

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32653/CH19411110-1123>



Research paper

Abbaz D. Osmaev,
Dr. Sci., Chief Researcher
H.I. Ibragimov Complex Research Institute of RAS, Grozny, Russia
osmaev@mail.ru

Evgenia M. Goryushina,
Cand. Sci. (Politics), Researcher
Center for Comprehensive European and International Studies (CCEMI),
Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
egoryushina@hse.ru

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF TAYP'S COLLECTIVE MEMORY IN THE POST-CONFLICT CHECHEN REPUBLIC

Abstract. This article discusses the formation of collective memory within Chechen *tayps*, focusing on the underlying mechanisms of this process. It investigates the development of *tayp* identity and the preservation of traditions in the post-conflict era of the Chechen Republic. The study employs content analysis of 24 sources related to Chechen *tayps*. The objective is to explore the collective memory of *tayps*, which underwent significant changes from the Late Middle Ages to the first half of the 19th century, yet remains a steadfast marker of Chechen identity. The subject of investigation is the mechanism of creating, altering, and transmitting collective memory within a *tayp*. Historically, the formation of *tayps'* collective memory relied heavily on oral sources. However, as a result of the deportation of 1944 and the subsequent political crisis in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, *tayps* experienced substantial loss of their traditional material culture and were partially or completely disconnected from their original places of residence. During the post-conflict restoration period of the Chechen Republic, there has been a renewed interest in the history, genealogy, and societal role of *tayps*. While oral sources were previously sufficient for transmitting this knowledge, the growing public demand has led to an increase in scientific and journalistic publications. The institutionalization of *tayp's* collective memory in modern Chechen society is achieved through the publication of books, essays, and articles about its history, the establishment of internet sites and social media groups, as well as the revival of ancestral towers and villages abandoned in 1944. To strengthen the *tayp* identity among its members, modern communication tools are utilized, enabling them to maintain contact regardless of their geographical location or country of residence.

Keywords: collective memory; group; *tayp*; institutionalization; Chechen Republic; crisis; post-conflict era.

For citation: Osmaev A.D., Goryushina E.M. Institutionalization of *Tayp's* Collective Memory in the Post-Conflict Chechen Republic. *History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Caucasus*. 2023. Vol. 19. N.4. P. 1095-1109. doi.org/10.32653/CH1941095-1109

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32653/CH1941110-1123>



Исследовательская статья

Осмаев Аббаз Догиевич

д.и.н., главный научный сотрудник

Комплексный научно-исследовательский институт им. Х.И. Ибрагимова РАН, Грозный,
Россия

osmaev@mail.ru

Горюшина Евгения Михайловна

к.полит.н., научный сотрудник

Центр комплексных европейских и международных исследований (ЦКЕМИ)

НИУ ВШЭ, Москва, Россия

egoryushina@hse.ru

ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛИЗАЦИЯ КОЛЛЕКТИВНОЙ ПАМЯТИ ТАЙПОВ/БРАТСТВ В ПОСТКОНФЛИКТНОЙ ЧЕЧЕНСКОЙ РЕСПУБЛИКЕ

Аннотация. В статье анализируется формирование коллективной памяти в чеченском тайпе. Цель – анализ основных механизмов этого процесса. Изучены особенности формирования тайповой идентичности и сохранения традиций в условиях постконфликтного развития Чеченской Республики. В исследовании использовался контент-анализ 24 источников, касающихся чеченских тайпов. Объектом исследования выступает коллективная память тайпа, претерпевшего кардинальные изменения ещё в Позднее Средневековье – первой половине XIX в., но сохраняющегося как устойчивый маркер чеченской идентичности. Предмет исследования – механизм создания, изменения и передачи коллективной памяти внутри тайпа. Процесс формирования коллективной памяти тайпа базировался в прошлом преимущественно на устных источниках. Отмечено, что в результате депортации 1944 г. и политического кризиса конца XX – начала XXI в. тайпы потеряли большую часть традиционной материальной культуры, частично или полностью были оторваны от мест своего проживания. В период постконфликтного восстановления Чеченской Республики вновь возникает интерес к истории тайпа, его генеалогии, роли в повседневности чеченского социума. Если ранее было достаточно устных источников для ретрансляции этих знаний, то теперь общественный спрос обусловил рост числа научных и публицистических публикаций. Институционализация коллективной памяти тайпа в современном чеченском обществе осуществляется посредством издания книг, очерков, статей о его истории, создания интернет-сайтов, групп в социальных сетях, а также с помощью возрождения родовых башен и сел, покинутых в 1944 г. Для укрепления тайповой идентичности между его представителями используются современные средства коммуникации, позволяющие поддерживать связь независимо от региона или страны проживания.

Ключевые слова: коллективная память; группа; тайп; институционализация; Чеченская Республика; кризис; постконфликтный период

Для цитирования: Осмаев А.Д., Горюшина Е.М. Институционализация коллективной памяти тайпов/братств в постконфликтной Чеченской Республике // История, археология и этнография Кавказа. 2023. Т. 19. № 4. С. 1010-1123. doi.org/10.32653/CH1941010-1123

During periods of political crises, there is an amplified significance placed on the past, which “resurfaces with heightened intensity” [1]. The various crises and transformations experienced in the latter half of the 20th century have sparked a renewed interest in “collective memory” and a general “yearning for remembrance” [2].

Given that collective memory is not a linear process and is influenced by contemporary realities [3], it undergoes reconstruction and alteration, often emphasizing the positive aspects while disregarding the contentious and non-complementary elements.

In societies that have undergone the downfall of repressive regimes, the subject of memory assumes a distinct importance. In such social contexts, the recourse to the past primarily serves as an endeavor to establish fresh foundations for collective (self-)identification.

The preservation and transmission of collective memory rely on specific mechanisms. Conventional preservation practices often encompass diverse narrative formats: memoirs, documentaries, works of fiction, and online content. However, due to its accessibility to a wide audience, collective memory is susceptible to distortion and manipulation.

Jan Assmann categorizes collective memory of the past into two distinct types: communicative (referred to as “memory of generations”, transmitted through oral history) and cultural memory [4, p. 50]. The former is accessible to all individuals, while the latter necessitates the presence of “guardians” such as shamans, storytellers, or, in modern terms, – historians, writers, artists, and others. Cultural memory relies on official traditions, including textbooks, monuments, and draws upon myth, ritual, customs, and institutional forms. It finds consolidation in officially sanctioned holidays, anniversaries, national symbols, and anthems [4, p. 50]. The question of “What must we not forget?” takes center stage within a group’s collective consciousness as it shapes identity and self-perception.

Furthermore, the bearers of any collective memory are inherently limited to specific groups within a particular time and space. In light of this, the authors of this study perceive *tayp* as an informal institution that encompasses both communicative and cultural memory functions. This perspective aligns with the principles of neo-institutionalism.

Within an institutional framework, collective memory becomes intricately intertwined with other informal institutions such as customs, habits, and traditions. Institutional theory regards customs as a form of social coercion, while habits represent behavioral rules rooted in rationalism, shaping individuals’ predisposition towards specific types and methods of response. Notably, in paternalistic societies, traditions can hold greater significance than legally established norms dictated by the state. This phenomenon is observable in contemporary post-conflict Chechen society.

Informal institutions share a common characteristic of lacking explicit regulation regarding their functionality, social roles, methods, means of activity, and sanctions for deviating behavior. Instead, these aspects are governed by informal mechanisms such as habits, customs, traditions, and social norms. Despite the absence of formal rules, informal institutions fulfill regulatory functions, often exerting a more significant influence than formal regulations.

The works of comparative political scientists G. Helmke and S. Levitsky hold significant relevance in relation to the concept of the Chechen *tayp* functioning as an informal institution. The scholars argue that those who overlook such informal rules of the game “risk missing many of the most important incentives and constraints that underlie political behavior” [5, p. 725]. Helmke and Levitsky’s contribution lies in their identification of existing challenges within the study of informal institutions. They highlight the lack of understanding among many researchers

regarding the causes and mechanisms of their emergence, as well as the characteristics and manifestations of stability and transformation within informal institutions [5, p. 726].

It can be argued that the Chechen tayp does not exist as a formal institution within the modern social structure. However, the tayp continues to hold significant importance in Chechen society. During the deportation, there was a decrease in self-identification with the tayp, and a stronger emphasis on belonging to the Chechen and Ingush peoples. The preservation of the Chechen tayp as an informal institution, serving as a carrier of collective memory, can be attributed to the following reasons:

The tayp has historically performed protective functions for centuries.

The dominance of tradition, which emphasizes the importance of knowing your ancestors and kinship.

The symbolic role of the tayp as a complementary structure within Chechen society, where ideals of freedom, justice, and equality are prevalent.

Numerous studies have been conducted on the social organization of Chechen society. However, a comprehensive scientific examination of the methodology and reliability of these descriptions is yet to be carried out. Upon analyzing existing sources on the topic, it becomes evident that a significant portion of publications lacks a unified definition of the term “tayp.”

The studies of the late 19th to early 20th centuries define the Chechen tayp in various ways, such as a family name, clan, tribe, tribal group, tokhum/tukhum, kin, or brotherhood. The prevailing official perspective suggested that the tayp, in its social essence, is synonymous with the clan, and that the social system of the Chechens was based on patriarchal-tribal relationships.

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, caucasiologist B.K. Dalgat described the Chechen tayp not as a clan institution, but as a brotherhood, representing a form of social organization within traditional Chechen society [6]. M.A. Mamakaev, a Soviet statesman, party leader, writer, and poet, referred to it as a clan, noting that it was no longer an “archaic clan” after the 16th century, similar to the Iroquois [7]. A.A. Usaev, a researcher, viewed the tayp as a historical society [8]. Ethnographer L.M. Garsaev, in one instance, described the tayp as an ethnic society [9], while in collaboration with Sh.A. Gapurov, they referred to it as a historical society [10]. Philosopher A.A. Mankiev regarded the tayp as an ancient social organization within Chechen society [11]. Researchers I.V. Saydaev and M.M. Ibragimov used the term “kin (tayp)” [11; 13]. Z.A. Tesaev, another researcher, expanded the scope and identified the tayp with the community [14]. Philologist N.N. Albekov [15], lawyer D.Kh. Saidumov [16], and researcher A.A. Abumuslimov [17] used the term tayp without providing a specific definition for it. Political scientist A.M. Saidarkhanov perceives the tayp not only as a distinct type of local community but also highlights its formation through related families [18]. Lawyer V.A. Aduiev emphasizes that the tayp represents a rural (aul) territorial community [19]. Historian S.A. Nataev provides the following definition of the tayp: “It is not classical kin but rather a brotherhood – an association of related and unrelated social groups united by common social and economic interests, as well as mythological kinship (although it may not be entirely accurate to label the tayp’s kinship as mythological – *author’s comm.*)” [20]. Sociologist S.Sh. Zhemchuraeva observes that the tayp institution has lost its social functions in the present day and has transformed into a brotherhood based on mythical memory. It no longer holds tangible social functions but instead serves as a source of family solidarity. In the hierarchy of respondents’ identities, tayp identity is significantly overshadowed by religious, family, and ethnic identities [21]. However, the authors argue that tayp memory is not purely mythical, and family solidarity indeed serves as a genuine social function. Ethnologist L.M. Ilyasov views the Chechen teip (using this specific

spelling – *author's comm.*) as a traditional self-governing territorial community, comprising one or multiple villages and delegating some of its powers to higher-level associations. By the end of the 19th century, the Chechen tayp began to fade as a social institution. Ilyasov also highlights the importance of tayp memory in the education of modern Chechen youth, as it has fostered a profound moral culture within the democratic framework of the tayp [22, p. 178, 183, 184].

Regardless of the various definitions provided by researchers, it is undeniable that the tayp persists as a phenomenon within Chechen society, evolving and adapting over time. It extends beyond the ancestral auls in the mountains and serves as one of the ways for Chechens to identify themselves, although it may not be the sole determining factor. Members of a tayp can hold diverse political positions, even find themselves on opposing sides during armed conflicts, reside in different settlements and regions of the republic or other countries, and speak different dialects of the Chechen language. However, the sense of belonging to a tayp remains firmly intact.

Similar to any social group, the tayp possesses a collective memory that is preserved and transmitted, including through modern means of communication. Traditionally, the collective memory within the tayp was maintained through oral transmission of information. However, as early as the Middle Ages, there was a tendency to document significant events and genealogy in tayp teptars (notebooks, journals in Chechen). Unfortunately, a majority of these records were destroyed during the 1944 deportation or lost during periods of social crises.

In the post-conflict era of the Chechen Republic's development, there has been an increased focus on creating, preserving, and transmitting the collective memory of tayps. This can be attributed to the lasting impact of the traumatic 1944 deportation and the course and consequences of two armed conflicts.

The initial and significant surge of interest in the history and significance of tayp identity in the post-Soviet period was observed during the presidency of D.M. Dudayev from 1991 to 1994. During this time, tayp congresses were convened, the territorial boundaries of tayps were determined, and tayp-based units were formed, such as the "Benoevsky" and "Galanchozhsky" regiments. It is worth noting that not only members of the same tayp but even individuals within the same family found themselves in different political camps. Some actively supported an independent Chechen republic, even taking up arms, while others advocated for remaining part of the Russian Federation. The division between mountain and lowland tayps (with the former predominantly supporting Dudayev and the latter mainly in opposition) also did not hold true. The political choices made by individuals were often independent of their tayp affiliation. For instance, individuals belonging to the Benoy tayp, such as A.A. Kadyrov, M.M. Saidulaev, and R.B. Yamadayev, held divergent political positions. Similarly, individuals from the Chinhoy tayp, like B.S.-A. Gantamirov and A.A. Osmaev, also had contrasting political stances.

Following the conclusion of the active phase of the counter-terrorism operation and the subsequent period of stabilizing the region and initiating the revival of the mountainous part of the Chechen Republic, there has been a renewed vigor in exploring the history of tayps. This interest is not limited to amateur historians but also includes professional scientists who themselves belong to one of the tayps within the republic.

A search using the keyword "тайп" in the Russian scientific electronic library e-Library. Ru yields 85 articles that directly or indirectly address issues related to the history, origin, and settlement of various tayps. These articles cover a range of tayps, including Benoy (8 publications), Gunoy (9 publications), Belgatoy (4 publications), Tsikaroy, Elistanzhoy,

Zandakoy, Kurchaloy, Tsontaroy, Chungaroy, Gordaloy, Biltoy, and Yalkhoy. While there are fewer monographs on this topic, historians such as S.A. Nataev, L.M. Garsaev, and researcher A.Z. Tesaev have actively contributed to the study of Chechen tayps. Each Chechen tayp has its own page on the Wikipedia (violates the legislation of the Russian Federation), and many tayps have social media groups. Some tayps even have their own websites, such as Akka, Terloy, and Vashtaroy/Vashendaroy. On the main page of the Vashendaroy website, there is an address to readers in the Chechen language emphasizing that the site's purpose is "not to elevate or belittle the tayp"¹. Instead, it aims to provide knowledge about origins and family ties to the younger generation. The website offers detailed information about the subdivisions of the tayp, the settlements where its members reside, and family genealogical trees. Additionally, it includes other relevant publications and photographic material.

Thanks to modern means of communication, connections are being reestablished between members of tayps living both on the lowland and in the mountains outside the Chechen Republic. In 2020, representatives of the Dishniy tayp registered the Regional Public Organization of the Chechen Republic called "Representation of the Dishniy tayp." For a period of time, it was located in the Press House in Grozny. One of the organization's activities is to address any distortions of the tayp's history in published materials.

In the Chechen historiography, there are currently no more than ten monographs and books specifically dedicated to the topic of tayps. Out of these, six have been authored by degree-holding scientists, while the remaining works have been written by writers, journalists (such as A.D. Kusaev, A.Kh. Mutsuraev, and Kh.R. Borkhadzhiev), and local historians. It is important to note that in many works describing the history of a particular Chechen settlement, there will invariably be references to one or more tayps whose members reside in that area.

One of the earliest books in the post-Soviet period that can be considered is the monograph titled "Akki and the Akkins in the 16th–18th centuries," based on a candidate's dissertation in history by A.A. Adilsultanov [23]. The objective of this work, as stated by the author, is to present a coherent picture of the formation of the "Akkin ethnos" (as formulated by A. Adilsultanov – *author's comm.*) during the 16th-18th centuries and to determine the level of socio-economic and political development in Akki, a Chechen society localized in the Tersko-Sulak interfluve and southwest Chechnya. According to the author, references to the Akkins (Aukhs) can be found in written sources dating back to the beginning of the Common Era. In his study, A. Adilsultanov primarily focused not on the origins of the Akkins themselves, but on justifying their residence in the Terek-Sulak interfluve, which is presented in the conclusion [23, p. 124].

In 1993, a brochure titled "The Role of the Benoy Tayp in the History of the Chechen People" was published in Grozny. The author, D.A. Khozhaev, is a representative of the Benoy tayp, a historian, and the head of the Archive Service of the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria. The brochure provides concise information about the structure of the tayp, its origins, and the founding of the village of Benoy over a thousand years ago. It emphasizes that the Benoy are the "true Chechens", and are described as "the largest, most powerful, and influential tayp in Chechnya" [24]. Furthermore, D. Khozhaev argues that the entire history of the Benoy tayp is an inseparable part of the history of the Chechen people, ... "the Benoy have never pursued selfish interests of individual groups" [24, p. 16]. The author's conclusion serves as a call for unity among the Chechens, particularly after the rise to power of D.M. Dudayev in 1991, given that D. Khozhaev himself was an active political figure and a supporter of Chechnya's independence.

1. Vashtaroy // <https://vashandaro.com/> (accessed on April 5, 2023)

Many publications on the history of tayps follow the model set by D. Khozhaev's brochure. Typically, these publications provide information about the location of the tayp's settlement or settlements, its structural divisions (such as *gars* and *neki* – branches, sub-branches), the size of the tayp, its influence, the residence of tayp members within the republic and beyond its borders, and the beginnings of its ancient history (mostly, legendary), participation in historical events. They also often include detailed accounts of notable individuals from the tayp, including military figures, scientists, athletes, and more.

Historians and representatives of the Benoy tayp, Sh.A. Gapurov and Kh.S. Umkhaev, have published essays dedicated to the largest and most populous Chechen tayp of the same name. In these essays, they analyze the ethnopolitical structure of Chechnya during the 16th-18th centuries and provide descriptions of all the societies within Ichkeria (Nokhch-Mokhk in Chechen), which includes the Benoy society. They also note that the history of ancient aul settlements “have its roots in the Bronze Age” [25, p. 4].

The essays also examine the participation of Nokhch-Mokhk and Benoy in the Caucasian War, highlighting the tragic fate of Benoy during the 1860-1870s. This period saw uprisings in which the Benoys actively took part, as well as the Kunta-Hadji² movement, resettlement to the Ottoman Empire, and the subsequent ruin and deportation of the Benoys. The authors also analyze the uprisings in Benoy during the 1920-1930s and examine the socio-political processes in Chechnya at the beginning of the 21st century. Regarding the problem of origin, the authors note that the first ancestor of the tayp migrated from Nashkha (a historical region in the southwest of Chechnya, which is believed to be the birthplace of many Chechen tayps) “approximately 1000 years ago” [25, p. 220]. Gapurov and Umkhaev provide a list of 11 Benoy villages (Benoy, Benoy-Vedeno, Alkhan, Gurzhi-Mokhk, Koren-Benoy, Pachu, Sterch-Kerch, Ozhi-Yurt, Osi-Yurt, Dengi-Yurt, Bulgat-Irzu) that are compactly located in the southeast of Chechnya. They also provide information about the representatives of the *gars* and *neki*, which are the structural divisions of the tayps, residing in these villages. They include the names of participants in the Great Patriotic War and those who lost their lives during military operations at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries. The authors also mention famous individuals, natives of these villages; discuss toponymy, and highlight religious places of worship known as *ziyarats*.

The Benoys have settled throughout the Chechen Republic, with significant communities found in cities such as Urus-Martan, Shali, Argun, and in villages like New Atagi, Aldy, Goyty, Alkhan-Yurt, and the Nadterechny district, among others. The book includes the names of notable Benoys, including theologians, military personnel, scientists, cultural figures, and athletes. Special attention is given to the first president of the Chechen Republic within the Russian Federation, A.A. Kadyrov, as well as the current head of the republic, R.A. Kadyrov.

Two notable publications on the history of tayps are the books “Elistanzkhoy in the history and culture of the Chechen people (historical and ethnographic essays)” [26] and “Gunoy in the history, culture, and politics of Chechnya. Historical and ethnographic essays” [27]. These books we are going to consider further.

In the introduction of the book “Elistanzkhoy...” the author highlights that the work focuses on the genealogy of the Chechen people through the lens of a historical society. Researcher L.M. Garsaev undertakes the task of reconstructing the history of the formation of the Elistanzhoy

2. Kunta-Hadji (Kunta-Hadji Kishiev, the year of birth is said to be 1800, 1812, 1815, 1830 – 1867. His murids believe that the sheikh did not die, but “hid” and must return) – propagator of the Kadyriyya tariqa in Chechnya, one of the most revered religious figures of Chechnya and Ingushetia.

society. According to Garsaev, the society's representatives migrated from Nashkha to their own mountain. The author suggests a version that the society is named after its first ancestor, Elsan, although other versions exist. Garsaev suggests that the Elistanzhins gradually populated the lowlands, reaching Aldy, and eventually establishing villages such as Khattuni, Tevzana, Nizhniye Agishty, as well as Ustrada-evla (Argun city) and Shali, alongside other pioneers from Nokhchmokhk [26, p. 43]. According to L. Garsaev, the village of Elistanzhi was founded in the 11th century. The book includes a comprehensive family tree of the tayp and provides information on the surnames of 76 Elistanzhins who participated in the Great Patriotic War. Among them, 45 individuals were either killed or went missing, while 31 returned alive, 2 individuals defended the Brest Fortress [26, p. 133-135]. It is highlighted that during the German Abwehr operation "Shamil" in the summer and autumn of 1942, not a single Elistanzhin citizen collaborated with the saboteurs deployed by the fascist command in the mountainous regions of the republic. Additionally, it was planned to relocate the underground regional committee of the CPSU to the village of Elistanzhi if necessary. The book also provides data on 12 natives of the village who served in Afghanistan from 1979 to 1989. According to the information presented, out of the Chechens who served in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA), 293 men were awarded state honors.

Garsaev meticulously examines the establishment of constitutional order during the period of 1994–1996 and the subsequent counter-terrorist operation from 1999 to 2009. In his work, he provides comprehensive lists documenting individuals who lost their lives during the carpet bombing by federal forces in October 1999. Additionally, Garsaev delves into the specifics surrounding the tragic murders of Qadi A-V. Madagov, EMERCOM employee A. Magomadov, and five Russian military personnel, all residents of a village, in June 2001 [26, p. 182–183, 189–193]. Furthermore, Garsaev offers a detailed account of the challenging daily life experienced by the Elistanzhins during their deportation in 1944, their subsequent relocation to Kazakhstan, and their eventual return to Chechnya in 1957.

The chapter titled "Famous People from the Elistanzhoy Tayp" presents an extensive dataset featuring information on hundreds of individuals. Notably, the chapter highlights Imam Sheikh Mansur, an influential figure in Elistanzhin, renowned as the leader of the uprising of 1785–1791 in the North Caucasus. Additionally, the book includes an appendix containing a family list of residents from the village of Elistanzhi for the year 1905 [26, p. 552–610].

The book "Gunoy in the history, politics, and culture of Chechnya. Historical and ethnographic essays," published in 2021, "is dedicated to exploring the history of the Gunoy tayp, a renowned and influential ethnic society in Chechnya" [27, p. 2]. The impetus for documenting the tayp's history originated from the Council of Representatives of the Gunoy tayp, established on November 22, 2015, comprising 12 individuals native to 11 villages where tayp members reside, including the village of Bammatt-Yurt in the Republic of Dagestan. The Gunoy tayp is dispersed across 73 settlements in the Chechen Republic, as well as in Dagestan and Ingushetia. It is noteworthy that the authors not only approach the task of recording the tayp's history from a scientific standpoint but also from a religious perspective, citing Caliph Umar ibn al-Khattab [27, p. 12].

In the book, the authors include DNA research, a recently popular field, and compare the findings with the results of excavations from settlements associated with archaeological cultures recognized in world science. They also draw upon diverse sources such as journalistic accounts, folklore, theology, religious discourse, information from historical informants, ancestral and family chronicles (teptarsh), as well as family trees. Right from the outset, the

authors underscore a crucial aspect: a segment of the Gunoy people, who chose not to embrace Islam, migrated to the Terek Cossacks and assimilated with them, even though the latter had no historical connection to the origin of the Gunoy tayp.

The work assigns a particular significance to the connection between the Gunoy tayp and the esteemed religious figure Sheikh Kunta-Hadji, who maintained a close friendship with the local Gunoy resident, Kerim. The representatives of the Gunoy tayp take justifiable pride in the historical fact that Sheikh Kunta-Hadji, along with his companions, performed the first circular and resonant dhikr prayer in their ancestral village. Notably, Sheikh Kunta-Hadji's mother, Kheda, finds her final resting place in the same village, and a ziyarat has been erected on her grave. This sacred site attracts thousands of Muslims from the republic and neighboring regions who embark on pilgrimages throughout the year.

A dedicated section considers the historical narrative of the formation and settlement of the Gunoy tayp, referred to by the authors as “the Gunoy ethnic society” [27, p. 54]. The upland clan cluster of the Gunoy people encompasses the villages of Guni, Avtury, Khazhin-Evla, Marzoy-Mokhk, and Mesedoy. According to folklore sources, in ancient times, the Gunoy people inhabited the plains of Chechnya extending up to the Sulak River. The progenitor of the Gunoy tayp, Guno (Gundal), traces his roots to the Nashkha area, a common origin for many Chechen tayps. The family tree of the Gunoy people, spanning approximately 26-27 generations from the eponym, suggests that the village of Guni was established in the first half of the 14th century. Mount Ertan-Kort holds particular significance as the mountain associated with the Gunoy people, though historically, the mountain in the vicinity of the village Elistanzhi was also considered as such. The book puts forward the proposition that the villages Chechen-aul were founded by Gunoy and Tsontaroy, with Gunoy further establishing the village of Aldy.

The work extensively delves into the toponymy of the Gunoy villages, exploring the migration of the Gunoy people from their ancestral village to the lowland regions of Chechnya and their subsequent settlement in new locations. A dedicated chapter is devoted to the active involvement of the Gunoy people in the Great Patriotic War: 125 residents from the village departed for the front (a comprehensive list is provided) [27, p. 245–251]. Regrettably, only 17 returned alive, and in their honor, the villagers erected a memorial obelisk [27, p. 245]. The authors notably address the participation of the Gunoy people in the events of the 1990–2000s. A significant portion of the community, in adherence to the teachings of the revered religious figures, refrained from taking the path of armed struggle. Instead, they offered staunch resistance to Shamil Basayev and Khattab, successfully expelling them from the village and thwarting their attempt to establish a military base on Mount Ertan-Korta [27, p. 279]. Furthermore, the book provides details about the noteworthy achievements in politics, science, culture, and sports accomplished by representatives of the Gunoy tayp. This section stands as an integral component in depicting the comprehensive portrait of any tayp.

The book “Turti-Khutor lights up the stars: the documentary story” [28] centers around the life of the school director A.B. Khatamaev. It also mentions the villages of the Alleroy tayp, including Meskety, Sogunty, Shovhal-Berd, Davletbi-Khutor, Beshal-Irzu, Alleroy, Isay-Yurt, Turti-Khutor, and Gansolchu, all situated in the Kurchaloevsky district. The book introduces the reader to the notable figures from these villages and provides a historical context. The founding year of the village is specified as 1840, accompanied by a comprehensive toponymy of the settlement. Within the narrative, the authors explore “the history of the origin of one of the largest Chechen tayps, Alleroy” [28, p. 86]. The tayp's founder is attributed to All or Allerish, who resided in Nashkha (Motsarkha) towards the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th

centuries. Allerish, along with his relatives, relocated to the east, specifically to Nokhch-Mokhk, where he established the village of Alleroy.

Journalist S. Bashirov, in his 2014 article titled “History of the Dishny tayp and the Toponymy of the Aul Endirei,” published in the republican newspaper “Vesti Respubliki,” asserts that “in ancient times, the migration of the Nakh-speaking tribe Dishny from the Middle East to the Caucasus occurred through Derbent”. He proposes that, “perhaps, during this migration to the Caucasus, the foothill village of Endira was initially established. Later, the high-mountain village of Endira was founded in the present Itum-Kalinsky district, serving as the starting point for Dishnys to settle across the territories of Chechnya, Ingushetia, Ossetia, and Georgia. At one point, the Dishny tayp held significant influence in the North Caucasus.” The author proves that renowned figures from the Caucasian War, such as Tashav-Hadji, Ochchar-Hadji, and Bashir-Hadji (Abu-Sheikh), belong to the Dishny tayp³. While many claims in the article are open to debate, they nevertheless provide interesting content and may serve as a catalyst for the author and other researchers to undertake further scientific substantiation. The article puts forth several key propositions regarding the history of this prominent and numerous tayp, including discussions on the Vainakh language, migration from the Middle East, the establishment of the historically significant village of Endirei (currently part of the republic of Dagestan), influence in the whole North Caucasus. Names of prominent political and military figures – representatives of the tayp – are also given.

The article authored by A. Usaev [7] investigates in detail the origin and settlement patterns of the Kurchaloy tayp, asserting that its formation as a tayp commenced in the early centuries of the 2nd millennium. Usaev posits that the tayp belongs to the warrior caste and, according to certain sources, has connections to the Orstkhoy tayp. The author aligns with legends suggesting that the tayp’s ancestors migrated from the Nashkha region. In line with the narratives, Usaev identifies Kurchalkh, the son of Kushul from Nashkha, as the founder of the village of Kurchali. He suggests that Kurchalkh returned to the lands of his ancestors, emphasizing that the tayp did not venture into new territories but reclaimed what belonged to them during the “Chechen Reconquista” (the period of Chechens’ return to the lowlands in the 16th century). The tayp mountain, an indispensable attribute of any indigenous tayp – “Kurchaloin Lam”, is situated in the Vedeno region. The tayp is divided into lower, middle, and upper branches (gars), which, in turn, are subdivided into over 22 neki. Usaev provides a comprehensive list of settlements in the Chechen Republic and the Republic of Dagestan where Kurchaloys reside, as well as sacred places (*ziyarats*) and offers brief descriptions of those commemorated by these sites.

D. Saidumov’s article follows a similar structure to other publications on tayp history, addressing elements such as origin, the etymology of the name, settlements inhabited by Belgatoy tayp members, the tayp’s eponym whose grandson migrated from Nashkha, and the toponymy of the ancestral village. Despite this, the Saidumov believes that efforts to revive a unified tayp organization, acting as an unofficial entity competing with official power structures, may result in societal stagnation and even division. However, the author acknowledges that the capabilities and influence of tayps should not be dismissed [29].

The article “On the Genealogy of the Tsontaroy Tayp” [30] explores the genealogy of one of the prominent Chechen tayps. The study is conducted through a comparative analysis of oral traditions passed down by the descendants of Kornî, who is recognized as one of the founders of the tayp’s structural division. Additionally, the research incorporates family lists of residents

3. Bashirov S. History of the Dishny tayp and the Toponymy of the Aul Endirei. *Vesti Respubliki*. 2014, 212 (2396).

from the Ichkerinsky district for the year 1867 and family lists specific to the village for the year 1886.

After the stabilization of the situation in the Chechen Republic, official authorities embarked on efforts to revitalize the mountainous areas of the region, with local enthusiasts – natives of these localities – actively participating in the endeavor. Field data provided by Kh. Yakhyaev, an employee of the Argun Museum-Reserve, who is also involved in road construction in mountainous Chechnya, highlights the initiatives in the historical region of Nashkha. Businessman Yakubov Sh.Sh. (belonging to the Peshkhoy tayp) played a significant role in this revival by constructing a complex in Peshkha. There, a mosque has been restored and a two-story house is being built by the initiative of Tushaev Z. In the village Khiylakh, businessman and a deputy of the State Duma of the Russian Federation V.A. Agaev (from the Nashkho tayp) played a significant role in restoring the mosque and five residential towers. Unfortunately, both businessmen passed away in 2021.

In Khaibakh village, the mosque, a military tower, and two residential towers were restored through the joint initiative of the republican authorities and the Regional Public Fund named after Hero of Russia A. Kadyrov. Additionally, a memorial complex was constructed on the site of the stables of the collective farm named after Beria, where people were burned during the deportation (although some authors, such as I.V. Pykhalov, deny the very fact of this tragic event). In the village Khiyzhakh, adjacent to Khaibakh, there are plans to restore a military tower and three residential towers in 2023. Furthermore, the towers of Bena-kha and Venda, associated with the legendary departure of the tayp founders Benoy and Gendargenoi, respectively, have been successfully restored. In Motsaroy village, the descendants of its inhabitants, including the writer A.T. Ismailov, played a role in the restoration of three residential towers in 2016. Additionally, Kh.S. Taimaskhanov took part in the restoration of the mosque in Nashkha. In Charmakh village, the mosque has been restored, and the Vice-Rector of GGNTU named after acad. M.D. Millionshchikov, R.R. Salgiriev, undertook the restoration of the residential tower of his ancestors.

In the village Tiysta, members of the Tsontaroy tayp undertook the restoration of the residential tower, which, according to legend, was once inhabited by their ancestor. The Mudarovs constructed a stone house on the ancestral plot. Up from the Charmakha village, M.S. Daudov, the Chairman of the Parliament of the Chechen Republic, built a military tower. Representatives of the Alleroy tayp erected a residential tower on the site where their ancestor lived. In Mogasta, a native of the village built a house and is actively engaged in animal husbandry in the area.

The descendants of those who once inhabited the historical region of Akka, located in the southwest of Chechnya, are actively involved in its restoration: in Akkha-basa, the mosque dating back to 1841 has been restored, and a nearby residential tower has been constructed. In Kerbecha, a descendant of local residents took the initiative to build both a residential and a military tower. In Moccha, a resident from the village Yandi has reconstructed his house on the site. There are plans for the restoration of the Diskhi tower. Furthermore, scientist D. K-S. Bataev has built a small house on his family plot in the village Tkuyista and frequently visits the area.

In the historical region of Terloy, A.N. Musaev, along with his tayp-brothers, has undertaken the construction of a comprehensive complex featuring a mosque, a spacious canopy, and hotel rooms. Here, in Estaga, gatherings of the Terloy tayp are annually held, with representatives from other tayps across the republic. The site serves as a venue for various events, including

weddings and competitions showcasing national cuisine. Additionally, mosques in the village have been subject to restoration efforts. In Nikaroi, Oshni, and Guoro, a descendant of local residents has built a stone house resembling a castle. Furthermore, in Bara, the restoration of a military tower, commissioned by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic, is near completion. In the towns of Khorichu and Gimara, individual houses have been constructed, with the natives of these places actively engaged in animal husbandry.

In addition to the restoration and construction of residential and military towers, there is also a notable trend of erecting monuments. In 2015, in the village of Nokhchi-Keloy, Shatoi district, a monument dedicated to fellow villagers who participated in the Great Patriotic War was erected through the contributions of residents. Notably, the inscription on the stone specifies that the monument was built with donations from the Nokhchi-Keloy tayp, rather than the residents of the village.

The increased importance of tayp identity in the post-conflict development of the Chechen Republic can be attributed, firstly, to the crucial regulatory role that traditions continue to play in modern Chechen society. The preservation of Chechen traditions and, consequently, collective memory, is nurtured within the brotherhood, or tayp. While the tayp does not exist as a formal institution in society, it holds a significant position in the everyday life of the republic.

However, the current tayp lacks a clear regulation of its functionality, defined social roles within the community, established methods and means of activity, and a well-developed set of sanctions for deviations in behavior.

Secondly, the mobilization of Chechens and their collective memory, taking into account their tayp affiliation, unfolds across different periods in the post-Soviet history of Chechnya:

1) During the years 1991–1994, under the leadership of D.M. Dudayev, emphasis was placed on the “long” collective memory of suffering and oppression, in particular, the deportation of 1944. During this period, these historical events were endowed with high social efficiency.

2) Following the conclusion of the counter-terrorism operation, a new phase emerged, characterized by efforts to establish stability and initiate the revival of the mountainous part of the republic. This phase is marked by the mobilization of national history.

During this period, there has been a notable increase in the publication of books, essays, and articles documenting the history of tayps. The demand for recording often controversial facts regarding the history of specific tayps is exceptionally high, frequently sparking debates within Chechen society. This “historiographical surge” is also a consequence of the traditional oral transmission of information about genealogy and family ties, which historically led to partial loss or inevitable distortion of the transmitted knowledge. Additionally, the oral transmission of tayp history contributed to the accumulation of myths and legends around it. Nevertheless, in almost all publications, the genuine foundations and key points of tayp collective memory remain visible, encompassing aspects such as genealogy, the tayp’s mountain, metropolitan settlements, and close or related tayps.

In addition to the ethnographic characteristics of tayps, the anthropological features of self-organization among tayp members have played a crucial role during critical periods, including wartime, deportation, rehabilitation, the collapse of the USSR, and the subsequent armed crisis in the Chechen Republic and adjacent regions.

Thirdly, a recurring theme in most works is the assertion that a particular tayp and its history are integral parts of the broader Chechen people and their shared history. Significantly, attention is dedicated to the involvement of tayp representatives in the Great Patriotic War, further contributing to ongoing debates surrounding the official reasons for the deportation of

1944 and the restoration of the collective memory of Chechens who participated in the events of 1941–1945. Commonly found in these works is the listing of names and brief information about tayp members who have achieved success in various fields such as science, sports, and the military.

Simultaneously, there is an ongoing institutionalization of tayp collective memory through the revival of ancestral towers and villages that had been abandoned during the deportation of 1944, remaining dormant for more than sixty years. This revival is actively supported by the republican government, which not only welcomes the restoration of high mountain regions but also organizes and promotes the construction of roads in challenging conditions, especially in regions like Nashkha and Peshkha.

While the relationship between power and tayp is not the primary focus of this study, it does prompt the consideration of the dynamics between informal institutions, such as tayps, and official governmental authority.

Acknowledgement. The study was carried out with the financial support of the Russian Science Foundation, project No. 23-28-01643 “Institutionalization of collective memory in the post-conflict period in Chechnya: dynamics and patterns.”

REFERENCES

1. Müller Jan-Werner (ed). *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002.
2. Maier Charles S. *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988.
3. Halbwachs M. *On Collective Memory*. The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
4. *Cultural Memory: Writing, Memory of the Past and Political Identity in High Cultures of Antiquity*. Moscow: Yaziki slavyanskoi kultury, 2004.
5. Helmke G., Levitsky S. Informal institutions and comparative politics: A research agenda. *Perspectives on politics*. 2004, 2(4): 725–740.
6. Dalgat B.K. *Life of Clans and Customary Law of Chechens and Ingush. Studies and Materials. 1892-1894*. Moscow, 2008.
7. Mamakayev M.A. *The Chechen Taip (clan) and its Decomposition*. Chechen-Ingush Book Publishing, 1962.
8. Usayev A.A. The Kurchaloi Historical Society. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic*. 2020, 4(51): 46–50.
9. Garsayev L.M., Garasayev A.M. The Elistanzhoy Ethnic Society. *Izvestiya SOIGSI. School of young scientists*. 2014, 12: 111–127.
10. Gapurov Sh.A., Garsayev L.M. Historical Society of Benoy. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic*. 2015, 3(28): 22–28.
11. Mankiev A.A. Counter-extremist potential of Old Chechen social organization. *Tallam*. 2021, 2(23): 72–78.
12. Saydaev, I.V. On the etymology of the ethnonym Giumkhoi in the name of one of the Chechen tayps (“kin”). *Arkhont*. 2022, 2(29): 66–73.
13. Ibragimov M.M. Islamisation of Chechnya by the example of one clan (taip) of Gunoy. In: R.M. Begeulov (resp.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Müller Jan-Werner (ed). *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past*. New York: Cambridge UP. 2002.
2. Maier, Charles S. *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988.
3. Halbwachs M. *On Collective Memory*. The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
4. Ассман Я. Культурная память: письмо, память о прошлом и политическая идентичность в высоких культурах древности. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004.
5. Helmke G., Levitsky S. Informal institutions and comparative politics: A research agenda // *Perspectives on politics*, 2004. Vol. 2. No 4. P. 725-740.
6. Далгат Б.К. Родовой быт и обычное право чеченцев и ингушей. Исследования и материалы. 1892-1894 гг. М., 2008. - 380 с.
7. Мамакаев М.А. Чеченский тайп (род) и процесс его разложения. Чечено-Ингушское книжное издательство, 1962.
8. Усаев А.А. Историческое общество Курчалой // *Вестник Академии наук Чеченской Республики*. 2020. № 4 (51). С. 46–50.
9. Гарсаев Л.М., Гарасаев А.М. Этническое общество Элистанжой // *Известия СОИГСИ. Школа молодых ученых*. 2014. № 12. С. 111–127.
10. Гапуров Ш.А., Гарсаев Л.М. Историческое общество Беной // *Вестник Академии наук Чеченской Республики*. 2015. № 3 (28). С. 22–28.
11. Манкиев А.А. Контрэкстремистский потенциал старочеченской социальной организации // *Таллам*. 2021. № 2 (23). С. 72–78.
12. Сайдаев И.В. Об этимологии этнонима «Гiumхой» в названии одного из чеченских тайпов («род») // *Архонт*. 2022. № 2 (29). С. 66–73.

ed.). *Islam in the spiritual space of North Caucasus: History, Philosophy, Sociology. Materials of the All-Russian scientific conference. The Karachay-Cherkessia State University*. 2011, pp. 167–171.

14. Tesaev Z.A. The Qur'an Colophon of 1911 as a source for genealogy of the Chechen community of Zandakoy. *The Theory of Law and Interstate Relations*. 2022, 2(24): 392–396.

15. Albekov N.N. Terminolexem «taip» as interdisciplinary concept. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic*. 2015, 4(29): 69–78.

16. Saidumov D.Kh. To the question of the study of Chechen taips: belgatoy as one of the constituent elements of a unified Chechen society. *Tallam*. 2016, 1(10): 80–87.

17. Abumuslimov A.A., Abumuslimov A.I., Shuaipov K.A.-V., Timeraliev Y.S., Tsalaev I.H., Abdulaev I.M., Ismailov U.A. Genealogy of Taip Tsiontaroi (K1orni-nek'e – descendants of Chaylbig). *Tallam*. 2016, 1(10): 7–14.

18. Saidarkhanov A.M. Constitutional-legal and socio-political aspects of national types of local communities. *Bulletin of the North Caucasus Humanitarian Institute*. 2017, 4(24): 579–584.

19. Aduев V.A. Socio-legal institutions of Chechens in the Middle Ages. *North Caucasian Law Bulletin*. 2017, 4: 34–39.

20. Nataev S.A. The Problem of the Chechen Taip in the Ethnographic Studies of the Caucasian Historian B.K. Dalgat. *Naychnaya Mysl Kavkaza*. 2015, 4(84): 67–72.

21. Zhemchuraeva S.Sh. Taip identity of the youth of the Chechen Republic in the perspective of sociological analysis. *Proceedings of the Saratov University. Sociology. Political Science*. 2013, 13(4).

22. Adilsultanov A.A. *Akki and Akkins in the XVI-XVIII centuries*. Grozny, 1992.

23. Ilyasov L.M. Chechen Teip. *The Chechen Republic and Chechens: History and Modernity: Proceedings of the All-Russian Scientific Conference*. April 19–20, 2005, Moscow, 2006.

24. Khozhaev D. *The Role of the Benoy Taipa in the History of the Chechen People*. Grozny, 1993.

25. Gapurov Sh.A. and Umkhaev Kh.S. *Benoy in the History and Culture of the Chechen People (historical and ethnographic essays)*. Grozny: AO Groznensky Rabochiy publishing and printing complex, 2016.

26. Garsaev L.M. *Elistanzhoy in the History and Culture of the Chechen People (Historical and Ethnographic Sketches)*. Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic, Grozny, 2017.

27. Ibragimov M.M. *Gunoy in the History, Politics and Culture of Chechnya. Historical and ethnographic sketches*. Grozny: Alef, 2021.

28. Dzhunaidov A.S., Dzhunaidov A.S. *Turti-Khutor lights the stars. Documentary story*. Grozny: Groznensky Rabochiy, 2018.

29. Saidumov D. Kh. Taip belgatoy as an integral part of Chechen society. *Law and the state: Theory and practice*. 2017, 5(149): 29–35.

30. Abumuslimov A.A., Abumuslimov A.I., Abumuslimova A.S. On the genealogy of Taip Tsiontaroi. *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic*. 2017, 3(36): 17–28.

13. *Ибрагимов М.М.* Исламизация Чечни на примере одного рода (тайпа) Гуной // Ислам в духовном пространстве Северного Кавказа: история, философия, социология. Материалы всероссийской научной конференции. Карачаево-Черкесский государственный университет / Отв. ред. Р.М. Бегеулов. 2011. С. 167–171.

14. *Тесаев З.А.* Колофон Корана 1911 года как источник по генеалогии чеченской общины Зандакой. // Теория права и межгосударственных отношений. 2022. Т. 2. №4 (24). С. 392–396.

15. *Альбеков Н.Н.* Терминологема «тайп» как интердисциплинарное понятие // Вестник Академии наук Чеченской Республики. 2015. № 4 (29). С. 69–78.

16. *Сайдумов Д.Х.* К вопросу изучения чеченских тайпов: белгатай как один из составных элементов единого чеченского общества // Таллам, 2016. № 2 (11). С. 80–87.

17. *Абумуслимов А.А., Абумуслимов А.И., Шуаипов К.А.-В., Тимералиев Ю.С., Цалаев И.Х., Абдулаев И.М., Исмаилов У.А.* Генеалогия тайпа Цюнтарой (Корни-некье – потомки Чаьлбига) // Таллам. 2016. № 1 (10). С. 7–14.

18. *Сайдарханов А.М.* Конституционно-правовые и социально-политические аспекты национальных типов местных сообществ // Вестник Северо-Кавказского гуманитарного института. 2017. № 4 (24). С. 579–584.

19. *Адуев В.А.* Общественно-правовые институты чеченцев в средние века // Северо-Кавказский юридический вестник. 2017. № 4. С. 34–39.

20. *Натаев С.А.* Проблема чеченского тайпа в этнографических исследованиях кавказоведа Б.К. Далгата // Научная мысль Кавказа. 2015. № 4 (84). С. 67–72.

21. *Жемчураева С.Ш.* Тайповая идентичность молодежи Чеченской Республики в ракурсе социологического анализа // Известия Саратовского университета. Сер. Социология. Политология. 2013. Т. 13. Вып. 4.

22. *Ильясов Л.М.* Чеченский тейп // Чеченская Республика и чеченцы: история и современность. М., 2006.

23. *Адилсултанов А.А.* Акки и аккинцы в XVI–XVIII вв. Грозный, 1992.

24. *Хожяев Д.* Роль беноевского тайпа в истории чеченского народа. Грозный, 1993.

25. *Гапуров Ш.А., Умхаев Х.С.* Беной в истории и культуре чеченского народа (Историко-этнографические очерки). Грозный: АО «Грозненский рабочий», 2016.

26. *Гарсаев Л.М.* Элистанжхой в истории и культуре чеченского народа (Историко-этнографические очерки). Грозный, 2017.

27. *Ибрагимов М.М.* Гуной в истории, политике и культуре Чечни. Историко-этнографические очерки. Грозный: Алеф, 2021.

28. *Джунаидов А.С., Джунаидов А.С.* Турги-Хутор зажигает звезды. Документальная повесть. Грозный: АО «Грозненский рабочий», 2018.

29. *Сайдумов Д.Х.* Тайп белгатай как неотъемлемая часть чеченского общества // Право и государство: теория и практика. 2017. № 5 (149). С. 29–35.

30. *Абумуслимов А.А., Абумуслимов А.И., Абумуслимова А.С.* О генеалогии тайпа Цюнтарой. // Вестник Академии наук Чеченской Республики. № 3 (36). 2017. С. 17–28.

Recieved 26.04.2023
Accepted 29.08.2023
Published 15.12.2023

Поступила в редакцию 26.04.2023 г.
Принята в печать 29.08.2023 г.
Опубликована 15.12.2023 г.