

The
**Carl Beck
Papers**

in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1801

Robert H. Greene

**Making Saints:
Canonization and
Community in Late
Imperial Russia**



At the shrine of St. Anna Kashinskaia, 1910

The
**Carl Beck
Papers**

in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1801

Robert H. Greene

**Making Saints:
Canonization and
Community in Late
Imperial Russia**

Robert H. Greene was educated at the University of Rochester (B.A., 1997) and the University of Michigan (Ph.D., 2004), where his doctoral dissertation (“Bodies Like Bright Stars: Saints and Relics in Orthodox Russia, 1860s-1920s”) was selected for the Rackham Distinguished Dissertation Award. He is co-editor, with Valerie A. Kivelson, of *Orthodox Russia: Belief and Practice Under the Tsars* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003). Greene was a post-doctoral fellow and lecturer at the University of Michigan from 2004-2006 and is currently Assistant Professor of History at the University of Montana. He is currently writing a monograph on saintly cults in the late imperial and early Soviet periods.

No. 1801, October 2006

© 2006 by The Center for Russian and East European Studies, a program of the University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh

ISSN 0889-275X

The Carl Beck Papers

Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden

Managing Editor: Eileen O’Malley

Editorial Assistant: Vera Dorosh

Photo from cover: Library of Congress, Prints & Photographs Division, Prokudin-Gorskii Collection, LC-DIG-prok-02342

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and between 40 and 90 pages in length. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4400 Posvar Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

ABSTRACT

The story of canonization in late imperial Russia has been told, traditionally, as a political and institutional narrative of church-state relations, of strategic decisions made at the highest levels by high-ranking clerics and members of the imperial family. This essay examines the cults of Anna Kashinskaia and Sofronii Irkutskii as case studies of canonization “from below,” demonstrating that in both instances local believers and clerics played prominent roles in initiating and ultimately securing official recognition for their locally-revered miracle-workers as a gesture of thanks for miracles rendered to the community. The efforts of the local faithful on behalf of their saints speaks both to the deep feelings of reciprocal obligation that characterized believers’ relationships with the holy dead, and to the powerful localized dimension of sanctity. The miracle stories attributed by local believers to Saints Anna and Sofronii reveal how the faithful saw and talked about their saints not as distant figures in another world but as hometown heroes forever present in the community where they had lived, served, died, and (most importantly) were buried.

When it shall please the Lord God to give glory to His saint on earth, then the Lord shall grant unto [the saint's] uncorrupted body the power to perform healings and miracles. . . . When there accrue many instances of grace-given healings from holy relics, then all the Orthodox people of that region ask their archcleric to open the relics of this saint [for veneration] and to number him among the ranks of the saints and to offer prayers (molebny) to him. The archcleric, having received the people's (narod) request, presents this matter before the Holy Synod. The Sovereign and the Holy Synod appoint for this matter a special commission from among all the estates of the narod to conduct an investigation. The commission collects verified information concerning the grace-given healings performed from the relics and makes inquiries into even the most minute details. Once convinced of God's great mercy, the Holy Synod presents this matter before the Sovereign. At His Majesty's pleasure, the Holy Synod gives instructions for the relics of God's saint to be opened, and then numbers him among the ranks of the saints. A day is designated for the ceremonial opening of the relics of the newly appeared saint, and all of Russia is given notice of this. A great many people gather together for the ceremony of the opening [of the relics]. Sometimes the Sovereign Emperor himself is present for the festivities, or else he sends a Grand Prince.¹

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Russian Orthodox Church rarely recognized new saints and often cracked down on the emergence of unsanctioned saintly cults.² The reign of Nicholas II, however, witnessed a sudden surge in the number of holy dead all across the Russian Empire, beginning with the canonization of Saint Feodosii Uglitskii of Chernigov in 1896. In all, the Holy Synod and the emperor sanctioned a total of seven canonizations during the last two decades of Romanov rule, as compared with only four in the preceding two centuries. Not since the Muscovite period had the Russian Church produced as many saints in so short a time. By the time the Bolsheviks came to power in 1917, the cases of at least a half dozen more saintly candidates had been brought for consideration before the Church Sobor.³

The question of just how saints were “made” in imperial Russia has been somewhat contended in the literature. Though I have used the word “canonization” to describe the process whereby holy men and women receive official recognition of their sanctity from an institutional church, the Russian Orthodox concept differs somewhat from the more rigorous and formalized system which developed over many centuries in the Roman Catholic Church. In the 1890s, E. E. Golubinskii explained that while the Roman Church spoke of the “canonization of saints” (*kanonizatsiia sviatykh*), the more traditional Orthodox designation for the process was “numbering [one] among the ranks of the saints” (*prichtenie k liku sviatykh*).⁴ In other words, the Russian Church claimed that it did not “make” saints so much as it “recognized” or “numbered” them, thus giving sanction to the veneration on earth of men and women to whom God had already granted glory in heaven. In the official Orthodox formulation, then, as shown in the epigraph above, God himself makes saints, and the role of the church and the faithful is restricted to one of reiteration—acknowledging in the visible world that which has already been resolved in the world unseen; namely, that the candidate in question is undoubtedly a saint who stands at the throne of God.⁵

Theology aside, however, human beings make saints, and oftentimes for very human reasons.⁶ Gregory Freeze has made a convincing argument that the flurry of canonizations under Nicholas II should be viewed in the context of the last emperor’s efforts to find a usable national myth, one that could galvanize and unite an increasingly fractured polity while bolstering the monarchy’s faded charisma. Though Nicholas II’s participation at some of these ceremonies was, in part, an expression of genuine piety, the presence of the emperor and his entourage was also a political gesture intended to “reify the mythic union of tsar and people from all classes and all regions” and forestall any further “erosion” of autocratic legitimacy. The highly stylized and ritualistic nature of these canonization ceremonies has prompted Freeze to dub them “great social dramas of

religious politics” whose choreographers sought to revitalize the ailing body politic by associating it with the miraculous, uncorrupted bodies and holy relics of the newly elevated saints.⁷

Yet Freeze acknowledges that these attempts to resacralize the autocracy were largely unsuccessful. Try as it might, the ruling dynasty was unable to co-opt or capitalize on the air of sanctity which surrounded the holy relics of God’s saints. The reasons for this failure, I would argue, go beyond the personal shortcomings of Nicholas himself and his high-handed disregard for the proper procedure of canon law. Sanctity failed to transfer on a national level—and missed the emperor’s person entirely—because the saints were, ultimately, too closely bound to specific localities. Orthodox saints functioned first and foremost as local heroes, protectors, champions, and friends. Their miracles were focused around the sites where their holy relics resided, and these latter were the most direct conduits through which believers could channel the power of the divine. Removed from the local soil in which their cults had flourished and suddenly transplanted and redefined as saviors of the nation, new saints tended to perform poorly. Even so prominent and popularly revered a holy man as the recently canonized Serafim Sarovskii “proved a total failure” at mobilizing Russian troops to fight the Japanese at Port Arthur. The soldiers, it seems, could not rally round a saint whose face they did not recognize and with whose resumé of miraculous intercession they were unfamiliar.⁸

Local saints had histories of their own well before the time their causes came before the Synod and the emperor. This essay will examine the canonization procedure from the bottom up, with particular attention to the role that ordinary believers and communities played in inventing, perpetuating, and promoting the cults of local saints at the end of the imperial period. My focus here is on the localized cults of Anna Kashinskaia in Tver’ and Sofronii Irkutskii in Siberia—two saints with distinguished resumé of miracle-working, but who lacked uncorrupted relics (*netlennye moshchi*).⁹ Unlike Serafim Sarovskii, whose canonization was pushed through the Synod in 1903 at the insistence of the royal family, or Patriarch Germogen, whose cause for sainthood was advanced by high-ranking clerics seeking to restore the autonomy the church had enjoyed under the ancient patriarchate, Anna and Sofronii owed their eventual canonizations to the determined efforts of lay believers and clerics at the local and diocesan level, who launched massive grass-roots campaigns for the official recognition of their local saints.¹⁰ They were also blessed with good timing. As Freeze has suggested elsewhere, the late imperial church, beset by the twin threats of sectarianism and secularism, was conscious that it needed “to bring [believers] into the Church rather than to drive them away.”¹¹ If the emergence of their cults is a testament

to the attachment and efforts of local believers, their official recognition speaks to a definite shift in priorities in St. Petersburg and a more tolerant acceptance for expressions of religious piety emanating from below.

I argue that the broad-based campaigns to canonize Anna, Sofronii, and other late-on-the-scene saints were fueled primarily by individual and community interests at the local level. Written sources suggest that a deep sense of obligation motivated many Orthodox believers to seek official (and often, it was believed, long-overdue) recognition for their saintly champions as a show of thanks for their centuries of providing for the well-being of the individual and the community alike. In the miracle stories submitted to diocesan officials by individuals and families, believers framed this obligation in reciprocal terms, commonly describing it as their “sacred duty” to give notice of the miraculous help they had received as a means of contributing to the cause of their saints’ canonization. Similar feelings were expressed in the resolutions of the city dumas and provincial zemstvo organizations, whose members joined their voices to the call for canonization and worked tirelessly to form committees, secure signatures, and lobby patrons in St. Petersburg on their candidates’ behalf. Institutions at the local and provincial level sought the official recognition of their hometown saints as a way of sacralizing the community, thereby elevating their hometowns and regions to the status of other sites across the empire similarly graced by God with the presence of the holy relics of a miracle-working patron. By focusing on the local dimension of sanctity, I seek to shift the narrative of late-imperial canonization away from the cloakrooms of the Holy Synod and courtly politics of the capital and resituate it in the local communities where the saints and their relics had been revered for generations and where the grass-roots movements for their recognition began. In late imperial Russia, canonization began at home.

Making and Unmaking Saints: The Case of Anna Kashinskaia

On 12 June 1909, a crowd of between fifty and one hundred thousand worshippers and pilgrims from all across the Russian Empire assembled on the square facing the Voskresenskii Cathedral in the provincial city of Kashin, some seventy miles northeast of Tver’, to celebrate the ceremonial opening of the holy relics of the newly glorified Orthodox saint, Princess Anna Kashinskaia. Metropolitan Vladimir of Moscow blessed the multitudes with holy water and an orchestra played *Kol’ slaven* (How Glorious Is Our Lord) to the accompaniment of the cathedral bells as the jeweled shrine containing Anna’s relics, covered in a purple velvet shroud, was borne through the crowds by a retinue of clerics headed by

fifteen bishops and eighty archimandrites. A parade line of police and mounted gendarmes from Moscow and Tver' attempted to keep order as the sea of worshippers threw white ribbons and scarves into the air and strained to touch the shrine as it made its way into the cathedral. Ticketed guests and invited dignitaries, princes, governors, and bureaucrats from the capital, were swiftly ushered into the cathedral for the prayer service, while thousands of peasants, cripples, and hysterics stood single-file in a line that stretched up and down the two main thoroughfares of downtown Kashin, waiting their turn to enter the church and kiss the miracle-working relics of their "little mother," Anna Kashinskaia, the newest saint of the Russian Orthodox Church. Pilgrims en route to the celebration swore they saw, shining above the cathedral domes, two radiant beams of light that were visible from more than a mile outside town—a sign interpreted by all as clear proof of God's favor for this blessed event.¹²

While the provincial and city newspapers in Tver' gossiped about which royal personages and local celebrities had been spotted at the public reception that followed the celebration and regaled readers with reports of the fireworks display and outdoor concerts in the city gardens, the religious press waxed poetic on such a rare and wondrous occasion.¹³ Anna's canonization was the first in nearly six years and only the fifth since the beginning of the nineteenth century. But what made 12 June 1909 particularly remarkable was that Anna had been through this once before. Demoted by order of the church council of 1678, Anna Kashinskaia was reinstated to the ranks of the saints by the Holy Synod in 1908 and her veneration officially reintroduced the following year, thus making her the first (and, to date, only) saint to be, in effect, *re*-canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church.

The earliest evidence for the veneration of Anna Kashinskaia dates to the Time of Troubles. In 1611, nearly two hundred fifty years after her death, Princess Anna is said to have appeared in a dream to a man named Gerasim, the ailing sacristan of the Uspenskii Cathedral in Kashin. Dressed in nun's robes and calling herself only Anna, the princess rebuked Gerasim and his fellow townspeople for failing to render due reverence to herself and her relics:

My grave is ignored by the people, you consider it to be but an ordinary thing, and you hold me in disdain. [When people enter the Uspenskii Cathedral] they fling their hats upon my grave, they sit atop it, and no one forbids them this. . . . Do you not know that I pray to the All-Merciful God and the Mother of God so that your city may not fall into the hands of your enemies, and that I preserve you all from many evils and calamities?¹⁴

Anna then proceeded to give Gerasim instructions for the care and well-being of her grave—which, over centuries of neglect, had begun to rise up from beneath the cracked and broken floorboards of the wooden cathedral—and entrusted the sacristan with relaying her message to his fellow clergymen. When Gerasim rose from his sickbed he discovered that his illness had passed, and he duly informed the prior of the cathedral that the dilapidated stone grave was no common hat rack, but the forgotten resting place of the Great Princess Anna Kashinskaia.¹⁵

Like other forgotten saints rediscovered in seventeenth-century Tver' diocese, Anna swiftly became the object of popular veneration.¹⁶ In light of Gerasim's miraculous recovery and the city's recent deliverance from invading Polish and Lithuanian armies, the Orthodox faithful, prompted by the episcopal elite in Tver', were inclined to credit these wondrous occurrences to some unseen, supernatural force protecting the city of Kashin and its residents.¹⁷ Shortly thereafter, requiem services (*panikhidy*) were being performed regularly at Anna's grave, now adorned with candles and ikon lamps, while the sick and crippled came to touch the princess's coffin in hopes of a cure from heaven. Thirty years and eight miracles later, the clergy of the Uspenskii Cathedral saw fit to bring the matter to the attention of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.¹⁸ In 1649, the tsar, who relished the discovery of new miracle-workers, ordered Archbishop Iona of Tver' and two Moscow monks to inspect Anna's relics and report on their condition. When the princess's body was discovered to be in a state of divinely ordained incorruptibility, measures were taken for Anna's canonization. A life (*zhitie*) of the soon-to-be saint was commissioned from a local deacon, and a liturgical church service to be sung in her honor on her feast days was written by a Kievan monk and scholar, Epifanii Slavinetskii.¹⁹ That same year, a council of Orthodox bishops announced her canonization, and on 12 June 1650, Tsar Aleksei himself traveled to Kashin and helped to shoulder the coffin containing Anna's relics as it was borne in procession through the city streets from the Uspenskii Cathedral to the more lavishly appointed Voskresenskii Cathedral. This ceremonial translation of the new saint's relics (*perenesenie*) and their presentation for public veneration (*otkrytie*) marked Anna Kashinskaia's elevation to the ranks of the saints revered by the Russian Orthodox Church.

But Anna's saintly status was to prove short-lived. Following the Church Schism of the 1660s, Patriarch Ioakim harbored a hostile suspicion toward any rituals and practices not in compliance with the liturgical reforms of his predecessor, Nikon. When rumors reached Moscow that Anna Kashinskaia's right hand was bent into the shape of the Old Believers' two-fingered cross (*dvuperstie*), he dispatched a four-man commission of clerics to look into the matter. Arriving in

Kashin in February 1677, the delegation, headed by Metropolitan Iosif of Riazan' and Murom, launched a thorough investigation of Anna's relics, her *zhitie*, and the collection of miracle stories which had served as the basis for her canonization more than two decades earlier. The commission discovered a total of thirteen instances in which the *zhitie* failed to correspond to events and details given in the chronicle accounts of Anna's life and death. Most of these inconsistencies were minor, but some discrepancies were troubling.²⁰ When pressed for questioning by the commission, the author of the *zhitie* said that he had simply written down the stories told him by the locals of Kashin (all of whom, it bears pointing out, lived two hundred fifty years after the saint's death).²¹ To cast further suspicion on Anna's cause, the commission found another dozen inconsistencies in the miracle cures attributed to her. The third and final strike, however, came when the commission members opened Anna's shrine for examination and discovered that the saint's body was in far worse shape than the *zhitie* would lead one to believe; not only had the princess's chasuble and vestments rotted away, but her body itself had undergone corruption.²²

After reviewing the commission's findings, Ioakim convened a preliminary council of all church hierarchs then present in Moscow. The members resolved that the discrepancies and inconsistencies surrounding Anna's sanctity were serious enough to warrant action, especially in light of the saint's apparent endorsement of the two-fingered cross. Anna's grave was ordered sealed pending further notice; her feast days were henceforth to go uncelebrated; the divine liturgy (*bogosluzhenie*) was not to be performed in the chapel church consecrated in her honor; finally, and most tellingly, the special prayers of praise sung to a saint (*molebny*) were to be replaced by the ordinary requiem prayers (*panikhidy*) rendered to any deceased Orthodox Christian.²³ In January 1678, a full council upheld the preliminary resolutions of the previous year. The archbishop of Tver' was instructed to collect all Anna's ikons from the diocese and send them to Moscow. The reading of her *zhitie* was forbidden in churches, along with the celebration of any prayer services in her honor. Evoking the statutes of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the delegates threatened with excommunication any lay faithful or cleric who continued to revere the former saint, that "if anyone has in his possession images of the pious princess Anna, or her *zhitie* or hymnals (*kanony*), let him bring them to the Most Holy Patriarch or to any of his archclerics, lest he be under the anathema of the holy fathers."²⁴ Thus, less than thirty years after her canonization, the veneration of Anna Kashinskaia was officially proscribed, her relics sealed to would-be worshippers, and her name stricken from the rolls of the Russian Orthodox saints.²⁵

But while prelates and patriarchs could issue thunderous injunctions against Anna's cult, the Muscovite Church was institutionally ill-equipped to prevent manifestations of popular devotion to the sainted princess. Nineteenth-century sources note that although the news of Anna Kashinskaia's demotion was met with bitterness and sorrow by believers in Tver' diocese, her veneration continued unabated in and around Kashin. A popular dictionary of saints that was published in the capital and went through multiple printings in the mid-nineteenth century not only included an entry on Anna Kashinskaia, but stated matter-of-factly, "The memory of the Pious Princess Anna is celebrated locally on 2 October."²⁶ In 1909, on the very eve of Anna's re-canonization, a clerical author remarked with great satisfaction that the Orthodox faithful of Kashin had never lost faith in their saint:

Two hundred and thirty years have passed from the time of the council's deliberations, but, among the residents of the city [of Kashin] and the surrounding districts, the memory of the pious princess, the veneration of her sainted remains and of this [place], the site of her deeds, did not stop even for a single day. All the feast days in her honor are celebrated joyously [*svetlo*], in every peasant hut her ikon stands alongside those of the other saints, and it is the rare house that does not have an ikon of the pious princess Anna. Parents bless their children with this ikon both at weddings and on the sickbed.²⁷

Another source observed that even though "not a single church service was performed in [Anna's] honor" for over two centuries, devotion to the princess was "deeply widespread" among the people of Kashin.²⁸ In other words, while the council could outlaw the singing of *molebny* at Anna's grave and keep worshippers from kissing her relics by sealing her shrine, it could not prevent the Orthodox faithful from honoring Anna's memory through other, extraliturgical means.

We can gauge the depth of the Kashinites' devotion to Anna by examining some of the "small," quotidian practices recorded in late imperial church sources and published miracle stories. The principal way, of course, in which believers interacted with the saint was by requesting miracles and healing cures at her shrine—a matter of no small importance in a town that could claim only one hospital with a mere thirty beds at the turn of the twentieth century.²⁹ Yet other details show how the relationships that the Orthodox faithful forged with their saints extended beyond the liturgical space of the church proper to encompass nearly every aspect of personal life from birth to death. One observer, commenting on Anna's popularity in the region, noted that "in her honor, names are given to little girls at holy baptism . . . newlyweds are blessed with ikons bearing her image; and those who desire to take monastic vows pray passion-

ately before her.”³⁰ Before beginning school, children were often brought to the Voskresenskii Cathedral by their parents to pray at Anna’s shrine for help in their studies. Similarly, adults, men and women alike, would pray to Anna for help in money matters or for assistance in finding work, either in town or elsewhere.³¹ In late-nineteenth-century Kashin, when the city’s economy was almost entirely dependent on the flax industry, it was common for citizens entering into business arrangements, binding agreements, or even the most mundane affairs to swear sacred oaths in Anna’s name.³² As one author explained, “The name of the pious [princess] is with the local residents from cradle to grave.”³³

The grace and heavenly assistance of “little mother Anna” were, in theory, available to all Orthodox men and women who sought her help in prayer. But Anna appears to have possessed a special spiritual resonance for the women of Tver’ diocese. Most of the thirty miracles attributed to Anna and recorded by the Tver’ diocesan consistory from 1897 to 1909 were reported by women (or, in some cases, by fathers or husbands on behalf of their healed daughters or wives).³⁴ Anna was such a popular name for young girls in the vicinity of Kashin that one observer counted more than thirty Annas in one small village in Kashinskii uезд alone.³⁵ It was tradition, too, for new brides and their husbands to be blessed by their parents on their wedding day with an ikon of Anna Kashinskaia.³⁶ Annas in Kashin city celebrated their name days on either one of the two principal feast days dedicated to Anna’s memory, and most alternated between the two dates from year to year: 2 October, the date of Anna’s “blessed end” (*konchina*), and 12 June, the feast day marking the translation of Anna’s holy relics in 1650.³⁷

The special affinity that female faithful displayed for Anna Kashinskaia may have had something to do with the gender-specific way in which church sources and ordinary believers talked about the princess saint’s particular love for the people of Kashin.³⁸ As her re-canonization drew near, the diocesan and provincial press published a number of articles and biographical sketches of Anna which emphasized her role as loving mother, faithful wife, and exemplar of feminine piety. The Tver’ diocesan press described Anna as “the very image of a Christian woman . . . a loving, suffering woman, ready to sacrifice her strength and means for the well-being of those near to her.”³⁹ The noted religious writer E. Poselianin, who authored a number of works on the saints, extolled Anna’s tearful farewell to her husband, Prince St. Mikhail of Tver’, as “the apotheosis of the Russian woman”: a combination of unconditional love and a resigned acceptance of God’s will.⁴⁰ Although every Orthodox saint was said to possess more than the requisite measure of Christian love and charitable sympathy, the discourse surrounding Anna Kashinskaia and her virtues took on a decidedly gendered cast. Church sources explicitly singled her out as a patron saint of the

married life: “All who are unhappy in marriage find help at the holy relics of Anna Kashinskaia; [on behalf of the faithful] the saint persistently obtains from God the blessing of a quiet and peaceful married life, the blessing of ‘counsel and love’ between men and women.”⁴¹

To prove the point, the editors of the religious journal *Kormchii* (The Helmsman) published an account of a miracle “performed before our very eyes,” describing the reunion at Anna’s shrine of an estranged couple whose marriage had broken up eight years before, after the wife’s parents cheated the young groom out of the dowry promised him. What is particularly noteworthy about this happy little tale is that the husband, who had headed east to start a new life in Siberia, is said to have learned of Anna’s abilities as a marriage counselor from reading articles about her which were appearing with ever greater frequency in the religious and secular press. Recent scholarship on the late imperial period has demonstrated how saintly reputations spread farther and faster thanks to the publicity afforded the sacred by new forms of mass media. Indeed, as this miracle story shows, so-called official sources and modern modes of mass communication combined with traditional stories, legends, and customs to not only reflect, but give shape to, the ways in which the faithful understood their relationship to Anna Kashinskaia in particular, and to the sacred more generally.⁴²

Strong evidence to suggest that believers understood and acted out these relationships with their saints in personal, intimate, and reciprocal terms comes from the votive gifts that they brought to saintly shrines across the empire. Such gifts were generally made in fulfillment of a pledge (*po obetu*) and were of a value proportionate to the donor’s means. Small offerings and heart-felt gifts adorned by the shrine of Saint Feodosii Chernigovskii some six months before his canonization:

The worshippers of God’s saint . . . bring incense, olive [branches], and small pieces of yellow wax; velvet and silken gloves adorned with rich embroidery to place on the prelate’s hands; sandals for his feet; shrouds and palls stitched with gold, silver, and silk; pillows for behind his head; and other offerings, both material and monetary, dropping the latter in the offertory box which stands beside the grave.⁴³

In a sermon delivered on the two-hundredth anniversary of Feodosii’s death, the archpriest of the cathedral drew his audience’s attention to the “great number of trinkets” which stood nearby at the saint’s shrine. The cleric described these gifts, brought to the shrine as a show of thanks for heavenly help, as “silent but eloquent witnesses of the miracles performed through the prelate’s intercession.”⁴⁴

Although in some cases these votive gifts were presented anonymously, the inventory of donations made to the shrine of Saint Anna Kashinskaia in 1909 includes samples of handmade linen cloth—offerings “from the labors of the righteous”—to adorn the saint’s shrine, along with several altar cloths (*vozdukhy*) with woven inscriptions bearing the names of the donors: “For the health of Fedor and Mariia,” “For the health of Pavel, Aleksandra, and Agrippina.” In fact, more than two-thirds of the 130 gifts donated in 1909 for Anna’s canonization ceremonies bore or made mention of the donors’ names.⁴⁵ Because they were on full view in such a profoundly public space as the local cathedral, we may surmise that they were intended to bolster the donors’ status and moral authority in the community. But the naming of the donors also had a spiritual purpose: it was important for Orthodox believers that the saints knew from whom their presents came. The deeply personalized relationship between the believer and the saint was predicated on an understanding of reciprocity: the saint worked miracles for the faithful, who, in turn, returned the favor, so to speak, by making a return pilgrimage to offer prayer, thanks, and sometimes gifts. Theologians spoke of this as evidence of the loving union of the church eternal in heaven and the church militant on earth. Whether or not the lay faithful conceived of the relationship in such refined terms, evidence from miracle stories shows that they did recognize the responsibility incumbent on them to render thanks for favors received and ensure further miracles in the future.⁴⁶

Anna’s love and protection for the faithful extended beyond the individual to encompass the entire community, serving, in essence, as a central myth that bound the community together. As we have seen, popular tradition credited Anna with having saved the city of Kashin from the Lithuanians during the Time of Troubles. Anna’s expertise expanded somewhat over the nineteenth century, enabling her not only to keep out the French in 1812 but stave off cholera epidemics in 1831 and 1848. Certain “pious citizens” in Kashin were inclined to believe that “the prayers and protection of the devout princess Anna” had delivered the city from upheaval and revolution during the “troubled years” of 1905-1906.⁴⁷ Again, this relationship was understood in reciprocal terms on both the individual and collective levels. In 1860, when a diocesan committee recommended that the number of parishes in Kashin be reduced—judging that nineteen parishes was far too many for a city with a population barely over seventy-three hundred—the public outcry was immediate, “It is impossible that a single parish be closed, *the pious princess Anna will not forgive us*. She helps us so much, we will provide the moneys for the maintenance of the churches and the parish clergy in perpetuity and we will thus keep all the parishes intact.”⁴⁸ The petitioners thought it an unspeakable affront to the dignity of their local patron saint if they allowed so-

called outsiders to close down one of their “own” parishes. Being the recipients of Anna’s assistance, therefore, also meant bearing the responsibility of protecting her interests and defending her honor.

If Anna herself stood as a symbol of Kashin’s special relationship with the divine, her shrine and relics were the central point around which this community cohered. In everyday speech, for example, citizens of Kashin commonly referred to the Voskresenskii Cathedral where Anna’s relics were housed, not by its proper name but as “the princess’s cathedral.” One source reports that “it was not uncommon to hear: I’m going to the Pious Princess’s [*k Blagovernoi*] for the vigil service. . . . I just came from the Pious Princess’s. . . . We’ll be married at the Pious Princess’s.”⁴⁹ By the late nineteenth century, Anna’s memory was celebrated on four different feast days, observed as public holidays in Kashin city and district. The grand religious processions (*krestnye khody*) staged on these feast days—with the clergy and laity of all estates marching through the city streets bearing ikons and banners with Anna’s likeness—satisfied not only the religious needs of individuals, but served also to sacralize the community’s civic and public space.⁵⁰ In 1899, the city fathers banned all commercial activity and trading during these processions, and in 1907 the city *duma* successfully petitioned the Ministry of Education to let children have the day off from school on 17 November so that they, too, could participate in the festivities.⁵¹ Also in 1899, the Kashin city volunteer fire brigade passed a resolution designating 12 June as its annual holiday, so as to coincide with the anniversary of the translation of Anna’s relics.⁵² When important visitors and prominent personages passed through Tver’, provincial authorities would often go out of their way to organize an excursion to Kashin so that they could worship at the shrine of Anna Kashinskaia. Such spiritual sightseeing was a matter not just of religious devotion, but of civic pride.⁵³ So too were the ikons of Anna often handed out as gifts by the governors of Tver’ Province to commemorate special occasions or anniversaries. In 1883, for example, Alexander III and Mariia Feodorovna received an ikon of Anna Kashinskaia to mark their coronation; and in 1900 the Moscow Dragoons Regiment was presented with a similar ikon on the occasion of the two-hundredth anniversary of its founding.⁵⁴ In 1908, when a delegation of dignitaries from Kashin traveled to St. Petersburg to petition the tsar and Synod for Anna’s restoration to the ranks of the saints, they brought with them an “ancient” ikon of Anna Kashinskaia to give to Nicholas II.⁵⁵ Although such gestures can be seen, of course, in the context of the turn-of-the-century trend toward historicizing Russia’s glorious pre-Mongol and Muscovite past, I would argue that they reflect the degree to which Kashin (and Tver’ Province more broadly) consciously sought to identify itself with the image and reputation of its local

saint.⁵⁶ By the late nineteenth century, Anna Kashinskaia was *the* symbol, not only of Kashin's Orthodox faith, but of the community's very identity. Nothing "said" Kashin more than Anna Kashinskaia.⁵⁷

Even though Anna's relics had been charred in a church fire some time in the first half of the nineteenth century—an accident that religious writers attributed to "spiritual carelessness and negligence on the part of us sinful humans"—miracles continued to be performed at her shrine.⁵⁸ Many of the miracle stories submitted by the faithful of Kashin and the surrounding districts show how average believers understood their community's relationship with Anna. Often these notions of community are made explicit, as in the recorded tale of a seventy-seven-year-old townswoman from Kashin, Liubov' Gavrilovna Feodorova. In June 1908, as the question of Anna's re-canonization was being raised with great excitement in the city *duma* and provincial *zemstvo* organizations, Feodorova was busy planning a summer pilgrimage. After narrowing her choices to either the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra or the shrine of Saint Makarii Zhabynskii at the nearby Kaliazinskii monastery (Tver' Province), Feodorova decided to sleep on it. In a dream, she imagined herself standing before Anna Kashinskaia's shrine in the Voskresenskii Cathedral. Seeing that the shrine was open, Feodorova bent down to kiss the saint's hand. Suddenly, Anna's hand turned warm and the saint said to her in a clear voice: "Pray here" (*Molis' zdes'*). When she woke up, Feodorova decided to abandon her plans to travel to a distant monastery and follow Anna's advice. In a letter written that same month to Father Ioann Amenitskii, the prior of the Blagoveshchenskii Cathedral and collector of Anna's miracle stories, Feodorova swore she was telling "the holy truth," and reported that she now attends the regular vigil services at Anna's shrine "with joy in [her] spirit."⁵⁹

Another miracle story from 1909 tells of a young married student, Nikolai Ivanovich Prokhorov, who feared that the "tight conditions" of his financial situation would force him and his wife to give up their rented house in Kashin and move in with his father, some twenty miles away. When he told his wife that they might miss the re-canonization ceremonies that summer, she exploded with rage: "What's the matter with you, Kolya? Other pilgrims will be coming in droves from other provinces, and we can't be troubled with a distance of just some thirty versts? Will we really not be able to find a place to stay?" That night, Nikolai dreamt he was in the cathedral, standing before Anna's shrine. He described a great longing to reach down and touch her relics, but shrunk back "with pain in my heart . . . since at that moment I was not pure enough of body to touch the shrine [*tak kak ne byl v etot moment nastol'ko chist' telesno*]." In the second half of his dream, Nikolai found himself sitting in a room with his wife, his parents, and his sisters, when Anna Kashinskaia walked in, clad in white robes, "radiant

and robust, though an old woman.” Nikolai fell to his knees to beg the saint’s pardon for not kissing her relics: “Little mother, Saint Princess Anna, forgive me, a sinner, and have mercy.” Anna flashed a “bright and tender smile,” and told Nikolai that she was touched by the discretion he had shown and the “sincere grief” that he now felt. She bid him rise and, as Nikolai later described in his letter to Amenitskii, said that “she had come to tell me that I ‘must’ be present during the glorification of Her Holy Relics, ‘for which,’ she said, ‘I have waited for so long.’” Nikolai promised Anna that he would be in Kashin without fail, whereupon the saint vanished “like a shadow.”⁶⁰ The student’s dream reflects strongly the notion of community and the feeling that the faithful of Kashin had an obligation to be present for the ceremonies that would reinstate their local patron to the ranks of the saints. As both his wife and Anna tell him, it would be unthinkable for a true believer of Kashin to absent himself from the city on the day of this long-awaited celebration.

In other stories, believers’ conceptions of community are imbedded in the details. In a letter to Amenitskii dated 9 April 1909, Aleksandra Irodova, the wife of the elder of the Spaso-Preobrazhenskii Church in Bezhetsk, Tver’ Province, described the miraculous cure of her two year-old daughter from pneumonia. Doctors pronounced the child’s condition grave and suggested that should she recover, “would be left an idiot forever.” Shortly after receiving this dreadful diagnosis, Irodova dreamt she was back home, “in the city of Kashin before the relics of the pious Saint Anna.” She heard a voice coming from Anna’s tomb, but was unable to make out the saint’s words. Upon waking, she interpreted the mysterious words as a divine summons to call on Anna for help and immediately sent word to her parents in Kashin to go and pray at Anna’s shrine for the child’s recovery. “At the same time,” she wrote to Amenitskii, “I too turned with prayer to the pious Saint Anna, whose image [*obraz*] I had brought from Kashin.” Placing the ikon on her sick child, Irodova prayed for a cure. Miraculously, her daughter recovered fully soon after, suffering no side effects from her serious illness.

Three things are particularly striking about this story. First is the role that extended family ties and kinship networks play in the resolution of the drama. Because she and her daughter are some distance away, Irodova pleads with her parents in Kashin to personally go and pray to Anna on their behalf. This reflects the general belief that prayers are more potent and the intervention of the saint more certain if the faithful pray directly at the saint’s shrine and have some physical contact with the saint’s relics. Second, as is the case with almost all miracle stories concerning as-yet-un canonized saints, Irodova claims it is her responsibility to announce this miracle and thus provide the church authorities with further evidence that the candidate-saint is deserving of canonization. In the

opening paragraph of the letter, Irodova asks Amenitskii to see that her story is published in the Tver' diocesan newspaper "for the sake of the glorification of . . . the relics of the pious great princess and for the sake of increasing the faith among the folk [*narod*]." Finally, and it seems, most importantly in discussing the question of community, Irodova notes almost in passing that she had taken an ikon of Anna Kashinskaia with her when she moved to Bezhetsk. Surely, as the wife of a church elder, Irodova must have had a whole house full of ikons, any one of which could conceivably have done the job. But the ties of family and faith, though stretched somewhat by distance, still bound Irodova to Kashin, and it was to Anna that the desperate mother, naturally, first turned in prayer.⁶¹

Anna's importance to the community of Kashin can be seen clearly in the events that led to her eventual re-canonization in 1909. As early as 1728, the mayors of Kashin regularly petitioned the archbishop of Tver' for permission to stage the annual religious processions with Anna's ikons. Even more significant is the fact that these petitions were routinely granted.⁶² The cathedral clergy in Kashin continued to keep inventories of miracles received through Anna's intercession, recording a dozen such miracles in the half century following Anna's disgrace.⁶³ In 1817, Archbishop Serafim granted a petition from Kashin requesting that Anna's relics be borne in procession and reinterred in the newly rebuilt Voskresenskii Cathedral; the day of this translation, 17 November, became a local holiday celebrated annually in Kashin.⁶⁴

Indeed, Anna's cult was not just tolerated but even encouraged by gestures and signals made by ranking prelates in the diocese, and the complicity of local and diocesan-level clerics was key in allowing Anna's cult to flourish. The reason that episcopal authorities supported efforts to re-canonize Anna, I would argue, were twofold. First, an event so glorious and rare as the canonization of a local saint would boost the credentials of any ambitious archbishop who desired to crown his career with a metropolitan's appointment or a seat on the Synod. Secondly, and far less cynically, the discovery of holy relics and the canonization of a saint carried deep theological ramifications. Such events were visible proof of God's favor for the people to whom he first revealed this saint and, more broadly, of God's love for the Russian Orthodox nation as a whole. As we saw above, the classic Orthodox understanding of sainthood maintains that the celebration of a saint on earth is but the reiteration of that glory which God in heaven has already given to the righteous man (or, in this case, woman). Faced with a host of documented miracle stories and undoubtedly excited that such wondrous events were unfolding in his very own diocese and on his watch, what choice had a pious bishop *but* to give Anna's cause his full blessing?

Endorsement on the diocesan level went hand-in-hand with a grass-roots secular campaign to restore Anna to the ranks of the saints. In 1853, the rural gentry of Kashin district secured over two hundred signatures to a petition requesting the Synod to authorize the singing of *molebny* to Anna at her shrine. Because canon law stipulated that only saints designated for all-church veneration could receive *molebny*, this petition, in effect, amounted to a request that the Synod reverse the 1678 council and re-canonize Anna. When this effort met with failure, a second petition was drafted in 1859, this time with the support of Archbishop Filofei and submitted directly to Emperor Alexander II. The chief-procurator of the Holy Synod, A. P. Tolstoi, consulted Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow for his opinion on the matter. After careful study of the 1678 resolutions, Filaret concluded that the council's rulings still held force until such time as God should "see fit to glorify the pious princess Anna by signs," that is, miracles. Undeterred, the citizens of Kashin sent a third petition in 1861 to the ranking member of the Synod, Metropolitan Grigorii of St. Petersburg, this time pointedly referring to blatant inconsistencies in synodal policy. The petitioners noted that even though Prince Daniil Aleksandrovich was never canonized by the church, *molebny* were regularly sung to him at his shrine in the Danilovskii monastery in Moscow, and that the Great Princess Evdokiia—like Anna, a victim of the Ioakim crackdowns—enjoyed similar favor at the Voznesenskii monastery. If the petitioners hoped that Grigorii, a former archbishop of Tver', would display some sympathies toward the cause of a local saint from his old see, they were mistaken. Once again, the Synod reiterated the conciliar position of 1678 and the matter was dropped.⁶⁵

If Synod members in distant Petersburg remained unreceptive to calls for Anna's reinstatement, diocesan officials in Tver' increasingly embraced the saint's cause and encouraged her devotion among the laity. In the second half of the nineteenth century, three successive archbishops of Tver' regularly included Anna's name in the liturgy, both during the benediction prayer blessing the bread and wine (*litiia*) and in the concluding prayer of commendation to the faithful (*otrust*).⁶⁶ And although *molebny* to Anna were expressly forbidden, priests and prelates in Tver' routinely dodged this restriction by singing *molebny* "to all the saints," and then including Anna's name at the end of the prayer: "Venerable Mother Anna, pray to God for us."⁶⁷ After Filaret's suggestion that documented miracles would show whether or not God possessed special favor for Anna, Archbishop Dmitrii instructed the ecclesiastical superintendents (*blagochinnye*) of the diocese to once again begin collecting miracle stories concerning Anna, a practice that appears to have fallen into abeyance sometime in the eighteenth century. In the decade from 1899 to 1909, thirty miracle stories were collected

and archived by the prior of the Voskresenskii Cathedral, as compared with a total of forty over the course of the entire preceding century.⁶⁸

The local petitions are also significant insofar as they represent a shift toward a greater scope and a broader social base of support for Anna's cause. We have already seen that eighteenth-century petitions calling for religious processions were commonly made and just as commonly granted by the episcopal authorities. But in the nineteenth century, petitions were addressed not to the archbishops and diocesan consistories (whose support for the cause had already been secured) but to the Synod and the emperor himself, and were seeking not just permission for religious processions but a full restoration of Anna's saintly status. What is more, the earlier petitions from mayors and provincial noblemen had given way, by the late nineteenth century, to petitions from citizens' organizations, zemstvos, and municipal dumas, as the movement spread beyond parish walls and gentry palaces and into the public sphere. The institutional structures created by the Great Reforms of the 1860s and 1870s thus played a key role in mobilizing the populace and spearheading Anna's re-canonization.

In May 1908, in an address to the Kashin city дума, I. Ia. Kunin, a member of the Tver' Scholarly Archival Commission and a longtime supporter of Anna's cause, posed the question: "Has the time not come for the restoration of full liturgical veneration for the pious princess Anna Kashinskaia?" The дума was sympathetic to Kunin's arguments, but voted to table any discussion until August, when the delegates were to reconvene following the summer holidays. Nonplussed, Kunin appealed directly to the mayor who, in turn, called for an extraordinary session of the city дума on 19 June. The delegates unanimously voted to accept Kunin's proposal and appointed a committee to travel to St. Petersburg and directly petition the emperor and the Synod in person. Within weeks, the Kashin district zemstvo had seconded the city дума's motion, and the marshal of the nobility for the district had also come out in support of the measure. Later that month, the entire clergy of Kashin city and representatives from the rural parishes met in a Kashin schoolhouse to discuss the question. Chaired by the vicar-bishop Aleksandr, the assembly voted to support the efforts of the city дума and zemstvo and resolved to keep parishioners abreast of the matter in their sermons and homilies. In Tver', members of the lay confraternities and brotherhoods named for Prince St. Mikhail, anxious that their patron's wife should also be canonized, joined parish priests in the city by speaking out in favor of Anna's cause. A district wide meeting of lay church sextons (*starosty*) in Kashin on 8 July pledged its support, as well. Within two days, delegates had set up tables in the vestibule of the Voskresenskii Cathedral to distribute literature on Anna and collect signatures from worshippers in support of her canoniza-

tion. Meanwhile, in St. Petersburg, the дума delegation met “every day” with Archbishop Aleksii of Tver’ (a member of the Holy Synod) to discuss possible strategies for the realization of their common goal.⁶⁹

After decades of dead ends and terse refusals, Anna’s cause was making remarkable headway in the summer of 1908. In July, Metropolitan Antonii, the ranking member of the Synod, put the question before a congress of thirty bishops assembled in Kiev, perhaps as a way of testing the waters and gauging the opinion of hierarchs with no ties to Tver’ diocese. Remarkably, the congress voted unanimously to support the effort and noted with approval that “the special faith in the sanctity of the pious great princess Anna Kashinskaia remains unshakeable in the Tver’ region and far beyond its borders to the present day, passed down from generation to generation, from age to age, fortified by the numerous signs and miracles which issue forth from her holy remains.”⁷⁰ That same month, the Fourth All-Russian Missionary Congress, also meeting in Kiev, discussed the possibility of Anna’s impending canonization and threw their hats in the ring as well, voting to support the canonization by whatever means lay at their disposal.⁷¹

On 30 October 1908, in what amounted to a complete reversal of its long-held position, the Holy Synod declared that, based on “the constant and numerous petitions from those who most piously venerate the memory” of Anna Kashinskaia and in view of the “unceasing miracles and healings [performed] through her prayerful intercession,” it now “deemed it proper and fitting to restore liturgical veneration of the pious great princess Anna as a saint, as was so prior to the Moscow Council of 1677.”⁷² On 7 November, Nicholas II gave his written consent to the Synod’s resolution with a tersely worded “Agreed” (*Soglasen*).⁷³ At the Kashin delegation’s request, the date for the display of Anna’s relics was set for 12 June, a date deliberately chosen to commemorate the first translation of Anna’s relics by Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich in 1650.⁷⁴ After 230 years, Anna Kashinskaia, the “little mother” of Kashin, was once again a saint of the Russian Orthodox Church.

A New Saint for Siberia: The Case of Sofronii Irkutskii

Following two centuries of official, though largely unenforced, proscription, Anna was now seemingly everywhere. By year’s end, the first new church dedicated in her honor was consecrated in an industrial district on the Vyborg side of St. Petersburg, with a second church appearing in the capital in 1910.⁷⁵ Ikon workshops in Kashin and Moscow began producing images of Anna in great

quantities and taking out large notices in *Tserkovnye vedomosti* (*The Church Gazette*) to advertise their handpainted images of the princess to a nationwide audience. “Work of the highest craftsmanship,” a local firm boasted, “delivered on request to all cities and towns in the Russian Empire (Blessed at the shrine containing her relics, at the purchaser’s request).” Prices started from twenty rubles, though wealthier devotees could spend upward of eight times as much on more elaborate cypress-wood models adorned with gold paint and enamel engraving. Capitalizing on the princess’s newfound fame, one entrepreneurial firm in Chernigov even offered 25 percent discounts to customers who bought a matching set of ikons featuring Anna and her husband, Prince Saint Mikhail.⁷⁶

The princess even turned up in eastern Siberia. On 1 August 1910, after nearly a week’s worth of deliberating how best to enlighten the souls of the native peoples of Siberia, the delegates to the Irkutsk Missionary Congress declared a recess so that they could attend a special service at the Kazanskii Cathedral. After the celebration of the divine liturgy by Archbishop Makarii of Tomsk, the delegates followed the archbishop onto the cathedral square, where they greeted a procession of clerics and lay believers bearing with them a chest containing fragments of Anna Kashinskaia’s holy relics. Archpriest Ioann Vostorgov, a prolific publicist and outspoken conservative, harangued the crowds with a lengthy speech on the significance of Anna’s life and the moral lessons that the Siberian faithful could learn from her example. With every church bell in the city ringing, it must have been difficult for even this experienced orator to make himself heard above the clamor. The believers who packed the square, however, had not turned out to listen to lectures, but to witness the arrival in their town of Anna Kashinskaia, whose reputation as a powerful patron preceded her. One delegate from the congress joyously predicted that the celebration would serve as an overdue summons for the spiritually slothful believers of Irkutsk: “The ceremony roused Irkutsk society, awakened it, and they will be talking about it for a long, long time to come.”⁷⁷

Siberia had a poor reputation for piety at the end of the old regime, and religious leaders fretted that their flock was much in need of spiritual renewal. A 1912 study commissioned by the newspaper *Sibir’* (*Siberia*) revealed the unsettling statistic that Irkutsk ranked first in drunkenness among seventy provinces and oblasts in the empire, much to the embarrassment of the archbishop.⁷⁸ Church officials and lay brotherhoods scrambled to construct churches and establish functioning parishes in order to meet the general religious needs of the thousands of new arrivals who yearly made the long and difficult trek to Siberia. Saints were in such short supply in the vast Siberian expanse that the Holy Synod was obliged to ship relic fragments from Kiev and Moscow so that new churches could

be consecrated in accordance with canon law.⁷⁹ The scarcity of relics and holy men would later prompt the Old Bolshevik and antireligious activist Emel'ian Iaroslavskii to joke that “Siberia has had no luck when it comes to saintliness.”⁸⁰ In the half decade preceding the First World War, however, this would change. While the elevation of Anna Kashinskaia was being celebrated on the other side of the empire, local believers were busily making plans for the canonization of their own saint, the prelate Sofronii Irkutskii, who, his devotees claimed, had been performing miracles with increasing regularity for the past half century.

Born in Poltava Province to Ukrainian parents, Sofronii Kristalevskii was, like many of his later devotees, an immigrant to Siberia. In 1753, the Synod confirmed his appointment as bishop of Irkutsk at the personal request of the Empress Elizabeth, whose confidence he had earned while serving as her majesty's father confessor. The new bishop soon found himself at the head of an enormous and farflung diocese that encompassed nearly half the land mass of the empire, stretching from west of Lake Baikal northward to the Arctic Sea and all the way east to Kamchatka. Sofronii proved an excellent administrator, however, and spent the next eighteen years training more priests to serve the diocese, opening new religious schools, consecrating churches, and supervising missionary work among the non-Russian native peoples. He died in 1771 at the close of a distinguished career, and his body was laid to rest in the Bogoiavlen-skii Cathedral in the city center of Irkutsk.⁸¹ It remained there undisturbed—and largely ignored—for the next sixty years until, in 1833, during restoration work on the cathedral floor, Bishop Meletii of Irkutsk took it upon himself to open his predecessor's coffin and examine the contents. The bishop was pleased to discover that his Sofronii's body and vestments had been preserved in a state of divinely ordained incorruptibility, a finding confirmed by three subsequent examinations carried out by the bishops of Irkutsk between 1853 and 1887.⁸²

It was during this period that Sofronii's cult began to gain popularity, as the prelate underwent the posthumous transformation from able administrator to miracle-worker. The very first issue of *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti* (*The Irkutsk Diocesan Gazette*), which appeared in 1863, carried a lengthy biographical essay on Sofronii and his career in Irkutsk, with special attention to the miracles being reported with ever increasing frequency at the site of his uncorrupted relics. In 1872, convinced that they had a true saint on their hands, the cathedral clergy began to keep a book of miracles to record all instances of Sofronii's heavenly intercession in the everyday lives of the Irkutsk faithful. Archbishop Veniamin, who presided over the diocese at the end of the nineteenth century, was also certain that Sofronii was, indeed, a true saint and miracle-worker. Veniamin introduced new local holidays into the liturgical calendar to honor the new Siberian holy

man. Annually on 11 March (Sofronii's name day) and again on 30 March (the anniversary of his death), special *panikhida* services were performed in Sofronii's honor, drawing large crowds to the cathedral. Biographies and images of Sofronii flooded the bookstalls and religious shops of Irkutsk. The first 500 copies of a special four-page booklet on the bishop's life and deeds sold out almost overnight in 1895; another 1,500 copies were swiftly published and eagerly purchased over the next two years, with an additional 5,000 appearing in 1901 to commemorate the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of Sofronii's death. Around this same time, the local artist M. A. Rudchenko began offering mass-produced portraits of the bishop for sale to the faithful. To satisfy the overwhelming demand, the Rudchenko workshops turned out 2,000 paper-and-cardboard images of Sofronii and another 4,000 on linen and silk.⁸³

By 1912, the number of miracles attributed to Sofronii over the past thirty years had already surpassed those of Irkutsk's more senior local saint, Innokentii, and showed no signs of slowing.⁸⁴ Sofronii proved so prolific a miracle-worker that from the early twentieth century onward the Irkutsk diocesan press seldom published miracle stories relating to any other saint; whereas readers formerly could thrill to the miracles wrought by saints all across the empire, coverage gradually concentrated on the activities and intercession of Irkutsk's own hometown holy men, Innokentii and Sofronii.⁸⁵ This suggests not only that the press was focusing more and more on Sofronii's miracles, but that local believers, too, were turning with increasing frequency to an accessible and conveniently located saint whose reputation for miracles was on the rise.

The shrine which housed the prelate's holy relics was the most immediate portal for accessing his divine power, and though believers treated Sofronii's grave with great reverence, their behavior reflects an informal ease and comfortable familiarity with their saint. The holy oil from Sofronii's ikon lanterns, for example, was much prized for its curative powers by lay believers and clerics alike. Lantern oil could be applied on the skin to ease arthritis or swelling and even rubbed on the gums or swallowed in case of toothache or internal pains. Believers would often approach the shrine in the middle of services and pour out a cup of oil, either to take home or administer on the spot.⁸⁶ It was common, also, for shirts and blouses belonging to the sick to be placed on Sofronii's shrine so that they could soak in the saint's wonder-working power. After praying for the loved one's recovery, the petitioner would retrieve the garments and place them on the sick person, often with miraculous results.⁸⁷ Indeed, so comfortable were believers in their saint's presence that they thought nothing of borrowing articles of his clothing. Sofronii's miracle-working slipper, for example, was loaned out on more than one occasion by the cathedral clergy; in 1899, one woman

reported that she was healed of an unspecified “illness of the breast” after applying Sofronii’s slipper to the affected area; in 1905, a 39 year-old townswoman claimed to have been cured of paralysis by wearing Sofronii’s miraculous slipper on each of her feet, in turn.⁸⁸

Orthodox believers imagined their saints not as specialists, but general practitioners who were qualified to treat any number of diseases and sicknesses and offer solutions to all sorts of human problems. Sofronii’s abilities were limited only by the needs of those who sought his assistance. Cases of reported miracles from the turn of the century cover every imaginable ailment, from toothaches, scarlet fever, and diphtheria, to chest pains, depression, broken limbs, paralysis, neuralgia, dizzy spells, loss of consciousness, and complications arising from pregnancy.⁸⁹ Yet while the prelate proved himself quite skilled in the standard repertoire of miraculous cures and healings, a great many of Sofronii’s miracles deal with the problem of adjusting to a new life in Siberia. With the construction of the Trans-Siberian Railroad and the introduction of the Stolypin land reforms, the early twentieth century witnessed a dramatic rise in population migration across the empire. Siberia, with its ample land holdings and opportunities for personal enrichment, soon outstripped all other regions as the favorite destination for relocation. In 1897-1916, 48.8 percent of all imperial subjects who packed their bags to start a new life in a new location were headed to Siberia. In the period 1907-1911 alone, a total of 1,695,000 men, women, and children arrived in Siberia, chiefly land-hungry peasants from the Central Agricultural Region, Belorussia, left-bank Ukraine, and the Volga provinces.⁹⁰ Many of these new immigrants settled in Irkutsk, whose population nearly doubled from 51,000 to 90,000 between 1897-1917.⁹¹ Though the allure of Siberia was powerful, the real cost of relocation was considerable. In 1912, it was estimated that a family in European Russia would require three hundred to four hundred rubles to make the move to Irkutsk Province, and at least one hundred more if they were headed all the way to the Pacific coast.⁹²

In the bodies and relics of their saints, Russian Orthodox believers found powerful avenues of recourse to assist them in mediating the perils and pitfalls of modern life. Not surprisingly, then, newcomers to Siberia often relied on recourse to the sacred to ease the difficult transition.⁹³ From the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the end of the old regime, Saint Sofronii served, in essence, as the unofficial welcome wagon for new arrivals in Irkutsk—Russians and Cossacks, peasants and townspeople alike. Miracle stories depict Sofronii helping immigrants to find lodging and employment and inspiring them to persevere in their surroundings. As the prelate told a desperate young woman on the brink of suicide, “I do not just help my own, but strangers, too.”⁹⁴ When Mikhail Ogoro-

dnikov and his family arrived in Irkutsk in 1877, they too were strangers, with little more than the clothes on their back; all of their other possessions had been lost in an accident while crossing the Enisei River. At that time, Ogorodnikov later recalled, they had no one to turn to for help, for “we didn’t even know of the relics of the Prelate Sofronii.” Soon, however, the saint introduced himself to the Ogorodnikovs, appearing to one of the daughters in a dream, blessing the family, and offering to help restore their fortunes if they commissioned an ikon with his likeness. “I will give glory to you and raise you up,” the saint told them, “if you give glory to me and have my image drawn.” The girl told her parents of the dream, but she could not remember the saint’s name. When the family made their first trip to worship at the Bogoiavlenskii Cathedral, the girl recognized Sofronii from the ikons that hung above his shrine. The family prayed to their patron for help and were soon able to set aside enough money to have an ikon of Sofronii painted. By 1891, when Ogorodnikov submitted his story to the cathedral clergy, he and his family had prospered and were enjoying a solidly middle-class life in the town of Verkholsk, Irkutsk Province—a miracle that he unreservedly attributed to Sofronii’s blessed intercession.⁹⁵

The story of V. A. Petrov, a St. Petersburg native who moved to Irkutsk in the 1890s, illustrates further how new arrivals in Siberia sought Sofronii’s help in adjusting to their unfamiliar surroundings. Upon arriving in Irkutsk, Petrov had asked his landlady to tell him everything about the city, “and, as an Orthodox, first and foremost about God’s holy churches.” It was from her, he recalled, “that I first heard of the Prelate Sofronii,” whose fame had not yet spread to the imperial capital. Since he had not managed to find employment, Petrov decided to enlist the help of Sofronii. “I stopped by the old cathedral,” he recalled, “and prayed at the grave of the Prelate Sofronii, asking him to be my protector and intercessor and to make my life and work in Siberia for the best.” One week later, Petrov received word that he had been hired to work in the Chita offices of the Zabaikal railroad company. Overjoyed, he returned to the cathedral to seek Sofronii’s assistance in recovering his wife’s baggage, which had been lost on the train somewhere near Tomsk. In thanks for this second miracle, Petrov offered a *panikhida* service to be sung at the prelate’s grave and immediately informed the cathedral record-keepers of the favors that had been rendered him: “I feared it a sin to remain silent and so I decided to set everything down, to the glory of the prelate.”⁹⁶

Those who had received the benefits of Sofronii’s intercession felt it was their duty to record such instances with the cathedral clergy for “the glory of the prelate” and as a show of thanks for miracles rendered. Feelings of reciprocal obligation allowed believers to forge highly personalized relationships with

Sofronii based on the expectation that the prelate would continue to help them so long as they, in turn, gave him proper credit for his miracles. The result, as writers of miracle stories often explained, was that praying to Sofronii became a routine and regular part of their spiritual lives. Indeed, these stories show that once the saint had proved himself powerful enough to grant a miracle, believers would turn to him time and time again and over the course of many years and many generations.⁹⁷ A mining engineer from Tomsk, A. S. Shakhmaev, for example, told of how Sofronii had first rescued him from sliding off a snowy precipice while his team was surveying for coal and oil deposits east of Lake Baikal in 1899. Ten years later, when Shakhmaev's house burned to the ground, Sofronii preserved from the flames a bundle of papers containing the engineer's invaluable maps and plans of the Sakhalin oil fields. Sofronii left behind a calling card of sorts, so that Shakhmaev would know who was responsible for this miracle: a silk-screen portrait of the prelate that had survived the blaze intact, "with only a slight trace of having been burned." "Ever since the unfortunate incident," the engineer recalled, "this image of the Prelate Sofronii has always been with me. I call upon this blessed saint for help in all of my affairs, and he always helps me." On top of all this, and in addition to healing him of various illnesses and sicknesses, Shakhmaev reported that Sofronii had also sent a rescue party of seal hunters to save him and his Kirghiz crew from drowning when their rowboat struck ice and nearly capsized in the Caspian Sea.⁹⁸

Encouraged by the Synod's 1908 decision to re-canonize Anna Kashinskaia, Irkutsk clerics followed suit by mounting their own campaign the following year. In March 1909, Archbishop Tikhon and a team of clerics examined Sofronii's body for the first time in more than two decades and once again discovered it to be uncorrupted:

[The commission] looked at the grave and relics of the Prelate Sofronii and found them to be uncorrupted, in almost the same form as was found during the inspections conducted earlier. For one hundred and thirty-eight years, despite the proximity to water (the Angara River is nearby), despite the constant dampness in the caverns beneath the cathedral floors, particularly in the summertime—the coffin, the clothing, and the body of the Prelate Sofronii were found uncorrupted. The impression [made] from looking upon the uncorrupted relics with one's own eyes, and from the distinct sweet-smelling fragrance emanating [from the relics] defies description.⁹⁹

Armed now with indisputable evidence of uncorrupted relics and a growing stack of miracle stories, the archbishop wrote again to the Holy Synod in 1910, informing that august body that Sofronii was most assuredly a true saint. If the accompanying documentation were not proof enough, Archbishop Tikhon sug-

gested that in canonizing the prelate, the church would surely win a great spiritual victory all across Siberia, in essence rechristianizing Russia's wild east:

I harbor the unshakeable hope that the glorification [*proslavlenie*] of the Prelate Sofronii will have a grace-giving effect on the religious and moral condition of the people of Siberia in general, who are not distinguished by the warmth of their religious feelings and who have, in the course of their lives, wandered far from the Christian ideal. I am certain, too, that the numerous non-Russians [*inorodtsy*] and non-Orthodox who populate Siberia, who listen keenly and watch carefully all the events that transpire in the life of the Russian Christian Orthodox Church, who now, in the majority of cases, regard the Christian religion skeptically and even hostilely—that with the glorification of the Prelate Sofronii, [they] will swiftly change their present attitudes toward Christianity . . . and that those who have fallen away will return at once to the bosom of Christ's Holy Church, and that the rest . . . will respond to her truths and unite in one Christian flock under the unseen leadership of the Prelate Sofronii, who labored so hard for the enlightenment of the natives of Siberia through the holy teachings of Christ.¹⁰⁰

By the time the Synod wrote back to request more materials and miracles in support of Sofronii's cause, Archbishop Tikhon was dead and the obligations fell to his successor, Serafim. In accordance with the Synod's wishes, the new archbishop was instructed "to conduct a thorough inquiry" into all reports of Sofronii's miraculous intercession and to submit a detailed report for the Synod's consideration.¹⁰¹ To assist him in his efforts, Serafim convened a special Commission for the Verification of the Miracles Performed Through the Prayers of the Prelate Sofronii, Third Bishop of Irkutsk, which held its first meeting in the fall of 1912. The archbishop and his fellow clerics were faced with the daunting tasks of having to sift through the 168 miracle stories attributed to Sofronii since 1872 and track down the whereabouts of all those who had claimed to have benefited from the prelate's intercession. At its second meeting, the commission decided to contact only those believers connected with particularly interesting or deserving miracles. Letters were then mailed out to miracle recipients, asking them to provide sworn testimony that their stories were indeed true. In addition, any believers who had experienced a miracle but had not yet come forward to tell their story were enjoined to do so now. The commission also sent out additional notices to the bishops of the neighboring Siberian dioceses, asking for their cooperation in Sofronii's canonization and for permission to publish a call for miracle stories in diocesan newspapers from Vladivostok to Viatka.¹⁰²

The matter of verifying miracles was treated with great seriousness by commissions in Irkutsk and elsewhere, and surviving documents in the central archival repositories demonstrate a high degree of legalistic rigor and meth-

odological thoroughness. The most immediate problem was logistical. Simply tracking down the whereabouts of miracle recipients and obtaining a statement from them proved an arduous task.¹⁰³ Witnesses who could be found and who provided oral or written testimony of Sofronii's miraculous assistance, for example, were required to swear a solemn and legally binding oath in the presence of their parish priests and representatives from the municipal administration. Thus, not only legal punishment but eternal damnation threatened those who offered false testimony:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I promise and swear by the Almighty God, before His holy Gospels and life-giving Cross, that I will, in good conscience, relate the entire truth concerning God's great and miraculous mercy shown me through the Prelate Sofronii Irkutskii, who lies in peace in the Old Cathedral in the city of Irkutsk, remembering that I must answer for all of this before the law and before God on His day of judgment.¹⁰⁴

Further evidence for the rigor of these proceedings comes from Astrakhan', where at this very time a similar commission was busy subjecting the miracle stories attributed to Metropolitan Iosif the Murdered to intense inquiry. Had the witness sought medical help prior to the miracle, and if so, were there extant hospital records to support the witness's claims and were the doctors reputable? How serious was the illness in question, and what were the normal chances for recovery in the absence of a miracle? How much time had elapsed from when the witness had first sought the saint's assistance till his or her recovery from the illness?¹⁰⁵ If their faith and desire to see their saints canonized prevented them from playing the role of true devil's advocates, the commission members who deliberated at Irkutsk, Astrakhan', and elsewhere were wrestling with a monumental issue—namely, when is a miracle truly a miracle?¹⁰⁶

Over the next two years, as the Irkutsk commission continued to collect and collate miracle tales, the "great cause" for Sofronii's canonization received official endorsement from the Irkutsk mayor and city duma, the governor's office, and various assemblies of the diocesan clergy.¹⁰⁷ The Brotherhood of the Prelate Innokentii, the largest and most elite confraternity in the diocese, also came out in support of the new saint's candidacy. Many of Sofronii's supporters joined the brotherhood, and its membership nearly tripled from 1912 to 1914.¹⁰⁸ The Thursday *panikhida* performed at Sofronii's grave since the late nineteenth century now became so popular that huge crowds were said to overflow the cathedral, obliging the clergy to take prayer requests and declarations of thanks by post.¹⁰⁹ Local almanacs and city guidebooks from this period made mention of Sofronii's miracles alongside such other essential information as commercial

statistics, the names and addresses of prominent local personages and government figures, and annual cultural events in the province, proudly noting that “at the present time, the question of his canonization is under review.”¹¹⁰

Sofronii’s cause suffered an apparent setback on the morning of 18 April 1917 (O.S.), when a fire broke out in the Bogoiavlenskii Cathedral, causing great damage to the interior of the church and completely consuming the saint’s coffin and uncorrupted body. “The believers of the city are in tears,” the Irkutsk diocesan press reported. “Only remnants [*ostanki*] are left from the relics.” The municipal government pledged a full investigation into the cause of the fire, but rumors swiftly spread. Church newspapers pointed out that the fire had taken place on May Day (new style) and suggested that there might be some link between the fall of the tsar, the rise of socialism, and the destruction of Sofronii’s relics.¹¹¹ At a special memorial service the following day, the new archbishop attempted to defuse the tension by announcing that the sins of all the Irkutsk faithful—not just the radicalized elements—were to blame for this catastrophe. “The Christian faith has begun to weaken in recent times, and nonbelief and vices to flourish,” the archbishop thundered, explaining that God had punished the people of Irkutsk for their wicked ways by depriving them of the relics of their new saint, just as he had taken the Ark of the Covenant from the Israelites and chastised proud Byzantium by allowing its sacred treasures to be plundered by the Turks.¹¹²

Ironically, the loss of Sofronii’s relics served as the impetus for a great upsurge in lay involvement in his cause. The archbishop informed the Synod with some pride that “veneration of the prelate has grown even stronger as a result of the fire,” and that Sofronii’s ikons could now be found in homes all across the city. Indeed, in response to popular demand, the cathedral clergy began holding two *panikhida* services at Sofronii’s grave each week, instead of just one, with believers coming to the cathedral “in greater numbers than before.”¹¹³ Within weeks of the fire, a Union of Orthodox Christians was formed in Irkutsk, whose members pledged to restore the cathedral and shrine to their former glory and to strive for “the active defense of the faith and Christ’s Church at any time and against anyone, as the situation demands.” Working closely with parish organizations, the union collected eighteen thousand signatures calling for the “immediate elevation of the blessed Bishop Sofronii” to the ranks of the saints, and sponsored a diocesan collection drive which brought in pledges totaling seven thousand rubles toward the purchase of a new shrine, lanterns, and ikons of the soon-to-be saint.¹¹⁴ That summer, the annual diocesan congress of clerics and laity resolved to expedite the canonization process by sending a special delegation to St. Petersburg to plead Sofronii’s case before the Synod.¹¹⁵

Finally, in April 1918, nearly a year after Sofronii's uncorrupted body had been destroyed by fire, Patriarch Tikhon and the Church Sobor announced the Siberian cleric's elevation to the ranks of the saints.¹¹⁶ But much had transpired in Irkutsk and the empire at large since the first murmurings of Sofronii's sainthood some eight years before. Russia had experienced world war, the collapse of the monarchy, two revolutions, and was now in the midst of civil war. What is more, the strong consensus that had formed around the saint's cause now showed signs of unraveling. In April, an assembly of high-ranking clerics, including the archbishop and representatives from the monastic clergy, selected 30 June as the date for the presentation of Sofronii's relics, and resolved to leave the saint's body in the old Bogoiavlenskii Cathedral "where the name of the Prelate Sofronii is connected with many memories and acts of grace, signs, and miracles performed through his holy prayers."¹¹⁷ However, a rival faction of laypeople (particularly women), parish priests, and the executive organ of the diocesan congress argued that Sofronii's relics should be relocated to the newly refurbished and "more spacious" Kazanskii Cathedral. They maintained that the Kazanskii Cathedral could hold three times as many worshippers as the Bogoiavlenskii, and that its "extraordinarily high ceilings, central heating, electric lighting, [and] good ventilation" would be a vast improvement over the "dreadful crampedness and closeness" of the latter, where "streams [of condensation] literally pour down the walls on big feast days and the candles burn out from the lack of air."¹¹⁸ In the end, proponents of tradition carried the day, but heated discussions continued over the date for the ceremonies. If the festivities were held in late June, critics charged, there would not be sufficient time to publicize the event "throughout Siberia and European Russia" and few pilgrims would have the opportunity to attend. "Instead of spiritual joy, there will be grief; instead of love of Christ—dissatisfaction, dissension, and unpleasantness." "The times we are now living through," they warned ominously, "are such that the slightest carelessness in this great affair may give cause for censure on the part of the enemies of Christianity and those who are wavering [in the faith]."¹¹⁹

With local believers at an impasse, the Sobor was obliged to intervene, eventually deciding that a 30 June ceremony was unfeasible:

Owing to the closing of the eastern borders and the transportation chaos, there are barely enough candles in the diocesan storehouse for the satisfaction of everyday needs: there is no flour, no lantern oil, no red wine, no images of the Prelate either on paper or on wood, no brochures and pamphlets necessary for such a ceremony. In order to make plans for the influx of pilgrims it is necessary to enter into some sort of agreement with the city administration, but at the present time the city дума and mayor's office are dissolved and Soviet power has replaced them in the persons of commissars. . . . Finally, the situation in

the city is extremely tense at the present time, owing to the movement from the Far East of armed forces mobilized against Soviet power, and it is difficult to say what this movement will lead to in a month or two from now.¹²⁰

Sofronii, it would seem, came too late to sainthood. The realities of civil war, political unrest, chronic shortages, and the collapse of the rail system made it impossible to stage the sort of grand festivities that had, in years past, traditionally attended the proclamation of a new saint. Rather than honoring Sofronii's relics with a citywide celebration, the faithful of Irkutsk would soon find themselves obliged to hide them in a secret location to avoid desecration and exhumation at the hands of the Bolsheviks.¹²¹

Whose Saints Are They Anyway?

Four days before the celebration of Anna Kashinskaia's re-canonization, the Tver' diocesan press predicted that "the city of Kashin will show itself as one big family on 12 June. Every participant in the Kashin ceremonies will feel this, will sense this. Everyone will profess his spiritual kinship in God with one mouth and one heart; everyone will be joyous and light of heart, everyone will be happy on this day."¹²² Yet if the canonization efforts in Kashin and Irkutsk show the power of religion as a force to unite local communities, we must also admit that these bonds were becoming increasingly difficult to maintain during the last decade of the old regime, as social divisions grew sharper and the empire was obliged to confront its multiconfessional status. Orthodox clerics in Kashin and Tver' frequently expressed the hopes that Anna's re-canonization would repair the centuries-old schism with the Old Believers, who denied the legitimacy of the Nikonian Church and thus had never ceased to recognize Anna's sanctity. One priest joyously anticipated that the restoration of Anna to the ranks of the saints "will signify for us the end of the *raskol* [schism] and lead to union and peace in the Church."¹²³ There was no clear sense, however, of how this peaceful harmony would come to pass, and the lofty rhetoric of religious reunion was undermined by actual practice. In preparation for the canonization ceremonies, cathedral clergy in Kashin took it upon themselves to correct a seventeenth-century tapestry of Anna by sewing a scrap of cloth over the saint's hand, thus replacing the two-fingered blessing with a more theologically palatable three-fingered cross. The incident prompted a group of Old Believers in Tver' to protest vigorously "against this inexcusable audacity and criminal defacing of an ancient monument . . . [by] unreasonably jealous lovers of the three-fingered cross." The archbishop bowed to public pressure and ordered that the replacement hand be removed.¹²⁴

Such actions on the part of Orthodox clerics did little to facilitate rapprochement with the Old Believers. Their message, however, was clear: if “Holy Rus” was to be reunited, it would be on Orthodox terms.

A rhetoric of healing was also deployed by conservative sources in Tver’ Province, who applauded Anna’s re-canonization and staked great hope on the chance that this historic moment would transcend party and class divisions and heal a nation fractured by the recent upheavals of 1905, that “feverish year of political and religious disintegration.”¹²⁵ Yet rather than build bridges, the Tver’ diocesan newspaper used the occasion of Anna’s re-canonization as an opportunity to attack the “intelligentsia vanguard” [*peredovaia intelligentsia*] for its slighting disregard for the Orthodox faith. The Orthodox press claimed that irreligious intellectuals had sought “to present the festivities in a false light . . . and to present the faithful children of the Church, the laity, as an ignorant mass, crude, incapable of sorting out the facts of the matter ‘rationally,’ and prone to accepting lies and fraud as truth.” An equally insidious threat to religious and political harmony was posed by unnamed “enemies of the Church,” whom rumor credited with plotting some sort of “revolt” (*bunt*) on the day of the celebration, possibly planning even to hurl a bomb into the crowds. The visible presence of mounted gendarmes brought in from Moscow and Kiev to provide security on the occasion added further dissonance to the key of harmony and unity in which the ceremony’s clerical organizers had sought to score the event.¹²⁶

Although the festivities proceeded in Kashin without incident, church authors took the opportunity to disparage the objectives of nonbelievers and socialists and warned that the path preached by the radicalized elements of Russian society was a spiritual dead end: “It is not in the economic morality of our nonbelieving intelligentsia that the simple folk [*prostetsy*] will find the source for rectifying and perfecting social life, not in the class war for survival, not in the class hostility and hatred which this morality depends on, but in quiet inspirational prayer here—in the saint’s own example, at the shrine of [her] holy relics.”¹²⁷ By distancing themselves from the religious traditions of the people, then, the radicals were accused of having lost touch with their “Russianness” and with the *narod* whose interests they purported to represent. The editors of *Kormchii* picked up on this divisive rhetoric, pointedly suggesting that the “Welcome!” sign that hung above the platform at the Kashin rail station be amended to read, “Welcome, our Russian people!” In an age of skepticism, relativism, and “open mockeries against the Orthodox Church,” the canonization of a saint remained a solemn—and exclusively Russian—event: “Here in Kashin, at this sacred celebration, there is no place for other peoples, particularly those who try so boldly and with such impunity to tread on everything that is Russian.”¹²⁸

In Irkutsk, too, the bickering of rival factions over the proper resting place for Sofronii's relics reflects the growing tensions within the Orthodox community, as laypeople sought to exert greater autonomy in religious life and to define the sacred on their own terms.¹²⁹ The militant platform of the Union of Orthodox Christians—whose members took it upon themselves “to protect the inviolability of . . . the remains of the prelate Sofronii from disgrace and desecration by the enemies of the Church”—suggests that the fraying of the social fabric that was becoming everywhere endemic in 1917 played out also in religious and spiritual matters.¹³⁰ By the end of the old regime, then, the image of a single community joined in loving harmony at the relics of its saint had become a fiction that was increasingly difficult to maintain, and even so momentous an occasion as the canonization of a saint could not put the polity back together again. The very relics and saints that had once united communities now exposed divisive societal fault lines, and would, after the Bolshevik Revolution, threaten to rend these local communities asunder.

* * *

The sociologist Pierre Deloos has pointedly observed that sanctity “depends on the opinion of others. . . . One is never a saint *except for other people*.”¹³¹ Indeed, while religious writers could claim that Anna's re-canonization depended “on the will of the Lord,” her cause, and that of Sofronii Irkutskii, owed much also to the goodwill of the chief procurator and emperor and the labors of local believers and institutions.¹³² Indeed, without the efforts of lay believers and clerics in Kashin and Irkutsk, Anna and Sofronii would likely never have received official recognition from the Synod and Sobor. It was the great rigor and thoroughness of the miracle commission in Irkutsk and the activism of lay committees, for example, that allowed Sofronii's dossier to stand out and receive special attention at a time when the chancelleries of the Church Sobor were swamped with similar, if shoddier, petitions on behalf of local saints whose causes suffered from poorly documented miracles and unsustainable claims to sanctity.¹³³

The work of lay believers and clerics on behalf of their saints points both to the sense of reciprocal obligation that characterized believers' relationships with the saints, and to the powerful localized dimension of sanctity. Orthodox believers saw their faith not as something remote but as an integral part of their everyday lives and of the world around them. Working for the cause of a saint whose canonization was under review was regarded by the faithful as a “sacred duty,” the highest show of thanks that could be paid to a holy man or woman for miracles rendered. The miracle stories submitted by believers in Tver' Province

and Siberia demonstrate that the faithful saw and talked about their saints not as distant figures in another world but as hometown heroes forever present in the community where they had lived, served, died, and been buried. The particular predisposition of the holy dead to meet the needs of their fellow countrymen first and foremost was seen by clerics and lay believers alike as a sign of the saints' special love for their home regions. Even though Anna's and Sofronii's relics had burned and could no longer be spoken of as uncorrupted, the miracles attributed to them by the Orthodox faithful were interpreted as comforting proof of the saints' continued presence in the community and as a sign that they had not withdrawn their love and assistance from the communities where their relics resided.

Notes

1. Hieromonk Aleksii, "O proslavlennii sviatykh i ob otkrytii ikh sv. moshchei (na den' Vkhoda Gospodnia v Ierusalim)," *Dukhovnaia beseda*, no. 4 (April 1913): 192.
2. Robert H. Greene, "'Bodies Like Bright Stars': Saints and Relics in Orthodox Russia, 1860s-1920s" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2004), ch. 1.
3. The seven saints canonized under Nicholas II were Feodosii Uglitskii (1896); Serafim Sarovskii (1903); Anna Kashinskaia (1909); Ioasaf Belgorodskii (1911); Patriarch Germogen (1913); Pitirim Tambovskii (1914); and Ioann Tobol'skii (1916). See Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii Arkhiv (hereafter, RGIA), f. 797, op. 84, otd. 2, st. 3, d. 372, ll. 100-100ob. See also Gregory L. Freeze, "Subversive Piety: Religion and the Political Crisis in Late Imperial Russia," *Journal of Modern History* 68 (1996): 310. On the cases of saintly candidates left unresolved by the Synod and inherited by the Sobor, see Greene, "'Bodies Like Bright Stars,'" ch. 3-4.
4. E. E. Golubinskii, "Zametka o slove 'kanonizatsiia,'" *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, tom 1, no. 1 (January 1895): 166-67.
5. This theological point informs the analysis of all prerevolutionary Russian Orthodox discussions of canonization. See, for example, E. E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi tserkvi*, 2d ed., (Moscow, 1903; reprint, Farnborough: Gregg International, 1969); Vasilii Vasil'ev, *Istoriia kanonizatsii russkikh sviatykh* (Moscow: Universitetskaiia tipografiia, 1893); Archimandrite Evgenii Mertsalov, *Kak sovershalas' kanonizatsiia sviatykh v pervoe vremia sushchestvovaniia Russkoi tserkvi?* 2d ed. (Murom: Tipo-litografiia N. V. Zvorykina, 1910); and M. E. V., "Istoriia kanonizatsii russkikh sviatykh," *Stavropol'skie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 14 (16 July 1894), neofits. chast': 633-59.
6. Historians of sainthood have long recognized that their subjects are not born, but rather made, the end result of a complicated process that combines social values and structures with religious ideals and spiritual aspirations. For influential statements of this argument, see, for example, Peter Brown, *Relics and Social Status in the Age of Gregory of Tours* (Reading: University of Reading, 1977); Stephen Wilson, ed., *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); and Peter Burke, "How to Be a Counter-Reformation Saint," in *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Kaspar von Greyerz (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1984), 45-55.
7. Freeze, "Subversive Piety," 315, 309, 311. On late-imperial canonization, see also Robert L. Nichols, "The Friends of God: Nicholas II and Alexandra at the Canonization of Serafim of Sarov, July, 1903," in *Religious and Secular Forces in Late Tsarist Russia: Essays in Honor of Donald W. Treadgold* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1992), 206-29.
10. The words of Grand Duke Aleksandr Mikhailovich are quoted by Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*, vol. 2; *From Alexander II to the Abdication of Nicholas II* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2000), 391, n. 92. A *chastushka* (satirical verse) from the Russo-Japanese War bears out the grand duke's observation: "After every fight, you see, / Like partridges we flee, flee, flee / Without looking back, from the Japanese, / Though in full military order, to be sure, you see / —Let them shoot us in the butt. / Well, what of it,

friend, so what? / We've relied on relics / And bowed down low to the ground / But instead of ammo for the fortifications / They carted out some ikons! / Serafim has let us down!" See "Voina i ugodnik (iz pesen vremen Russko-Iaponskoi voiny)," in *Antireligiozni chtes-deklamator*, ed. A. Bessonov (Moscow: Bezbozhnik, 1929), 344.

9. On bodily incorruptibility (*netlennost'*) in the Russian Orthodox tradition, see Gail Lenhoff, "The Notion of 'Uncorrupted Relics' in Early Russian Culture," in *Slavic Cultures in the Middle Ages*, ed. Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes, California Slavic Studies 16 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 252-75; Jean-Pierre Arrignon, "Le rôle des reliques dans la Rus' de Kiev," in *Les reliques: Objets, cultes, symboles*, ed. Edina Bozóky and Anne-Marie Helvétius (Tournhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1999), 57-63; O. G. Postnov, "Netlennye moshchi i mertvye dushi: smert' v Rossii," in *Traditsiia i literaturnyi protsess* (Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo S[ibirskogo] O[tdeleniia] RAN, 1999), 349-64; and Eve Levin, "From Corpse to Cult in Early Modern Russia," in *Orthodox Russia: Belief and Practice Under the Tsars*, ed. Valerie A. Kivelson and Robert H. Greene (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 81-103. It should be noted, however, that while Russian Orthodox believers regarded the miraculous preservation of the body as a great and wondrous sign of God's favor for the deceased, the church never held that incorruptibility was a prerequisite for sainthood, nor that holy relics need necessarily be uncorrupted. In fact, most nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Russian Orthodox theologians and church sources argued, on the basis of canonical tradition and Slavonic etymology, that *moshchi* could refer to bare bones and bodily fragments. My reading of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century miracle stories suggests that ordinary believers understood the definition of relics in more functionalist terms: holy relics were regarded as such if they performed miracles; incorruptibility was a secondary concern.

10. See Freeze, "Subversive Piety," 312-42. Evidence that Germogen's cause was fast-tracked in order to coincide with the Romanov tercentenary of 1913 comes from the deliberations of the commission appointed to investigate his miracles. On 8 February 1913 the commission decided that only ten of the most "particularly significant miracles" attributed to Germogen were to be examined and that all paperwork must be completed by the end of Lent. See the commission's protocols in RGIA, f. 796, op. 205, d. 263, ll. 2-3ob.

Evidence of the elaborate civic rituals surrounding the canonization and celebration of local saints in the urban spaces of the medieval and early modern West offers an instructive parallel with the imperial Russian case. See André Vauchez, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, ed. Daniel E. Bornstein, trans. Margery J. Schneider (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), ch. 13; and Moshe Sluhovskiy, *Patroness of Paris: Rituals of Devotion in Early Modern France* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), esp. 65-67.

11. Gregory L. Freeze, "Institutionalizing Piety: The Church and Popular Religion, 1750-1850," in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 235.

12. For a description of the events of 12 June, see "U raki Sv. Anny Kashinskoi," *Strannik*, tom 1, no. 2 (June 1909): 908-10; "Chudesa i znamenii nebesnyia v Kashine," *Poslednie Tverskie novosti*, no. 13 (14 June 1909): 3; "Torzhestvo vozstanovleniia pochitanii sviatoi blagovernoi Anny Kashinskoi," *Pribavlenie k Tserkovnym vedomostiam*, no. 25 (20 June 1909): 1140-45; and "Torzhestvo otkrytiia moshchei sv. blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi," *Sovremennoe obozrenie* (supplement to *Kormchii*, no. 25, 1909): 98. Commentaries from such leading

publications as *Novoe vremia*, *Golos pravdy*, *Svet*, *Kolokol*, and *Russkoe chtenie* are excerpted in “Russkaia pechat’ po povodu otkrytiia moshchei kn. Anny Kashinskoi,” *Strannik*, t. 1, otd. 2 (June 1909): 910-11.

13. See, for example, the breathless speculation as to which dignitaries might attend the celebration and the follow-up coverage in “Mestnaia khronika,” *Poslednie Tverskie novosti*, no. 11 (31 May 1909): 1; and “12 iunia, den’ proslavleniia Sv. Anny Kashinskoi,” *ibid.*, no. 13 (14 June 1909): 3-4. Although the emperor and empress were not present in Kashin, the Grand Princess Elisaveta Feodorovna was in attendance, along with Sergei Luk’ianov, chief procurator of the Holy Synod, numerous representatives from the Tver’ nobility (including some who claimed to trace their noble lineage back to Saint Anna), representatives from the Ministry of Education, delegates from the Kostroma branch of the right-wing Union of Russian People, an entourage of Orthodox standard-bearers (*khorigvenostsy*) from Iaroslavl’, the commander of the armed forces for the Moscow military district, and the governors of Tver’ and Novgorod. See “U raki Sv. Anny Kashinskoi,” 908-10; “Torzhestvo vozstanovleniia,” 1140-41; and “Mestnaia khronika,” *Poslednie Tverskie novosti*, no. 15 (28 June 1909): 1-2. The secular press’s coverage of a canonization ceremony often read like society-page gossip. In 1896, on the occasion of Feodosii Chernigovskii’s canonization, the provincial newspaper published the guest list and menu for a five-course banquet to commemorate the event. Two hundred and twenty-five invited guests and luminaries of Chernigov society dined on sterlet soup, sturgeon with mayonnaise, and roast meat with vegetables, followed by sweets, fruits, coffee, tea, and liqueurs, topped off by sixteen champagne toasts in honor of Feodosii himself. See “Obed 9-go sentiabria,” *Chernigovskie gubernskie vedomosti*, no. 912 (15 September 1896): 1-2.

14. T. Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia Anna Kashinskaia* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1954), 110-11. E. E. Golubinskii (*Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 161) notes that soldiers from the city garrison, barracked near the cathedral, would rest their caps atop her wooden coffin while attending services.

15. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 161.

16. Isolde Thyret’s current work on the translations of holy relics in Tver’ in the mid-seventeenth century is particularly relevant here. She argues that the cults of Saints Arsenii and Mikhail were introduced by the bishops of Tver’, in part, to help heal a region ravaged by the Time of Troubles. See Isolde Thyret, “Accounts of the Transfer of Relics and Cults of Saints in Muscovite Russia: Saints Arsenii and Mikhail of Tver’” (paper presented to the conference “Modern History of Eastern Christianity: Transitions and Problems,” Harvard University, 26-27 March 2004). My thanks to Professor Thyret for making this paper available to me. On the discovery of holy bodies and the establishment of local cults more broadly, see Levin, “From Corpse to Cult.” In the Catholic West, too, periods of great devastation were often followed by a renewed interest in localized saintly cults. On the emergence of new and forgotten saints in France after the Hundred Years’ War, see Michael E. Goodich, *Violence and Miracle in the Fourteenth Century: Private Grief and Public Salvation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 121-46. Similar evidence exists for southern German Catholic bishoprics following the Thirty Years’ War. See R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe, 1550-1750* (London: Routledge, 1989), 157.

17. On the legend of Kashin’s miraculous deliverance from Lithuanian siege, see Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 161. Despite Anna’s intercession, however, the city fell twice to

Polish armies, first in 1609 and again in 1612. The hagiographical literature surrounding Anna makes no mention of this second assault, which followed one year after the healing of Gerasim. On the devastation of Kashin during the Time of Troubles, see G. Ia. Mokeev and I. Iu. Merkulova, “Kashin XVI-XVII vv. i goroda skhodnogo tipa,” *Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo* 36 (1988): 165-74; and D. I. Karmanov, *Istoricheskiia izvestiia o prinadlezhchikh k Tverskomu namestnichestvu gorodakh* (1778) in *idem, Sobranie sochinenii, otnosiashchikhsia k istorii Tverskago kraia* (Tver’: Tipografiia gubernskago pravleniia, 1893), 144-45. On the ruin suffered throughout Tver’ diocese more broadly, see Thyret, “Accounts of the Transfer of Relics.”

18. Eight miracles were attributed to Anna between 1611 and 1649. The beneficiaries of her intercession belonged to various strata of the social pyramid, including the crippled wife of a Kashin blacksmith, the paralyzed son of a gentryman, and the blind wife of a “gentryman of foreign birth.” See Priest S. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa sviatoi blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi* (St. Petersburg, 1909), 56-57.

19. *Ibid.*, 62; V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Drevnerusskiia zhitia sviatykh kak istoricheskiia istochniki* (Moscow, 1871), 340-41; and N. P. Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii* (St. Petersburg, 1882), 41-43. On Epifanii’s role in the reform of liturgical books under Patriarch Nikon, see Paul Meyendorff, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the Seventeenth Century* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s Press, 1991), 108-13.

20. The *zhitie*, for example, says that Anna died in 1337, while in the chronicles, she lives another twenty years. According to the *zhitie*, Anna was the daughter of a Kashin boyar and a native of the town, while the chronicles claimed her father was Prince Dmitrii Borisovich of Rostov. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 160. A reprint of the seventeenth-century text outlining the thirteen inconsistencies is found in I. Ia. Kunkin, *Gorod Kashin: Materialy dlia ego istoriia*, vyp. 2 (Moscow: Izd. Imperatorskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh, 1905), 62-67.

21. A. P. Bogdanov, *Russkie patriarkhi, 1589-1700*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Terra, 1999), 2: 118-19. See also Kliuchevskii, *Drevnerusskiia zhitia sviatykh*, 340-41.

22. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 71-72. The findings of the patriarchal commission are reprinted in V. I. Kolosov, *Blagovernaia kniagina Anna Kashinskaia* (Tver’, 1905), 30-46.

23. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 165.

24. *Pamiati sv. blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi* (Moscow, 1909), 4.

25. The full text of the 1678 *sobor* resolution is given in Priest S. A. Arkhangelov, “Opredelenie Moskovskago Sobora 1678 goda o zhitii i podviga Blagovernoi Velikoi Kniagini Anny Kashinskoi,” *Strannik*, tom 1, no. 1 (April 1909): 534-54. In his accompanying commentary to the text, Arkhangelov, an ardent champion of Anna’s cause, was sharply critical of the decision, arguing that the council’s grounds for de-canonizing Anna “prove to be unfounded.” (p. 534). Most nineteenth- and twentieth-century sources, Orthodox and Old Believer alike, agree that Ioakim’s decision to inspect Anna’s relics was motivated principally by the church’s desire to discredit the *dvuperstie*. See, for example, P. Koltypin, *Svedeniia o zhizni blagovernoi velikoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi, suprugi sv. velikago kniazia Mikhaila Tverskogo* (St. Petersburg, 1872), 19; and Archpriest Aleksandr Skobnikov, *Sviataia blagovernaia kniagina Anna Kashinskaia*

(Kashin, 1909), 6-7. Interestingly, though, the commission's report of 1677 makes no mention of the two-fingered cross and even explicitly states that although Anna's right hand was bent over her breast, "the palm and fingers are straight, and *not in the form of a blessing*." (Quoted in Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 165, emphasis mine). For Golubinskii and others, this silence was read as part of a patriarchal cover-up designed to prevent Old Believers from using her relics to justify the legitimacy of the two-fingered cross. This argument is lent some greater weight by the fact that Ioakim's patriarchate also witnessed the demotion of Evfrosin Pskovskii (canonized 1549) from all-church saint to local saint, after an examination of his *zhitie* revealed numerous references to the saint's championing of the double hallelujah (another liturgical tradition supported by the Old Believers). See G. P. Fedotov, *Sviatye drevnei Rusi* (Paris, 1931; reprint, Rostov-on-Don: Feniks, 1999), 13.

26. See D. A. Eristov, *Slovar' istoricheskii o sviatykh proslavlennykh v Rossiiskoi tserkvi, i o nekotorykh podvizhnikakh blagochestiia, mestno chtimykh* (St. Petersburg, 1836), 30; and the second edition of the same title (St. Petersburg, 1862), 23-24. In both cases, Anna was listed alphabetically, with no reference whatsoever to her disgrace under Patriarch Ioakim.

27. Archpriest Aleksandr Skobnikov, *Na mogile kashinskoi pravednitsy v Uspenskom sobore* (Elets, 1909), 6.

28. Priest S. A. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaiia velikaia kniaginia Anna Kashinskaia k dniu – 12 iunია 1909 g.—vozstanovleniia Eia proslavlenniia* (St. Petersburg, 1909), 16.

29. "Kashin," in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, 41 vols. (St. Petersburg: Brokgauz-Efron, 1890-1904), 28: 820.

30. *Sviataia blagovernaiia velikaia kniaginia* (Moscow, 1910), 35.

31. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 17.

32. I. V. Bazhenov, *Sv. blagovernaiia kniaginia Anna Kashinskaia* (St. Petersburg, 1891), 16. On commerce in late-imperial Kashin, see Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 13; and "Kashin," *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, 28: 819-21.

33. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 17.

34. *Ibid.*, 134-49.

35. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 80.

36. Skobnikov, *Na mogile*, 6.

37. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 80; and *idem*, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 18.

38. Much of the scholarly literature on women saints focuses on their marginal status in a company dominated by holy men. Katherine K. Young, for example, argues that women saints earned the suspicion of religious authorities because they were one of the many "renegade group[s] . . . that threatened their grip on power." See her introduction to *Women Saints in World Religions*,

ed. Arvind Sharma (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 25. While Anna's sex no doubt influenced her representation in Orthodox sources as devoted wife and loving mother to all her children of Kashin, I have found no evidence to suggest that her cult was in any way marginalized on this account. In fact, the only sources that *do* marginalize Anna are those from "enlightened" Soviet writers. One such text makes the untenable claim that Anna was demoted from the ranks of the saints and her relics deemed unworthy of veneration "on account of her debauched life. She was a first-class flirt [*bol'shoi ruki kokotka*], as anyone who has rummaged around in such [old] books knows." See S. Groza, "Nashi chudotvortsy," *Belevskii proletarii* (Belev, Tver' Province), no. 32 (1 May 1919): 2.

39. "Dlia chego chestvuetsia sv. Anna Kashinskaia? (K voprosu o znachenii zhenshchiny sovremennom khristianskom obshchestve)," *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 22 (8 June 1909), neoff. chast': 438-39.

40. E. Poselianin, "Pred Kashinskimi torzhestvami," *Pribavlenie k Tserkovnym vedomostiam*, no. 23 (6 June 1909): 1061. Prince Mikhail Iaroslavich was summoned to the court of the Mongol khan in 1318, where he suffered a martyr's death. See Priest A. V. Sokolov, *Sviatyi blagovernoi velikii kniaz' Mikhail Iaroslavich Tverskii* (Tver', 1864); reprinted in *Mikhail Iaroslavich, velikii kniaz' Tverskoi i Vladimirskoi* (Tver', 1995), 70-72.

41. N., "U sviatykh moshchei sv. Anny Kashinskoi," *Kormchii*, no. 26 (1909): 309. On Anna as a role model for Christian men and women, see also Prudnikov, *Istoricheskiia svideniia o blagovernoi kniagine Anne Kashinskoi, supruga sv. Mikhaila Tverskago*, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1859), 18. Gendered representations of the saint are encountered still today. A recent text celebrates Saint Anna for her "quiet" and "humble" character, a demeanor "befitting an Old Russian princess." See G. S. Gadalova, "Zhenshchiny Tverskogo kniazheskogo dvora (Velikie Kniagini Kseniia i Anna—mat' i zhena Mikhaila Tverskogo)," in *Velikii Kniaz' Tverskoi i Vladimirskii Mikhail Iaroslavich: Lichnost', epokha, nasledie. Mezhdunarodnaia nauchnaia konferentsiia. Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii* (Tver': Arkhivnyi otdel administratsii Tverskoi oblasti, 1996), 49.

42. The miracle story of the married couple is recounted in N., "U sviatykh moshchei," 308-10. On the relationship between the spread of saintly cults and modern technology, see Nadieszda Kizenko, *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, 2000), 151-96; and Greene, "'Bodies Like Bright Stars,'" ch. 2.

43. "Sviatitel' Feodosii Uglitskii, Arkhiepiskop Chernigovskii. Po povodu 200-letnei godovshchiny so dnia blazhennoi konchiny ego (vnebogosluzhebnoe chtenie dlia naroda)," *Chernigovskie eparkhial'nye izvestiia*, no. 8 (15 April 1896), neoffits. chast': 267.

44. Archpriest Ioann Platonov, "Slovo v nedeliu Syropustniuu i den' 200-letii so vremeni blazhennoi konchiny Sviatitelia Feodosiia Uglitskago, Arkhiepiskopa Chernigovskago, 4 fevralia 1896 goda," *Chernigovskie eparkhial'nye izvestiia*, no. 4 (15 February 1896), neoffits. chast': 122. Offerings and votive gifts to the saints were encouraged by the Orthodox clergy, so long as they fell within the prescribed norms of decency and propriety. The practice of attaching coins to ikons or reliquaries, for example, either in hopes of a cure or as a show of thanks for a miracle rendered, was expressly forbidden by an edict of the Holy Synod dated 10 January 1722. A late-nineteenth-century gloss on this ruling noted that priests should explain to parishioners

that monetary donations should be placed in the proper receptacle, i.e., the offertory box. See N. Nikol'skii and M. Izvol'skii, *Sistematicheskii sbornik nedoumennykh voprosov i otvetov na nikh vstrechaiushchikhsia v tserkovno-prikhodskoi praktike, pomeshchennya v izdavaemom pri S.-Peterburgskoi Dukhovnoi akademii "Tserkovnom vestnike" za posledniia (1875-1895) dvadtsat' let* (St. Petersburg: Izd. knizhnago magazina "Narodnaia pol'za," 1896), 9-10. In Vologda Province, believers would leave silver or wooden miniatures of legs, arms, heads, teeth, etc., at ikons and shrines as votive offerings of thanksgiving. See I. A. Kremleva, "Obet v religioznoi zhizni russkogo naroda," in *Pravoslavie i russkaia narodnaia kul'tura*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Institut etnologii i antropologii RAN, 1993), 2: 128-57. Though this practice seems in Russia to have been restricted to the northern regions, it was common throughout much of Catholic Europe, especially in Spain, Portugal, and Italy. See Mary Lee Nolan and Sidney Nolan, *Christian Pilgrimage in Modern Western Europe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 71-75.

45. See Priest Pokrovskii, *Sv. blagovernaia kniaginia Anna Kashinskaia. Zhizn', chudesa i molitvennoe pochitanie blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi pravoslavnyim russkim narodom* (Moscow, 1909), 32; and "Opis' podnoshenii, prinesennykh v dar Kashinskomu Voskresenskomu Soboru v den' tserkovnago proslavlennii Sviatoi Blagovernoi Velikoi Kniagini Anny Kashinskoi—12 iunია 1909 goda," *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 25 (30 June 1909), offits. chast': 275-82.

46. See, for example, the record of monetary donations pledged by the faithful to outfit a new shrine and canopy for Anna's relics and to underwrite "other expenses for the [1909] ceremony" in *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 8 (23 February 1909), offits. chast': 92-93. Donations ranged from one to one thousand rubles.

47. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 16-17; idem, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 79; and Priest Ioann Zav'ialov, *Gorod Kashin, ego istoriia, sviatyni i dostoprimechatel'nosti. S kratkim zhitiiem blagovernoi kniagini Anny* (St. Petersburg, 1909), 13-14. Despite Anna's intervention, the cholera epidemic of 1848 raged for nearly four months in Kashinskii uезд and accounted for the deaths of some 1,500 people (1.4 out of every 100 people in the district), the second-highest mortality rate in Tver' Province. Nevertheless, the residents of Kashin might well have thought themselves fortunate to escape relatively unscathed from a disease that claimed 99,000 victims in the central industrial region alone. See G. I. Arkhangel'skii, *Kholernyia epidemii v Evropeiskoi Rossii v 50-ti-letnii period 1823-1872 gg.* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia M. Stasiulevicha, 1874), 251-52. Similarly, the intercession of Saint Sergii Radonezhskii was credited with having spared the Orthodox residents of Sergiev Posad from the epidemics of the 1830s and 1848. See Archpriest Petr Smirnov, *Chudesa v prezhnee i nashe vremia*, 2d ed. (Moscow, 1895), 11-13.

48. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 18 (emphasis mine). In 1866, the population of Kashin city and the surrounding localities was 7,372. See N. R—v, *Ocherk Kashina* (n.p., 1867), 27-28.

49. Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaia kniaginia*, 151.

50. These feast days were 12 June (marking the translation of Anna's relics in 1650), 21 June (the day of the discovery of her relics), 2 October (the day of her death), and 17 November (the date of the second translation of Anna's relics, from the Uspenskii Cathedral to the Voskresenskii, in 1817). See Zav'ialov, *Gorod Kashin*, 14. On the use of religious processions to sacralize civic space, see, for example, Richard Mackenney, "Public and Private in Renaissance Venice," *Renaissance Studies* 12 (1998): 109-30.

51. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 20-21. The municipal edict of 1899 appears to have been more strict than imperial law, which stipulated only that “eating and drinking establishments be closed and that no one traffic in anything at all, save basic food necessities, until the procession returns to church.” As quoted in Priest Aleksandr Tresviatskii, *Kalendar’ sviashchennika* (Samara, 1893), 161-62.
52. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 22.
53. Among the royal visitors to Anna’s grave in the decades before her re-canonization were the Empress Mariia Feodorovna and the Great Princess Ekaterina Pavlovna. See Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 23. The Great Princess Elisaveta Feodorovna personally attended the 1909 canonization festivities in Kashin and afterward sent a glowing telegram of thanks to the city fathers for inviting her to participate in these “wondrously joyous days.” See “Mestnaia khronika,” *Poslednie Tverskie novosti*, no. 14 (21 June 1909): 1-2.
54. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 83-84.
55. “Neobychainoe religioznoe voodushevenie v g. Kashine,” *Tverskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 30 (21 July 1908), neoff. chast’: 672.
56. Wortman, *Scenarios of Power*, 2: 235-70.
57. The Tver’ diocesan press noted with approval that Kashin’s population was “exclusively Orthodox,” and that “not even any Old Believers” could be found in the town. See “Neobychainoe religioznoe voodushevenie,” 673.
58. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 89. The incident explains why nineteenth- and twentieth-century sources never refer to Anna’s relics as “uncontaminated” (*netlennnye*). A similar fate befell the relics of Sofronii Irkutskii in 1917 (see text below).
59. *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 139.
60. Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 144, 145-47.
61. Irodova’s story was duly published in Tver’ diocese and subsequently reprinted in a nationwide religious periodical. See “K proslavleniiu blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi,” *Tverskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 15-16 (20-27 April 1909), neoffits. chast’: 298-99; and “K proslavleniiu blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi,” *Kormchii*, no. 23 (1909): 266.
62. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 16.
63. Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaia kniaginia*, 141.
64. Pokrovskii, *Sv. blagovernaia kniaginia*, 30.
65. These three petitions are discussed in *ibid.*, 144-45. See also Arkhangelov, *Zhitie i chudesa*, 89 and *Sviataia blagovernaia velikaia kniaginia*, 34.

66. Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 150.
67. Arkhangelov, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 28; and Skobnikov, *Na mogile*, 6.
68. Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 151.
69. A narrative of the events of May-July 1908 is given in “Neobychainoe religioznoe voodushevlenie,” 670-73. On support for Anna’s cause in Tver’, see also Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 28-30; *Tverskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 44 (27 October 1908), offits. chast’: 606-07; and “Otkrytie moshchei blagovernoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi,” *Pochaevskii listok*, supp. no. 22-23 (1909): 161-66.
70. “Poslanie Sviateishago Sinoda vozliublennym o Gospode chadam Pravoslavnoi Russkoi Tserkvi o vozstanovlenii tserkovnago pochitaniia blagovernoi velikoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi,” published as a special supplement to *Tserkovnyiia vedomosti*, no. 21 (23 May 1909), off. chast’: 3.
71. *Ibid.*, 3; and Manukhina, *Sviataia blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 28-30.
72. “Poslanie Sviateishago Sinoda,” 3-4.
73. RGIA, f. 797, op. 84, otd. 2, st. 3, d. 372, ll. 100-100ob.
74. See the Synod’s subsequent decree of 11 April 1909 (No. 4627), in *Tverskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 14 (13 April 1909), neoff. chast’: 134-35.
75. “Osviashchenie pervago khrama vo imia sv. kniagini Anny Kashinskoi,” *Tverskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 51-52 (28 December 1909), neoffits. chast’: 1069-70; and *Kashin, pravoslavnyi russkii gorod* (St. Petersburg: V. V. Gusev, 1998), 26-27.
76. See the advertisements in *Pribavlenie k Tserkovnym vedomostiam*, no. 25 (20 June 1909): 129 and no. 26 (27 June 1909): 136. One visiting priest present for Anna’s canonization ceremony commented unfavorably on the intrusion of commercialism on such a solemn occasion: “Vendors were dashing about, vying with one another and calling out to buyers: ‘In memory of Saint Anna Kashinskaia! A booklet, an ikon, and a leaflet—all three for five kopecks!’” Nevertheless, the priest did purchase two ikons of Anna (presumably from a less strident salesman), had them blessed at her shrine, and brought them back for the edification of his parishioners in Groznyi. See Priest Ioann Popov, *V Kashin i Poltavu, na vs Rossiiskiiia torzhestva i “mimoezdy moi” (Nabludeniia, vpechatleniia i zametki palomnika-turista)* (Vladikavkaz, 1909), 6, 10.
77. *Irkutskii missionerskii s’ezd. 24 iulia—5 avgusta 1910 goda. (Dnevnik uchastnika s’ezda)* (Tomsk: Tipografiia Priiuta i doma trudoliubiia, 1910), 75-76. The arrival of relic fragments in a new locality was always celebrated as cause for celebration and an outpouring of religious enthusiasm. See, for example, the account in “Ot Zhitomira do Ovrucha,” *Volynskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 22 (1 August 1905), neoffits. chast’: 732-39, and no. 23 (11 August 1905), neoffits’ chast’: 761-71.
78. On the archbishop’s “shock and shame” regarding this unfortunate news, see “Slovo

Arkhiepiskopa Serafima o neobkhodimosti bor'by s p'ianstvom," *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 23 (1 December 1912), neofits. chast': 639-47; and P.B., "Potreblenie vina v Sibiri i p'ianstvo v Irkutskoi gub.," in *ibid.*, 669-71. The related problems of deviance and crime are treated in Alan Wood, "Russia's 'Wild East': Exile, Vagrancy and Crime in Nineteenth-Century Siberia," in *The History of Siberia: From Russian Conquest to Revolution*, ed. Alan Wood (London: Routledge, 1991), 117-39.

79. On the shipment of holy relics to consecrate new churches, a practice dating to the earliest centuries of the Christian Church, see the 1874 correspondence between Bishop Pavel of Kamchatka and the Holy Synod in RGIA, f. 796, op. 155, d. 638, ll. 1-4ob. A similar request was made in 1866 by State Councillor O. Saken; see RGIA, f. 796, op. 147, d. 1404, ll. 1-2. The Kievo-Pecherskaia Lavra, which was positively overflowing with holy body parts, fulfilled many of the orders placed for relic fragments. In 1870, for example, the lavra sent portions of the relics of Saints Nifont, Feofil, Isaakii, and Ipatii to consecrate a newly constructed church dedicated to "All the Saints of Kiev" in Viatka Province. See *Vstrecha sviatykh moshchei v gorode Viatke* (Viatka, 1871). On relics and church consecration more broadly, see Archpriest V. G. Pevtsov, *Tserkovnoe pravo. Lektsii chitannia v 1891-92 akad. godu* (St. Petersburg: Tipo-litografiia V. A. Vatslika, 1892), 99-100.

80. E. M. Iaroslavskii, "12 funtov sibirskikh moshchei," *Sovetskaia Sibir'*, 28 January 1921; reprinted in *idem*, *O religii* (Moscow: Gospolizdat, 1957), 30-31.

81. For a brief biography of Sofronii and an account of his tenure as bishop of Irkutsk, see Archpriest Milii Chefranov, *Blazhennyi Sofronii, 3-i episkop irkutskii* (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1907); and O. E. Naumova, *Irkutskaia eparkhiia XVIII – pervaiia polovina XIX veka* (Irkutsk: Izd. Irkutskogo gos. tekhnicheskogo universiteta, 1996), 55-69.

82. See the report of Bishop Feodosii of Chernigov and N. I. Znamirovskii, both of the Church Sobor's Department on the Liturgy, Sermons, and Churches ("Doklad o kanonizatsii sviatitelia Sofroniia, tret'iago episkopa irkutskago," undated; no later than 8 December 1917), in Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiskoi Federatsii (hereafter, GARF), f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 303, l. 6. The incorruptibility of Sofronii's relics was regarded as all the more miraculous because the bishop's unembalmed body had lain in state for more than six months before his burial—"during the summer, no less," as Archbishop Tikhon informed the Synod. See the archbishop's letter of 19 March 1910 to the Holy Synod in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 409ob.

83. Chefranov, *Blazhennyi Sofronii*, 342, 329, 343.

84. The miracle books of the Voznesenskii monastery credit Saint Innokentii with 103 attested miracles, three-quarters of which were performed prior to his 1803 canonization. See Priest In. Popov, "O chudesakh Sviatitelia Innokentii," *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 6 (15 March 1910), neofits. chast': 160-64; and Archpriest P. V. Gromov, *Nachalo khristianstvo v Irkutске, i Sviatyi Innokentii, pervyi episkop Irkutskii, ego sluzhenie, upravlenie, konchina, chudesa i proslavlenie* (Irkutsk, 1868), 285-408.

85. A rare exception to this localized coverage is a belated report of a miracle attributed to the intercession of Saint Nicholas the Wonder-Worker. See "Pomoshch' Sv. Nikolaia, iavlennaiia odnomu semeistvu v noch' s 26 na 27 ianvaria 1883 goda," *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 3 (1 February 1909), neofits. chast': 96-98.

86. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, ll. 414-15. Liudmilla Popova, widow of a chancellery employee in Irkutsk, suffered from intense migraines and toothaches which only Sofronii's holy oil could relieve. When she suffered an attack while attending services at the cathedral one day, she knelt before the saint's shrine and rubbed oil over her head, neck, and gums. Shortly thereafter, she reported with great joy that her teeth had begun "to come loose and fall out one after the other," which solved, at least, the problem of her recurring toothaches.

87. See, for example, the account of a young girl's recovery from diphtheria and scarlet fever in 1899, as told by her parents to their parish priest, in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 413.

88. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 417; "Chudotvoreniia, proissshedshiia pri grobe Sofroniia, ep. irkutskago," *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 20 (15 October 1912), neoffits. chast': 570-74.

89. See the miracle stories recorded in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, ll. 413-21; and *Iavlenie blagodatnoi pomoshchi Sviatitelia Sofroniia, 3-go episkopa irkutskago* (Irkutsk, 1915).

90. V. Dashkevich, *Pereselenie v Sibir'* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia A. S. Suvorina, 1912), 51-52; V. M. Kabuzan, *Emigratsiia i reemigratsiia v Rossii v XVIII – nachale XX veka* (Moscow: Nauka, 1998), 125, 173, 267-68. See also Donald W. Treadgold, *The Great Siberian Migration: Government and Peasant in Resettlement from Emancipation to the First World War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

91. N. G. O. Pereira, *White Siberia: The Politics of Civil War* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 27.

92. Dashkevich, *Pereselenie v Sibir'*, 38.

93. To the extent that Siberia represented the Russian Empire's colonial frontier, comparison with European arrivals in the New World is apt. See, for example, Peter N. Moogk, "Reluctant Exiles: Emigrants from France in Canada before 1760," *William and Mary Quarterly*, no. 3 (1989): 463-505. On the translation of saintly cults by Italian immigrants to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Mary Elizabeth Brown, "Italian-Americans and Their Saints: Historical Considerations," in *The Saints in the Lives of Italian Americans: An Interdisciplinary Investigation*, ed. Joseph A. Varacalli, Salvatore et al. (Stony Brook, N.Y.: University Center for Italian Studies, 1999), 35-67.

94. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, ll. 419-419ob. On Sofronii's help of non-Russians, see the miracle stories in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 413 (the healing of a cossack girl), and d. 301, ll. 109-10 (the healing of an illiterate cossack widow). The ethnic diversity of new arrivals to the Siberian provinces increased sharply toward the end of the old regime. In 1858, immigrants from the Ukrainian provinces (cossacks and ethnic Ukrainians) accounted for 0.1 percent of the Siberian population; by 1917, the figure had risen to 9.4 percent. See Kabuzan, *Emigratsiia i reemigratsiia*, 173, 268. On the popularity of Sofronii's fellow Siberian saint, Vasilii Mangazeiskii, among baptized pagans and non-Russians, see a 1912 account of his miracles in RGIA, f. 796, op. 445, d. 344, ll. 2-3.

95. "Chudesa po molitvam Blazhennago Episkopa Sofroniia," *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 24 (15 December 1913), neoffits. chast': 797-800.

96. “Chudesa po molitvam Blazhennago Episkopa Sofroniia,” *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 12 (15 June 1914), neoffits. chast’: 399-403. Indeed, diocesan newspapers reminded readers that it was a sin to keep silent when miracles had been rendered them. Those who had received miracles were expected to share this news with the faithful, just as the blind man healed by Jesus at the pool of Siloam had done in John 9. See “K slave novoiavlennago ugodnika Bozhiia, sviatitelia Feodosiia, Chernigovskago Chudotvortsia,” *Chernigovskie eparkhial’nye izvestiia*, no. 7 (1 April 1899), neoffits. chast’: 235-43.

97. See, for example, the tale of Sofronii’s assistance to three generations of a local merchant family, as recounted in “Chudo po molitvam Sviatitelia Sofroniia,” *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 9 (1 May 1913), neoffits. chast’: 259-62. The author’s son, who had been healed of a serious illness in 1870, later repaid his debt to the saint by cosponsoring a costly restoration project at the cathedral where Sofronii’s body lay. On the reconstruction of the cathedral, see “V starom sobore,” in the special supplement to *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 1 (1 January 1917): 39.

98. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 301, ll. 89-91ob (letter of Aleksandr Stepanovich Shakhmaev to the Commission for the Verification of the Miracles Performed Through the Prayers of the Prelate Sofronii, Third Bishop of Irkutsk, 3 February 1914).

99. See Tikhon’s letter to the Holy Synod in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 411ob.

100. *Ibid.*, l. 412.

101. See the Synod’s ukaz no. 7975 to the archbishop of Irkutsk (31 May 1912), as published in *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 19 (1 October 1912), offits. chast’: 141-45.

102. The form letters sent out by the commission read: “Dear Sir! A statement of the following content has been received from You [date and year] regarding the bountiful assistance [received] through the prayers of the Prelate Sofronii. At the present time, by order of the Most Holy Synod, it is asked that You confirm Your statement under oath, in the presence of a parish priest, two laypeople, and a representative of the civil administration, and that Your witnessed statement be sent to Irkutsk, to His Grace, Archbishop Serafim, Chair of the Commission.” See “Zasedaniia Komissii po odostvoreniiu deistvitel’nosti chudotvorenii po molitvam Sviatitelia Sofroniia, 3-go episkopa irkutskago,” *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 7-8 (1-15 April 1913), offits. chast’: 59. On the activities of the commission, see also *ibid.*, no. 20 (15 October 1912), offits. chast’: 149-52.

103. In Chernigov, for example, the local commission investigating the miracle stories attributed to Feodosii Chernigovskii found that “in almost all instances” the recipients of miracles recorded in the cathedral registries were either already dead or could not be located. See “Novyi molitvennik za zemliu Russkuiu pred Gospodom, sviatitel’ Feodosii Uglitskii, arkhiepiskop Chernigovskii,” *Rukovodstvo dlia sel’skikh pastyrei*, tom 3, no. 41 (13 October 1896): 167-68.

104. See GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 301, l. 55. A slightly different oath was used by clerics in Astrakhan’ to obtain testimony regarding miracles attributed to Metropolitan Iosif the Murdered: “I promise and swear by the Almighty God and before His Holy Gospels and Life-Giving Cross, that I will, in good conscience, being swayed neither by friendship nor kinship, nor in expectation of any rewards, nor by any other factors, give the whole truth in this matter and will withhold

nothing known to me, remembering that I must answer for all of this before the law and before God on the day of His last judgment. In affirmation of my oath, I kiss the Word and Cross of my Savior. Amen.” See RGIA, f. 796, op. 445, d. 346, l. 161. In the Catholic West, ecclesiastics had introduced the practice of receiving sworn testimony from witnesses to miracles already by the mid-thirteenth century. See Goodich, *Violence and Miracle*, 6-11. Orthodox canon law was strict on the sanctity of oaths; anyone who broke an oath sworn on the cross or gospels had violated the commandment against taking the name of the Lord in vain and was declared anathema for ten years, which meant that liars ran the very real risk of dying without first having taken holy communion. See P. I. Nechaev, *Prakticheskoe rukovodstvo dlia sviashchennosluzhitelei, ili sistematicheskoe izlozhenie polnago kruga ikh obiazannostei i prav*, 12th ed. (Petrograd: Tipografiia P. P. Soikina, 1915), 387-94; “Pouchenie pred prisiagoi,” *Dukhovnaia beseda*, no. 9 (September 1909): 304.

105. On the work of the Astrakhan’ commission, see RGIA, f. 797, op. 83, otd. 2, st. 3, d. 411, ll. 1-7ob; and *Ot Komiteta po delu otkrytiia i proslavleniia chestnykh ostankov Mitropolita Iosif Ubiennago* (Astrakhan’: Parovaia tipografiia S. N. Semenova, 1911). For examples of this commission’s deliberations and methodological approach to the investigation of miracles, see RGIA, f. 796, op. 445, d. 346, ll. 112-12ob, 138-39, 172-72ob, 253-53ob, 272-72ob, 279ob, 365, 373, 383. A similar commission was operating at the same time in Tambov diocese to investigate the miracles attributed to Saint Pitirim. See RGIA, f. 796, op. 205, d. 262, ll. 8-9ob (Bishop Kirill of Tambov to the Holy Synod, 7 February 1913).

106. Golubinskii approved of such thoroughness in the investigation of miracles and dismissed as “modern-day nonsense” the allegations of critics who charged that the course of canonization in the Russian Church had devolved into “a drawn-out, complicated, and sometimes even petty investigation exhibiting all the characteristics of bureaucratic formalities.” Certain procedural precautions were necessary, he countered, to prevent the attribution of “fabricated or invented miracles” from allowing an unworthy candidate to slip into the ranks of the saints. See Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh*, 284-85, fn. 1.

107. The phrase is that of the mayor of Irkutsk. Various statements of endorsement from public officials on behalf of Sofronii’s candidacy may be found in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, ll. 430-33.

108. See Innokentii Pisarev, “Kratkii otchet Irkutskago tserkovnago vo imia Sviatitelia Innokentiiia Bratstva za 1912 g. (2 dekabria 1911 g.–2 dekabria 1912 g., XI god ego sushchestvovaniia),” *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 16 (15 August 1913), neoffits. chast’: 496-509; and the special supplements to *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 23 (1 December 1913), neoffits. chast’, and no. 24 (15 December 1913), neoffits. chast’. By the end of 1914, in its thirteenth year of existence, the brotherhood boasted 366 active members (five out of every six of whom were laymen); various honorary members, including the governor-general of the province, the archbishop, and Metropolitan Makarii of Moscow; and nearly thirteen thousand rubles in capital. See “Ocherk o sostoianii Irkutskago tserkovnago vo imia Sviatitelia Innokentiiia Bratstva za 1914 goda (2 dekabria 1913 g.–2 dekabria 1914 g., XIII god ego sushchestvovaniia),” published as a special supplement to *Irkutskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti*, no. 23 (1 December 1914).

109. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 411.

110. *Kalendar’-spravochnik po g. Irkutsku i Irkutskoi gubernii na 1914 god* (Irkutsk, 1914),

111.

111. “V starom sobore,” *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 7-8 (1-15 April 1917), neoffits. chast': 268. The article also reported that a “grandiose gathering of soldiers and workers” was underway on the cathedral square on the morning of the fire, casting further suspicion on radical elements in the city. For more on the fire, see the report of Archbishop Ioann to the Holy Synod in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, ll. 436-37 (19 September 1917).

112. Archbishop Ioann, “Rech' pred panikhidoi po Sviatitele Sofronii (19 aprelia 1917 goda),” *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 9-10 (1-15 May 1917), neoffits. chast': 275-76. The destruction of holy relics or the corruption of relics that had once been uncorrupted were generally interpreted as a message from God. One eyewitness to the canonization ceremonies of Serafim Sarovskii overheard a pilgrim explaining the “real” reason why Serafim’s relics were not preserved in a state of incorruptibility: “The Lord sent [this sign] to us because of our sins. Not wanting to punish us completely, He sent us the holy elder’s incomplete relics [*ne polnyia moshchi*] for edification and consolation.” See Archimandrite Evdokim, “U moshchei prep. Serafima Sarovskago,” *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, tom 2, no. 7-8 (July-August 1903): 513-63, here, 514.

113. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, l. 436ob.

114. *Ibid.*, l. 437. The signed petitions are in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 300, ll. 14-56, 87-338; and d. 302, ll. 1-36. On the formation of the union and its efforts, see “V soiuze pravoslavnykh khristian,” *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 9-10 (1-15 May 1917), neoffits. chast': 326-29; “Ot Soveta soiuza pravoslavnykh khristian pros'ba,” in *ibid.*, pp. 329-30; and GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 303, ll. 7-8. To put the figure of 7,000 rubles in some perspective, Irkutsk donors pledged a mere 400 rubles that same year to purchase oil and an ikon lantern to hang above the shrine of the newly canonized Ioann Tolbol'skii in the city of Tobol'sk. Religious patrons preferred to keep their charity local. See Archbishop Ioann, “Otchet v izraskhodovanii deneg, sobrannykh na lampadu i ikonu Sviatitelia Ioanna, mitropolita Tobol'skago i Sibirskago,” *Irkutskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 3 (1 February 1917), offits. chast': 30-31.

115. *Zhurnaly Irkutskago 49-go ekstrennago eparkhial'nago s'ezda dukhovenstva i mirian Irkutskoi eparkhii 29 maia – 11 iunია 1917 goda* (Nizheudinsk, 1917), 18-20.

116. See the decree of 5/18 April 1918 in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 303, ll. 22-25ob; subsequently republished in *Tserkovnye vedomosti*, no. 19-20 (1-14 June 1918): 109-14.

117. RGIA, f. 831, op. 1, d. 83, ll. 14-14ob (Archbishop Ioann to the Holy Synod, 29 April 1918).

118. See the petition of Irkutsk parish clergy to Patriarch Tikhon in RGIA, f. 831, op. 1, d. 83, ll. 16-17ob (undated; likely late April or early May 1918).

119. *Ibid.* Earlier in the decade, even before his canonization had been officially approved by the Synod, Patriarch Germogen was the subject of debate among church publicists who argued whether it would be more fitting to celebrate the patriarch’s memory on 22 October (the date in 1612 when he discovered the ikon of the Kazan’ Mother of God, under whose banner Pozharskii’s forces defeated the Poles) or 17 January (the anniversary of Germogen’s death). See A. Lebedev, *V kakoi den' naibolee prilichno chestvovat' pamiat' Patriarkha Germogena* (Saratov, 1910). The

difference here, however, is that the debates in Irkutsk were more broad-based and inclusive, involving not just religious thinkers and elites, but rank-and-file clerics and lay believers.

120. See the Sobor's protocol of 14/27 May 1918 in GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 303, ll. 28-29. The Holy Synod had raised similar reservations concerning plans for the canonization ceremonies of Metropolitan Ioann of Tobol'sk in 1915, "when all the forces of the Government and society are directed toward facilitating a victorious conclusion to this terrible war without precedent." It would be more prudent, the chief procurator opined, to postpone the celebrations "until the conclusion of military actions." See RGIA, f. 797, op. 84, otd. 2, st. 3, d. 372, ll. 18-19 (V. K. Sabler to Bishop Varnava of Tobol'sk, 29 April 1915). On the circumstances surrounding Ioann's controversial canonization, see Freeze, "Subversive Piety," 342-48. Revolution and civil war similarly delayed the canonization ceremonies for Metropolitan Iosif the Murdered of Astrakhan'. Shortly after the patriarch's decision to canonize the new saint, the diocese of Astrakhan' requested, with a certain poignant optimism, that the festivities be delayed to 11 May 1919, "on account of local conditions [and] in view of the circumstances of these present times." See RGIA, f. 831, op. 1, d. 82, l. 3 (Metropolitan Mitrofan of Astrakhan' to Patriarch Tikhon, 12/25 June 1918).

121. According to the 1930s memoirs of a monk who had taught for some time in the Irkutsk seminary before the Revolution, local believers attempted to hide the relics of their saints from Bolshevik desecration. "All those accused of hiding the holy relics of the bishops Innokentii and Sofronii were, of course, shot." See Archimandrite Feodosii (Almazov), *Moi vospominaniia (Zapiski Solovetskogo uznika)*, ed. M. I. Odintsov (Moscow: Krutitskoe Patriarsh'e Podvor'e, 1997), 112. On the Bolshevik campaign to exhume holy relics, see Greene, "'Bodies Like Bright Stars,'" ch. 4-6.

122. "Dlia chego chestvuetsia sv. Anna Kashinskaia?," 437.

123. Zav'ialov, *Gorod Kashin*, 13-14. Similar sentiments were expressed in the petition of support drafted by the clergy and laity of Tver'; see *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 44 (27 October 1908), neoffits. chast': 606-07.

124. A. V. Simakov, *Zhitie i podvigi blagovernoii velikoi kniagini Anny Kashinskoi (Ural'sk, 1909)*, vi.

125. "Svetlye dni v gorode Kashine," *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 15-16 (20-27 April 1909), neoffits. chast': 291.

126. On the security measures at the Kashin ceremonies taken by Governor N. G. Biunting, see "Ot Tverskago gubernatora," *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 20 (25 May 1909), offits. chast': 237. Biunting, who was appointed governor in the wake of the Revolution of 1905, had earned a reputation for enforcing law and order in the province. This would cost him his life in February 1917 when revolution broke out in Tver'; the governor was murdered in broad daylight on the main street of Tver' and his body trampled by the crowds. A present-day source grants Biunting the posthumous sobriquet of "first victim of the February Revolution." See *Tverskie gubernatory: K 200-letiiu obrazovaniia Tverskoi gubernii* (Tver': Arkhivnyi otdel administratsii Tverskoi oblasti, 1996), 55-60.

127. Priest Ioann Il'igorskii, "Po povodu Kashinskikh torzhestv," *Tverskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, no. 37 (21 September 1909), neoffits. chast': 761, 765-66, 768.

128. "Sviatye dni," 101. This article appeared in the periodical pamphlet *Sovremennoe obozrenie*, published as a supplement to *Kormchii*, no. 26 (1909).

129. On the movement for greater lay activism and autonomy in the late imperial period, see Glennys Young, "'Into Church Matters': Lay Identity, Rural Parish Life, and Popular Politics in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Russia, 1864-1928," *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 23 (1992): 315-34; P. A. Leont'ev, "Revoliutsiia v tserkvi: S"ezdy dukhovenstva i mirian v 1917 godu," in *Tserkov' v istorii Rossii*, vyp. 2 (Moscow: Institut Rossiiskii istorii RAN, 1998), 214-48; and Vera Shevzov, "Miracle-Working Icons, Laity, and Authority in the Russian Orthodox Church, 1861-1917," *Russian Review* 58 (1999): 26-48.

130. GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 303, l. 7.

131. Pierre Deloos, "Towards a Sociological Study of Canonized Sainthood in the Catholic Church," in *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 194 (emphasis in original).

132. Bazhenov, *Sv. blagovernaiia kniaginia*, 16.

133. In March 1918, for example, the Sobor rejected a petition from a former archbishop of Vladimir regarding the canonization of the holy fool, Kiprian. Although Kiprian was credited with thirty-one miracles, the Sobor ruled that strong evidence was lacking and that the petition itself read as though it had been "composed hastily." That same month, the Sobor passed on a proposal to canonize Vasiliu Mangazeiskii, arguing that the petition had no popular support, having been brought forward "by one lone individual" (a former bishop of Enisei) and "without any information for a proper decision (in the file there is neither a *zhitie*, nor a book giving an account of [his] miracles)." See GARF, f. R-3431, op. 1, d. 304, l. 6, 11. The Sobor also rejected a motion to canonize Prokopii Ust'ianskii and sent his dossier back to Vologda for further documentation. See *ibid.*, ll. 1-2ob.

Center for Russian & East European Studies
University Center for International Studies
University of Pittsburgh
4400 W. W. Posvar Hall
320 S. Bouquet Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
(412) 648-8716
www.ucis.pitt.edu/crees/cbpaper.html.

Ronald Linden, Bob Donnorummo, William Chase, Co-Editors
Eileen O'Malley, Managing Editor
Vera Dorosh, Editorial Assistant