were in unorthodoxy and reconciled to the Christian community that has crosses on thuribles and introduced you to Christians, they died with no division, they are together with us, Church and body are one, they did not divide because of crosses on thuribles) (14/74; folio 473v).

The dispute over the inscription on the cross revolved around its formula. Fedoseyans suggested the so-called “Pilate’s titlo” — I.H.I.C. (Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews), which was not accepted by either Fedoseyans or Filippians, who preferred the inscription I.X.I.C. (Jesus Christ the King of Glory). The debate lasted for a long time. Fedoseyans constantly searched for ancient crosses with a “Pilate’s titlo”, however, they were unsuccessful and the controversy did not cease. Varsonofy Ivanovich noted the search for the confirmation of the correct inscription on the cross «A ob onoj Pilatom napisannoj title voobrazhali li eju v drevlepravoslavnoj cerkvi chetyr’mi bukvami svjatii na obrazech krestnyh, o sem dostovernyh svidetel’stv ishhem; da togo radi i pisati teh bukv opasaemsja, ponezhe u drevnih svjatyh voobrazheny ne obretaem. A kogda priluchitsja nam byti v strannyh i obretajushhimsja u nih zhivotvorjashhim krestam s podpisaniem: car’ slavy Isus Hristos nika. Ashhe i titla na teh zhe krestah chetyrmi bukvami voobrazhena, i tem zhivotvorjashhim krestam poklonenie tvorim i inem sovetuem poklonenie tvoriti» (As for the aforesaid titlo written by Pilate, we are searching for good evidence whether it was used in Old Orthodoxy to put the four holy letters on crosses; we sometimes fear to write these letters, inasmuch as we do not see the confirmation in the images of ancient saints. And when it befalls us to find in our journey the holy cross with the inscription: Jesus Christ the King of Glory. If there is also the titlo on these crosses, we honor these holy crosses and suggest to honor them) (14/74; folio 477).

Varsonofy Ivanovich then, as a sign of peaceful relations between the communities of Tyumen and Kuliga, gave examples of Old Believers’ visits to one another. «Vremjanno priezzhali pri moej bytnosti v Tjumen’ Artemij Stepanovich i Ivan Emel’janovich* i molilis’ s nami s tjumenskimi vmeste i kadili kadil’nicami kaki u nas v Tjumeni imejutsja, a osobyh kadil’nic radi svoego priezdu ne trebovali i kresty s kadil’nic ne ubirali. No i kadili kogda Artemej Stepanovich i Ivan Emel’janovich, to so obvozheniem, a kogda Martin Tarasovich kadil, to krestoobrazno, no obache za eto cerkov’ ne razdelili nadvoe i tako bez razdelu i pomerli» (There was a time when, in my presence, Artemy Stepanovich and Ivan Emelyanovich visited Tyumen and prayed together with us and used incense with the thuribles we had in Tyumen and did not require any special thuribles for their visit and did not remove the crosses from the thuribles. Artemy Stepanovich and Ivan Emelyanovich used incense with an outline, Martin Tarasovich used incense crossways, but the church was not divided in two because of that and they died with no division) (14/74; folio 479v).

Varsonofy Ivanovich’s ultimate goal of addressing his opponents was to unite and prevent yet another fragmentation of the confession. A positive attitude was demonstrated: «vas ne branili i ne branim za zastarelye obychai» (you were not scolded and we do not scold you for obsolete habits) (14/74; folio 489v). The author concluded in the “Nadsloviye” (conclusion): «Togo radi molju vas, bratie, da ostanemsja bez razdorov...no prebudem v ljubvi i Bog s nami prebudet» (I pray, brethren, let us be

* Artemy Stepanovich Lazarev, the leader of the Filippian community of Old Believers in Kulakovo. He was a fairly credible mentor and a competent reader.

without strife... but abide in love and the name of God will be upon us) (14/74; folio 489v – 490). However, he insisted on a return to the old custom: «da i v tom eshhe prosim vas s kotoryh kadil'nic kresty snjali, postavte ih opjat' na svoe mesto, potomu chto v pisanii ne viditsja togo, chtob zastavleno bylo ubirat' kresty s kadil'nic» (But we ask you to put the crosses that you removed from thuribles back to their places, because the Holy Books did not suggest removing crosses from thuribles) (14/74; folio 490).

The first message by Makarov was addressed to a group of Old Believers, subsequently only Ivan Grigoryevich Kundukov spoke on behalf of Kuliga Filippians.

“Questions from Varsonofy Ivanov to Ivan Grigoryevich” was started in March 31, 1886 (9201/2; folio 451). Makarov’s position was already given in the preamble to the writing: «Az greshnyj i nedostojnyj i nepotrebnij Varsanofej nachinaju pisati vseprevozljublenneshemu moemu bratu, izhe nekogda byvshemu so mnoju edinomyslennomu sotrudniku i vo blagih pospeshniku, nyne zhe soprotivne na mja sostavshemu, Ivanu Grigor'evichju ot mene i ot edinomyslennyh so mnoju bratii ot pravoslavnyh hristijan kratkija nashi voprosy» (I, sinful and unworthy and obscene Varsonofy, am starting to write brief questions to my dearest brother, who was once of one mind with me, now turned against me, Ivan Grigoryevich, from me and my brothers of one mind, Orthodox Christians) (9201/2; folio 450).

In the given extract the sorrow over the arisen disagreements is visible. Another attempt is made to soften Ivan Grigoryevich’s stand by “Christian love”. Makarov’s loyalty manifests itself both in the attitude towards Fedoseyans and in the fact that his writings do not contain harsh criticism of his opponent. The main tool of the Tyumen mentor is his erudition.

This text helps to reconstruct the chronology of the conflict. Makarov indicates that Ivan Grigoryevich formed a group of supporters and separated from the community of his co-religionists in 1883.

The central theme of Makarov’s text is the attitude towards Fedoseyans, whether to treat them as heretics or to accept them as representatives of a confession close to Filippians.

Varsonofy Ivanovich backed up his argument with an extract from the preface of the “Tyumen Articles” of 1805, which consolidated the relationship between the Filippians and Fedoseyans of Tyumen: «Po obshhemu sovetu vseh hristijan sobravshijsja v gorode Tjumene u nekoego bogoljubca i sovoproshalis' besedoju ot bozhestvennago pisanija o dogmateh cerkovnyh i obychaeh ot drevleposledujushhih. *I polozhilis' my soborne vsi na edino obshhee s temi, koi priderzhalis' feodosievyh soglasii vsi so utverzheniem, chtoby nam posledovat' prezhnim stradalcem i uchitelem cerkovnym, kotorye za drevlecerkovnoe blagochestie ot Nikona i ego novoljubcev i zhizn' svoju okonchishe*» (by general council of all Christians that gathered in the city of Tyumen in the house of a believer and discussed the Holy Books and dogma and rituals from the old adherents, *we all relied on what is common with those who adhere to the Fedoseyan soglasiye* (the author’s notes are in italics) everyone with

the claim to follow the erstwhile martyr and mentor, who perished due to Nikon and his accomplices for canonical devotion) (9201/2; folio 454).

Unlike Makarov, Ivan Grigoryevich stuck to more radical views. He treated Fedoseyans as heretics. Ivan Grigoryevich put emphasis on accusing Makarov and his co-religionists of non-compliance with the prescribed rules and the introduction of new ones, to which he attributed the cross on the thurible and the cross-shaped incense, virtually accusing them of heresy.

Thus, the controversy between Filippians came a long way, from minor ritual differences to a break in relations and accusations of heresy. The position of Ivan Grigoryevich did not change — he firmly remained in the position of rejecting Fedoseyans, despite all the peace agreements between confessions and even the decisions of the local Tyumen convocation (1805), which clearly stated the unity of Filippians and Fedoseyans. Kundukov was radical in his views, harsh and unyielding in controversy.

Varsonofy Ivanovich was loyal both in his views and debate. He patiently answered his opponent's questions and, in the case of an absence of response from his opponent, wrote new questions bringing new arguments, which apparently did not produce the desired effect — reunification with the detached part of the Filippian community of Kuliga.

Another important fact in the study of this debate is that Moscow's "Bratsky Dvor", which became the coordinating center of the Filippian soglasiye in the mid-18th century, in the 1870s-1890s disintegrated into two groups — supporters of a more tolerant attitude towards Fedoseyans and "starozheny" (persons who entered into marriage before joining the Bespopovtsy community rejecting marriage) and their uncompromising opponents. M.V. Pershina concluded that V.I. Makarov was congenial to the position of loyal policy towards Fedoseyans, which is confirmed by the given debate. Perhaps on a regional level, it reflected the situation at the heart of the "Bratsky Dvor" confession. M.V. Pershina suggests that in the debate between two Filippian groups, the group with more radical views towards Fedoseyans had an advantage [10; 31].

In 1882, in the village Popovka near the city of Kolomna, a convocation of Old Believers was held, which adopted a resolution establishing strict rules of accepting Fedoseyans from Vologda. This confirmed the victory of the radical group of "Bratsky Dvor".

Article 15 of the Moscow convocation of 1895 stated: «Tjumenskoj mestnosti hristijane nekoliko chelovek prinjaty bysha v Cerkvi hristovoj s 4-desjatym postom, posledi zhe okazasja, chto u nih bolee 30-ti let potomstvennyja pravoslavnyja krestiteli prekratilis', a zastupili ih prolazom vshedshija k nim fedoseevcy. S teh por i nachalos' kreshhenie v nih fedoseevskoe» (several Christians of the Tyumen area visited the Christian church during the forty day fast, subsequently it became known that they had not had hereditary orthodox baptizers for 30 years and their place was taken by Fedoseyans. It was then that Fedoseyan baptism started for them) [10; 32]. The authors of the decree named Artemy Stepanovich as the last "legitimate" Baptist.

In our opinion, the relationship between confessions throughout the 18th and 19th centuries was determined by the positions of their leaders — if they were inclined to compromise and were willing to “turn a blind eye” to some of the differences in the doctrines, then peace agreements were signed which, so to speak, verified the friendly intentions of the Old Believers towards each other. On the contrary, a radically-minded leader cut short any initiatives of peaceful coexistence of the confessions.

It is clear, though, that in the second half of the 19th century the Old Believers departed from the discussion of important dogmatic and historical issues. Discussions related to minor details of ritual practice led to fragmentation of the confession, which may signify a spiritual crisis among the Old Believers. Minor items not only aroused ongoing disputes, but also caused fragmentation of the Old Believers into a number of groups, communities and doctrines.

Under the guise of the defense of the “true faith”, rules of rites of reception were toughened, a return to the old radical positions was noted, which alienated the Old Believers, causing them to wonder whether the chosen “faith”, confession and doctrine were true. This resulted in fragmentation, the formation of even smaller groups, or a search for like-minded people to unite with and to oppose the radical part of the Old Believers.

It is unclear yet, whether these regional divisions were due to the opposition of the two groups in “Bratsky Dvor” with the dominance of the radical one, or if there were deeper causes that inevitably led to crisis among Old Believers.

REFERENCES

1. Milovidov, V.F. Old Believers in the past and the present (Starobryadchestvo v proshlom i nastoyashchem). Moscow, 1969. 112 p.
2. Smirnov, P.S. Controversy and division in the Russian Schism in the first quarter of the XVIIIth century (Spory i razdeleniya v russkom raskole v pervoy chetverty XVIII v.). St. Petersburg, 1909; Smirnov, P.S. Disputes in the schism in the second quarter of the XVIIth I century // Christian reading. 1911. No. 1. Pp. 50-73; No. 2. Pp. 168-195; No. 3. P. 325-352; No. 4. Pp. 451-490.
3. Iustinov, P.D. Fedoseevschina inter vivos of its founder (Fedoseyevshchina pri zhizni ee osnovatelya) // Christian reading. 1906. No. 2. Pp. 256-281; No. 3. Pp. 391-414; No. 4. Pp. 604-615; Iustinov, P.D. To the history of Fedoseevsky wing (K istorii fedoseyevskogo tolka) // Bogoslovsky vestnik. 1910. No. 9. Pp. 135-148; No. 11. Pp. 483-497; No. 12. Pp. 680-694, 1911. No. 5. Pp. 194-208.
4. Maltsev, A.I. Old Believers’ “soglasiya” without priests in the XVIIIth — early XIXth centuries: The problem of relationships (Starobryadcheskiye bespopovskiye soglasiya v XVIII — nachale XIX v.: problema vzaimootnosheniy). Novosibirsk: «Sova» publ., 2006. 573 p.
5. Maltsev, A.I. Problems, concerning relations between Filippian and Pomeranian Old Believers’ “soglasiya” in the second half of the XVIII century (Problemy vzaimootnoshenij starobryadcev filippovskogo i pomorskogo soglasij vo vtoroj polovine XVIII v.) // Sources on the basis of Russian history and literature: The Middle Ages and modern times. Novosibirsk: Publishing House of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2000. P. 139-154.

6. Guryanov, N.S. To the history of relations between the Filippian and Fedoseyan “soglasija” (K istorii vzaimootnoshenij mezhdru filippovskim i fedoseevskim soglasijami) // Humanities in Siberia. No. 3. 2003. Pp. 59-63.

7. Pershina, M.V. Discussion over the attitude towards marriage in Filippian “soglasije” in the end of the XIXth century (Obsuzhdenie voprosa otnoshenija k braku v filippovskom soglasii v konce XIX v.) // Humanities yearbook. Novosibirsk, 2005. No. 6. C. 03.11; Pershina, M.V. Fraternal yard and regional communities of Filippian “soglasije” in the second half of the XIXth century (Bratskij dvor i regional’nye obshhiny filippovskogo soglasija vo vtoroj polovine XIX v.) // Humanities in Siberia. No. 3. 2006. Pp. 28–33; Pershina, M.V. Filippian community in Tyumen and Fraternal yard (Filippovskaja obshhina g. Tjumeni i Bratskij dvor) // Humanities in Siberia. No. 3. 2009. Pp. 19–23.

8. Description of collections: Belyaeva, D.C., Panich, T.V., Titova, L.V. Description of Tyumen Old Believers’ collections of manuscripts of IliiF of the USSR and the USU (Opisanie tjumenskikh staroobradcheskih sbornikov iz rukopisnyh sobranij IliiF SO AN SSSR i UrGU) // Sources based on the history of social thought and culture of late feudalism. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1988. Pp. 156–268. Templing, V.Y. «Nachah pisat’ sii stat’i v pol’zu dushespasitel’nuju chtushhim...» (Old Believer scribe V.I. Makarov) // Journal of Tyumen State University, 1999. No. 2. Pp. 162–167.

9. Gruzdeva, N. S., Arguments and divisions in Filippian community of Old Believers in Tyumen and Tavatuy village at the end of 80s — beginning of 90s of the XXth century (Spory i razdelenija v filippovskoj obshhine staroobradcev g. Tjumeni i s. Tavatuj v konce 80-h — nachale 90-h gg. XIX veka) // Old Belief in Tyumen Region in the 17th — 21th centuries. No. 2. 2008. P. 128-144.

10. Pershina, M. V. Fraternal Yard... P. 31.