Anna Makariev, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, in the Reviews of Contemporaries and Descendant

Abstract: this article observes the reviews of contemporaries and descendant of Makarius (Bulgakov), metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, about his monumental work «The history of the Russian church».
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The Russian church is rich in outstanding researchers. Among them are Metropolitan of Kiev Evgeny (Bolkhovitinov), Archbishop of Chernigov Filaret (Gumilevsky) Professor of the Theological Academies Evgeny Golubinsky, Peter Znamensky, Alexander Gorsky and many others. But, undoubtedly, Makarius (Bulgakov), Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, occupies a very special place among them in Russian church historiography.

His 12th-volume monumental work «The History of the Russian Church» has still not lost its relevance and continues to be a fundamental work in the field of Russian church history.
In his «History of the Russian Church», as well as in the theological work «Orthodox-Dogmatic Theology», Makarius was the founder of a new direction in Russian church science – the method of systematic presentation of a material. The pre-existing works on church history and dogmatics were either separate, unrelated treatises, or partly related to each other. One of the main merits of the metropolitan as a scientist is precisely that he managed to link the disparate materials of theological disciplines into a complete and integrated system, connected by a single semantic line.

It must be noted that «The History of the Russian Church» is not the first work on church history by Metropolitan Macarius. The first was an essay on the history of the Kiev Theological Academy that was paid much attention by scientists. Then in 1846 was published the «History of Christianity in Russia before the Equal-to-the-Apostles Prince Vladimir as an Introduction to the History of the Russian Church». Later, in 1847, the work of the Metropolitan «Essay on the History of the Russian Church» appeared in the period of pre-Tatar: 988–1240». Subsequently, the last two works were reworked into the «History of the Russian Church».

The work of the Metropolitan was recognized and approved in his lifetime by the majority of church and secular sientists. But, nevertheless, there were those who criticized his work.

It is worth noting that before the monumental work of Metropolitan Macarius on the history of the Russian Church, a similar experience was written by His Eminence Filaret (Gumilevsky). I. A. Chistovich recognized the «History...» of Makarius significantly superior to the «History...» of Filaret «in completeness; accuracy in the presentation of events, the rigor of conclusions and impartiality in assessing events, individuals and characters simplicity, thoroughness and general understanding of the presentation» [5, p. 72–78].

Russian historian M. P. Pogodin has already recognized the introductory volume of Makarius' work of 1846 as «a brilliant proof of... maturity» [4; p. 65]. of our church-historical science. Later he wrote about the fourth and fifth volumes: "... your book should be read at the market and become the desk book of every educated person» [9, p. 311–312].
But along with praise, Makarius also came across some critical remarks, among which there was a lack of references to the primary sources in the first part, devoted to the history of Christianity in the Caucasus and Crimea [3, p. 82–84]. And more serious criticism was expressed by His Eminence Filaret (Gumilevsky), who reproached Makarius for inaccuracies and even mixing of canonical and apocryphal books, which, in the opinion of the biographer of Metropolitan Fedor Titov, questioned not only the scientific competence of the researcher, but his orthodoxy.

In this case, perhaps, in Filaret (Gumilevsky) scientific jealousy began to speak, since his own work on the history of the Russian Church was much less perfect and systematic. Makarius himself spoke of Filaret's «History...» in a letter to Innokenty Khersonsky: «It although is accurately learned, but is very short, without a general idea, without the spirit of consistency, and more like a simple beautiful story... and therefore still makes want a better one, worthy history of our Church...» [10; p. 805].

In 1857, the first three volumes of The History of the Russian Church were published and immediately became the subject of criticism. Released in 1866, the fourth and fifth volumes of the «History of the Russian Church» Metropolitan Macarius were met, in the words of Metropolitan Fedor Titov, a biographer, also «sympathetically» Russian scientists and especially historians.

Ustryalov wrote to Archbishop Makarius: «Yesterday I read most of the fourth volume and can safely say that we did not have a church history written in such a harmonious manner, with such knowledge of facts, with such impartiality and clarity in the smallest details And, to the completion of everything, in such an engaging syllable» [9; p. 312].

It should be noted that the favorable reviews of contemporaries were very important for Metropolitan Makarius as evidence of the demand for his scientific activity and gave him the strength to continue his work with even greater jealousy and speed for the benefit of people. And even many years after the death of Metropolitan Macarius, the researchers recognized that «in terms of the richness of the actual content and the documentary nature of the presentation, this monumental work (The History of the Russian Church») remains unsurpassed until now» [1; p. 236].

This evaluation is also repeated by the author of one of the latest studies on the history of the Church, A.V. Kartashov: «The outstanding dignity of the monumental
creation of Metropolitan Makarius is his not yet surpassed factual fullness, thanks to which it represents for historians of the Russian Church such a treasure trove of special knowledge, The history of S.M. Solovyov for the general history of Russia. The actual completeness is also connected with the novelty of the materials put into the scientific turnover, especially in the exposition of the ancient period» [6; p. 28].

It will be fair to note that over the past century and a half since the death of Metropolitan Makarius, many new archaeological discoveries have been made, and therefore some of the scientist's reports demanded clarification. But, in general, the work of the Metropolitan continues to be the main one on the problem of the history of Christianity in the territory of Russia.
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