



Canadian Slavonic Papers

Revue Canadienne des Slavistes

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rcsp20>

Reimagining the diocese: administrative, sacred, and imperial space in the Russian Empire

Irina Paert & James M. White

To cite this article: Irina Paert & James M. White (2020) Reimagining the diocese: administrative, sacred, and imperial space in the Russian Empire, *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 62:3-4, 234-244, DOI: [10.1080/00085006.2020.1823080](https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.2020.1823080)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.2020.1823080>



Published online: 05 Oct 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 419



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Reimagining the diocese: administrative, sacred, and imperial space in the Russian Empire

Irina Paert ^a and James M. White ^{a,b}

^aSchool of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia; ^bLaboratory for the Study of Primary Sources, Ural Federal University, Ekaterinburg, Russia

KEYWORDS Russian Orthodoxy; diocese; Russian Empire; religious space

The study of the Orthodox diocese¹ in the Russian Empire has a long and storied tradition. Imbued with significant practical advantages (the ability to identify and select a relatively manageable body of source documents, for instance), this approach has proven enduringly popular among Russian-speaking scholars in particular. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw a plethora of literature on dioceses, such as histories, directories, and guides to local holy sites, not to mention the local diocesan gazettes that sprouted up across the empire from the 1860s onwards.² The post-Soviet descendants of such researchers have been no less active, publishing both scholarly and popular investigations within a diocesan framework.³ Perhaps one of the most spectacular instances in this genre is *Istoriia Ekaterinburgskoi eparkhii* (The history of Ekaterinburg diocese), edited by Anna Mangileva, one of the contributors to this special issue: a huge coffee-table volume, the work combines a wealth of vibrant visual materials with commentary by both churchmen and historians⁴

Nonetheless, the approach has manifested significant drawbacks: a proclivity for amateurish *kraevedenie* (local studies), antiquarianism, and, occasionally, confessional polemic are perhaps the most serious problems one encounters when perusing such works. In this introduction and throughout this special issue, we would like to focus on another glaring oversight of which both western and Russian academics are culpable: the failure to interrogate the imperial diocese as something more than a mere framework, thus ignoring the religious mapping of administrative space. All too often, the diocese has been conceived as coinciding directly with the province, the principal regional unit of the state. Historians may be excused such a conception given that the territorial division of the Russian Orthodox Church did indeed follow an imperial logic: from the eighteenth century, the boundaries of most dioceses replicated those of provinces. This had its roots in Christianity's distant past. Cyril Hovorun has pointed to the impact on the Church of Rome's methods of organizing newly acquired territories: "The structural similarity between the church and the empire facilitated the church in adopting the Roman philosophy of territoriality." When the principle "one bishop in one city" was adopted by the Church, it "began losing communities from its sight and concentrated its attention on the administrative structures."⁵ The Council of Nicea (325) adopted the fourth canon,

which institutionalized the shift of the ecclesial paradigm from community to territoriality.⁶ The tension between these two principles, territorial and communal, is apparent in canon law: while the 34th apostolic canon speaks about bishops of the people (ἔθνος), the ninth rule of the Council of Antioch defines the bishop as the ruler of a territory (ἐπαρχία) who has to pay respect to the chief bishop (a metropolitan). Historians point out that these two principles, the national and the territorial, became prominent in the ecclesiastical disputes of the twentieth century, as demonstrated vis-à-vis Georgia by Paul Werth and Ukraine by Nicholas Denysenko.⁷

However, assumptions about the permanency of the diocese mean that scholars have generally failed to interrogate the way in which it was shaped by, and shaped in turn, the ever-shifting priorities of the imperial centre, local authorities, and other regionally based agents. Dioceses were created, amended, divided, and abolished with regularity. The processes involved and the motives behind such changes, sometimes quite radical in scope, have not been given the attention required. One early exception is Simon Dixon's examination of St. Petersburg diocese during the city's late imperial expansion: a more recent discussion comes from our contributor Aileen Friesen in her book about the Siberian diocese of Omsk.⁸

For instance, suffragancies have been almost entirely neglected in the literature, but the creation of these institutions reflected the changing character of local space, the evolving needs of the religious community, and the roving focus of various secular and ecclesiastical authorities. The growth of cities and Russian settlement of the imperial borderlands, especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, pushed dioceses to establish suffragancies to deal with the expanding flock: there were 70 such suffragan bishops by 1917. Meanwhile, the successes (or the pursuit of success) in the Church's "inner" and "outer" missions persuaded authorities and other interest groups to establish suffragancies especially focused on consolidating and expanding missionary activities. Mara Kozelsky elaborates on this both in her contribution here and elsewhere.⁹

The diocese's flexibility makes clear that, first, as a highly contingent administrative unit, it was a locus of interaction between a dizzying array of discourses, institutions, peoples, and priorities that evolved over time to reflect developing relationships between individuals, groups, and agencies. Second, noting the changeability of ecclesiastical bureaucratic borders points to their fluidity and permeability, allowing the passage of people, objects, and ideas between two or more contiguous or non-contiguous territories: this suggests a "horizontal" study of Russian Orthodoxy (examining transfers between equivalent units) rather than the traditional "vertical" approach, which prioritizes relations between the ecclesiastical centre and its peripheries. Third, and perhaps most importantly, this demonstrates that the dioceses were imagined spaces in several senses.

In one sense, dioceses were imagined spaces of religious community, with the bishop leading a flock of the faithful (and not-so-faithful). These communities were shaped by certain mechanisms of imagination that fostered ideas of a shared communal identity: these could be press organs, maps, shared institutions, or mutual privileges/limitations. As mentioned earlier, a huge array of church literature, ranging from mundane directories to multivolume academic tomes, furnished the space of the diocese, yet most historians still treat these sources like mines of empirical information rather than rhetorical and discursive artifacts worthy of investigation in their own right. Such works turned the diocese into an imagined space of the Orthodox sacred: in a semiotic reading, the administrative

borderlines were sustained and reinforced by places within them that were imbued with especial holy significance by authorities and people alike.

And in those cases where the imagined space was not Orthodox or where their imputed Orthodox character was under threat, the diocese also represented a project and a promise to “Orthodoxize” that space. Indeed, all of the articles here, in one way or another, touch upon how the presence of non-Orthodoxy, whether it be Old Belief, Lutheranism, sectarianism, or indigenous faiths, acted as an engine of diocesan institutionalization, spurring further development through a rhetoric of Orthodox (and Russian) vulnerability.¹⁰ Dioceses were imagined spaces of empire and colonization, the framework for a space wherein different agents and subjects of empire routinely interacted with each other and with the actors of the imperial centre. Again, it is desirable to look at these horizontal relationships alongside the vertical ones: we must also problematize the latter by emphasizing the way in which local bodies influenced the centre and acted with their own sense of agency.

Dioceses were also imagined ecclesiological spaces, given shape and structure by the discourses that leading canon lawyers and confessional historians produced. In terms of church jurists, discourses about the diocese and the bonds that gave it shape provided particular metaphorical structures for conceiving religious community, the duties and rights of each member of that community, and the nature of hierarchical relationships. This was a controversial subject in the late Russian Empire, with canon law specialists providing often irreconcilable visions of communal ecclesiological space: Alexey Beglov, both here and in numerous other publications, has made this his special area of study.¹¹ In terms of confessional historians, they often imagined the origin of a particular diocese in the “ancient past,” thus allowing the Church to assert and legitimize a canonical right to particular territories and construct an identity of itself as an agent with the authority to exercise that right. However, this right was frequently contested by other confessions and the rise of nationalism.

The relationship between territory and the Church is a problem addressed in current Orthodox ecclesiology. The identification of the territorial sovereignty of national states with church sovereignty in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, on the one hand, and conflicting claims over “canonical territory” by the churches and communities, on the other, invites historical analysis of ecclesiastical territorial regimes in the Russian Empire.¹² The exclusive claims of communities over territories that were produced in the imperial and revolutionary eras represent a fascinating field of study. Within our special issue, this subject is tackled by Irina Paert in her article on the formation of the Estonian Apostolic Orthodox Church from the ruins of the imperial Riga diocese.

Administrative factors, in other words, framed the creation and perpetuation of communal, sacred, imperial, and ecclesiological spaces while also fostering interactions between these kinds of imagined space. Equally, in all these senses of space, the diocese was also temporally in flux: linked to a (constructed) vision of a sacred past, acting in a concrete present, and projected into a (potentially utopian, potentially threatened) future.

From this, it should be clear that agents within the diocese, both ecclesiastical and secular, walk onto centre stage when the diocese is the chief unit of analysis. As an example of how this can be useful, we may consider the person of the bishop. While it is true that the Synod and its chief procurator frequently moved bishops from diocese to diocese in an effort to regulate their behaviour and reinforce their dependence on the central authorities, this was not true in all cases and does not justify treating the bishop as

a figure who dwelt exclusively in splendid isolation, having only a minimal influence on the institutions and people entrusted to his care.¹³ Equally, while it is certainly justified to view bishops as agents of empire and authority, nonetheless they remained individuals with their own biographies, agency, and priorities: they were not necessarily interchangeable and oblivious yes-men. This is true of their interactions with secular authorities (both local and central), with emergent civil society (both regional and all-empire), with each other (other bishops and high-ranking churchmen), and with the institutions and groups directly subordinated to their command (consistories, clergy, and parishioners). Our contributor Gregory Bruess has certainly shown that this was true of Archbishop Nikephoros (Theotokis), a Greek churchman in the southern reaches of Catherine the Great's empire.¹⁴

Examined from the diocesan perspective, the personalities and activities of the senior clergy can be looked at anew, as key actors operating within and contributing to imagined spaces and temporalities of administration, community, the sacred, ecclesiology, and empire. What is true of bishops is true of other local ecclesiastical agents, be they individual clergymen, missions, clerical congresses, brotherhoods, monasteries/convents, or parish councils: this Heather Coleman has shown in terms of Father Petro Lebedyntsev's career in Kyiv.¹⁵ Such is also the concern of Anna Mangileva in this issue and beyond, where she has intensively studied the interrelationship of the clerical estate and the distinctive topographical and discursive space of Perm diocese.¹⁶

Furthermore, taking the diocese as the main unit of analysis invites comparison. Placing two (or more) dioceses side by side allows one to see how contemporaneous practices of constructing and sustaining imagined spaces populated by interactions between diverse active agents differed, if indeed they did. Such an exercise has the added bonus of demonstrating the extent to which the imperial Russian Church was a heterogeneous institution and how its structures, aims, and actions were flexible or inflexible depending on spatial location. And, as noted above, understanding the borders of dioceses as contingent and fluid may allow us to take a "trans-diocesan" perspective, focusing not on the dioceses themselves but rather on the transit of ideas, people, and objects between them. By collecting in this special issue studies on the Omsk, Riga, Perm'-Ekaterinburg, and Kherson-Tauride dioceses, we aim to offer a potential jumping-off point for future comparative and trans-diocesan investigations.

Placing the diocese at the centre of one's investigation, then, potentially offers much interrogative potential to the scholar. However, one must offer two notes of caution drawn from recent literature. On the one hand, the diocese (much like the region) cannot be simply a reflection of the whole or the centre. This has often been the case in Russian church and religious history, where a locality is chosen because of its presumed ability to demonstrate general trends: this, however, tends to neglect the specificities fostered by a particular religious space. Worthy of note in this regard is Catherine Evtuhov's recent call on historians to focus on the way in which ecclesiastical institutions and persons were deeply interlinked with local politics.¹⁷ On the other hand, one must not study the diocese "for its own sake." Too great an obsession with the particularities and peculiarities of one diocese may lead us to neglect centre-periphery or periphery-periphery processes. It is therefore necessary to understand the diocese, in Aleksei Miller's terms, as a space of interactions,¹⁸ one which invites comparison and whose borders were fluid enough to allow for the repeated intrusion of external dynamics.

In this special issue, all the contributors have been guided by a definition of the diocese that emerges from the above discussion: the diocese was a contingent and fluid space that provided a flexible and penetrable framework for a wide assortment of interactions between local and central agents and that was imagined, both spatially and temporally, in administrative, communal, sacred, imperial, and ecclesiological terms, with each of these imagined forms interacting with and influencing each other. The special issue moves from providing a general picture to exploring the creation of new diocesan spaces, particularly on the Black Sea and Baltic littorals; it then considers the role of people and institutions in constituting the diocese.

Alexey Beglov opens the special issue with his article on the relationship between parish and diocese. As well as providing a great deal of general information on the diocese and its gradual evolution over the course of the imperial period, Beglov presents an arresting study of the fleshy tendons of diocesan power: finance and bureaucracy. Often overlooked in the historiography, these two material manifestations of authority shaped not only institutional relationships within the diocese but also provided the framework for the conceptualization of diocesan space and the human interactions that gave it substance.¹⁹ As Beglov shows, by the beginning of the nineteenth century money and administration created (and constituted) a fundamental power asymmetry between parish and diocese, with the latter very clearly dominating; no surprise in the ever-centralizing and ever-bureaucratizing Russian Empire of the nineteenth century. This was both a cause for and a consequence of a vision of the diocese as the most fundamental unit of the Church, the main site for the exercise of clerical, episcopal, Synodal, and state authority. The parish was effectively sidelined and denied formal legal status: parishioners were largely denuded of any effective way to manage their religious lives.²⁰ The tension created by this financial and bureaucratic asymmetry ultimately led, in the midst of revolutionary disorder, to a conceptual and practical reorganization of the place of the diocese, moving towards a lay- and parish-focused vision of space and ecclesiastical authority.²¹ This reconceptualization was partially fought out in the domain of canon law, demonstrating not only its fundamental role in determining the discursive boundaries of the diocese, but also its marginalized and fitful influence on diocesan realities, where the concerns of vested interest groups (consistory officials, clergymen) and the pace of events often proved more formative.

For her part, Mara Kozelsky considers a far rawer exercise of power in the formation and maintenance of diocesan space, that of state-mandated interconfessional violence. Crimea, conquered by the Russian Empire in 1783, was a multiconfessional and multinational space, containing Muslim Tatars, Karaite Jews, and Orthodox Greeks: the annexation, along with the interminable wars and conflicts leading up to it, caused mass deprivation and migration. The Russian Orthodox Church's administrative presence in the area, initially weak by virtue of its tiny flock, grew and developed on waves of subsequent state violence, be it directed at the Tatars or sectarians, deported *en masse* in the 1830s in a bloody march to the southern Caucasus.²² From the tiny suffragancy of Feodosiia–Mariupol (established in 1787), diocesan structures in the locality profited hugely from the devastation of the Crimean War (1853–56) and subsequent ethnic cleansing directed against the Muslim Tatars, thereby finally obtaining the status of a full diocese in 1860.²³ Orthodox bishops and priests supported such actions through various mechanisms before, during, and after the war. Laying claim to Crimean space as

Orthodox from time immemorial, churchmen construed the Orthodox population as a community threatened by forces hostile not only to the Church and its faith but also to the Russian state. In a time of war, their appeals helped establish the reputation of the Crimean Tatars as almost inherently traitorous and thus contributed to the justification of ethnic cleansing. Diocesan space in the Crimea, then, was not fixed but was instead in constant flux, being transformed in step with policies of state violence against minority peoples.

Efforts to transform the religious space of the Russian south through the foundation of dioceses also occupy Gregory Bruess, although his focus is overwhelmingly on the eighteenth century. Having conquered the vast territory of Novorossia in the Russo-Turkish War of 1768–74, Catherine the Great sought to integrate the new lands into her empire, especially through settlement. This imperative led her to encourage the colonization of the area by groups that did not necessarily belong to the Russian Orthodox Church: these included not only the ever-present Old Believers but also non-Russian Orthodox groups, German Mennonites, Armenian Gregorians, and others.²⁴ The religious diversity in this new space necessarily posed challenges to the Russian Orthodox Church once it established diocesan administrations in the region. On the one hand, there was clearly an effort to adapt to the empress's policies of religious tolerance in the region: the first two bishops were both highly educated Greek prelates who conspicuously styled themselves as men of the Enlightenment. Equally, innovative new experiments in missionary outreach were attempted, most notably the first efforts to utilize *edinoverie*, the united faith, as a mechanism to return the Old Believers to the fold.²⁵ On the other hand, the new diocese could not accommodate Dukhobor sectarians who had also settled in the region, leading to rather traditional recommendations from the diocesan authorities: imprisonment and exile. As a result, the imaginary and administrative boundaries of the diocesan community were the subjects of contestation. Churchmen could accept some groups, like the Old Believers, into the fold, albeit after concessions were made; others were deemed to be beyond the pale.

Irina Paert's contribution focuses on the transformation of the imperial-era Riga diocese into a new ecclesiastical unit, the autonomous Estonian Orthodox Church, which was territorially located within the borders of the independent Estonian Republic. This new church was formed under the influence of theological discussions in the pre-revolutionary period: the meaning of the canon laws that regulated church structures was historicized, with concepts of a "people's church," based on notions of the parish community as the cell of ecclesiastical life, serving as the discursive basis of the new structure. While the relationship between the mother Church and the Orthodox community in Estonia did not develop smoothly between 1917 and 1923, it would be wrong to claim that the hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church were adamantly inflexible in their attitude to this formerly subservient diocese. As the balance of power within the dioceses shifted during the revolutionary storms of 1917, even conservative prelates showed a degree to adaptability and allowed a shift of power from the centre.

Dioceses were constituted as spaces by the interactions between representations, personnel, geography, and institutions. In her article, Aileen Friesen considers the role of bishops and episcopal visitations in the newly founded Siberian diocese of Omsk at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Generally speaking, neither contemporaries nor historians have been kind to the phenomenon of episcopal visitations,

treating them as ineffectual, unwelcome, and rare interventions from a physically distant social superior. However, Friesen demonstrates that the situation was somewhat different in Omsk diocese, a religious space discursively demarcated by feelings of vulnerability. On the one hand, the region's Orthodox were settlers suffering from the physical and emotional difficulties inflicted by migration into an alien environment lacking even the paltry comforts of a central Russian village. Church infrastructure was weakly developed, a factor both caused and exacerbated by huge distances and difficult topography. On the other hand, the diocese was home to substantial non-Orthodox populations, most notably dissenting sectarians and non-Russian indigenous peoples. As such, several bishops of Omsk were keen to conduct regular visitations of the diocese: they regarded them as a means to secure the settlers in their Orthodoxy and, in some cases, present an attractive vision of Russian Christian civilization to indigenous groups. In this sense, episcopal visitations very much resemble the cross processions conducted around the borders of parishes and villages: they were both physical and symbolic demarcations of a confessional community and an effort to "Orthodoxize" a region where the faithful were perceived as vulnerable to myriad threats. Here, the bishops were aided greatly by the diocesan gazette, which faithfully narrated and disseminated to a wider public both the visitations themselves and the sense of diocesan community they sought to impart.

Following a similar theme, Anna Mangileva examines a much less privileged group of ecclesiastical personnel, the parish ("white") clergy, in the context of Perm and (to a lesser extent) Ekaterinburg dioceses. The Urals have often been conceived of as a liminal space in Russian imaginative geographies, sitting somewhere between the imperial centre and the Siberian periphery.²⁶ Equally, the regional economy was (and remains) characterized by the presence of heavy industry, mining, and factory settlements, not the agricultural economy so often assumed of the imperial Russian province. A distant den of Old Belief still undergoing colonization in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Urals only attained a diocese in Perm in 1799: the need to drive schismatics back into the fold led to the establishment of the Ekaterinburg suffragancy in 1833, which itself became a full diocese in 1885 as the region's pre-modern industry gave way to modern mass production and concomitant waves of urbanization. All these socio-economic and church structures had an influence on the parish clergy and their career strategies. As Mangileva discusses, the relative distance of the Urals from established urban and church centres meant a paucity of priests in the region and a lack of educational infrastructure. Thus, even in the wake of late eighteenth-century demands for seminary certificates and the 1808 ecclesiastical educational reforms, the clergy relied more on intricate clan networks spidering out over the Urals than on scholastic achievement for job security. In other words, factors of geography, administration, and personnel interacted to produce dioceses bearing the characteristic hallmarks of Urals liminality.

To conclude the issue, James White examines how the creation of a new Orthodox monastic tradition in the Baltic provinces, a border territory dominated by Lutheranism, transformed Riga diocese from a backwater into a bulwark in both rhetorical and material terms.²⁷ The establishment of monasteries and convents in the 1880s and 1890s was justified not only as a form of missionary outreach to non-Orthodox Estonians and Latvians but also as a defense of Russians and Russian land from assault by the Lutheran German landed elite, casting the diocese as an embattled frontier position in a civilizational struggle. At the same time, the lack of financial and human resources in Riga diocese itself meant that the new

monastic institutions were dependent on the creation and activation of religious networks stretching not only across the Russian Empire but even beyond: enabling the exchange of people, ideas, money, and objects, these networks increasingly integrated Riga diocese into a wider Orthodox world. Simultaneously, these cloisters became centres of religious practices largely unknown in the Baltic provinces: icon worship and pilgrimages in particular increasingly worked to demarcate the Orthodox community of Riga diocese, integrating its internal religious space more closely. Both internal and external networks were formed by modern technologies: railways, steamboats, the telegraph, and cheap printing played conspicuous roles. However, these networks were still only in their infancy when the First World War essentially shattered them: the revolutionary chaos destroyed Riga diocese, dividing its territory between the new states of Latvia and Estonia. There emerged a new sense of religious space, albeit one that did build on what had come before.²⁸

Numerous themes, then, unite all of the contributions to the issue: the construction of diocesan spaces through material and discursive mechanisms; the interactions between personnel, institutions, and geography in constituting the diocese; the role of non-Orthodox groups as an impetus for the further development and expansion of dioceses; the relationship between periphery and core, especially in relation to imperial policy; the agency and multiplicity of church actors in a church–state relationship which overwhelmingly favoured the latter; the porosity, changeability, and flexibility of diocesan institutions and borders; and the influence of modern technologies and discourses on the evolution of diocesan space. However, it is our belief that this is only the tip of the iceberg as far as interrogative and critically analytical studies of the imperial Russian diocese are concerned. We hope that both this somewhat theoretical introduction and the more concrete findings of the individual contributions will act as a springboard for future examinations of the interaction between administrative frameworks, sacred communities, and religious practices in the history of the Russian Empire and, perhaps, elsewhere.

Notes

1. *Eparkhiia* in Russian: although the most direct English translation of the word is “eparchy,” the relevant literature overwhelmingly treats it as interchangeable with “diocese.”
2. See, for example, *Adres-kalendar Ekaterinburgskoi*; Chernavskii, *Orenburgskaia eparkhiia*; Dranitsyn, *Adres-kalendar Nizhegorodskoi eparkhii*; Geno, *Dannye o Peterburgskoi eparkhii*; *Kratkie statisticheskie svedeniia*; *Kratkoe istoricheskoe opisanie*; Kutepov, *Pamiatnaia kniga*; *Penzenskaia eparkhiia*; *Spravochnaia kniga*; *Statisticheskie svedeniia*; *Viatskaia eparkhiia*. For a monumental imperial-era study, see Pokrovskii, *Russkii eparkhii v XVI–XIX vekakh*.
3. To give only a few instances of an extremely popular genre: Gavrilin, *Ocherki istorii Rizhskoi eparkhii*; Iakunin, *Istoriia Samarskoi eparkhii*; Dulov and Sannikov, *Irkutskaia eparkhiia*; Dvoretzkaia, Terskova, and Khait, *Pravoslavnaia tserkov'*.
4. *Istoriia Ekaterinburgskoi eparkhii*.
5. Hovorun, *Scaffolds of the Church*, 75.
6. *Ibid.*, 76.
7. See Werth, “Georgian Autocephaly”; Denysenko, *Orthodox Church in Ukraine*.
8. Dixon, “Church, State and Society”; see also his study of the Orthodox diocese of Finland, Dixon, “Sergii (Stragorodskii)”; Friesen, *Colonizing Russia's Promised Land*.
9. Kozelsky, “Borderland Mission.”
10. For a study of Orthodox confession building in reaction to Old Belief, see White, *Unity in Faith?*

11. See, in particular, Beglov, “‘Obshchina, uchrezhdenie, bratstvo ...’.” For the leading Western historian’s perspective on these debates, see Shevzov, *Russian Orthodoxy*.
12. For a discussion of such conflicting claims in the early Soviet period, see Kalkandjjeva, *Russian Orthodox Church*.
13. Specialist works on the episcopate in both Russian and English largely avoid talking about the bishop’s social role. See Koniuchenko, *Arkhieireiskii korpus*; Plamper, “Russian Orthodox Episcopate.”
14. Bruess, *Religion, Identity and Empire*.
15. Coleman, “History, Faith, and Regional Identity.”
16. Mangileva, *Sotsiokulturnyi oblik*.
17. Evtuhov, “Church’s Revolutionary Moment,” 377.
18. Miller, “Between Local and Inter-Imperial.”
19. The finances of the Synodal Church have been almost completely ignored by modern historians. For a very general outline, see Firsov, *Tserkov’ v imperii*, 376–404.
20. For similar conclusions, see Scarborough, “Pastoral Dilemma”; Scarborough, “Faith without Works.”
21. For a diocese-based view of the “Church Revolution,” see Brown, “Orthodox Church.”
22. A more detailed account of the fate of the Dukhobory and other sectarians in the region can be found in Breyfogle, *Heretics and Colonizers*.
23. Kozelsky goes into much greater detail on this subject in her new book: see Kozelsky, *Crimea in War*.
24. On confrontations between the Armenian and Orthodox hierarchies in the Russian south, see Bruess, “Battling Bishops.”
25. On *edinoverie*, see White, *Unity in Faith? Palkin, Edinoverie*.
26. For an interesting recent study on the liminality of the Urals, see Bugrov and Bugrova, “Na grani zhizni.”
27. For a recent study of the transformation of Baltic space in this period, see Brüggemann, *Licht und Luft des Imperiums*.
28. For an overall view of Orthodox space in the Baltic, see Paert, *Pravoslavie v Pribaltike*; for an account especially focused on the interwar period, see Rimestad, *Challenges of Modernity*.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the University of Tartu [grant number PHVUS 18916].

Notes on contributors

Dr. Irina Paert is Senior Research Fellow at the University of Tartu (School of Theology and Religious Studies). She is the author of two monographs, *Old Believers: Religious Dissent and Gender in Russia, 1760–1850* (Manchester University Press, 2003) and *Spiritual Elders: Charisma and Orthodoxy in Russia* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2010).

Dr. James M. White defended his thesis in 2014 at the European University Institute. He has been Senior Research Fellow at Ural Federal University since 2016 and Research Fellow at the University of Tartu since 2018. His book, *Unity in Faith? Edinoverie, Russian Orthodoxy, and Old Belief, 1800–1918*, will be published in 2020 by Indiana University Press. He is the founder of www.balticorthodoxy.com, an online resource platform for research into Orthodoxy in the Baltic region.

ORCIDIrina Paert  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7238-2584>James M. White  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4549-9381>**Bibliography**

- Adres-kalendar Ekaterinburgskoi eparkhii na 1887 god.* Ekaterinburg, 1887.
- Beglov, Aleksei L. "Obshchina, uchrezhdenie, bratstvo ... ': Poisk identichnosti pravoslavnogo prikhoda v proektakh i diskussiiakh kontsa XIX – nachala XX v." *Dialog so vremenem* 48 (2014): 241–264.
- Breyfogle, Nicholas B. *Heretics and Colonizers: Forging Russia's Empire in the South Caucasus*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Brown, Patrick. "The Orthodox Church in Revolutionary Cheliabinsk: Reform, Counter-Reform, and Popular Revolution in 1917." *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue canadienne des slavistes* 59, nos. 1–2 (2017): 70–100.
- Bruess, Gregory L. "Battling Bishops in Catherine II's Russia." In *Thresholds into the Orthodox Commonwealth: Essays in Honor of Theofanis G. Stavrou*, edited by Lucien J. Fray, 393–402. Bloomington: Slavica, 2017.
- Bruess, Gregory L. *Religion, Identity and Empire: A Greek Archbishop in the Russia of Catherine the Great*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Brüggemann, Karsten. *Licht und Luft des Imperiums. Legitimations- und Repräsentationsstrategien russischer Herrschaft in den Ostseeprovinzen im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2018.
- Bugrov, Dmitrii, and Ekaterina Bugrova. "Na grani zhizni i smerti: pogranichnyi Ural v tanatologicheskoi kul'ture." *Quaestio Rossica* 7, no. 4 (2019): 1199–1213.
- Chernavskii, Nikolai M. *Orenburgskaia eparkhiia v proshlom i nastoiashchem*. 2 vols. Orenburg, 1900.
- Coleman, Heather. "History, Faith, and Regional Identity in Nineteenth-Century Kyiv: Father Petro Lebedyntsev as Priest and Scholar." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 34, no. 1–4 (2015–16): 343–372.
- Denysenko, Nicholas E. *The Orthodox Church in Ukraine: A Century of Separation*. DeKalb: NIU Press, 2018.
- Dixon, Simon M. "Church, State and Society in Late Imperial Russia: The Diocese of St Petersburg, 1880–1914." PhD thesis, University of London, 1993.
- Dixon, Simon. "Sergii (Stragorodskii) in the Russian Orthodox Diocese of Finland: Apostasy and Mixed Marriages, 1905–1917." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 82, no. 1 (2004): 50–73.
- Dranitsyn, Nikolai I. *Adres-kalendar Nizhegorodskoi eparkhii na 1904 g.* Nizhnii Novgorod, 1904.
- Dulov, Aleksandr V., and Aleksandr P. Sannikov, eds. *Irkutskaia eparkhiia v XVIII – nachale XX veka*. Irkutsk: Izdatel'stvo IGU, 2013.
- Dvoretskaia, Anna P., Aida A. Terskova, and Nadezhda L. Khait. *Pravoslavnaia tserkov' i naselenie Prieniseiskoi Sibiri, 1700–1919 gg.* Krasnoyarsk: Sibirskii federal'nyi universitet, 2018.
- Evtuhov, Catherine. "The Church's Revolutionary Moment: Diocesan Congresses and Grassroots Politics in 1917." In *Russian Culture in War and Revolution, 1914–22. Book 1: Popular Culture, the Arts, and Institutions*, edited by Murray Frame, Boris Kolonitskii, Steven G. Marks, and Melissa K. Stockdale, 377–402. Bloomington: Slavica, 2014.
- Firsov, Sergei. *Tserkov' v imperii. Ocherki iz tserkovnoi istorii epokhi Imperatora Nikolaia II*. St. Petersburg: Satis' Derzhava, 2007.
- Friesen, Aileen. *Colonizing Russia's Promised Land: Orthodoxy and Community on the Siberian Steppe*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020.
- Gavrilin, Aleksandr. *Ocherki istorii Rizhskoi eparkhii. 19 vek*. Riga: Filokaliia, 1999.
- Geno, Aleksandr. *Dannye o Peterburgskoi eparkhii: K 200-letiiu S.-Peterburga*. St. Petersburg, 1901.
- Hovorun, Cyril. *Scaffolds of the Church: Towards Poststructuralist Ecclesiology*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2018.

- Iakunin, Vadim N. *Istoriia Samarskoi eparkhii*. Tol'iagetti: Povolzhskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 2011.
- Istoriia Ekaterinburgskoi eparkhii*. Ekaterinburg: Sokrat, 2010.
- Kalkandjieva, Daniela. *The Russian Orthodox Church, 1917–1948: From Decline to Resurrection*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Koniuchenko, Andrei I. *Arkhieireiskii korpus Russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi vo vtoroi polovine XIX – nachale XX veka*. Chelyabinsk: Tsentri istoriko-kul'turnogo naslediiia g. Cheliabinska, 2005.
- Kozelsky, Mara. "A Borderland Mission: The Russian Orthodox Church in the Black Sea Region." *Russian History* 40 (2013): 111–132.
- Kozelsky, Mara. *Crimea in War and Transformation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Kratkie statisticheskie svedeniia o prikhodskikh tserkvakh Kostromskoi eparkhii: Spravochnaia kniga*. Kostroma, 1911.
- Kratkoe istoricheskoe opisanie prikhodov i tserkvei Arkhangel'skoi eparkhii*. 3 vols. Arkhangel'sk, 1894.
- Kutepov, Nikolai M., ed. *Pamiatnaia kniga po S.-Peterburgskoi eparkhii*. St. Petersburg, 1899.
- Mangileva, Anna V. *Sotsiokulturnyi oblik prikhodskogo dukhovenstva Permskoi gubernii v XIX – nachale XX v.* Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Uralskogo universiteta, 2015.
- Miller, Aleksei. "Between Local and Inter-Imperial: Russian Imperial History in Search of Scope and Paradigm." *Kritika* 5, no. 1 (2004): pp. 7–26.
- Penzskaia eparkhiia: Istoriko-staticheskoe opisanie*. Penza, 1907.
- Rimestad, Sebastian. *The Challenges of Modernity to the Orthodox Church in Estonia and Latvia (1917–1940)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012.
- Paert, Irina, ed. *Pravoslavie v Pribaltike: Religiiia, politika, obrazovanie, 1840-e–1930-e gg.* Tartu: University of Tartu Press, 2018.
- Palkin, Aleksandr S. *Edinoverie v seredine XVIII – nachale XX veka: Obshcherossiiskii kontekst i regional'naia spetsifika*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta, 2016.
- Plamper, Jan. "The Russian Orthodox Episcopate, 1721–1917: A Prosopography." *Journal of Social History* 60 (2001): 5–24.
- Pokrovskii, I. M. *Russkiiia eparkhii v XVI–XIX vekakh, ikh otkrytie, sostav i predely*. 2 vols. Kazan, 1897–1913.
- Scarborough, Daniel. "Faith without Works is Dead: Sacred Space and Civil Society in Late Imperial Moscow and Tver." *Jahrbucher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 63, no. 2 (2015): 207–232.
- Scarborough, Daniel. "The Pastoral Dilemma: Clerical Mutual Aid and Famine Relief during Russia's Crop Failure of 1905." *Russian History* 41 (2014): 68–83.
- Shevzov, Vera. *Russian Orthodoxy on the Eve of Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Spravochnaia kniga po Tverskoi eparkhii na 1915 god*. Tver, 1914.
- Statisticheskie svedeniia o tserkvakh i prichtakh Polotskoi eparkhii*. Vitebsk, 1884.
- Viatskaia eparkhiia: Istoriko-geograficheskoe i statisticheskoe opisanie*. Viatka, 1912.
- Werth, Paul. "Georgian Autocephaly and the Ethnic Fragmentation of Orthodoxy." *Acta Slavica Iaponica* 23 (2003): 74–100.
- White, James M. *Unity in Faith? Edinoverie, Russian Orthodoxy and Old Belief, 1800–1918*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020.