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Abstract

In the mid-seventeenth century Nikon, Patriarch of Moscow, introduced a number of reforms to bring the Russian Orthodox Church into ritualistic and liturgical conformity with the Greek Orthodox Church. However, Nikon’s reforms met staunch resistance from a number of clergy, led by figures such as the archpriest Avvakum and Bishop Pavel of Kolomna, as well as large portions of the general Russian population. Nikon’s critics rejected the reforms on two key principles: that conformity with the Greek Church corrupted Russian Orthodoxy’s spiritual purity and negated Russia’s historical and Christian destiny as the Third Rome – the final capital of all Christendom before the End Times. Developed in the early sixteenth century, what became the Third Rome Doctrine proclaimed that Muscovite Russia inherited the political and spiritual legacy of the Roman Empire as passed from Constantinople. In the mind of Nikon’s critics, the Doctrine proclaimed that Constantinople fell in 1453 due to God’s displeasure with the Greeks. Therefore, to Nikon’s critics introducing Greek rituals and liturgical reform was to invite the same heresies that led to the Greeks’ downfall. However, Tsar Alexei’s support for Nikon’s reforms in 1666 split the Russian Orthodox Church in the raskol, between those who supported the reforms, and those who rejected the reforms and identified themselves as staroobriadtsy, or Old Believers (more properly known as Old Ritualists). In the centuries since the raskol, Old Believers maintained their identity as...
not only defenders of pre-Nikonian Russian Orthodoxy, but also their understanding of Russia’s historical destiny as the Third Rome.

This dissertation focuses on the importance of place (defined by geographic location, the construction of community buildings, architecture, the layout of community space, liturgical spaces, and economic foundations) and community (defined by a shared spiritual identity and goals of maintaining spiritual purity) to the Old Believer community of the Rogozhskoe Cemetery of Moscow from its founding in the 1770s until 1917. Founded by priestly (pospopvtsy) Old Believers (those who still accepted the sanctity and significance of priests in a “corrupt” world, unlike the priestless (bespopovtsy) branch), the Rogozhskoe community eventually became a major spiritual center for the priestly branch of the Old Rite throughout the Russian Empire.

Drawing primarily from a collection of archival material held in the Russian State Library and published documents and works by the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, I argue that Rogozhskoe Cemetery both became a physical and ideological representation of the community’s attempt to create a “Holy Moscow” in their understanding of the Third Rome Doctrine. Furthermore, I argue that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers envisioned their Holy Moscow as a part of two worlds: a community devoted to their shared faith in the Old Rite and as a model Christian community within the Russian Empire. This study, then, argues that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers adapted their Holy Moscow to meet their need to maintain their faith and respond to the political, social, cultural, and economic changes in Imperial Russia from the second half of the eighteenth to early twentieth century.
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Introduction

Two Romes have fallen.
The Third stands firm.
And there will not be a fourth.
No one will replace your Christian Tsardom.
Hegumen Filofei of Pskov to Grand Duke Vasili III (1510)

Since the early 16th century, the Third Rome Doctrine claimed that Muscovite Russia inherited the legacy of the Roman Empire following the collapse of the Byzantine Empire in 1453. In this worldview, Russian society and the Russian state not only became the New Rome, but also the protectors of the one true, uncorrupted Christian faith. The Russian people and their faith were the final bastion of Christianity until the End Times. Ultimately, the idea of the Third Rome Doctrine developed into one of the most critical influences in shaping Russian culture and political development for centuries to come.

However, by the mid-seventeenth century, Russia’s Third Rome fell into chaos as Church reforms introduced by Patriarch Nikon in 1656-1666 led to the raskol, or schism, of the Russian Orthodox Church. Due to the outcry against the reforms by many laity and spiritual leaders throughout Muscovite Russia—who claimed the reforms invalidated and corrupted the purity and legacy of Russia’s Third Rome—the raskol resulted in the
formation of the religious group that came to be known as the Old Believers (staroobriadtsy).¹ Emerging as challengers to both the tsarist regime and the Russian Church, many Old Believers attempted to resist the clutches of a world they believed to now be controlled by the Antichrist following the corruption of the Russian Church’s spiritual purity. As there was no monolithic or unitary movement against the reforms, those who rejected Nikon’s amendments responded in numerous ways: many migrated to the far reaches of the growing Russian Empire in search of seclusion, hiding themselves from state tax collectors and census takers, while others engaged in open, violent opposition, or even utilized group suicide as a resistance technique.

Yet the adherents of the Old Rite permeated all levels of Russian society, particularly amongst the tradesmen and merchants of large cities such as Moscow. In contrast to the Old Believers who chose violence or migration, these Old Believers sought to find a means to maintain their livelihoods and businesses and to remain integrated in the affairs of Russian society writ large, while still defending their faith. In turn, because of their public presence, these urban Old Believers became easier targets for any potential oppression against the Old Rite as a whole. However, over the course of the eighteenth century, the Moscow Old Believers gradually became some of the city’s most successful merchants and business owners, despite continuous challenges by tsarist and Russian Church authorities to restrict their ability to practice their faith. By

¹ It is important to note that while more commonly referred to in English as “Old Believers” the Russian term staroobriadtsy is more properly translated as “Old Ritualists.” This is an important distinction in understanding the origins and history of the staroobriadtsy movement as those who recognized themselves as staroobriadtsy maintained dogmatic orthodoxy with the Russian Orthodox Church but objected to changes in rituals and the introduction of spellings in liturgical books. Therefore, throughout this dissertation I use the more popular term “Old Believers” and the proper term “Old Ritualists” interchangeably and similarly refer to the general movement as either the “Old Belief” or “Old Rite.”
remaining in their professions, however, the Moscow Old Believers became participants in two, vastly different ideological and cultural worlds – the perceived spiritually pure Old Rite and the rapidly changing world of contemporary Russia. Ultimately, a major goal for the groups of Muscovite Old Believers in the centuries after the raskol was to find a means to embody and defend their spiritual and moral ideals as champions of the Old Rite and the Third Rome Doctrine while remaining active members of Muscovite, and Russian Society.

This dissertation examines the specific Moscow Old Believer community that developed around Rogozhskoe Cemetery and their attempts to develop a spiritual and physical embodiment of an Old Rite Holy Moscow that upheld their understanding of the Third Rome Doctrine. Named for the designated burial site for the priestly (popovtsy) Old Believers during the Moscow Plague in 1771, in the years and decades following its founding, the priestly Muscovite Old Believers built Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a representation of their ideal Old Rite community. While the history of Rogozhskoe continues to this day, I end their story here with the dual revolutions of 1917.

This dissertation argues that Rogozhskoe Cemetery served as an adaptable physical and ideological embodiment of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ own desires to restore Moscow of the Third Rome Doctrine. Their Holy Moscow was by no means a static concept, but one that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers actively and purposefully adjusted through their history to define themselves spiritually, morally, culturally, economically, and socially within the Old Rite and Russian Empire. Throughout,
however, their understanding of Holy Moscow encouraged them to uphold their devotion to the Old Rite and served as a sacred boundary with the outside world.

Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its community of Old Believers remain largely ignored in the greater historiography of the Old Rite. The works by historians such as E. M. Iukhimenko and V. E. Makarov contribute the most comprehensive, although brief, general historical surveys of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers.²

This project makes two contributions to the study of the Old Rite in Imperial Russia. First, this dissertation is one of the few works that brings the Rogozhskoe Old Believers into the larger history of the Old Rite movement—especially important since a disproportionate amount of the historiography has focused on the priestless. Within this context, I explore how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers envisioned their Holy Moscow as a part of the priestly Old Rite and used it to define their place within both the Old Rite and Christendom as whole. Second, this dissertation attempts to refocus our understanding of Old Believer communities, and other religious minorities, within the Russian Empire. Common themes of many previous histories of the Old Rite focus on persecution and survival—how religious minority communities preserved their spiritual identity in the face of oppression.³ While persecution and survival remain core themes throughout this

² See, E. M. Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheski tsentr za Rogozhskoi zastavou (Moscow, 2005) and V. E. Makarov, Ocherk istorii Rogozhskogo kladbisha v Moskve (K 140-letiui ego sushestvovaniia: 1771 – 1911 gg.) (Moscow: BARC, 1994).
³ For such examples in the study of Old Believers and Old Rite communities see, Robert O. Crummey, The Old Believers and the World of Antichrist (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), Irina Paert, Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender in Russia, 1760 – 1850 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003) and “Regulating Old Believer Marriage: Ritual, Legality, and Conversion in Nicholas I’s Russia,” Slavic Review, 63 no. 3 (Fall 2004), 555 – 76, Roy R. Robson, Old Believers in
work, it is the intention of this dissertation to present the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’
Holy Moscow as a story of opportunity. As tsarist Russia changed politically, socially,
economically, and even spiritually into the early twentieth century, the Rogozhskoe Old
Believers used such opportunities purposefully and carefully to adapt their own definition
and understanding of their Holy Moscow to fit the community’s immediate needs to be a
part of both the Old Rite and contemporary Russian society. The story of opportunity
also becomes a story of a successful religious community in a potentially oppressive state
in two key areas. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers boasted some of Russia’s most
economically and socially influential merchant and industrial dynasties. In addition, over
the course of its history, Rogozhskoe Cemetery fashioned itself into one of the most
important spiritual centers within the Old Rite movement, ultimately serving as the center
for the Old-Rite Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in Russia.

Furthermore, central to this dissertation is the idea that Rogozhskoe Cemetery
represented the physical and spiritual embodiment of the community’s understanding of
the sacred and the corrupt. Here they struggled to make firm the boundaries between the
public world of their socio-economic activities and their private devotion to their faith.
The Rogozhskoe Old Believers built their community as an attempt to return to Holy
Moscow as the Third and final capital of all of Christendom while maintaining an active
role in the rapidly changing world around them. In all their efforts, they struggled with
the larger questions of how to live a proper Christian life: the relationship between wealth

*Modern Russia* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1995), and Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Russkoe
and salvation, the meaning of good deeds, the connections between laity and clergy, and the place of a religious minority in a persecuting state.

Scholars of religion such as Emile Durkheim and Mircea Eliade both acknowledged that religion shapes a community’s view of both the spiritual and physical worlds. Durkheim, for example, stresses that through religion, a community divides the physical and spiritual world between the sacred and the profane, the holy and corrupt. To Durkheim, it is a community’s representations and veneration of the sacred that truly defines their ties to their religion. Furthermore, Durkheim concludes that religion and the idea of the sacred represent the embodiment of a system of ideas by which individuals or communities represent to themselves their own ideal society. Within such a context, communities of religious minorities, such as Rogozhskoe, needed to rely on their immediate community, specifically their physical structures as well as the collection of members, to develop their own ideal society, sense of the sacred, and ties to their religion.

Mircea Eliade also stresses the importance of a community’s awareness of a real and meaningful world based on sharp definitions of sacred and profane. He underscores the significance of the hierophany – an ideal manifestation of the sacred. To Eliade it is only through the hierophany that anything gains value, meaning, or purpose. Furthermore, communities develop their own sense and even create their own

---

understanding of reality through their perception of the hierophany.  In Eliade’s conclusions, the whole purpose of a religious community is to structure its own morals and society on the closest model possible to the ideal of the hierophany. Building off Eliade’s model, then, this dissertation argues that Rogozhskoe Cemetery served its community’s need to embody the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ strictest ideals and morals from their devotion to the Old Rite to shape the community’s interaction with the non-Old Rite world.

Using the methodological insights of Durkheim and Eliade, this dissertation reveals that the Old Believers at Rogozhskoe Cemetery actively developed a means to both divide and embody their perceptions of the sacred and the profane. Within this context, the “interiors” of Rogozhskoe became the sacred spaces – designed solely as a means to reaffirm the community’s devotion to the Old Rite and their place as protectors of perceived pure Christianity. The “exteriors,” by contrast, served two primary purposes. The façades of Rogozhskoe’s structures were designed to separate the sacred grounds of the community from the corrupt outside world. Such a division was both physical and psychological. Wealthy merchant families, for example, separated their public lives as industrialists and entrepreneurs from their spiritual lives. They constructed simple homes in or near Rogozhskoe to live in during Church holidays and for the entire Lenten period, such as the Riabushinskii Cell (kelya) that the family continually modified and expanded over the course of the nineteenth century to accommodate all members during Lent. In the Cell, the Riabushinkiis devoted

---

7 Dudley, *Religion on Trial*, 50 – 58.
themselves solely to their spiritual obligations such as prayer and fasting, refusing to take part in any part of their businesses during all of Lent.\textsuperscript{8} Within these private cells, the Rogozhskoe merchants left their wealth and influence behind, choosing instead to give full devotion to their faith using the Old Rites during holidays and fasting periods alongside other Rogozhskoe parishioners. Through the creation of separate, complementary sacred/profane spaces, they were able to maintain their dual roles to both their community and businesses in their respective worlds.

This dissertation looks at four major periods to explore how and why the Rogozhskoe Old Believers developed and adapted their identity and presentation of their Holy Moscow. Chapter 1 explores the first period in Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the community’s development over the first fifty years of its existence. It was during this period that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to build their community from scratch as well as determine the community’s place within the Old Rite and the Russian Empire. This early period was characterized not only by the creation of an Old Rite community that practiced its faith but also actively incorporated popular architectural styles and contributed extensively to rebuilding Moscow following the events of 1812. The second period that shaped the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow follows the effects of increased tsarist and Russian Orthodox Church persecution toward the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and the Old Rite as a whole in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. During this period, Rogozhskoe’s economic and spiritual influence became the target of state oppression, led primarily by Tsar Nicholas I and Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow,

\textsuperscript{8} A. S. Provorikhina, “Moscovskoe staroobriadchestvo,” in \textit{Moscow v ee proshlom i nastoiashchem}, 10\textsuperscript{th} ed. (Moscow, 1912), 51.
requiring the community to redefine themselves in the face of government intervention. This period also witnessed new efforts by the community to redefine their Holy Moscow in the greater history of Christianity and Orthodoxy. They sought a means to reestablish a Church hierarchy, ultimately playing a crucial role in the formation of the Old Rite Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. Chapter 3 explores the third period in Rogozhskoe’s history from 1856 until 1905 and how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers responded to the dramatic social, political, and economic changes instituted by the Great Reforms and industrial development from the 1860s onward. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers used the challenges and opportunities of the Reform and post-Reform era not only to seek an end to their spiritual oppression, but also to express their devotion to the Tsar while remaining followers of an independent Old Rite Church Hierarchy. Finally, Chapter 4 looks at the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ attempts to realize their ideal Holy Moscow following Nicholas II’s ukaz granting religious toleration for the Old Rite in 1905. While very brief, the period from 1905 to 1917 ultimately allowed the Rogozhskoe community a chance to build their Holy Moscow, physically and spiritually, freely as they saw fit. Yet, they continued to maintain the same devotion to serving the larger Russian, Christian community as an ideological and moral symbol through the community’s extensive economic and social influence.

Ultimately, one of the greatest attributes that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers held, in contrast with the majority of their fellow Old Believers, was that they developed as a very visible representation of the Old Rite movement. Whereas Old Believers spread throughout the Russian Empire and abroad, Rogozhskoe grew and achieved its success in
the very heart of Russia’s Old Capital. Therefore, while many Old Believers shared a devotion to the Pre-Nikonian understanding of the Third Rome Doctrine, the Rogozhskoe community chose to publically display their very ideals for all of Russian society to see and to establish themselves as an Old Rite Holy Moscow.

**Ill. 1:** Layout of Rogozhskoe Cemetery 2007. 1 – Pokrovskii Cathedral, 2 – Nativity Cathedral, 3 – Church of St. Nicholas (Russian Orthodox), 4 – Belltower, 5 – Offices and Hotel, 6 – Almshouse, 7 – Morozov Hospital, 8 – Old Rite Institute, 9 – Community Buildings, 10 – 20th century buildings. *Pamiatniki arkhitektury Moskvy*, 93.

**Russia, Orthodoxy, and the Third Rome Doctrine: Origins of the “Third Rome”**

As Patriarch Nikon introduced his reforms to the Russian Orthodox Church in the mid-seventeenth century, one of the primary outcries for those who later became the Old Believers was that the reforms invalidated Russia’s claim as the Third and Final Rome.
In the most general sense, the Third Rome Doctrine proclaimed that Muscovite Russia inherited the leadership of the Christian world as passed through the legacy of the Roman Empire, from Rome, to Constantinople, and finally to Moscow. But a particular question that theologians such as Father John Meyendorff, and historians such as Dimitri Stremoukhoff and Gustave Alef once sought to answer was: what exactly was the “Third Rome” and how did Russia come to develop this new religious and political ideology?

On the surface, the simplest explanation for the development of the Third Rome Doctrine in Russia was that following the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, and the end of the Mongol Yoke in 1480, Russians found themselves as the sole, independent Orthodox Christian state. Furthermore, Grand Prince Ivan III’s (the Great) marriage in 1472 to Sophia Palaiologina, the niece of the last Byzantine Emperor Constantine XI, created a direct, familial link to the Imperial Byzantine bloodline. With its newfound independence and ruling bloodline tied to the fallen Byzantine Empire, Muscovite Russia, then, needed to define its place and purpose in history. In particular, Isabel de Madariaga sees the marriage between Ivan and Sophia as a crucial moment in the development of the Third Rome Doctrine. de Madariaga explains that Sophia’s presence introduced the political aura of the Byzantine Empire to Russia through insistence on using grand political and court ceremonies modeled after Byzantine court customs.⁹ Furthermore, de Madariaga sees Sophia’s presence as crucial to Russia’s political development due to her own insistence that Ivan establish Moscow as the capital.

of an Orthodox Christian state, even claiming that Sophia’s influence drove Ivan to end tribute to the Golden Horde.\(^\text{10}\)

However, the ideological basis for the development of the Third Rome Doctrine actually has its origins even before the fall of Constantinople. As argued by Father John Meyendorff, Dmitri Stremoukhoff, and Gustav Alef, Russia’s path toward developing the very idea of their destiny as the Third Rome began in the events following the Byzantine’s Church’s agreed spiritual union and subjugation to Rome at the Council of Florence in 1439. As word spread throughout the Russian lands about the agreed Union, the Russian Church took its first steps away from Byzantine influence by outright rejecting the Union, forcing any bishops who supported Union to recant their support or face imprisonment. Vasili II, Grand Prince of Moscow, even imprisoned and deposed the head of the Russian Church, Isidore the Metropolitan of Kiev (a Greek by birth), for his support for the Union.\(^\text{11}\) As Meyendorff argues, the Russians rejected the Union on both political and spiritual grounds: as the Byzantine Empire seemed doomed to fall to the Turks, the Union only served the political elite in Constantinople and for the Russians, “The Orthodox faith could not be betrayed for the sake of the questionable and problematic survival of a dying empire.”\(^\text{12}\)

Yet despite their objections, Russia had no intention to break away from the Church in Constantinople. Rather, as argued by Meyendorff and Stremoukhoff, when

\(^{10}\text{Ibid.}\)


\(^{12}\text{Ibid., 105.}\)
compared to Bulgarians and Serbs who had continually sought to pull away from Byzantine political and religious influence since their conversion, the Russians remained fully devoted and dependent on the Church in Constantinople and looked upon the Byzantine Emperor as both a spiritual and political guide well into the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{13} Dmitri Stremoukhoff argues that the Bulgarian and Serbian kingdoms’ decisions to recognize their own emperors as tsars, and establish their own independent patriarchates, pushed the Greeks and Russians to form even stronger cultural and spiritual bonds as the Russian Church sought to define itself as “the obedient pupils of the Greeks.”\textsuperscript{14} Furthermore, Meyendorff argues that loyalty to Byzantium and its legacy defined and shaped Russian culture for the first five-hundred years following Vladimir’s conversion in 988, thereby fostering a strong desire amongst the Russian Princes and Church to maintain a strong political and spiritual relationship with Constantinople.\textsuperscript{15}

Ultimately then, Meyendorff, Stremoukhoff, and Alef see the Council of Florence as a critical moment in the eventual development of the Third Rome Doctrine. For the Russian Church, the reports of the clergy returning from Florence painted a dark picture of the proceedings, many claiming that the Latins, the Greeks, and even Metropolitan Isidore, one of the most vocal supporters in favor of the union amongst all of the Orthodox representatives, coerced and blackmailed them into supporting the union.\textsuperscript{16} For Vasili, the Russian state, and the Russian Church, news of the Greeks’

\textsuperscript{14} Stremoukhoff, “Moscow the Third Rome,” 87.
\textsuperscript{15} Meyendorff, Rome, Constantinople, Moscow, 113.
“betrayal” and support for union came as a shock. In response to the news, one critic rhetorically addressed Emperor John VIII Palaeologus, “What have you done? You have exchanged light for darkness; instead of divine law you have received the Latin faith; instead of truth and righteousness, you have loved flattery and falsity.” Initially, Vasili refused to believe that the Greeks would comply with and uphold the union, and appealed directly to the Patriarch Metrophanes of Constantinople to appoint a new Metropolitan – but with the stipulation that the new metropolitan be Russian. However, as Metrophanes also supported union with Rome, he declined to acknowledge the vacancy created by Isidore’s imprisonment thereby leaving the Metropolitanate of Kiev vacant for nearly a decade.

Therefore, it can be argued that it was in fact Constantinople that pushed Moscow on the path to developing the Third Rome Doctrine by choosing to ignore the situation in Muscovy. Metrophanes’ refusal to respond to Isidore’s removal and the Emperor’s role in the union left Muscovy and the Russian Church as the apparent sole defenders of the Byzantine legacy and Orthodox Christianity. For Orthodox Russians, Vasili II became what Meyendorff refers to as “the new Constantine” a god-sent ruler to uphold the purity of their faith. The first step, then, toward Russian Orthodox autonomy and the eventual creation of the Third Rome Doctrine came on December 5, 1448 when the Russian council of bishops, with Vasili’s approval, elected Iona as Metropolitan of All Russia, which produced two major consequences. First, Constantinople’s continued refusal, and

---

17 Quoted in, Meyendorff, Rome, Constantinople, Moscow, 108.
18 Ibid., 107.
19 Ibid.
inability, to respond to Iona’s election made *de facto* the autocephalous status of the Russian Church. Second, Iona’s election firmly established the seat of the Russian Church in Moscow by creating the Metropolitanate of Moscow and All Rus’, thereby contributing to Muscovy’s growing influence and dominance throughout the Russian lands.  

Ultimately then, the Council of Florence, and the Russian Church’s rejection of union put the Russian state and Church on the path toward establishing its own social and political identity as inheritors, rather than disciples, of the Byzantine legacy.

To the Russians, this Byzantine legacy was the very source of their understanding of society, religion, and politics. As Meyendorff argues, Prince Vladimir’s adoption of Orthodoxy allowed the Russians to import a ready-made religious, legal, and social system directly from the Byzantine Empire that held a specific world and universalistic view of the role of the Church and of a single, Holy Emperor to guide Christendom. More specifically, as Russians adopted more and more Byzantine culture, Orthodoxy was not just a religion but also the very source of Russia’s cultural identity and understanding of Christian politics. The assumed Greek corruption of what appeared, to the Russians, as a direct violation of these Roman-Byzantine traditions, then, *required* that the Russian

---

21 Prior to this time, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church held the title of Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus’ even though the Metropolitan did not reside in Kiev since the late thirteenth century. Ioan’s election, contributed to the growing political divide between Muscovy and Kiev who resented the Grand Prince of Moscow’s growing influence. In response, Kiev elected its own Metropolitan in 1458, Gregory II, recognized by both the King of Poland, Casmir, and Pope Calixtus III eventually setting the foundations of the Uniate Church in Polish-controlled Russian lands. However, as Gregory was a disciple of the deposed Metropolitan Isidore, the Moscow Metropolitanate continued to champion itself, successfully, as the remaining bastion of untainted Orthodox Christianity. See Meyendorff, *Rome, Constantinople, Moscow*, 108 – 110, 134 – 36, Stremooukhoff, “Moscow the Third Rome,” 87 – 89, and Alef, “Muscovy and the Council of Florence,” 399 – 401.

state and Russian Church rise as defenders of Orthodoxy in order to maintain some semblance of the foundations of their society.

The fall of Constantinople in 1453 to the Ottoman Turks established an even greater foundation for Moscow’s future claims as the Third Rome. It was in response to the fall of Constantinople that literature describing Russia’s destiny as the inheritor of the Byzantine legacy first appeared. One of the most famous claims first appeared the detailed accounts about Constantinople’s final days written by “Nestor-Iskander”, a Russian taken into slavery as a child by the Ottomans and present in the Turkish camp during the siege. Nestor-Iskander’s account provides two major moments that helped to shape the Third Rome Doctrine. The first was an account of the Holy Spirit abandoning Constantinople and the Hagia Sophia the night of May 21. The visible flight of the Holy Spirit as a burning fire from the Hagia Sophia into the heavens was a visible sign of God’s displeasure with Constantinople. Second, and most important, was Nestor-Iskander’s account of the supposed prophesy of Russia’s destiny: “For it is written: ‘The fair ones (the Ruskii rod) are a race who, will vanquish all of the Ishmaelites and will inherit Seven Hills with its former laws. The fair ones will rise to the throne of Seven Hills and will hold it firmly.” While Nestor-Iskander’s account did not appear in Russia before the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, thereby raising questions about the account’s accuracy, the author’s tale of the fall of Constantinople played a significant role.

---

24 Ibid., 95.
in the literature establishing Moscow and the Russian lands as the successor to the Byzantine Empire.

At the same time that Nestor-Iskander’s account of Constantinople’s final days appeared in Russia, other pieces of literature appeared that firmly established that Russia was the new Rome. In 1510 the hegumen of the Eleazarov Monastery near Pskov, Filofei, is credited as the author of two critical works that shaped the Third Rome Doctrine. The first, *The Legend of the White Cowl of Novgorod*, mirrored the fabled *Donation of Constantine*. In the Russian variant, Constantine the Great presented Pope Sylvester with a white cowl as recognition of the Pope’s rule over the Christian Church. Eventually the last “Orthodox” Pope foresaw Rome’s fall into heresy and sent the cowl to the Patriarch of Constantinople, who in turn eventually sent the cowl to the bishop of Novgorod before the Greeks fell into heresy at the Council of Florence.\(^{25}\) Filofei’s second work, however, proved to be more notable as he laid the very foundations of the Third Rome Doctrine in a letter to the Grand Prince of Moscow, Vasili III. In his letter, Filofei proclaims that only the Russian state remains as the one, true bastion of Christendom remaining in the world, concluding with his statement, “Two Romes have fallen. The third stands firm. And there will not be a fourth. No one will replace your Christian tsardom.”\(^{26}\)

Filofei’s argument presented a new ideological destiny for Russia, its people, and Russian Orthodoxy as the final bastion of Orthodox Christendom until the End Times.


\(^{26}\) Ibid.
Russia’s Third Rome was not only a continuation of the Roman-Byzantine legacy, but also the last uncorrupted, ideal Christian society. As Nicholas Zeronov elaborates, Rome gave to Christendom law, order, and discipline, representing the paternal authority of the Father. Constantinople offered intellectual leadership as it focused its existence around the formulation of creeds and the struggle against heresy, representing the Logos in the Trinity.27 The role of the Russian Orthodox state then was to maintain the True Christian Faith, uncorrupted, as the entire Russian populace became the chosen vessels of the Holy Spirit before the Second Coming.

The remainder of the sixteenth century witnessed Russia’s attempts to further formulate and define their understanding of Orthodoxy and thereby contribute to the Third Rome ideology. In some instances, religious texts sought to explain how the Russian Church remained uncorrupted—one work, a mid-sixteenth century account of the Life of St. Sergius of Radonezh even attributed the rejection of the Council of Florence as a posthumous miracle to one of Russia’s most beloved Saints.28 A crucial moment for the Russian Orthodox Church came with the Stoglavii Sobor, called by Metropolitan Makarii in 1551, aimed to better establish a uniform understanding of Russian Orthodoxy itself. Specifically, the Stoglav sought to standardize liturgical texts

28 This particular account can be found in Hilandar Monastery Slavic manuscript #485. Leaves 278 recto to 286 verso contain a chapter title and synopsis, “The miracle, which occurred in the Latin lands, was performed by St. Sergius after his death: About Isidore, Metropolitan of Moscow, who wanted to create with the Roman Pope, Eugenius, an eighth ecumenical council, and to co-mingle Rus’ with the Latins; and he was denounced, and not enduring the denunciation, with shame he fled, expelled from the Episcopal See.” See both, Hilandar Research Library and Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies (HRL), HM.SMS.485 and Predrag Matejic, “Rediscovered Texts from the Life of St. Sergius of Radonezh: Understanding Russia and Russian Orthodoxy in the 16th Century.” The Trinity-Sergius Lavra in Russian History and Culture, Vladimir Tsurikov, ed., (Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Seminary Press, 2005), 251 – 98.
and church rituals, respond to the growing debate between the Possessor and Non-Possessor movements in regard to monastic land ownership, and even determine the acceptability of certain forms of icon painting.\textsuperscript{29}

However, the most significant event of the sixteenth century in the development of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Third Rome Doctrine was the elevation of the Metropolitan of All Russia to the Patriarchate of Moscow. The first overtures made for the recognition of a Russian Patriarchate began under Ivan IV as means to bolster Moscow’s prestige. Not only did Ivan’s insistence on the use of the title of “Tsar” lay claim to the legacy of the Byzantine and Roman Emperors, but Ivan’s conquest of the Muslim Khanates of Kazan in 1552 and Astrakhan in 1556 secured the Muscovite borders as well as the claim as the only remaining Orthodox power. However, it would be under the reign of Tsar Feodor, mostly due to the diplomacy and flattery of Boris Godunov (Fyodor’s brother-in-law, \textit{de facto} regent, and Ivan’s former advisor) that Patriarch Jeremias II of Constantinople, while visiting Moscow on a fundraising journey, consented to create a Russian Patriarchate. The result was the election of Job the Metropolitan of Moscow as the first Russian Patriarch on January 26, 1589.\textsuperscript{30}

The combination of the \textit{Stoglav} and the new Patriarchate of Moscow, then, defined the perceived \textit{pure} form of Orthodoxy that would shape Russia’s Third Rome. Free of any Greek corruptions introduced by the Council of Florence, for any who

\textsuperscript{29} Dmitry Pospielovsky, \textit{The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia} (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press), 62 – 64.

\textsuperscript{30} George Maloney, \textit{A History of Orthodox Theology Since 1453} (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishers, 1976), 30.
accepted the Third Rome Doctrine, Russian Orthodoxy was now the beacon of the one true Christian faith remaining in the world. It was the perceived duty of all spiritual Russians to protect the purity of Russian Orthodoxy and succeed where their Greek predecessors failed. For the Russian religious mind, then, Russian Orthodoxy, and their Third Rome remained strong and pure so long as no outside influence corrupted their faith. Any deviation from this Russian Orthodoxy surely meant the onset of the Apocalypse.

Restoring the Third Rome: The Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their Holy Moscow

The mid-seventeenth century, however, introduced a new challenge to the Third Rome ideology with the ascension of Nikon to the Russian Patriarchate. Upon his election, Nikon made it his goal to bring the Russian Orthodox Church into direct ritual and liturgical conformity with the Greek Church. However, by introducing Greek rituals and new translations to conform to Greek phrases and spelling, many Russians viewed the reforms as foreign corruptions of their pure Orthodox faith. The Third Rome Doctrine proclaimed that the Greeks fell to the Ottomans as punishment for turning from God, so what prevented the same calamity befalling the Russians for conforming to Greek rituals?
The Russian church soon split into the *raskol* between Nikon’s supporters and those who would become known as the Old Believers, who rejected the reforms as a contradiction and corruption of Russian Orthodoxy and the Third Rome Doctrine. For those who became the forerunners of the Old Rite movement, the primary disagreements with the Nikonian reforms centered on making the sign of the cross with three fingers rather than two, and editing all Russian liturgical books to conform to the contemporary Greek books, which included changing the spelling of “Jesus” from *Isus* to *Iisus*. The Church and Old Believers quickly became rivals in gathering followers throughout the Empire. The disputes over the changes to liturgical books and specific practices influenced many in the Russian Orthodox Church to view Old Believers as heretical schismatics, and equally vice versa. Old Believers therefore appeared not only as a competition to the Russian Church, but also as a threat to Orthodoxy and to the very foundation of Russia and Russianness itself.

A central assertion of this dissertation is that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow was a manifestation of the community’s attempts to present themselves as the model community for both the priestly Old Rite and Russian society. While Rogozhskoe’s records from their early history are sparse, the combination of their actions early in their history and their later records, opinions, and actions reveal the Rogozhskoe

---

31 These concerns remained at the core of the Old Rite even centuries later. For an excellent example of the Old Rite teachings on these reforms and changes see D. Permiakov’s *Vypiski* of 1913. While only Part I was published, the *Vypiski* includes a number of chapters on Old Believer teachings and understanding of issues including the spelling of “Jesus,” the proper number of fingers used in the sign of the cross, “On the Errors of the Greek Church,” “On Drinking or dining with heretics,” “On beards” and “Cutting hair,” and many other issues. D. Permiakov, *Vypiski iz Sviashchennago i sviatootecheskago pisaniia, i tvorenii sviatykh otsov i uchitelei tserkov: o vnesenii patriarkh Nikonom i ego priemnikami novizn i lozhnago ucheniia; chast I*, (Moscow: P. P. Riabushinskii, 1913).
Old Believers’ efforts to present their community as a priestly Old Believer Holy Moscow. This identity then entailed a number of key elements. First, as with all Old Believers, the community was bound by their devotion to the pre-Nikonian rituals and liturgical books as the core of their faith and approach to Orthodox Christianity. Within this basic framework, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers set about creating their own identity both within the Old Rite and Imperial Russia. For example, as priestly Old Believers, part of this ideal and identity—and a key element in the Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s Holy Moscow—meant maintaining some connection to a clergy, most often by taking in “runaway” or defrocked Orthodox priests who agreed to conduct services using the pre-Nikonian rituals and liturgical books. As described in Chapters 2 and 3, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers made great efforts to not only maintain a clergy but recreate a new Old-Rite Church hierarchy through sponsoring the creation of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in the mid-nineteenth century. As this dissertation reveals, maintaining some tie to a clergy was vital to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ identity within the Old Rite itself. Therefore, one of the defining characteristics of the Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s Holy Moscow was the community’s need for establishing a clerical hierarchy, and more importantly its justification for rejecting the state-sponsored Edinoverie hierarchy.

Second, as an Old Rite community, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ sought to present their Holy Moscow as the embodiment of the community’s spirituality and morals. As particularly noted by some of Rogozhskoe members (such as the Prokhorovs and Vladimir P. Riabushinskii), the community understood the Old Rite as a faith that both defended Russian history and tradition against the incursions of Western European
culture, as well as maintained strong Christian values such as the use of capital and wealth for charity over self-indulgence. Within this context, Rogozhskoe Cemetery was the community’s attempt to connect to, restore, and maintain their understanding of the Third Rome Doctrine.

Rogozhskoe Old Believers such as Riabushinskii, Kirillov, and Senatov writing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century argued that the Third Rome Doctrine remained a critical component of Old Believer ideology. A common theme shared amongst each of these authors was that they viewed Nikon’s reforms, and Tsar Alexei’s support for the reforms, as not only the corruption of Russian Orthodoxy and rejection of the Third Rome Doctrine, but the official negation of Russian history and identity. For example, Riabushinskii writes:

The idea [of Moscow the Third Rome] filled the Russian soul with pride and awe, for it warned that only through the wickedness of the Third Rome – Moscow – and the collapse of piety give the world over to the power of the Antichrist. Thus our ancestors grew a sense of responsibility not only for ourselves but for others, and therefore feared falling into heresy… Muscovite Orthodoxy held the Greeks in suspicion.  

In regard to Nikon’s rise to power and attack on Russian piety and history and the Old Rite’s purpose, he continued:

As to the reasons behind Nikon’s “greekification” one only needs to look at his character – it was his love of power…the old prayer books were declared corrupt, evil,

full of errors, clearly concluding for the people: All of the Russian Church Hierarchs of the previous centuries, including the most famous, respected, even the most beloved saints, have obviously been all, without exception, either heretics or ignorant…. Therefore, for the enlightenment of the Russian spirit one must understand the meaning of the Old Believers and need to consider what role they played in the history of Russian culture… for it is the Old Believers, and their religious phenomenon, that are most acquainted with the history of this spiritual feeling in Russia, especially in the period from the late 17th century to the present day, and therefore becoming all the more important to gain a proper understanding of Russian Orthodoxy, and indeed the Russian reality.  

Similar to Riabushinksii, both Kirillov and Senatov use phrases such as “national mourning” and “oppression of the Russian idea” to describe the Nikonian Reforms’ effects on the Third Rome Doctrine. As displayed by the writings of Riabushinskii, Kirillov, and Senatov, the Old Rite remained a defender of Russian piety and Russian history – core characteristics of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow. They placed great emphasis of not only collecting numerous valuable icons, but also maintaining a devotion to their understanding of Christian piety shared primarily through charity.

The Raskol, Third Rome, and Old Believer Historiography

---

33 Ibid., 15 – 20.
The history of the Nikonian Reforms reveals the very controversial nature of Nikon’s efforts from the very beginning. Nikon first met much resistance from members of the Church Council of 1654. However, after Nikon’s removal of Bishop Pavel of Kolomna (and the boycott by council members protesting Bishop Pavel’s removal), Nikon replaced the openings on the council with his supporters and easily gained approval for his reforms.\textsuperscript{35} Most of the Russian Orthodox Church still refused to abide by the Nikonian reforms, and thereby forced Nikon to compromise and approve some clergy to use the old practice. Nikon received so little support that on July 10, 1658 he resigned as Patriarch and went into self-exile.\textsuperscript{36} For those championing the old practices, fate apparently had spared Russia from the reign of the Antichrist in the guise of Nikon.\textsuperscript{37}

With the Patriarchate empty and seeking to strengthen his control over the Church, however, Tsar Alexis approved and adopted all of the Nikonian reforms in 1666 and forced the new practices onto the Russian Orthodox Church. The champions of the pre-Nikonian Church now emerged as traitors to both Church and state.\textsuperscript{38} Many Old Believers changed their view to consider that Alexis, not Nikon, was the true Antichrist, who possibly even demonically possessed Nikon in order to destroy the Church.\textsuperscript{39} From this time on Old Believers believed that the monarchy was in league with the devil. Old

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{36} Meyendorff, \textit{Russia, Ritual, and Reform}, 62-64
\bibitem{38} Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii Ser. I vol. 2, (Saint Petersburg, 1830), 647 – 50. Hereafter \textit{PSZ}.
\bibitem{39} Crummey, \textit{The Old Believers and the World of Antichrist}, 14.
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Believers would not pledge their loyalty to the monarch and thus caused obvious tensions with each successive reign.\textsuperscript{40}

While the authorities described all Russians who opposed the Nikonian Church Reforms or the Church itself as \textit{raskol’niki}, I agree with Robert Crummey and Georg Michels that it is important to distinguish the \textit{staroobriadtsy} from other \textit{raskol’niki}. Old Believers belonged to the groups of Russian Orthodox Christians who defined themselves by rejecting the liturgical reforms of Patriarch Nikon.\textsuperscript{41} Identifying the first Old Believers often proves difficult as the state and Church initially referred to any individuals (such as those who protested against the Church but did not support or identify with Old Believers) or groups (such as the \textit{khlysts}) who protested against or openly violated Church practices and policies as \textit{raskol’niki}.\textsuperscript{42}

There are many interpretations of why the Old Believers rejected the Nikonian reforms. To some church scholars, such as I. F. Nil’skii, Afanasii Shchapov, and V. V.\textsuperscript{40} James Cracraft. \textit{The Revolution of Peter the Great} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 123.

\textsuperscript{41} While the Old Believers split themselves into groups known as the “priestly” (\textit{popovtsy}) and “priestless” (\textit{bespopovtsy}), the term \textit{staroobriadtsy} refers to the followers of the Old Rite movement as a whole all of whom shared these common disagreements with the Russian Orthodox Church while dividing themselves amongst questions of gender relations, marriage, social interaction, social organization, and the role of a clergy in Post-Nikonian Orthodoxy. While neither branch maintained a monolithic view of the Old Rite, in the most general sense the division between the priestly and priestless was the question over the legitimacy of the priesthood and Sacraments. Whereas the priestless rejected both as illegitimate as there were no Old Rite bishops to ordain priests, the priestly maintained both priests and sacraments through taking in defrocked or runaway priests from the Russian Orthodox Church who agreed to perform services using the pre-Nikonian rituals and liturgical texts. See also, Georg Michels, \textit{At War with the Church: Religious Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Russia} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 13 – 14, Zenkovsky, \textit{Russkoe staroobriadchestvo}, 7 – 12, and Robert O. Crummey, “Old Belief as Popular Religion: New Approaches,” \textit{Slavic Review}, 52 no. 4 (Winter 1993), 701.

\textsuperscript{42} For greater detail on individuals who protested either the Russian Orthodox Church, the Nikonian Reforms, or both yet did not sympathize with those who identified themselves as Old Believers, see, Georg Michels, \textit{At War with the Church}. On the \textit{khlysts} see, John Eugene Clay, “Russian Peasant Religion and its Representation: The Christ-faith (Kristsovshchina) and the Origins of the ‘Flagellant’ Myth, 1666 – 1837,” (Ph. D. diss., University of Chicago, 1989).
Andreev, the *raskol* was not a religious dispute but a social and political protest against the authority of the state and Church. They saw “ignorance” as the primary cause of the schism since the *raskol’niki* did not understand that the reforms did not change church doctrine. 

Along similar lines, Shchapov and Georg Michels argue that early Old Ritualists and Old Rite leaders did not protest on behalf of all pious Russians but rather protested reforms in order to promote personal goals and out of personal grievances with the Church or state. To Michels in particular, the early Old Rite lacked any real unity and instead merely centered on a few outspoken individuals. In contrast to the works by Nil’skii, Shchapov, Andreev, and Michels, historians of the Old Rite movement such as Michael Cherniavsky, Robert Crummey, and Serge Zenkovsky argue that religious issues were the primary cause behind the *raskol*. The Old Believers saw any changes to Russian Orthodoxy as defiling their pure Christianity. Ultimately then, this dissertation builds off of the arguments of these scholars that the Old Believers viewed the Nikonian reforms as a direct challenge to the “Third Rome” Doctrine. Nikon based his reforms on making the Russian Church uniform with the Greek Orthodox Church. However, to the Russian religious mind, the Greek betrayal at Florence and the eventual sack of Constantinople in 1453 revealed God’s displeasure with the Greeks. If the Greeks fell into heresy and experienced God’s wrath at the hands of the Infidels, would not emulating the Greek Church therefore bring about the Apocalypse? Furthermore, for many religious Russians,

---


44 See, A. Shchapov, *Russkii Raskol staroobriadstva, razsmatrivaemyi v sviazi s vnutrennim sostoianiem russkoi tserkvi i grazhdanstvennosti v XVII veke i pervoi polovine XVIII* (Kazan: Isdanie knigoprodavtsa Ivana Dubrovina, 1859) and Michels, *At War with the Church*, 217 – 19.

45 Michels, *At War with the Church*, 217 – 19.
editing the spelling of names or changing of rituals challenged the populace’s own understanding of not only Orthodoxy but the Christian Faith. Each of these scholars suggest that by urging the Tsar to uphold Orthodoxy for the sake of the world, Christendom, and Russia, what developed into the Old Rite movement was the perceived attempt to protect the Third Rome Doctrine and Russian Orthodox purity from outside corruption. Ultimately, such apocalyptic rhetoric helped the Old Believers attract supporters. The Russian Orthodox Church therefore could not offer toleration to such ideas but desired to reeducate Old Believers that their following was based on superstition and ignorance. However, many clergy continued to protest the reforms and desired to save Holy Russia.

One of the Old Rite’s most famous and outspoken leaders was Archpriest Avvakum, and he provides an excellent example of the early Old Believer mindset. Avvakum was by far one of Nikon’s more popular rivals, and was Nikon’s primary challenger for the Patriarchate in 1652. Avvakum’s resistance to the Nikonian reforms encouraged persecution and brutality at the hands not only of the state and Church authorities but also of the general populace who opposed him for speaking against religious and state leaders. During his second forced exile to Siberia (1669 – 72), Avvakum began work on his *Vita*, or *Life*. The Archpriest spares no words when describing his animosity for Nikon. Promoting the beliefs of Antichrist, Avvakum wrote

---

of Nikon, “He belched forth his venom.” Avvakum describes events that the Russian religious mind would have found horrible: Nikon ordering those who resisted his authority shaved (at the time it was considered heresy for a man to be without a beard) and icons weeping, foretelling of Russia’s impending misfortunes for betraying the true faith. Avvakum also noted a number of ominous events occurring in 1654, the year Nikon began his reforms: a great plague in Moscow, which killed nearly half of the inhabitants; a solar eclipse; and the prolonged appearance of a comet all were accepted as signs that the Apocalypse was at hand. How could the Orthodox Church combat such colorful and frightful depictions of such events? Not surprisingly, many members of the Russian Orthodox Church read the works of Avvakum and other Old Believer leaders and blamed ignorance and superstition as the cause of the schism rather than the defense of pure Orthodoxy. Therefore, rather than provide religious toleration, both the state and Church hoped to either forcibly convert or enlighten the schismatics of their errors in order to bring them back into Orthodoxy.

Historians Daniel Rowland and Marshall Poe note that it was the Old Ritualists who invoked the Third Rome Doctrine far more often than either tsarist or Church officials. As Poe argues in particular, tsarist and Church authorities in the late

48 Avvakum, Life, 52 – 58.
49 Avvakum, Life, 58 – 60.
seventeenth and throughout the eighteenth century disregarded the Third Rome Doctrine stating that, “the doctrine was ignored by secular authorities, who were uninterested in its imperial implications, and it was later banned by clerics, who recognized it as an article of the heretical Old Believer faith. In the eighteenth century, ‘Third Rome’ survived in Old Believer writings, but it was almost entirely forgotten by mainstream Russian culture.”\(^52\) As Rowland also notes, “By the second half of the seventeenth century, [the concept of Moscow the Third Rome] was under attack and by the 1700s was discarded by everyone except the Old Believers, who of course used it to undermine the state rather than strengthen it.”\(^53\) As both scholars note, in fact, it would not be until the mid-nineteenth century that tsarist and Church authorities took greater interest in the Third Rome Doctrine, and in particular of how to combat the Old Believers.\(^54\)

However, the Third Rome Doctrine was not the only social, political, and religious ideology guiding the Russian state and Church from the late fifteenth century onward. Concurrent with the rise of the Third Rome Doctrine in Russia was a growing sense of the Russian lands as a New Jerusalem, or New Israel. In many regards, the Third Rome Doctrine and New Jerusalem reflected very similar ideas on Russia’s place and destiny in history. Whereas the Third Rome proclaimed direct inheritance of the Roman-Byzantine political and spiritual legacy based in Christianity, New Jerusalem proclaimed the Russian people as God’s new Chosen people as passed from Israel,


\(^{54}\) See, Ibid.
through Rome and Constantinople, and finally Russia’s place as the last remaining, 
*independent* Orthodox state. As Rowland notes, Third Rome and New Jerusalem were not only potentially synonymous but were also used interchangeably in Russian politics and religion from the late fifteenth to mid-seventeenth century. However, it was particularly with the rise of Nikon to Patriarch that “New Jerusalem” began to take precedence in Russian Orthodox Church ideology. For example, Nikon went so far as to “attempt to create archeologically correct versions of buildings existing in contemporary Jerusalem” such as recreating the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Nikon’s new spiritual center, the New Jerusalem monastery. As Rowland argues, under Nikon the New Jerusalem ideology took greater precedence, at least within the Russian Orthodox Church, over the Third Rome Doctrine.\(^{55}\) Using Rowland’s conclusion, it can be argued that the issue of defending the Third Rome Doctrine and its political, social, cultural, and religious implications can be tied into the essence of the *raskol* as a whole.

In building on such arguments, this dissertation places the Rogozhskoe community into the greater historiography created by such scholars as Robert Crummey, Irina Paert, and Roy Robson, which maintains that the Third Rome Doctrine was a vital component of the Old Rite movement and how Old Believers emulated the Third Rome into the physical and ideological foundations of their communities.\(^{56}\) Combined, the studies by Crummey, Paert, and Robson paint a broad picture of how Old Believer communities developed and organized themselves in order to preserve their faith and

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 608 – 12.  
\(^{56}\) Crummey, *Old Believers and the World of Antichrist*, Irina Paert, *Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender*, and Roy R. Robson, *Old Believers in Modern Russia*.
identity from the late seventeenth century and into the early twentieth century. As explained by each scholar, Old Believer communities formulated their own understanding of community, history, identity, faith, culture, and morals based on each individual community’s regional, social, and economic experiences throughout the Russian Empire. It was in such contexts, then, that Old Rite communities both defended and created their ideal understanding of Russian history, Russian Orthodoxy, and the Third Rome Doctrine. In his work *Old Believers and the World of Antichrist*, Robert Crummey looks at how the Vyg community of priestless Old Believers developed their community physically and ideologically in Russia’s northern frontier from the early eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century. As Crummey reveals, the Russian wilderness provided ample opportunities for the Vyg Old Believers to organize themselves mostly free from outside interference, initially choosing to create two separate “men’s” and “women’s” settlements in order to recreate a disciplined, monastic lifestyle to fully devote themselves to the Old Rite.  

Comparatively, Irina Paert’s work *Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender in Russia*, focuses on priestless Old Believer communities in Saint Petersburg and Moscow from the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century. Unlike the Vyg Old Believers, Paert uses the ideals of marriage and gender relations to explore how urban Old Believer communities approached issues of spiritual and communal morality.

As described in Chapters 1, 3 and 4, as part of their communal identity the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, particularly the community’s members of the merchantry, all
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57 Crummey, *Old Believers and the World of Antichrist*, 70 – 85.
58 See Paert, *Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender*.  
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shared a common ideology that one of God’s greatest gifts is love and charity.\textsuperscript{59} It was through an emphasis on charity that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, and its wealthy parishioners sought to present their community as the continuation of true Orthodox piety. For example, Timofei Prokhorov of the Prokhorov cotton dynasty wrote in the early nineteenth century: “wealth is bad and pure evil,” noting that wealth forces a person away from God and Christian duty to provide for the impoverished.\textsuperscript{60} As the Rogozhskoe historian Makarov argues it was through an emphasis on charity that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought to set themselves apart from Russia’s westernized nobility, and break away from what they viewed as western corruptions of the use of capital.\textsuperscript{61} Vladimir Riabushinskii in particular blamed Peter the Great’s westernization for introducing a foreign culture to the Russian nobility that based advancement civilly or militarily more on a family’s wealth and property than their contribution to Russian society.\textsuperscript{62}

Another element of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow was the community’s adaptability—foraging and re-forging Rogozhskoe Cemetery physically, spiritually, socially, and economically as both a part of the Old Rite and the changing world of Imperial Russia. However, a critical trait of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was the community’s ability to both maintain, through their use of space, their devotion to the Old Rite while actively participating in the non-Old Rite world. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers, then, fit into the historical paradox noted by many historians that while the

\textsuperscript{59} Vladimir P. Riabushinskii, \textit{Kupchestvo moskovskoe} (Moscow: Rodina, 1992), nos. 8 – 9, 176.
\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Materialy k istorii Prokhorovskoi trekhgornoi manufaktury i torgovo-promyshlennoi dieiatel’nosti sem’i Prokhorovykh: gody 1799 – 1915} (Moscow 1996), 108 – 09, 124 – 25.
\textsuperscript{61} Makarov, \textit{Ocherk istorii}, 7.
\textsuperscript{62} See, Riabushinskii, \textit{Staroobriadchestvo i russkoe religioznoe chuvstvo}, 41 – 51.
Old Rite movement presented itself as a defense of Russian Orthodox and Russian cultural purity, a number of Old Believer communities and individuals became what Paert refers to as “agents of modernity.” They took on leading roles as many of Russia’s earliest and successful entrepreneurs, industrialists, and patrons of the arts.63

Roy Robson also looks into how this paradox manifested amongst Old Believer communities and how they used, created, and defined sacred spaces. Analyzing Old Believer communities following Nicholas II’s ukaz on religious toleration in 1905, Robson argues that “[Old Believers] sought to integrate their own views with the emerging modern society, culture, and politics of the period.”64 In discussing Old Believer sacred structures prior to 1905 Robson continues, “In legislating how the exterior of an Old Believer temple had to appear but ignoring the interior, previous centuries of imperial law had fostered a dichotomous relationship between the outside of an Old Believer structure and its inside design. This phenomenon created a curious aspect of Old Believer buildings – while tradition mandated a strict interpretation of liturgical space indoors, the outside of Old Believer buildings varied in light of legal problems, local conditions, and regional aesthetic.”65 Building off Robson’s arguments, this dissertation argues that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow actively

65 Ibid., 165.
adapted their physical ideology to the changes in the world around them. For example, as described in Chapter 3, a critical moment within the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ definition and understanding of their identity was how their sacred spaces could function following the government’s forced closure of the community’s altars in 1856. During the second half of the nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, then, defined their Holy Moscow both as the struggle to reclaim their altars and place within the Old Rite and Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, but also to fully display their loyalty to tsarist Russia in contrast to the growing political and social turmoil during that period. This dissertation therefore presents the idea that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow purposefully remained an adaptable ideology that preserved the community’s devotion to the Old Rite and to remain an active part of Moscow and the Russian Empire as it changed over the course of the late eighteenth to early twentieth century.

While the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ own understanding and definition of their Holy Moscow responded directly to the changes around them, the community’s devotion to the ideological restoration of the Third Rome Doctrine permeated each successive generation of the community. This is a key theme presented throughout the dissertation. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers, and even the community’s more affluent families, embodied the essence of their Holy Moscow even while Imperial Russia changed around them. The continuity of the core ideas and practices of Holy Moscow has often been overlooked or dismissed in historical studies of some of Rogozhskoe’s more prominent
families such as the Morozovs, Rakhmanovs, and Riabushinskiis. Whereas histories of these families focus on specific individuals who broke with the Old-Rite tradition to become leading examples of Russian capitalism, such as the works of William Blackwell and Jo Ann Ruckman, this dissertation argues that, in fact, these families became the very public embodiment of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ideals of a proper Christian society.

Community and Faith in Tsarist Russia

This dissertation explores how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers used their community as both a means to defend the Old Rite as well as adapt the community’s presentation of their morals and ideals to the outside world. Robson, Crummey, and Paert all examine how the idea of community played a significant role in developing Old Believer identity and their understanding of their place within the Old Rite, Russia, and Christianity. In his work, Old Believers in Modern Russia, Roy Robson contributes to this theme by focusing on Old Believer communities following their legal recognition by tsarist Russia in 1905. Robson argues that Old Believers’ creation of autonomous communities that governed social and religious affairs allowed these same communities
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to more easily respond to the changing world around them. Crummey, too, in his work *Old Believers in a Changing World* also argues that as “unofficial” religious institutions, “[Old Believer communities] governed their own affairs independent of any hierarchical structure or national organization.” In turn, Crummey notes that such organization allowed Old Rite communities to develop communities founded on parish, or laity, autonomy and domination in both social and religious affairs, thereby allowing Old Rite communities to develop a religious and social organization that both maintained the Old Rite while actively participating in Imperial Russian society, economics, and culture.

Furthermore, this study of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers examines the role of religious and social ideologies, their relationship with state and Church authorities, and the sources of self-identity amongst Christian communities throughout the Russian Empire. Christian minorities (Old Believers included) who did not recognize or belong to the mainstream Russian Orthodox Church faced some level of social and religious restriction during most of the tsarist period. However, these same religious groups formed communities that both enhanced their own religious beliefs and identity while allowing them to interact with mainstream society. In some instances, the state forcibly encouraged migration of particular groups of sectarians. For example, in his work *Heretics and Colonizers*, Nicholas Breyfogle explores how groups such as the Dukhobors, Molokans, and Subbotniks forged communities designed to preserve their unique views of Christian morality and spirituality while becoming a key colonizing
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force in Transcaucasia for Imperial Russia in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{70} As Breyfogle reveals, while distinctly different in terms of ideology and ritual, each group defined itself in communal terms as each believed itself to uphold “the true Christian faith” while becoming a potential “Russifying” colonizing force for what they viewed as a heretical state.\textsuperscript{71}

Historians such as Heather Coleman and Sergei Zhuk also focus on the role community played in defining the identity and interaction of minority religious groups such as the Russian Baptists, the Shalaputs, and Stundists. In particular, these groups faced significant challenges as members of Protestant sects, in particular how to integrate their communities into Russian society as adherents of a very western religious tradition. As in the case of the Baptists, Coleman puts forward the argument that their communities developed to create a model in which “one could be at once Russian and non-Orthodox and, later, both Baptists and socialist.”\textsuperscript{72} Furthermore, both Coleman and Zhuk look at how these Protestant communities continuously adapted their communities to allow for their spiritual lives to flourish and spread through evangelicalism and proselytism in response to Russia’s political and social upheaval during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.,
Similarly, historians such as Vera Shevzov also note an increased desire to better define spirituality and self-identity amongst mainstream Orthodox communities during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Shevzov uses her work, *Russian Orthodoxy on the Eve of Revolution*, to explore how various communities imagined and maintained their “sacred community” in response to the sweeping social and political changes from the emancipation of serfs in 1861 until the Revolutions of 1917. As Shevzov argues, it was during this period that the Russian Orthodox laity refused to remain as “silent observers” and challenged long held definitions and understanding of the “Orthodox community” in terms of the authority of any ecclesiastical institution, the theological vision of the community, and popular forms of devotion such as veneration of icons and celebration of holidays. Ultimately then, post-Reform Russia became a period in which the Russian Orthodox laity took an active role in defining the very nature of both their faith and the boundaries of the proper Orthodox community.

As these historians highlight, Imperial Russia witnessed the rise of numerous communities who created direct links between religion and identity and their embodiment in the physical and ideological community. As this dissertation explains, in the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ case they not only identified with the larger Old Rite movement which viewed itself as the one pure form of Russian Orthodoxy, but sought to fully recreate both the spiritual and physical Third Rome Doctrine within their community. However, the story of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers is about how they recreated their Holy Moscow not only as a testament to their devotion to Old Rite and
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Russian traditions but to also serve as a spiritual, moral, and economic example for both the Old Rite and Russian society as a whole.

A Note on Sources

This dissertation makes use of a wide range of sources, the most important of which is the Rogozhskoe Cemetery archives now held in the Russian State Library. Confiscated directly from Rogozhskoe Cemetery by Soviet authorities in 1923, this extensive collection holds numerous private documents belonging to both the Rogozhskoe community and the Archbishop of Moscow and All Rus’ of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. These documents include financial records, collection records of icons and other relics, telegrams, letters, donations, census records for the community’s almshouse, personal accounts of community meetings and events, and other materials from the second quarter of the nineteenth century to the early 1920s. This dissertation also makes use of archival materials from the Moscow Secret Committee on Old Believers held in the Russian State Archive of Early Acts, which contains communications, inquiries, and meeting notes by tsarist and Russian Orthodox Church officials in Moscow regarding the activities of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.
This study also uses collections of published documents collected from Rogozhskoe Cemetery by nineteenth century historians and religious scholars, most notably N. I. Subbotin and N. I. Popov, as well as the personal publications of Rogozhskoe individuals such as Vladimir Riabushinskii. This dissertation also relies on sources from the end of Imperial Russia from Old Believer publications *Tserkov’* and *Slovo Tserkvi*, journals printed and owned by Rogozhskoe members. A final source of very rare published Old Believer documents, books, and materials that this dissertation benefitted from are held in the Pimen M. Sofronov Collection at the Hilandar Research Library at The Ohio State University.

Combined these sources provide both an internal look at how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers shaped and developed their community and identity and Imperial Russia’s response to these actions. Ultimately then, these documents provide a greater understanding not only of how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers defined themselves but also defined their place in the Russian Empire, and Christianity, in response to the changes politically, socially, economically, and culturally in Imperial Russia.
Chapter 1:

Building Holy Moscow: The Old Rite in the Mid-Eighteenth Century and The Rogozhskoe Community’s Early History

On the big holidays the large cathedrals could not hold all of the zealous pilgrims who travelled from all corners of Moscow; before the old icons glittering with gold and jewels and lit candles the service was decorous, the choir sang beautifully, and the processions to the cemetery and holy waters with the icons was especially solemn...Such a sight touched the hearts of all devout Old Believers!

-An eyewitness account of services at Rogozhskoe Cemetery in the Early Nineteenth Century

Introduction

For the century following the Raskol of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1666, Moscow remained as a significant center for followers of the Old Rite. Unlike many Old Believers who attempted to escape state persecution by establishing communities throughout the wilderness and periphery of the Russian Empire, both popovtsy and bespopovtsy Old Believers made up a significant portion of the Moscow merchant and small shopkeepers and chose to remain devoted to both their faith and their livelihoods by remaining in Moscow. Through their wealth and communal structures, the Muscovite
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Old Believers found themselves in a very favorable condition to adapt and use the
opportunities provided by the onset of religious toleration under the reigns of Peter III
and later Catherine the Great beginning in 1762.

Yet in the end it was calamity—bubonic plague—that provided the Muscovite
Old Believers with the opportunity to build physical representations of their devotion to
the Old Rite and sense of community. The outbreak of bubonic plague in Moscow
beginning in November of 1770 eventually caused city-wide panic and forced city and
tsarist officials to seek any means to address the situation and prevent further spread of
disease. Like other Muscovites, the Old Believers were concerned with self-preservation,
but as devout Orthodox Christians they were equally concerned with the need to care for
victims of the plague (including proper burial and church services, if needed). In the
confusion and fear of the darkest days of the plague in the Autumn of 1771, Muscovite
Old Believers petitioned tsarist authorities for approval to establish gated, quarantined
communities to prevent the further spread of plague. These segregated spaces were to be
a refuge to quarantine the healthy from disease; medical quarantines for victims of the
plague; and, most importantly, cemeteries to ensure Old Believer victims received
services in the Old Rites. With approval directly from Saint Petersburg, the Muscovite
Old Believers received permission to build communal religious complexes—
Preobrazhenskoe Cemetery for the priestless and Rogozhskoe Cemetery for the priestly
Old Ritualists. Relying heavily on the wealth of many of its affluent merchant families
and strongly influenced by their adherence to the traditions and ideology of the Old Rite,
the Rogozhskoe Cemetery Old Believers used this new opportunity to build a physical
and spiritual embodiment of a model, Old Rite Christian community—a Rogozhskoe Holy Moscow.

The first decades for the Rogozhskoe community witnessed two critical moments that shaped the community’s new Holy Moscow: the community’s founding during the outbreak of bubonic plague in Moscow in 1771 and the aftermath of Moscow’s destruction following Napoleon’s invasion in 1812. These two moments ultimately set the tone for Rogozhskoe’s development over the course of the rest of its history until the 1920s. While unfortunately many documents from the Rogozhskoe Old Believers during this period have been lost, the community’s origins were well known to later historians and scholars such as P. I. Mel’nikov and N. N. Subbotin, as well as the Rogozhskoe community historian V. E. Makarov who collected documents from multiple sources on Rogozhskoe’s early history. Building off the sparse information available, this chapter explores how these two moments witnessed the first attempts by the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to first define and understand their Holy Moscow for themselves. It also examines how they worked to adapt their identity to maintain an active relationship both with the greater priestly Old Rite movement and the changes in contemporary Muscovite and Imperial Russian society.

This chapter, then, explores the origins and early goals of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers from the period before the community’s founding and up until the onset of

77 For example, E. M. Iukhimenko states that it is unknown why there are so few documents from the Rogozhskoe Community for much of the community’s early history, but that tsarist authorities later blamed a fire at Rogozhskoe in 1840 destroyed many of the early records. Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 10–13.
greater tsarist and Church scrutiny beginning in the 1820s. First, it explores the history of the Old Rite in eighteenth century Russia and Moscow, noting that a combination of tsarist policies toward the Old Rite and the continued presence of Old Believers in Moscow provided the first foundations for the formation of a community of priestly Old Believers at Rogožhskoe Cemetery. Second, this chapter also looks at early challenges that both the tsarist state and Old Believers themselves faced in identifying the Old Rite movement and its following. This confusion over Old Believer identity found its origin in two key moments – the onset of toleration toward the Old Rite under Peter III and Catherine II in 1762 and the creation of a state-sponsored branch of the Old Rite known as Edinoverie. Third, this chapter explores the events surrounding the bubonic plague outbreak in Moscow in 1771 and how it allowed the Muscovite priestly Old Believers to successfully obtain permission from authorities in both Moscow and Saint Petersburg to establish their own community. Fourth, then, this chapter looks at the community’s development of its physical boundaries and how they shaped Rogožhskoe’s idea of Holy Moscow through construction projects after 1771, most notably their temples. This chapter argues, that these structures also became the community’s first attempt to present themselves as members of both the Old Rite and contemporary Russia. Their newly constructed temples architecturally incorporated the popular, western styles of the day yet upheld strict Old Rite approaches toward iconography and spirituality within these temples. Finally, this chapter explores how the Rogožhskoe Old Believers took on a greater role in Muscovite society, and within the Old Rite, following the Moscow Fire of 1812. It was in the aftermath of 1812 that the Rogožhskoe Old Believers not only
achieved their first peak of economic and spiritual success. They served as an example of Old Rite piety for all of Russian society through efforts to rebuild Moscow’s early industrial sector and increased charity to the general public.

Flexibility and Opportunity: The Old Believers in Imperial Russia and Moscow to the Mid-Eighteenth Century

While a religious minority, Old Believers made up a significant, if ultimately unknown, portion of the Russian Empire’s population in the eighteenth century. The vast majority of Old Believers throughout Russia chose to protect their adherence to the Old Rites through two primary means. They established isolated communities throughout the Russian wilderness and periphery, far from the control of tsarist and Church authorities; or they deceived authorities by presenting themselves as members of the dominant Church while practicing the Old Rite in the privacy of their homes. Small groups of Muscovite priestly and priestless Old Believers, however, chose to remain in the city as merchants, shopkeepers, and textile manufacturers, becoming one of the most publically visible, and financially successful populations of Old Believers within the Empire.
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It is important to see that the Old Believers’ experience was part of a larger interaction between Imperial Russia and religious minorities. The Old Ritualists were one part of the multi-ethnic, multi-confessional Russian Empire, in which tsarist authorities willingly allowed minorities to contribute to the growth of the empire. The example of the Old Believers as Christian dissenters within Orthodox Russia, and the state’s flexibility, sets this relationship apart from other historical, more intolerant approaches to religious dissent, particularly in Western Europe, during the early modern era.

As witnessed in France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the interaction between French Catholics and Huguenots was one of the least accommodating relationships between two Christian denominations following the Protestant Reformation. Like the Old Belief in Russia a century later, while attracting followers from all stratum of society, the Huguenot minority of France often found themselves at the mercy of the state authorities and the Catholic population. While the Huguenots and Old Believers both claimed to champion the true Christian faith, the Huguenots and French Catholics could not establish a flexible coexistence, unlike their Russian counterparts. In his work exploring France’s persecution of the Huguenots, Brian Strayer writes that the “Catholic-Huguenot polarity was absolute and unconditional, based on exclusive claims of
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possessing the sole God-given truth for human salvation….Therefore, mutual exclusivity, violence, even extermination of the ‘other’ was justified in the defense of truth.”

The inflexibility of the French Catholic state toward the Huguenots stemmed from the inability to accept religious pluralism. Strayer continues, “To the 16th century mind, …to tolerate something (abuses, rebellion, heresy) meant that a superior authority was forced ‘to suffer’ an undesirable situation or an inferior group to exist, ‘to endure’ it, ‘to permit’ it only because they were powerless at the moment to effect changes.”

Therefore, many French Catholics from the peasantry to the aristocracy saw toleration of the Huguenots as undermining not only the Catholic Faith, but France itself. Even while some Huguenots not only owned profitable businesses but were also members of the aristocracy, Catholic France saw little choice but to remove the perceived Protestant threat through persecution and forced exile. Louis XIV’s revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 in favor of the Edict of Fontainebleau officially illegalized Protestantism and ordered the conversion, expulsion, or imprisonment of all Huguenots in France leading many Huguenots to return to Catholicism or seek shelter in England, the Netherlands, and European colonies spread across the globe.

While state authorities in both Imperial Russia and seventeenth-century France instituted policies to persecute and punish religious dissent, each varied in the ultimate
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goal of such policy. While France actively sought a means to eradicate Protestantism from its lands, Russian authorities were much more accommodating toward the Old Belief and other religious minorities. Even while encouraging minorities to convert to Russian Orthodoxy, Imperial Russian policies remained flexible. They allowed religious minorities to maintain their faith in order to promote social and, most importantly, economic stability throughout the empire.

The foundations for the varying policies of seventeenth-century France and Imperial Russia toward religious dissenters grew from the very dissimilar approaches to the place of the Church in the models of absolutism used by Louis XIV in France and Peter the Great in Russia. The two monarchs possessed very different opinions and understanding of both the role of religion in their personal lives and religion’s place in their empires. Louis’ approach toward absolutism included a strong influence from the Catholic Church, often relying solely on the council of his confessors in state matters. Furthermore, Louis enviously desired to model France after Spain and its ability to achieve confessional unity through the Inquisition.84 Strayer writes of Louis, “This passion for confessional unity led him to see dissenters as dangerous enemies tainted by republicanism, heresy, or schism. The presence of two distinct religions in the State ‘defiled’ the realm and ‘enfeebled the king’s glory.’”85

Peter’s approach to religion was much more complex both in his personal faith and interactions with the Russian Orthodox Church. On the one hand, some of Peter’s
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personal choices such as smoking, his favoritism of foreigners, adopting western dress and customs, and most notably his antics conducted with his retinue of the “All Drunken Council of Fools and Jesters,” shattered the Russian populace’s conception of the natural piety of the Tsar. Peter’s debauchery encouraged many enemies, including the Old Believers, to denounce Peter as the Antichrist. Yet, while fervently denouncing some religious practices and traditions as superstitious, historians such as Evgenii Anisimov argue that Peter was not an atheist but rather a firm believer in both God and Christianity who approached religion through rational and reasoned thought. However, unlike Louis’ model of absolutism, Peter envisioned the role of the Orthodox Church in the new Russian Empire as an institution compliant with the state under the firm rule of the Tsar. Peter’s creation of the Most Holy Synod in 1721 officially ended the office of Patriarch (until its reinstatement in 1917) thereby placing the Russian Orthodox Church in a submissive rather than equal role of the Tsar. Placing the Church under the authority of the state, Peter created the precedent for a flexible relationship between the state and religious minorities, as the priorities of the state in terms of political, social, and economic stability trumped religious uniformity.

Many Old Believers took advantage of tsarist Russia’s flexible religious and economic policies in the eighteenth century to become some of the most important forces in the development and advancement of the Russian economy. Even while identified as
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religious dissenters, Old Believers were free to continue owning their own businesses, trades, and industries throughout the Russian Empire.

Throughout the eighteenth century, many Old Believers remained or migrated to Moscow primarily for economic opportunities. Many Muscovite Old Believer families maintained shops, worked in trades, produced handicrafts, or belonged to or maintained ties to the Moscow merchantry.\(^{89}\) Even into the early eighteenth century, Old Believers represented a significant portion of the Moscow Streltsy regiments (regiments created in the sixteenth century as a musketeer force) – a number of whom participated in the Streltsy Uprising of 1698 against Peter the Great, for which they were severely punished.\(^{90}\)

Ultimately, over the course of the eighteenth century, particularly during the reign of Peter the Great, authorities enacted laws designed to both identify Old Believers as well as punish them for their strict adherence to the Old Rites. The most popular examples of such legislation targeting Old Ritualists included Peter the Great’s infamous beard taxes, dress taxes, and double poll tax.\(^{91}\) Peter’s policy toward the Old Rite, then, was two-fold: to create a means to identify members of the Old Rite through their ties to traditional Russian culture; and either extract as much revenue as possible from the more affluent Old Believers or encourage them, and the destitute, to convert to the Orthodox Church and avoid extra taxation. However, the fact that the Old Ritualists maintained
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their devotion not just to their faith, but to traditional Russian culture, particularly in appearance and dress, meant that Peter’s taxes never worked as fully intended since most Old Ritualists simply blended in with the dominant Russian peasant culture.

It was not difficult for wealthy Old Rite families or communities to circumvent the issues of taxation and other restrictions. Bribery of state and Church authorities was quite common to avoid registration for the double tax or other fines. However, in many instances, tsarist Russia proved to be quite flexible in its attempted regulation of the Old Rite. In order to prevent disruptions in the economic production of raw materials, manufactured goods, trade, and the like, tsarist authorities and Old Believers created symbiotic relationships. Such mutual benefit is seen clearly in the case of the Vyg community and such individual families as the Demidovs of the Urals, who played such a crucial role in Russian iron production. Following the community’s formation, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, too, developed a means to maintain their ties to the Old Rites while creating a working relationship with the greater Russian state and society.

However, Old Ritualists were neither the first nor the only minority group to benefit economically from the flexibility of the Russian state. Prior to the Raskol, the
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conquest of the Tatar lands along the Volga River expanded the Russian borders to incorporate numerous Muslim communities, thereby bringing Orthodoxy and Islam into direct contact in the Russian state. Andreas Kappeler and Matthew Romaniello both explore the flexibility of tsarist authorities toward Muslims beginning in the sixteenth century. Following what Kappeler describes as “pragmatic flexibility,” the Russian state instituted a policy that cooperated with Muslim elites to guarantee the continuation of social status and privilege in return for military duty and commercial capacities. Throughout the late sixteenth and through the seventeenth centuries, Volga Tatars maintained important and almost exclusive rights to trading along the Volga River. Furthermore, by dominating the Volga trade, as well as very profitable regional businesses in the production of honey and beeswax, the Volga Tatars became a major factor in Russia’s international trade. Foreign investors such as the English and Dutch traders to Persia sought to circumvent trade through the Ottoman Empire and send their goods north, utilizing the Volga to send goods to Arkangel’sk.

Alfred Rieber argues that during Russian expansion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, regionalism was the major factor that allowed specific groups to develop and maintain significant influences in the development of the Russian
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economy. Like the Old Believers spread throughout the Russian Empire, each of these groups capitalized on their preexisting businesses, trades, and industries to not only encourage tsarist flexibility, but also to strengthen their own positions in Russian society. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the western and southwestern provinces of former Poland and Ukraine saw Polish but especially Jewish merchants and entrepreneurs become major influences in the Imperial Russian economy. As the influence of Polish merchants weakened during the first half of the nineteenth century, Jewish merchants became a major economic force in the region, primarily in textiles. By the 1830s, Jewish merchants controlled 30 percent of the textile industry in the Ukraine. Rieber attributes the Jewish economic success under Imperial Russia to the ability of the Jewish merchants to serve as middlemen in the commerce along Russia’s western boarders in the Pale of Settlement, thereby encouraging trade between the borders of Russia, Germany, and Austria.

The Russian Empire’s religious policy remained to allow religious minorities to maintain their religious practices and social status and even obtain greater economic influence through a working relationship alongside the state. Old Believer, Tatar, and Jewish merchants and entrepreneurs each established themselves as vital influences and investors in the imperial economy. It was such approaches that ultimately allowed Muscovite Old Believers to build up what would be the economic and influential foundations of Rogozhskoe Cemetery.
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The question of how both the members of the Old Rite and tsarist state defined Old Believer identity was the most important factor in shaping the interaction between Tsarist Russia and Old Believers. Since the Raskol itself, the primary questions that both tsarist and Church officials, as well as Old Ritualist communities themselves, tried to answer were: Who are the Old Ritualists? How do they fit into Russian society? What is their place in the greater world of Orthodoxy and Christendom? There were very conflicting views on the essence and characteristics of the Old Rite and its adherents as well as a very conflicting view of Orthodoxy itself.

Culturally, Old Believers championed themselves as ardent defenders and examples of traditional Russian culture. Spiritually, however, the vast number of Old Believers throughout the Russian Empire could not provide a universal definition of staroobriadtsy. Even within the larger branches of the popovtsy and bespopovtsy, Old Believers held many different understandings of their own faith as well as their place in the world. Individual Old Believer communities, such as the bespopovtsy communities founded in Vyg and the Moscow Preobrazhenskoe Cemetery, as well as popovtsy communities such as Rogozhskoe Cemetery, defined their own understanding of their
place in Russia and Christendom based on the unique needs and settings of their communities as they changed over time.\textsuperscript{100}

In the most general of definitions, the only shared identifying characteristic of the Old Believer movement was that it was a direct response to and rejection of the liturgical and ritualistic changes created by the Nikonian Reforms of 1656 – 1666. Individual Old Believer groups, or \textit{soglasie}, held varying beliefs and understandings of what it meant to be an “Old Believer.” Yet, the vast majority of Old Believers, even if not in communion with one another, did recognize one another as members of the Old Rite due to their mutual rejection of the Nikonian Reforms and mainstream Russian Orthodox Church, as well as their shared experience of persecution under the tsarist state. A good example of this is the often cordial relationship between members of the Preobrazhenskoe and Rogozhskoe Cemeteries. While divided over the issue of a clerical hierarchy, the members of both communities shared very similar backgrounds and experiences: in particular, their ties to the Moscow merchantry and similar restrictions enacted by the government against their communities.\textsuperscript{101} These shared economic and spiritual interests proved most valuable during the oppressions of the nineteenth century as Preobrazhenskoe occasionally offered to accept members of the Rogozhskoe community

\textsuperscript{100} For greater detail of the Vyg community of Old Believers, see, Robert O. Crummey, \textit{The Old Believers and the World of Antichrist}. For greater detail of the Preobrazhenskoe Cemetery, see, Irina Paert, \textit{Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender}.

(but encouraged them to declare themselves bespopovtsy) to pray in their chapels following the closure of the Rogozhskoe temples.102

In the minds of all Old Believers, they were the only pure members of the Orthodox Church, rejecting what they viewed as “Western” corruptions of Russian Orthodoxy. Within this mindset, Old Believers not only placed themselves against the mainstream Russian Orthodox Church, but also instituted a culture and practice of resistance to the secular, tsarist authorities. Therefore, in the most general of definitions, the greater community of all Old Believers could identify themselves as part of Russian culture, yet they remained outside of mainstream society as targets of spiritual and civil oppression at the hands of the Russian Orthodox Church and tsarist authorities.

At the same time, tsarist and Church definitions and categorizing of religious dissenters shaped the self-identity of adherents of the Old Rite as much as each individual community. Imperial Russian leaders struggled to determine how to identify and properly restrict the spread and influence of dissenters throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, the general term used by the Church and state, raskol’niki, potentially incorporated anyone who did not follow the proper Orthodox belief, or pravoverie.103 Not only could tsarist authorities not provide a uniform definition of pravoverie, authorities faced the problem of identifying the difference between religious groups that had no connection to the events of the Raskol and the larger movement of Old Believers. The general opinion of the tsarist state was that Old

Believers refused to follow the Russian Orthodox Church out of ignorance, and therefore should be encouraged to return to the mainstream church. 104 The problem then became recognizing the best method of ending the Raskol and bringing Old Believers back into the state-supported Church. First and foremost, tsarist and Church officials needed to determine exactly who the Old Believers were and how many lived in Imperial Russia. Through this need, as Irina Paert states, the Russian state not only defined the “norm” and what was “irregular” for Russian society and Orthodoxy, but also influenced the definition of the “self.” 105 As Paert argues, “The observed population often did not understand these categories, appropriated the language of the dominant religion to describe their position in religious history, and actively resisted the attempts to be targeted as statistical objects. Therefore, the statistical description of religious dissenters was entwined with the clash between the official language and the self-understanding of the religious believers.” 106

However, Russia’s own vast Empire, as well as the fact that Old Believers maintained their close ties to traditional Russian culture, provided numerous opportunities for Old Believers to either escape persecution or disguise themselves amongst the general population – ensuring that state categorization and attempts at identifying raskol’niki, failed throughout the eighteenth century. This made enforcing legislation, such as Peter the Great’s “double-tax” and “beard tax” (specifically designed to identify, persecute, and encourage Old Believers to rejoin the Russian Orthodox
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Church) nearly impossible. Even with legislation enacted by Empress Anne in 1735 requiring that all Old Believers attend confession each year, and pay all necessary taxes, many Old Believers could simply present themselves as members of the mainstream Church to avoid both registration as a dissenter and taxation. As Paert argues, “the state was concerned with the ‘invisible’ character of dissent.”

As the eighteenth century progressed, tsarist authorities not only attempted to better understand the Old Rite, but seemingly accepted it as a permanent fixture in the Russian Empire – albeit a fixture that still required some state intervention and control. Specifically, with the onset of a more moderate approach toward governing Russia’s vast, multi-confessional state during the reigns of Peter III and Catherine II. In her “graciousness,” Catherine ended the policy of the double tax and the use of the term raskol’nik to classify Old Believers as part of her expanding ideas of religious toleration. After removing the term raskol’nik (as followers of the Old Rite deemed it as derogatory) tsarist authorities used the identifying moniker staroobriadtsy (Old Ritualists). Ultimately, the new definition forced the state to be even more precise in its own definition of who was legally and spiritually identified as an Old Believer rather than
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108 PSZ, Ser. 1, vol. 9, 551. Empress Anne took a much more strict approach toward the Old Rite than her predecessors. For example, it was under Anne that it became legally required that Old Believers not only have their children baptized in the Orthodox Church, but at that time also pledge to not teach the Old Rite to their children or to let their children marry another Old Ritualist. See PSZ, Ser. 1, vol. 9, 789 – 91. Also see, PSZ, Ser. 1, vol. 10, 624 – 26 on more strict laws on harsher penalties for civil authorities and Church officials who did not properly register Old Believers.
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a member of other unofficial Christian factions throughout the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{111}

However, believing that superstition – not political, civil, or religious dissent – to be the cause of the \textit{Raskol}, tsarist authorities still sought a means to make the Old Rite more “acceptable” to the state’s and Church’s political and religious views of the Orthodox world.

\textbf{Opportunities out of Calamity: The Plague of 1771}

The reign of Catherine the Great established a new approach by tsarist authorities toward the Old Rite, when she upheld Peter III’s 1762 decree of toleration for the Old Rite. To Catherine, the reasoning for toleration was that the Old Rite was not based on political treason or heresy, but rather superstition.\textsuperscript{112} Furthermore, in December 1762, Catherine amended the decree on religious toleration to allow for Old Believers to either return from abroad or from the wilderness to Russia’s urban centers.\textsuperscript{113} Her decree ended the policy of collecting taxes on and requiring Old Believers to maintain their beards and traditional Russian dress as identifying markers of the Old Rite.\textsuperscript{114}

Catherine designed the new toleration policies with specific goals in mind. First, the goal of the toleration policy was to make the Old Rite a much more public entity in
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the Empire by offering the opportunity for Old Believers to become much more active in Russian society. Essentially, Catherine and tsarist and Church officials hoped to get a greater sense of the influence and strength of the Old Rite throughout the Empire.

Second, Catherine designed the toleration policy with two other goals: economic and urban growth, and colonization or inhabitation of some of Russia’s least populated regions. These goals would be achieved through restrictions listed within the conditions of toleration: Old Believers living within Russia in 1762 were permitted to move, or in the case of Old Believer serfs seek permission to move, where they chose. Old Believers returning from abroad were restricted to only settling in designated regions (in the listed preferred order) near Tobol’sk, Omsk, Saratov, along the Samara River near Orenburg, and near Belgorod.115

Moscow in particular benefitted significantly from the ease on restrictions on Old Believer rights and movement. Both the established Muscovite Old Believers and the Old Believers coming from the Moscow countryside saw Catherine’s toleration as a moment of opportunity. For the established merchants, freedom of movement provided the prospect to aid fellow adherents of the Old Rite through either the purchase of freedom for Old Believer serfs, or providing charity or funds for Old Believers to leave the countryside and move to Moscow.116 While a sense of loyalty and common identity as Old Believers played a significant role in their patronage, by funding the mobility of former serfs and peasants, the Old Believer merchants found a means to increase their
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own labor force for their enterprises as well as a means to maintain their image as benefactors and patriarchs of their workers.\textsuperscript{117}

For the rural Old Believers, Catherine’s toleration policies provided access to potential social and economic opportunities. Moscow experienced an influx of both priestly and priestless Old Believers, pushing their combined numbers into at least tens of thousands.\textsuperscript{118} Yet, contrary to the goal of Catherine’s toleration to make the Old Rite more visible, some Old Believers feared Catherine’s polices were a ploy to attack the Old Rite and still avoided registration as members of the Old Rite by continuing to present themselves as members of the Orthodox Church or bribery.\textsuperscript{119} At the time, the Muscovite priestly Old Believers, many of the future founders of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, developed communities near the Donskoi Monastery in the south and near the Tver’ Gates in the northwest suburbs of Moscow.\textsuperscript{120} These gatherings were made up of a small number of families who worked together most often either as merchants or shopkeepers. However, while their professions allowed them to interact with the general public, these early communities often gathered in private houses to conduct religious services and hide their priests by moving them between families.\textsuperscript{121} As rural Old Believers migrated to Moscow, they often found refuge within these communities to escape detection, or even reliance on the influence and wealth of the merchant families to protect them.
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Poor record keeping of the numbers of peasants and Old Believers moving to Moscow during the early years of Catherine’s reign, combined with the Old Believers’ ability to avoid contact with (or bribe) authorities, created a “floating” population found predominately in the suburbs of Moscow.\textsuperscript{122} The collection of census figures was so problematic that by 1770, there was little consensus on even the total number of inhabitants in Moscow itself: various sources place the number of Muscovites anywhere from the police statistics of 152,190 to numbers as high as 500,000 by tsarist officials.\textsuperscript{123} Such disorganization proved devastating throughout 1771 as an outbreak of bubonic plague devastated the population of Moscow and sent city and tsarist officials scrambling for any means to both combat the plague and maintain social order in the ensuing chaos.

Like their fellow Muscovites, the Old Believers suffered from the combined devastation of the plague and often harsh quarantine restrictions created by Moscow authorities that often prevented food and medical supplies from reaching areas of the city for days at a time.\textsuperscript{124} Following the Plague Riot in September, Catherine appointed Count Grigori Orlov to head a commission to restore order throughout the city. Under Orlov’s watch, the situation in Moscow improved as officials instituted a number of public work projects and greater distribution of food for the citizenry, as well as easing restrictions within quarantines to allow for trade and the use of public baths.\textsuperscript{125}
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What proved to be one of the most important steps in the founding of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, the Plague Commission appealed directly to Moscow’s wealthy merchantry for assistance in combating the plague. Orlov and the commission looked to members of the merchantry to establish new quarantines and aid in the care for victims and prevention from continued spread of the plague primarily due to the close ties between members of the merchantry and their personal wealth. It was under this call for assistance that the priestly and priestless Muscovite Old Believers petitioned the Senate, Orlov, and city officials for permission to establish their own, Old Believer-exclusive quarantines and cemeteries. With guarantees that any new community would be fully constructed, guarded, staffed, provisioned, and administered without the need for state aid, Orlov and the Lieutenant-General of Moscow (as acting Governor-General of Moscow), Petr Eropkin, sent the petition with their approval on to the Senate. On December 8, 1771 the Senate, in-turn, approved the creation of what would become Rogozhskoe Cemetery and designated twenty-four hectares of land one mile east of Moscow in the village of Novoandronovka and between the roads to Vladimir and Ryazan.

The wealthy Old Believer merchant families and other members of the priestly sect throughout Moscow used all of their means to establish their new community. Rogozhskoe Cemetery soon provided its community, and any who sought the aid of the community (including non-Old Believers), with access to medical aid, charity, and
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religious services meant to both comfort the victims of the plague, as well as provide a quarantine to prevent further spread of disease. Yet Rogozhskoe also served a much greater purpose to its founders and community: the opportunity to build a community devoted to the traditions and ideals of the Old Rite.

Holy Moscow as Reality: Rogozhskoe as the Boundary between Sacred and Profane

To the Rogozhskoe community of Old Believers, their new community could protect them and their faith from the world outside the community’s boundaries. Initially this protection was from the ravages of the plague and the genuine fear that Old Believer victims would not receive proper medical attention, or Old Rite religious or burial services. In the months immediately following the Senate’s decree granting the land for the creation of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, the priestly Old Believers began construction of the first structures at the cemetery, which initially included an infirmary, some living facilities, an almshouse, and a wall enclosing the structures. Religious services were originally held in private chapels built within the almshouse and infirmary to provide spiritual comfort for the plague’s victims.

Rogozhskoe was of two worlds, both sacred and profane. Because of their economic ties to the merchantry and due to legal restrictions the community had to stylize their community as a sanctuary for an Old Rite Holy Moscow and as a part of the

128 Makarov, Ocherk istorii, 10 - 13.
contemporary Moscow they lived in. In maintaining their ideal of their community as a representation of Holy Moscow, the space inside of Rogozhskoe Cemetery was just as vital to this image as was protecting that space by separating the outside world. However, as a religious minority already under suspicion and distrusted by tsarist and Church authorities, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers had to cautiously manipulate their use of external presentations of their piety. The true issue for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, as will be explained, was not only how to “protect” their identity, their ideal, and their understanding of sacred space, but also how to remind its own members of the boundaries between sacred and profane, and interior and exterior.

The first boundary and one of the earliest for Rogozhskoe was that it was, in fact, a walled community. Initially constructed as part of the plague quarantine, Rogozhskoe’s walls in fact represented much more. Eventually surrounding the entire area of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, Rogozhskoe’s wall served as a true divide between interior and exterior as well as sacred and profane. In particular, so as not to incur scrutiny from the Orthodox Church, the community itself restricted all displays of Old Rite spirituality, such as burial services and holiday celebrations, to the space within Rogozhskoe’s wall. Furthermore, within Rogozhskoe’s walls, the community became an Old Rite monastery – even the community referred to the main, western gates as the Holy Gate.129
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130 RSL. Fond 246. K. 3, Ed. 3, L. 60-60 ob. Also see, Makarov, Ocherk istorii, 6 – 10. This “monastic” communal organization was in fact common amongst Old Believer communities. As in the Russian tradition, monasteries often developed throughout the Russian wilderness in order to allow for these monastic communities to fully devote themselves to their spirituality and remove themselves from the corruptions of the world outside of the monasteries. See Fr. Seraphim Rose, The Northern Thebaid: Monastic Saints of the Russian North, (Plantina, CA: Saint Herman Press, 1995). A number of monasteries, particularly throughout the Northern regions such as Karelia and throughout the Urals and
Whereas Rogozhskoe Old Believer merchants and other parishioners were expected to, and encouraged, to maintain their livelihoods and interact with the world outside Rogozhskoe, the interior was sacred ground, reserved for practicing and upholding the traditions and expectations of the Old Rite. Some of Rogozhskoe’s merchant families such as the Gol’skiis and Rakhmanovs built family homes in Rogozhskoe Cemetery (and later seen in examples such as the Riabushinskii family cell) in which the families would live during many of the fasting periods throughout the Orthodox calendar, particularly the Great Lent, in order to fully immerse themselves in their spiritual duties.\footnote{131}

In 1776, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers received permission from the Moscow authorities to build their first chapel at the cemetery so that the community could hold burial services for the community.\footnote{132} Dedicated to Saint Nicholas, the structure was single-story and constructed of wood.\footnote{133} While tsarist authorities, and especially the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church, often attempted to slow and regulate the construction of Old Believer chapels, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers had a major factor working in their advantage. That was that in the five years since its founding, along the Volga, in fact became major supporters and centers for the Old Rite immediately following the \textit{raskol}, even becoming sites of violent confrontation between early Old Believers and the tsarist state. See for example, Georg Michels, “The Violent Old Belief,” and Peter T. De Simone, “Enemies and Partners: Resistance, Economics and the Relationship between Old Believers and Imperial Russia,” (MA Thesis, Ohio State University, 2008). Ultimately, historians have argued that Old Rite communities often emulated monastic communities as as a means for both order and communal structure as well as to protect the purity of their Orthodoxy through strict adherence to spiritual customs and observations as in monasteries. See for example, Robert O. Crummey, \textit{The Old Believers and the World of Antichrist} and \textit{Old Believers in a Changing World}. Also see Irina Paert, \textit{Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender}.
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Rogozhskoe Cemetery was already well known a charitable center for all Muscovites.\textsuperscript{134} The construction, and continued expansion, of charitable foundations such as the community’s almshouses ultimately allowed greater access to religious services for the community in recognition of upholding the Christian value of charity.

Due to their charity and vast amounts of wealth, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers obtained even greater privileges from the authorities. Of particular note, in 1791 Rogozhskoe petitioned the Governor-General of Moscow, Prince A. A. Prozorovsky, for the right to construct a large temple dedicated to the Intercession of the Holy Virgin built of stone on the grounds of Rogozhskoe Cemetery.\textsuperscript{135} legally, Russian laws restricted Old Believers to only being able to construct and use wooden chapels (as Orthodox rules prohibited the Divine Liturgy being served in chapels). As such, the request to construct an Old Rite temple out of stone was extremely bold and reveals just how far the Rogozhskoe Old Believers were willing to press for the creation of their version of Holy Moscow. Even under Catherinian toleration, Church and tsarist decrees only recognized Old Believer religious structures as chapels, thereby not only legally restricting the structures to performing the services of Vespers, Matins, and Hours, but also forbade for their construction in stone – a right only reserved for the construction of permanent, Orthodox churches.\textsuperscript{136}

Yet citing that the only law regarding the construction of Old Believer buildings within Moscow dated to 1722 and only required for a community to petition for approval
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for the construction of any structure, as well as noting that the parishioners at Rogozhskoe numbered nearly 20,000, Prozorovsky approved the community’s request.  

Pokrovskii Cathedral was not simply a structure for Rogozhskoe to meet the needs of its parishioners and establish a permanent religious structure for the community – Pokrovskii Cathedral was going to serve as the seat of Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers soon hired an architect by the name of Kazakov to build a grand cathedral for Rogozhskoe. The original design for Pokrovskii Cathedral provides an excellent insight into the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ understanding of their community as a new Holy Moscow. Specifically, in size the Rogozhskoe Pokrovskii Cathedral would have surpassed the Dormition Cathedral in the Moscow Kremlin – still one of the largest cathedrals in Moscow and recognized as the Mother Church of Muscovite Russia and remained the site for the coronation of the Tsars.  

Furthermore, during initial construction, builders modified Kazakov’s plans to increase the size of the cathedral as well as changing the number of domes from a single dome to five domes – the same as the Dormition Cathedral.  

Such symbolism was not lost on Church authorities in Moscow who immediately brought the situation to Catherine’s attention, demanding construction halted. Under direct orders from Catherine, Prozorovsky oversaw the destruction of the foundations for the Pokrovskii Cathedral. However, Catherine did provide that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could build a smaller cathedral, and so the structure was completed.}
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Believers could rebuild the temple, in stone, but only under supervision of the Moscow authorities.  

Knowing now that authorities could intervene in the physical construction of their ideal community the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized that they needed a new means to combine both their faith and create outward, physical displays of their ties to the outside world. The new Pokrovskii Cathedral ultimately served as a melding of the two worlds that Rogozhskoe remained trapped between. While still large in size, and with only one dome, the exterior now reflected the popular architectural styles of the time with traces of baroque and neoclassical styles, topped by the true symbol of a traditional Russian Orthodox Church – an onion dome.

Ill. 2: Pokrovskii Cathedral, 1883
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Eventually, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers received permission from the Moscow Governor-General to construct a third temple to serve their growing community in 1804. Under the leadership of the merchant Ilya Sheviakov and designed by Ivan Zhukov the construction of what would become the Church of the Nativity represented the completion of Rogozhskoe’s own Cathedral Square. As Pokrovskii Cathedral’s large size made it ineffective and expensive to heat in the winter, the Church of the Nativity’s purpose was to serve as a winter cathedral. Once again, the community used the Church of the Nativity to build a representation of a mix of contemporary architectural styles externally and expressions of Old Rite iconography internally.

143 Document reproduced in Makarov, Ocherk istorii, 25.
The Church of the Nativity was entirely built in neoclassical, or Empire, style that gained popularity under Alexander I. Constructed in the shape of a Latin cross, and topped with a large dome and colonnade, the Church of the Nativity externally displayed the Rogozhskoe community’s ties and connection to the rest of Moscow as well as to the greater Russian Empire through its use of the popular architectural styles of the day.

Similar to Pokrovskii Cathedral, the only “Russian” aspect of the Church of the Nativity was the addition of a small, golden onion dome on top of the distinctively neoclassical dome. Yet, just like Pokrovskii Cathedral, the Church of the Nativity served as a division between the sacred space within the temple and the profane, non-Old Rite, outside world.

Ill. 4: Nativity Cathedral, 1883
While the exteriors of Rogozhskoe’s temples reflected the community’s participation in popular architectural trends of the late-eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers decorated the interiors in the style of fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth century Russian churches, highlighted by the exclusive use of icons and antiquities from those periods. For Rogozhskoe, the interiors were the true testament to the community’s devotion to and their ideal in the Old Rite. As stated by the nineteenth century Old Believer historian P. I. Mel’nikov, “The Temple (Pokrovskii) is beautifully decorated. The icons are excellent examples of the ancient style – Rublev, Stroganov and others, gilded in rich silver with precious stones and pearls, silver chandeliers and candlesticks with large shrouded candles, a large iconostasis and
magnificent and panels – all testified as to the zeal, and the wealth of the Rogozhskoe parishioners.”¹⁴⁴

It was within the cathedrals that the community could glorify the Old Rite how they saw fit. Namely, unlike its external appearance that reflected the popular styles of the day, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers decorated the interior of Pokrovskii and Nativity Cathedrals in pre-Nikonian style frescoes and paintings while also serving as the home for Rogozhskoe’s ever-increasing collection of old Russian icons donated to the community or purchased by wealthy patrons.¹⁴⁵ As explained below, covering the interior walls in icons dating as far back to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and wall frescos reflecting the styles of the Russian schools of icon painting served as yet another means for the Old Believer community to reject the spiritual and cultural changes introduced by Nikon and, later, Peter the Great. The new Cathedrals, then, served as Rogozhskoe’s new understanding of its own identity as Holy Moscow. The community would now actively define themselves as protectors of the Old Rite, but also they would emphasize a connection to the world around not soley through their charity work but also physically by incorporating popular, often western, contemporary architectural styles for the exterior (rather than relying on more traditional, Russian architecture).

*Preserving the Past: Rogozhskoe, Icons, and Manuscripts*

Part of what made Rogozhskoe’s ideal of Holy Moscow viable to the community was their sense that it maintained some ties to, and protected the sacredness of, the Old
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Rite. Not only did Rogozhskoe Cemetery need to shield its Old Rite parishioners from the perceived spiritual corruption of the outside world, it also needed to guard what the community viewed as sacred representations of their faith—icons and other church decorations, as well as ancient Russian manuscripts. As witnessed by the community’s continuously growing icon collection the Rogozhskoe Old Believers prided themselves on the preservation of tradition of not only their faith but of Russian history. As the Rogozhskoe historian Makarov later claimed, “In the course of those early decades, there were hardly any churches in Russia that could claim as many precious treasures as collected for Rogozhskoe’s cathedrals: particularly the ancient icons… all of which spoke to the ineffable affection, zeal, and love of the cemetery’s parishioners.”

Rogozhskoe Cemetery therefore became a center for the collection of Russian religious relics, icons, and ancient Russian manuscripts. Rogozhskoe’s wealthiest merchant families of the early nineteenth century such as the Gol’skiis, Shelaputins, Rakhmanovs, and Tsarksys (and eventually families such as the Morozovs, Riabushinskiis and Soldatenkovs) spent fortunes to purchase and refurbish numerous antiquities of traditional Russian religious life and culture. Eventually, over the course of the nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers possessed one of the largest collections of ancient Russian manuscripts and icons in all of Russia. These collections not only instilled a sense of pride amongst the immediate community but also inspired
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numerous Old Believers and Orthodox alike to flock to view the collection of traditional Russian icons and manuscripts held and displayed in the Rogozhskoe temples.  

Collecting, maintaining, and displaying centuries-old icons became a key defining trait of both Rogozhskoe and its Old Believers, and icons served as a special medium to their understanding of the sacred. In the Old Rite mindset, all aspects of Russian spirituality and spiritual expression were corrupted by the introduction of the Nikonian Reforms. In particular, late seventeenth-century and later Russian icons also reflected the ritualistic changes Nikon introduced: the spelling of changed from “Jesus” from Isus to Isus, Moreover, the iconographic abbreviation for Jesus Christ (formerly IC XC) changed to IIC XC, the depiction of blessing changed from the two-fingered sign of the cross to three-fingers. Furthermore, icons began to take on more “western” characteristics, particularly the use of greater detail to the icons subjects and greater amounts of color. As Oleg Tarasov argues, to the Old Ritualists, the new forms of iconography were nothing less than iconoclasm that not only depicted the new heresies but Russia’s spiritual loss of grace as iconography seemed to now to focus on creating aesthetically pleasing images rather than theological symbolism. As even the Archpriest Avvakum once noted, “They paint the image of the Savior Emmanuel: the face is rounded, the mouth is bright red, the hair is curly, the arms and muscles are plump… and he is all big-bellied as a German… and all of it is painted in a fleshy way: for these sort of heretics have come to love fleshy corpulence and have rejected the value
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of tears.”

Therefore Old Believers across the Russian Empire held special reverence for icons painted, and the styles of icon painting, before the schism. It was during these centuries that Russian icon painting also distinguished itself as unique from its Byzantine- and Greek-style heritage. Masters such as Andrei Rublev established a definitive Russian style of icon painting - noted more for its use of gentle tones, rounded and elongated figures, and emphasis on complex theological symbolism (such as Rublev’s using the story of the Hospitality of Abraham to depict the mystery of the Holy Trinity). It was this tradition that the Old Rite upheld as the only proper method of icon painting, rejecting eighteenth- and nineteenth-century changes to icon painting along with the Nikonian Reforms.

As the embodiment of a new Holy Moscow, then, it became the mission of many of Rogozhskoe’s wealthy merchant families, as well as its leading Trustees, to obtain and protect these sacred icons and other antiquities from what the later Rogozhskoe historian V. E. Makarov viewed as the “ignorant Orthodox.” While the Rogozhskoe Old Believers did commission for the creation of new icons for the iconostasises of their new temples, painted in the pre-Nikonian styles, icons from the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, and a few from the seventeenth century, dominated the Rogozhskoe
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icon collection.\textsuperscript{154} Using their wealth, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers obtained many of these icons from poorer Orthodox families who, in the minds of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, neither appreciated nor understood the icons’ true spiritual value (as a sacred relic and a connection to Russia’s history).\textsuperscript{155} Some of Rogozhskoe’s earliest acquisitions after the community’s founding included a number of icons painted in the Novgorod School style (popular in the fourteenth century) and even an icon of Our Lady of Smolensk painted by Russia’s greatest iconographer, Andrei Rublev.\textsuperscript{156} It was also common place for Rogozhskoe parishioners to donate personal icon collections in commemoration of holidays, anniversaries, or, more commonly, in memorial for loved ones. One such example was that the Gol’skii family that donated several of the first icons donated before 1800, one being a large icon of the Theotokos of Tikhvin (one of Orthodox Russia’s most revered images of the Virgin Mary) in memorial of Nazar Stefanovich and Peter Nazarovich Gol’skii.\textsuperscript{157}

The themes of many of the Rogozhskoe icons, much like in Orthodox Churches, included depictions Christ as Acheiropoietos (Made without Hands) and Pantocrator (Ruler of All) as well as the Theotokos (Mother of God) in her traditional Hodigitria (She who shows the Way) and Eleusa (Tenderness) depictions.\textsuperscript{158} Similarly, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also collected a number of icons depicting the lives and works of many traditional saints revered in the Russian Orthodox Church: Nicholas the Wonderworker; Nicholas the Wonderworker; Nicholas the Wonderworker;
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George the Warrior; and John the Baptist. The Rogozhskoe collections also included Russian saints such as Dmitri Donskoy, the twin Martyrs Boris and Gleb, and Sergius of Radonezh – of whom Rogozhskoe’s Pokrovskii Cathedral displayed six icons alone.\textsuperscript{159}

Yet Rogozhskoe did possess some icons that reflected their devotion to the Old Rite and as dissenters against tsarist and Church authorities. For, example, similar to many Old Rite communities, since Rogozhskoe collected right from its founding a number of icons of archpriest Avvakum Petrov, Patriarch Nikon’s most outspoken critic and viewed as a father and Saint of the Old Rite movement.\textsuperscript{160} However, a more curious part of Rogozhskoe’s collection included a pair of seventeenth century icons of Metropolitan Philip II of Moscow. While revered as a Saint within the Russian Orthodox Church as well, it is Philip’s legacy that deserves attention in understanding the significance of these icons to Rogozhskoe’s identity as Holy Moscow. During the mid-sixteenth century Philip served as Metropolitan of Moscow during the reign of his once childhood friend, Ivan the Terrible. At the height of Ivan’s oppression of his political enemies under the \textit{Oprichnina}, Philip openly challenged Ivan’s royal authority as subservient to the authority granted by God to the Orthodox Church and its offices – a challenge that led to Philip’s murder.\textsuperscript{161} Eventually recognized as a martyr of the Church, Philip posthumously received recognition as a Hierarch of Moscow. Ironically, it was Patriarch Nikon who glorified Philip as a saint in 1652, making Philip one of the last

\textsuperscript{159} For photographs of such icons, see Lukhimenko, et. al, eds. \textit{Drevnie i dykhovni sviatini staroobriadchestva.}

\textsuperscript{160} As of March 2012, the Russian Orthodox Old-Rite Church unveiled plans to erect a monument to Avvakum on the grounds of Rogozhskoe Cemetery in commemoration of his martyrdom for the Old Rite. See, “Na Rogozhskom sostoyalos’ zasedanie Moskovskoi eparkhii,” 19 Marta 2012. http://rpsc.ru/news/novosti-mitropolii/2012/na-rogozhskom-sostoyalos-zasedanie-moskovskoj-eparkhii

\textsuperscript{161} S. Bulgakov, \textit{Handbook for Church Servers}, (Kharkov, 1900), 22.
mutual saints recognized by both the Old Ritualists and Orthodox Church. For Rogozhskoe, however, one can see how the veneration of Philip’s icons played to the idea of the community as the new Holy Moscow. Specifically, Philip’s claim that true authority extended from God and not title reflected the Old Rite rejection of a true Church hierarchy and in some ways civil authority as well. Likewise, Philip’s recognition as a Hierarch of Moscow reaffirmed Rogozhskoe’s ties to the city of Moscow itself.

For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, and visiting Old Believers and Orthodox, their collection of ancient icons served as yet another means to display not only their devotion to the Old Rite, but their ideal of Rogozhskoe as the foundation of Holy Moscow. Furthermore, the use and collection of the ancient icons reaffirmed the community’s understanding of the boundaries between Rogozhskoe and the Orthodox world as it represented the community’s attempts to preserve both historical artifacts as well as iconographic styles and traditions of the past. Frescoes painted in pre-seventeenth century styles and ancient icons served as a means for Rogozhskoe’s parishioners to transport themselves back to an idealized period and idealized reverence for the Old Rite. This, in turn, would shape not only the Rogozhskoe community’s approach to their own understanding of their faith in the Old Rite, but also how to use their devotion and piety to reshape the external world as well.

\[162^{162}\] Ibid.
Catherine and the Old Rite: The Path to *Edinoverie*

Even with the opportunities provided by Catherine’s new approach toward the Old Rite, the relationship between the Old Believers and Imperial state and Church often remained as a source of conflict. For example, only a short while after the Rogozhskoe and Preobrazhenskoe Old Believers established their communities, the outbreak of the Pugachev Rebellion in the Urals from 1773 - 1774 renewed suspicions about Old Believer loyalty. Described by historian John T. Alexander as “the most prolonged, widespread, and destructive uprising against an indigenous Old Regime prior to 1789”¹⁶³ Catherine remained convinced that Emelyan Pugachev’s success came from an extensive conspiracy. In fact, as Pugachev not only attracted Old Believers to his following but also was rumored to be an Old Believer himself, Catherine even assumed that “he surely corresponds with schismatics in Moscow, but their names are unknown.”¹⁶⁴ While authorities never definitively tied the Old Rite to the Pugachev Rebellion, even after extensive interrogation of Pugachev and his followers, the event revealed that the tsarist state still questioned the place of the Old Rite within the Russian Empire.

A major challenge for Catherinian Russia then was how to encourage the Old Rite to become an entity that contributed to the stability of the Empire. As Catherinian Russia experienced a more open approach to cultural and social outsiders such as the Old
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¹⁶⁴ Catherine II of Russia, “Catherine to Volkonsky, 31 July 1774,” *Osmnadsatyi vek: istoricheskii sbornik*, P. I. Bartenev, ed., vol. I (Moscow, 1868), 116 – 17,
Believers, bishops within the Russian Orthodox Church itself determined to reach out to the Old Believers in order to bring them back into communion with the dominant Church hierarchy. The result was the first attempt at religious toleration known as *Edinoverie*, or “Unity in Faith.”

As both a term and as a movement, *Edinoverie* recognized that while Old Believers and the Post-Nikonian Church varied primarily in the practice of rituals, they shared the same Faith and same dogmas after the *Raskol*. Writing in the early twentieth century, the historian of Russian Orthodoxy E. E. Lebedev asserted that the Russian Orthodox Church since its foundation had been anything but monolithic – that is, it had *from its inception* been in a state of *edinoverie*.¹⁶⁵ The history of Russian Orthodoxy, he believed, was a history of a collection of followers who all believed and protected the same faith and same dogmas, yet there was never any unanimous acceptance or practice of Church rituals. Indeed, the lack of consensus on ritual throughout Russian Orthodoxy was in fact one of the primary issues that Patriarch Nikon strove to correct with his reforms. Furthermore, the lack of support for the reforms gave Nikon little choice but to allow clergy to continue using the Old Rites if they desired, thereby leaving ritual as one of the primary variables amongst those who identified themselves as Orthodox.¹⁶⁶

Building off of Lebedev’s paradox, M. V. Pervushin and Vladimir Karpets argue that the major influence that led to the formation of *Edinoverie* was, using Pervushin’s terminology, the realization amongst members of the late-eighteenth century Church that

¹⁶⁵ E. E. Lebedev, *Edinoverie v protivodei’stvii russkomu obriadovomu raskolu: Ocherk po istorii i statistike edinoveriya s obzorov sushestvuoshich o nem mnenii i prilozeniami* (Novgorod, 1904), 1.
¹⁶⁶ Meyendorff. *Russia, Ritual, and Reform*, 62 - 64.
a state of “natural edinoverie” existed between the Old Rite and the Russian Orthodox Church. This realization, along with the atmosphere of greater religious toleration created by Catherine’ policies influenced religious leaders such as Archbishop Nikifor Theotokis and Platon, the Metropolitan of Moscow, to seek some form of reconciliation between the Old Rite and the Russian Orthodox Church. Specifically, as both Pervushin and Karpets suggest, the common ground that would be the basis for the movement of Edinoverie was the realization amongst leaders such as Nikifor and Platon that, at the core, Old Believers were not different from their Orthodox counterparts – most importantly they shared the dogmas and the same Faith.

The first steps toward Edinoverie began early in Catherine’s reign in 1765 when Platon, while serving in Catherine’s Court as religious tutor to her son Paul, published his sermon, “An exhortation to the truth and hope of the Gospel of Love.” Within this work, Platon laid the groundwork for his future desires as Metropolitan of Moscow to bring the Old Rite and Russian Orthodox Church together. In his sermon, Platon states his belief that as long as unity in faith and unity in dogma existed between the Old Rite and the Russian Orthodox Church, ritual differences did not truly divide the Church. As Platon states, “Ceremonies themselves cannot divide the faithful.” Platon’s accepting view of the Old Rite, and open understanding of “Orthodoxy,” served as a major influence in his future career as Metropolitan of Moscow, for it was under Platon’s Metropolitanate that

---
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both the Rogozhskoe and Preobrazhenskoe Old Believer communities received
permission to build their first chapels. Likewise, Platon’s attempts to bring the Old Rite
and Russian Orthodox Church together also shaped the mind and eventual policies of his
young pupil and future Tsar, Paul. By the 1780s, due to the more open nature of both the
Catherinian state and religious leaders such as Platon, who was by then serving as
Metropolitan, other religious leaders amongst the mainstream Church and the Old Rite
sought an opening for at least moderate reconciliation. Serving as an Archbishop in the
newly acquired southern provinces of “Novorossiya”, Nikifor Theotokis took some of the
earliest steps in approaching members of the Old Rite with reconciliation. 170 Coming
from the Greek Orthodox Church, as invited by Catherine to serve in New Russia,
Nikifor on one hand resented the existence of dissent within Russian Orthodoxy and
accepted Old Believers as members of the same Orthodox faith. However, Nikifor
realized that Old Believers could not be swayed to return to the Church hierarchy by
religious propaganda and persecution at the hands of the state and Church. Rather, it was
the duty of the Church to reach out to the Old Rite to initiate a dialogue. 171 Travelling
amongst Old Believer communities around Elisavetgrad (now Kirovograd, Ukraine),
Nikifor offered Old Believers the opportunity to have their churches recognized as legal
churches (rather than chapels), and the right to have a priest of their choosing legally
ordained within the Russian Orthodox Church to use the Old Rites. In exchange, the Old
Believer’s church, and the community itself, would be integrated into the larger

170 See, Gregory L. Bruess, Religion, Identity and Empire: A Greek Archbishop in the Russia of Catherine
171 Yu. A. Katunin and A. V. Belsky, “Etapi bor’bi za sozdanie tserkvi u staroobriadtsev,” In, Kul’tura
administration of the Russian Orthodox Church and Holy Synod. While many communities rejected Nikifor’s offers because they would be subject to the authority of the Holy Synod, some Old Believers used this opportunity to begin a dialogue with tsarist Russia, and in some instances begin negotiating terms for returning to the Church Hierarchy.

However, a discrepancy soon developed between the majority of the Old Rite and the tsarist state concerning the issue of the place of Old Rite clergy in the Church hierarchy and its relationship with the Holy Synod under the terms of Edinoverie. By the end of the eighteenth century, many Old Believer communities, Rogozhskoe Cemetery included, often approached tsarist and Church authorities with two major requests: First, rather than selecting priests from candidates provided by the Holy Synod and Russian Orthodox Church, Old Rite communities asked to put forward their own candidates to be ordained priests. Second, and most importantly to many Old Believers, was the request that the Russian Orthodox Church allow for the creation of an Old Rite Bishopric. The Old Rite bishop, ideally, would serve as the spiritual bridge between the Old Believers and their Orthodox brethren. He would, thereby bring the Old Rite back into full communion with the Russian Orthodox Church hierarchy, but with its own branch and own bishop to ordain as many Old Rite priests as required. Ultimately, the request to create an Old Rite Bishopric was to guarantee that Old Believers returning to the Church hierarchy would still maintain some autonomy: rather than relying on the Holy Synod or

\[172\] Ibid.
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Russian Orthodox Church to *approve* the appointment of a priest (or the number of Old Rite priests).

The Holy Synod and tsarist authorities refused to accept the creation of an Old Rite bishop as contrary to the goal of *Edinoverie* to recognize dogmatic Orthodoxy while establishing greater state and Church control over the Old Rite. In August 1785, imperial decree established *Edinoverie*: offering to legally recognize Old Rite communities and Churches if they placed themselves under the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod and Russian Orthodox Church hierarchy.\(^\text{174}\) Catherine’s successor, Paul I, inspired by his former tutor Platon took an even more open approach toward the Old Belief than his mother, making integration of the Old Rite into the Russian Orthodox Church one of his prime interests. Specifically, Paul sought a means to make *Edinoverie* much more appealing to the Old Rite and occasionally invited Old Believers to meet with him and listen to their suggestions and requests.\(^\text{175}\) To usher in a new period of toleration toward the Old Believers, Paul issued an imperial decree on March 12, 1798 ordering all Russian Orthodox bishops to ordain priests in the Old Rite, and permitted the construction of Old Rite Churches.\(^\text{176}\) However, Paul did not offer any further concessions as he modified the terms of the *Edinoverie*. Under the advice of Platon, he would not create a new bishopric.
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\(^{175}\) Karpets, “Chto takoe edinoverie?”, and Pervushin “Edinoverie do i posle mitropolita Platona (Levshina),”  
\(^{176}\) *PSZ* Ser 1. Vol. 25, 133.
The state’s intention with Edinoverie was to completely redefine the relationship between Old Believers and both the tsarist state and the Russian Orthodox Church. However, the end result of the state-sponsored Edinoverie was the creation of a division between “loyal” (from the state’s perspective) Old Believers who accepted union with the Orthodox Church, and the disloyal who refused to accept union.177 Once Platon’s “Eleven Terms of Edinoverie” firmly established the institution, tsarist authorities could, and would, use Edinoverie as a social and religious weapon against those Old Rite communities, such as Rogozhskoe Cemetery, that remained outside of the Church hierarchy.

Furthermore, the terms and ideas of Edinoverie and edinovertsy directly challenged the identity of Old Believers everywhere. While the issue between the Old Rite and the Russian Orthodox Church was who followed the “pure” form of Orthodoxy, Edinoverie created the problem of determining defining the “pure” form of the Old Rite. Rogozhskoe and other Old Believer communities, particularly popovtsy communities, now would not only have to define themselves within the greater movement of the Old Rite and Orthodoxy too, but also defend their faith and identity against the encroachment of the state-defined branch of Old Believers in Edinoverie.

177 Paert, “Two or Twenty Million,” 81 – 82.
Leading by Example: Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow, 1812 - 1825

Yet events would soon allow the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to both define and strengthen their own identity within the Russian Empire without the need to turn to Edinoverie. Quite similar to the events of 1771, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found great opportunity out of the devastation of 1812. Following Napoleon’s invasion of Russia, the French Occupation and Moscow Fire left Moscow scarred both physically and psychologically. Abandoned and helpless, the Moscow Fire left nearly three-quarters of the city destroyed with countless valuables either looted by French troops or lost in the blaze. Yet Rogozhskoe Cemetery remained unharmed (either from fire or looting) and was influential in rebuilding Moscow. The catastrophes of 1812 allowed the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to actualize the ideals of their Holy Moscow, and to serve as an example of true Orthodox piety and charity not just to their fellow Muscovites, but to Old Believers and Orthodox throughout the Russian Empire.

Unlike much of Moscow, Rogozhskoe escaped both the fire and the loss of its priceless relics and icons. While a legend amongst the community that Rogozhskoe was structurally unharmed during the occupation proves false, as French troops destroyed the doors of Rogozhskoe’s temples and other buildings while searching for pillage, Rogozhskoe’s spiritual valuables remained unharmed and untouched. Through the encouragement of the community’s spiritual leaders, particularly the priest Ivan

---

Yastrebov who “when all others left, remained behind in the cemetery,” most of Rogozhskoe’s valuable relics, icons, and other collections were left behind and buried within the cemetery and the Church of the Nativity while the parishioners evacuated the city.

Rogozhskoe’s survival in the destruction of 1812 helped buttress the community’s resolve and ideal in their idea of Holy Moscow. While Rogozhskoe did, in fact, suffer damage at the hands of the French forces one event in particular seemed to prove to the returning Rogozhskoe Old Believers of the sanctity of the community that they created. Accounts relate that while Yastrebov and other members of the community evacuated or hid the vast majority of Rogozhskoe’s icons and other antiquities, some relics remained behind. One in particular, an icon to Saint Nicholas the Wonderworker, came to represent Rogozhskoe’s perception of the events of 1812. This particular icon, housed in the Church of the Nativity, possessed a gilded silver frame, decorated with a number of gemstones. Miraculously, neither the icon nor its ornamental frame suffered at the hands of the French. Upon their return, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers placed an inscription on the icon:

In the Summer of 7320 [1812] during the disastrous invasion of the hordes of Napoleon, who forced his hand everywhere, designed to kidnap any items of value in this divine temple befitting God and this holy image of gilded silver was found constantly in the sight of the numerous villains as it was not stored by anyone and unprotected, and was mercifully kept intact by the most-illustrious Lord and
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his great saint of many miracles and blessings Saint Nicholas, from sacrilegious enemy hands.\textsuperscript{182}

For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, the physical survival of its temples, buildings, and its icons and antiquities allowed the community to put into action its understanding of Christian charity and community to aid Moscow’s rebuilding efforts.

The events of 1812 left Moscow’s economic foundations in tatters, providing many openings for the foundation for some of Rogozhskoe’s, and Moscow’s, future merchant dynasties. More established merchant families, such as the Rakhmanovs and Gol’skiis, found new opportunities to expand their businesses and industries. Concurrently after the French Occupation and Moscow Fire, Rogozhskoe and Moscow witnessed a new migration of Old Believer entrepreneurial peasants, some of whom would found the most successful merchant and industrial dynasties in the Russian Empire.

One such family that would benefit from both the late eighteenth and early nineteenth era of toleration and the devastation of 1812 was the highly influential, and eventually extremely successful, textile merchant family - the Morozovs. The progenitor of the Morozov family, Savva Vasilievich, began his career as a serf in the silk-weaving factory of a merchant by the name of Kononov in the Bogorodsky District of the Moscow Province. Wanting his freedom and needing to repay Kononov a large debt for paying off Savva’s recruitment fee to the army, Morozov and his family established their own weaving studio in the village of Zuyevo in 1797. It was not until the destruction of most

\textsuperscript{182} Ibid. 835 – 836.
of Moscow’s industries in 1812, and especially its textile industry, that allowed Savva to truly prosper as he met an ever increasing demand for not only silk, but wool products as well. Eventually Savva was able to not only pay off his debt, but also pay for his and his family’s freedom from serfdom at 17,000 rubles.\textsuperscript{183} Moving to Moscow, the Morozovs quickly became one of the most wealthy merchant families both in Rogozhskoe Cemetery as well as city.

Similarly, it was during this same time that witnessed the rise of other equally wealthy and influential merchant families such as the Riabushinskiis and Soldatenkovs. The introduction of new families and wealth played a major role in Rogozhskoe and its idealization of Holy Moscow for the remainder of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. However, what the events of 1812 also provided the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was an opportunity to use the combination of their Old Rite piety, their economic influence and wealth, and their sense of duty and patriotism to spread their ideal of Holy Moscow outside of the boundaries of Rogozhskoe through the extensive use of charity and patronage in Moscow.

\textit{Charity and Patronage in Rogozhskoe’s ideal of Holy Moscow}

The period immediately following the events of 1812 forever influenced Rogozhskoe’s understanding of their Holy Moscow. Rather than serving as an ideal for a single Old Believer community and a means to keep the rest of the world out of the community’s sacred ground, the Rogozhskoe community came to view their Holy

Moscow as an ideal that needed to be broadcast both in and around Moscow and to a much larger audience than just Old Believers. One of the greatest defining features in the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ desire to recreate Holy Moscow was their emphasis on charity as tantamount for any Christian community. Amongst the wealthy Rogozhskoe merchantry, charity was seen as part of their duty and shared culture. As the merchant Vladimir Riabushinskii wrote, “The Lord hath sent three gifts. Yea, the first gift is the cross and prayer. The second gift is love and charity. The third gift is the night orison.”

For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, charity was the ultimate bridge between the Old Rite, their Holy Moscow and the rest of the world. Specifically, to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, the emphasis on using wealth for philanthropy and charity was not only part of their duty as Christians, but also set themselves apart from what they viewed as the greedy, “carefree and careless noble estate.”

For pious Rogozhskoe merchants, the accumulation of wealth, while beneficial, was still viewed as sinful and took to heart the gospel that “it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God.” To Moscow Old Believer merchants, then, the ultimate challenge was to take capital, something sinful, and use it for good. Charity and patronage provided the solution and became the major means for Rogozhskoe merchants to ensure that their capital was used for good.
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The approach to capital amongst the Rogozhskoe merchantry is best summarized by the experience of the influential and wealthy Prokhorovs. Vasily Prokhorov, the founder of the Prokhorov manufacturing dynasty, like many of Rogozhskoe’s wealthy merchant families (although he was not born an Old Believer), spent the early years of his life as a serf, eventually earning and paying for his freedom in 1764. Prokhorov then founded a successful brewing business. Vasily proved to be one of the more fortunate victims of the 1771 plague, when an Old Believer associate had Vasily sent to the newly founded Rogozhskoe community for care. It was during his time at Rogozhskoe that Vasily not only recovered but took greater interest in and openly discussed issues of religion, spirituality, and the use of capital with the Old Believers around him. He eventually converted to the Old Rite. Soon after his conversion, Vasily Prokhorov gave up his brewing business as “inappropriate” for any pious man and transitioned to textiles, eventually founding the “Trimount” factory and one of Moscow’s greatest cotton dynasties.

The Prokhorovs best summarized the Rogozhskoe approach to wealth and use of capital after 1812 in essays written by Vasily’s eldest son Timofei in essays written to his brother, Konstantine, entitled “On Acquisition of Wealth,” and “On Poverty.”

Wealth is often acquired for vanity, luxury voluptuousness, etc. This wealth is bad and pure evil: it leads to the perdition of the soul… if wealth is acquired by work, its loss will preserve the man from downfall; he will resume
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working and can still acquire more than he had, for he lived in God.  

As best summarized by the historian Galina Ulanova, the Old Believer merchants’ strong emphasis on piety, patronage, and charity was not only more central to their identity than their merchant status, but also served as a means for the merchants and their families to distance themselves from the accumulation of perceived “sinful” wealth. Going further, for the Rogozhskoe mercantile in particular, charity and patronage, not only provided a means for their own salvation but also to set themselves apart from the Orthodox gentry whom the Rogozhskoe merchants viewed as both vile and corrupt for the gentry’s use of wealth for self-glorification and self-gratification.

Rogozhskoe’s approach to capital and the need and use for charity, then, would play a major role in developing Rogozhskoe’s understanding of Holy Moscow in the years following the events of 1812. It also reflected one of a series of shifts or adaptations in the views of the Rogozhskoe community over the nineteenth century as they strove to bridge the gaps between their internal, spiritual world and the changing Russian society around them.

Old Believers founded Rogozhskoe Cemetery itself on the basis of providing aid and charity to both victims and those seeking shelter from the plague. From that point on, Rogozhskoe never truly suffered from a lack of funds for pursuing more outlets for charity. The community received numerous, and generous, donations from its wealthy
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merchants, from the body of the general parishioners, and from Old Believers from across Russia. Charity was so foundational to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ sense of piety and identity that it was the formal duty of the Rogozhskoe Trustees to ensure that the financial needs of Rogozhskoe’s almshouse, and later its infirmaries, orphanage, and school, were met.

The almshouses in particular became a central defining element in the nineteenth century, as the identity of “Rogozhskoe Almshouse” became interchangeable with “Rogozhskoe Cemetery” over the course of the nineteenth century. Unfortunately it is unclear what the original almshouses and infirmaries looked like. The construction plans and records for the first almshouses and infirmaries were lost to a fire on June 13, 1840. By that time, the original structures had been replaced with eight, two-story stone structures. In Rogozhskoe’s first decades, the almshouses alone had an annual 2,000 ruble fund simply for basic maintenance and decoration to create a more livable atmosphere for the various inhabitants who were most often widows, the infirm, or elderly. Charity was so important to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers that even the duties expected of the Trustees stressed: “This place is entrusted to you, and we offer our prayers to God… and ask that you serve as a kind and dear benefactor and remain
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vigilant, and we ask that you care and watch over all of those who do not possess shelter or refuge.”

With Moscow devastated structurally and economically, and the Rogzhsloe fortunes relatively intact the Rogozhskoe Old Believers were handed an opportunity to put their ideal of their Holy Moscow on full display. Rogozhskoe opened up its almshouses, orphanages, and medical facilities to all Muscovites regardless of religion. While Rogozhskoe had never previously refused to take in non-Old Believers into their charitable facilities, it was in the aftermath of 1812 that Rogozhskoe’s began to present itself as a model for charity in Moscow as soldiers, the homeless, the impoverished, and others all found refuge at Rogozhskoe. Furthermore, as seen in the examples of the Morozovs and Prokhorovs, as owners of most of the surviving textile, candle, paper manufacturing, and other industries, the economic demand for such projects only brought greater wealth to the Rogozhskoe merchantry and by extension the entire community. More wealth for the Rogozhskoe merchants ensured more funds for Rogozhskoe’s charity.

Rogozhskoe’s charity took on many forms after 1812. One of the first projects was the expansion of Rogozhskoe’s own institutions such as the almshouses and medical facilities to provide greater space and more access to those who required aid. Significantly, this played a role in spreading Rogozhskoe’s notoriety throughout Moscow as Rogozhskoe came to rival the almshouses, orphanages, and hospitals administered by
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the state and Orthodox Church primarily in terms of the funding provided for both the community’s facilities and wards. As described in the following chapter, the Orthodox Church’s perception of Rogozhskoe’s popularity ultimately became a primary source of conflict with state and Church authorities in the mid-nineteenth century. By providing charity to victims of the French occupation and fire in 1812, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers not only emphasized their piety and understanding of a truly Christian use of capital, but also provided a means for the community to display their patriotism and to connect with the Russian Empire. Rogozhskoe also provided charity for rebuilding Moscow structurally as many merchants donated or even directly participated in funding and designing construction projects.

Patronage—in which merchants presented themselves as patrons and fathers of their workforce—was also a key element in Rogozhskoe’s identity and understanding of its ideal of Holy Moscow. Not only did such practices meet labor demands, it also served the purpose of strengthening the bond between merchant-industrialist and worker spiritually in the Old Rite, economically, and socially. Workers were by far the most important resources that Moscow required following the events of 1812. The city needed workers not only to serve as labor for construction, but also to work in factories to meet the increased demands placed on the surviving industries. The main source of labor came from the peasantry. In turn, this provided numerous opportunities for Russian serfs, such as Savva Morozov, to find work in order to put funds toward their eventual freedom.


Ibid.

However, Rogozhskoe merchants, too, saw opportunity in the need for labor – especially since it was their factories that needed more workers. To meet to needs for workers, many Rogozhskoe merchants sought out Old Believer serfs. Common practice for the merchants became either to hire these serfs or purchase their freedom outright. Through such influence, the Rogozhskoe merchants displayed the community’s understanding of the role of their Holy Moscow in the daily lives of their wealthiest members by emphasizing patronage and charity, but also presented their ideal to those who benefitted from this Holy Moscow such as individual families’ laborers or the Rogozhskoe community’s wards.

Initially, such influence provided even greater freedom for Rogozhskoe in regards to religious toleration to the point that all Old Rite services were held in Rogozhskoe’s chapels as authorities did not want to disrupt the aid provided by the Rogozhskoe merchcantry in rebuilding the city or the charity to needy citizens. For example, during the years immediately after 1812, part of the garrison that helped to maintain order and restore Moscow, and that was left in charge of the regions that contained Rogozhskoe, was comprised of a regiment of Cossacks, a group historically noted for their devotion to the Old Rite. As the historian Makarov argues, the Cossacks ensured that the
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Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their property remained unharmed, due to the Cossacks’ sympathy toward their Old Rite brethren. In addition, the community received permission from the Moscow civil authorities to freely conduct religious services, including the Divine Liturgy. These freedoms of religious practice were contrary to the laws that forbade the Divine Liturgy in any structure other than an official Russian Orthodox Church. As the community gathered more wealth and influence from their projects in Moscow, other Old Rite communities turned to Rogozhskoe to meet their spiritual needs. Such a demand soon allowed Rogozhskoe’s image as an Old Rite Holy Moscow to serve as a unifying idealization for priestly Old Believers throughout the Russian Empire.

**Rogozhskoe’s Influence on Priestly Old Believers throughout Russia**

In the decade after 1812 Rogozhskoe Cemetery developed and openly presented itself as the center of the priestly Old Rite throughout the Russian Empire. Rogozhskoe sought to provide any spiritual need for the priestly Old Believers, only reaffirming the idea of the community as an Old Rite Holy Moscow. Pilgrims from throughout the Empire flocked to Rogozhskoe to participate in services held in Rogozhskoe’s grand temples.

On the big holidays the large cathedrals could not hold all of the zealous pilgrims who travelled from all corners of Moscow; before the old icons glittering with gold and
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jewels and lit candles the service was decorous, the choir sang beautifully, and the processions to the cemetery and holy waters with the icons was especially solemn...Such a sight touched the hearts of all devout Old Believers!\footnote{Anonymous, “Iz rasskazov i zapisok V.A. Sapelkina.” \textit{Russkii vestnik}. 1864. No. 11. 190 – 91.}

Tourists, too, came from all over Moscow and Russia to view the grandeur of Rogozhskoe’s temple decorations, frescos, and icons – only adding to the wealth of Rogozhskoe’s coffers.

Furthermore, the dearth of Old Rite priests throughout the world of the priestly Old Believers actually benefitted Rogozhskoe as well. Rogozhskoe served as a center for any Old Believers to obtain baptism, marriage, communion, or give confession – all services that may not have been available to many Old Believer communities due to the lack of priests. At its peak of power in the 1820s, Rogozhskoe was home to twelve priests and four deacons and Rogozhskoe’s number of \textit{registered} Old Believer parishioners exploded from 35,000 in 1822 to an estimated 68,000 members in 1825, as Old Believer peasants from the surrounding countryside flocked to Moscow to work in factories owned by Old Believer merchants.

The services provided by Rogozhskoe to priestly Old Believers resulted in immeasurable spiritual and cultural influence for the community throughout the Russian Empire. Old Believer peasants from around Moscow and the rest of Russia turned to Rogozhskoe to fulfill some of their most basic spiritual needs. The demand for Rogozhskoe’s priests proved both beneficial and strenuous for Rogozhskoe. On the one hand, the Rogozhskoe priests received substantial financial compensation for their
services – which the entire community benefitted from as the priests regularly donated at least half of their pay to the community funds. Yet even with a large number of priests, the demands placed on the Rogozhskoe priests proved extraordinary. For example, it was not uncommon that in days leading up to, or the days immediately following holidays, that Rogozhskoe priests serviced between ten to fifteen weddings a day, one right after the other. Ultimately, however, the fact that Rogozhskoe could provide such a service allowed the community to not only spread its influence, but also come to identify itself as a Holy Moscow to priestly Old Believers throughout the Russian Empire.

One of the most important institutions that not only strengthened the unity of Rogozhskoe itself but also played a major role in spreading the community’s influence throughout Russia was the establishment of a school at Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Since the Raskol, how to educate future generations was a central priority of Old Rite culture. In many instances, young Old Ritualists relied entirely on their parents and older generations not only for their formal education, but as the sole protectors and transmitters of the Old Rite itself. Through family teaching, literacy amongst Old Believer communities reached extremely high levels, and families emphasized not only the protection of ancient manuscripts but also the ability to read them as well.

Rogozhskoe came to serve as both a protector and transmitter of Old Rite education. In the rewriting of the duties of Rogozhskoe’s Trustees in 1823, the
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community placed a greater emphasis on the need to make education of its younger members more formal. With Rogozhskoe’s increasing wealth, a major addition to the duties of the Trustees was to “ensure that care and training are given to the young by capable instructors in literacy and writing in Russian.”\textsuperscript{211} It was with such instructions in mind that Rogozhskoe opened its own school that instructed its students in lessons in reading and writing in both contemporary and Church Russian, arithmetic, and church singing. Priests, deacons, and designated “book-readers” all participated in educating Rogozhskoe’s youth and orphans.\textsuperscript{212} These new educational efforts would allow Rogozhskoe’s elder generations to transmit their understanding of Rogozhskoe’s place as Holy Moscow to their successors – constantly emphasizing the community’s importance as both a spiritual influence as well as an ideal understanding of their place in the world as Old Believers and as part of Moscow and the Russian Empire. In particular, the Rogozhskoe trustees needed to ensure funding for the schools so that “all of the youths are trained in reading and writing in Russian, so that they may establish themselves as notable members of a peaceful society.”\textsuperscript{213} As seen with merchant dynasties such as the Morozovs and Riabushinskiis, each successive generation maintained a strong sense of duty toward maintaining and spreading the ideals of Rogozhskoe Cemetery.

However, Rogozhskoe’s schools did not only provide instruction for immediate members of the community. The community also took on the identity as an instructional center for priestly Old Believers as well. Even before Rogozhskoe’s patronage of the
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Belokrinitskaya Old Rite Metropolitanate in the middle of the nineteenth century (discussed later), priestly Old Rite communities looked to Rogozhskoe as a source for either instructing a community’s priest or spiritual leaders, in the Old Rite.\textsuperscript{214} Rogozhskoe’s collection of five convents and two monasteries constructed over the previous decades also provided means for Rogozhskoe to send instructors to Old Rite communities throughout Russia.\textsuperscript{215} Through instruction and teaching spiritual leaders of communities, Rogozhskoe gradually developed the image as the spiritual and educational center for the entire priestly Old Rite in the Russian Empire. It was a very favorable position to be in as it further allowed Rogozhskoe to spread its self-identity as the new Holy Moscow outside of its own community and through the Old Rite world as other communities sent their own priests or spiritual leaders to Rogozhskoe to learn from the Rogozhskoe priests.\textsuperscript{216}

\textbf{Conclusion}

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers found themselves in truly fortunate times in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. It was during this period that Rogozhskoe’s self-identity as the center of a new Holy Moscow took shape. In the first of many changes and adaptations to their social and spiritual practices—and their sense of place in the
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larger Russian world—the community’s fortunes forced the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to re-conceptualize their idealized Holy Moscow in relation to a much larger Old Rite community outside of its walls, outside of Moscow, and outside of the Moscow District.

By the early 1820s, it truly appeared that the Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s Holy Moscow was a true representation of the Old Rite spiritual and social ideal as the community established itself as one of Moscow’s most successful industrial and charitable entities. However, Rogozhskoe’s fortune did not last. As Rogozhskoe’s influence and wealth increased so did the animosity and jealousy of Orthodox and tsarist officials. While Rogozhskoe Old Believers still presented themselves as arduous Russian patriots and a foundation of the Moscow economy, their ties to the Old Rite still left them as outcasts in the eyes of the authorities. While Catherine and her immediate successors upheld her toleration policies, Rogozhskoe thrived.

Yet Rogozhskoe’s success was primarily conditional on two accounts: First, the Rogozhskoe Old Beleivers’ success derived from their ability to adapt their definition and presentation of their Holy Moscow in response to the environment around them. Particularly, this meant responding to the religious policies of the time and larger events, such as the Moscow Fire in 1812, which provided the opportunity, but still restricted, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ability to define their Holy Moscow. The second condition for Rogozhskoe’s success was the level of what can be described as “usefulness” in the eyes of the tsarist authorities. As described in numerous works on religious minorities in the Russian Empire, many minority communities received preferential treatment so long as they remained undisruptive to social stability and also provided some perceived benefit
to the state (most often economically). Such forces ultimately played a major factor in the necessity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to adapt their Holy Moscow in response to the world around them.
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Chapter 2:

Identity in Crisis: The Conflict between the Rogozhskoe Cemetery Old Believers, Tsarist Russia, and Edinoverie, 1822 - 1856

“Supporting the schism in Rogozhskoe Cemetery – is to support it even to the remotest parts of Russia, and, conversely, to weaken it in Rogozhskoe Cemetery – means to weaken it everywhere.”
-Filaret, Metropolitan of Moscow

The economic, spiritual, and influential fortune that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers experienced in the years immediately following the events of 1812 would not last. For nearly a decade, Rogozhskoe served as a beacon of the potential for a peaceful and prosperous relationship between the community and Tsarist Russia. However, by the mid-1820s, tsarist authorities and officials in the Russian Orthodox Church had become increasingly resentful of Rogozhskoe’s growing influence both in Moscow and throughout the Russian Empire. Tsarist and church officials replaced the gratitude and praise for the Rogozhskoe community’s contributions toward rebuilding Moscow structurally and economically, as well as the gradual increase in religious and political leniency since the times of Catherine the Great, with ire, suspicion, and open hostility.

Throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, and particularly during the reign of Nicholas I, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced an increasingly hostile and oppressive situation at the hands of both tsarist and Church authorities.

In the mid-nineteenth century in particular, imperial authorities such as the Minister of Internal Affairs Dmitri Bibikov, Metropolitan of Moscow Filaret, and even Nicholas I viewed state intervention and control of Rogozhskoe Cemetery as integral to bringing an end to the *raskol* itself. For much of the nineteenth century, Rogozhskoe served as a critical focal point for the relationship between Tsarist Russia and the Old Rite as a whole. The growing hostility toward Rogozhskoe Cemetery by the state and the Russian Orthodox Church initially began as a process to weaken Rogozhskoe’s influence as a priestly spiritual center. Eventually, the increased oppression by the authorities turned into a combined effort by both the tsarist government and Church to gain total spiritual and social control of the community itself as well as to reshape the community’s identity as both Old Believers and members of the Orthodox Church.

The second-quarter to middle of the nineteenth century served as a particularly challenging period for the Rogozhskoe community as one of the main weapons used by the state and Church against the community was *Edinoverie*, the state-sponsored branch of the Old Belief. *Edinoverie* gradually became the state’s attempt to create a loyal branch of the Old Rite. During the reign of Nicholas I, state support for the movement and for coerced conversion became the state and Church’s primary tactic to attack the strength, solidarity, and empire-wide influence of the Rogozhskoe community, as well as their self-identity and faith in the Old Rite.
The reign of Nicholas I, then, served as a moment in which the hostile authorities as well as the *edinovertsy*, directly challenged the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ideals and understanding of their own community as the embodiment of the Third Rome. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers resisted this external challenge by supporting the creation of a new, Old Rite Hierarchy. This chapter looks at the increase in state and Church oppression against Rogozhskoe beginning in the early 1820s and particularly under the reign of Nicholas I. It examines the combined efforts of state agencies such as the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, the Holy Synod, and especially the Metropolitan of Moscow, Filaret, who was one of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ greatest critics and transgressors. This chapter also explores how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers responded to state oppression during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. As this chapter argues, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers looked to their spiritual identity as priestly Old Believers, which ultimately led to the community’s desire to restore a Church hierarchy for the Old Rite and establish in the the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. Finally, this chapter will explore in depth the significance of the tumultuous 1850s in the history of Rogozhskoe Cemetery. During this time, the state and Orthodox Church directly challenged the Rogozhskoe community’s identity through the forced cohabitation of Rogozhskoe Cemetery with *edinovertsy*. They also began direct, state supervision of the Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the state seizure and closure of the Rogozhskoe temples.

Since the community’s founding in 1771, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers had developed their own image and practice of what their community meant to both its
members and its place within the history of the *Raskol* and Russian Orthodoxy. However, Rogozhskoe’s interaction with state authorities also played a major role in shaping and defining their experience and the ability of Rogozhskoe to present itself as a sacred recreation of pre-Nikonian Russia. As Rogozhskoe became a spiritual and cultural battleground between tsarist Russia and the Old Rite, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced a fight for not only the physical and spiritual existence of their community, but a fight for their own identity both as a community and as Old Believers.

**The Old Rite under Siege: Rogozhskoe Cemetery during the Reign of Nicholas I**

As discussed in the previous chapter, Alexander I continued many of his grandmother’s and father’s policies toward the Old Rite and, in fact, allowed for communities such as Rogozhskoe to flourish due to their strong ties to charity and merchantry. Yet toward the very end of Alexander’s reign in the early 1820s, specifically with the rise of Filaret to Metropolitan of Moscow in 1821, state agents in both Moscow and Saint Petersburg took a more active role in its attempts to intercede in Rogozhskoe’s affairs. The increased response due primarily to the lax enforcement of state and Synod restrictions on the Old Rite – particularly the restrictions placed upon Old Believers preventing the use of the Divine Liturgy in their chapels.
However, the relationship between the Old Rite and Imperial Russia dramatically changed under Nicholas I. The policies of Nicholas’ Russia from 1825 – 1855 could be reduced to an ultimatum to Old Believers everywhere: convert to Orthodoxy; adopt the terms of *Edinoverie*; or face punishment and religious restriction under the law. The Old Believers of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, in particular, served as one of the primary targets of oppression at the hands of tsarist and Church authorities during this period. Under the influence and oppressive polices of the likes of Nicholas, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow and the Holy Synod, Rogozhskoe Cemetery was a battleground to combat the Old Rite throughout the Russian Empire by means of civil and religious oppression. Tsarist Russia placed the objective of this battle as nothing short of destruction of Rogozhskoe as a religious and ideological center of the Old Rite throughout the empire.219 Throughout the second quarter of the nineteenth century Nicholas and Filaret sought any means to end the *Raskol* by enacting legislation meant to disrupt and oppress the identity and foundations of the Rogozhskoe community. Their ultimate goal was the total conversion of Rogozhskoe to *Edinoverie* or the Russian Orthodox Church.

To Nicholas, dissent from his definition of the status-quo, in any form, needed to be rooted out, wherever it existed. The Old Rite in particular was something to despise as
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it remained outside the control of both state and Church. Likewise, toleration of the Old Rite amongst leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church in the times of Platon was soon replaced with the rise of Filaret Drozdov to the post of Metropolitan of Moscow. From his position, Filaret viewed the Old Rite as divided between the loyal Old Believers of Edinoverie, and the disobedient and “dangerous” Old Believers who refused to place themselves under the authority of the Russian Orthodox Church. The tragedies experienced at the hands of the tsarist authorities for the duration of Nicholas’ reign soon forced the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to question their own standing with God, accepting Nicholas’s oppression as God’s punishment for a perceived decline in the community’s piety and morals.

In addition to the personal inclinations of Nicholas and Filaret, Rogozhskoe’s growth as a religious center of the popovtsy Old Rite throughout Russia was a significant concern for tsarist authorities. Not only did popovtsy from around the Russian Empire travel to Rogozhskoe to attend services in Rogozhskoe’s extravagant cathedrals and chapels, but they arrived for training as priests, to attend the community’s school, and even to hold wedding services. Depending on the availability of priests available at Rogozhskoe, it was not unheard of for Rogozhskoe to hold upwards of fifteen weddings a day! Similarly, as Rogozhskoe’s influence in Moscow grew in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Muscovites, including non-Old Believers, turned to Rogozhskoe for
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its charities, hospital, orphanage and almshouses rather than their Church counterparts. Rogozhskoe’s immense wealth and influence in and outside of Moscow by the 1820s, particularly that of Rogozhskoe’s merchant families, spurred jealousy amongst Church leaders and rival merchants.

This atmosphere prompted the first government action against the Rogozhskoe Cemetery in 1823 when Jacob Ignatiev, a merchant of the third guild and an “Orthodox who could not stand to witness such temptations,” informed Metropolitan Filaret that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers were openly participating in the Holy Liturgy in their chapels on January 13 and 14. Even without evidence to back Ignatiev’s claims, Filaret urged the Holy Synod and the authorities to take action against Rogozhskoe as “it would be the triumph of the raskol, and terrible for the Orthodox” if the community went unpunished for even their assumed illegal actions. Ultimately, authorities did temporally close Rogozhskoe’s churches, but, without evidence to support Filaret and Ignatiev’s claims, they soon allowed for them to reopen with a guarantee from the community that the churches would not serve the Holy Liturgy.

By 1825, then, for Filaret, and numerous state and religious authorities, Rogozhskoe was much more than a single community of dissenters. Instead, Rogozhskoe was the hub of a much larger, Old Rite network that spanned the Russian Empire and, due to the unknown nature of the Old Rite, was a potential religious, financial, and social
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threat to maintaining order throughout the empire. Under Nicholas’ regime and Filaret’s
tenure as Metropolitan, Rogozhskoe Cemetery suffered under tsarist and Church
legislation designed to weaken the Old Rite as a whole as well as face special regulations
focused solely on the community itself.

Nicholas’ earliest decrees against the Old Rite struck at the foundations and
identity of the family and community: marriages and churches. Nicholas first redefined
Old Believer marriage in the eyes of the tsarist state. First and foremost, under these new
laws, only Orthodox priests could perform marriages between Old Believers, thereby
invalidating any marriages performed by priests in the Old Rite. Anyone refusing to
marry according to Orthodox practices was now subject to the civil authorities rather than
the Synod. As Irina Paert argues, such policies all but criminalized Old Believer
marriages. Redefining the legality of Old Believer marriages created numerous
questions about the core of Old Rite families. Particularly, and as was a fear amongst the
some of the wealthy merchant families of Rogozhskoe, this brought into question issues
of legitimacy and the ability to pass wealth and property through wills. By attacking
the institution of marriage, Nicholas therefore challenged much more than an Old
Believer’s marital status, but the financial stability of wealthy families and the
community as a whole. Furthermore, by placing Old Believer marriages under the
jurisdiction of civil authorities, the state redefined its own understanding of the Old Rite
as more of a civil than spiritual threat. Following the bans on Old Believer marriage,
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Nicholas soon issued decrees directly attacking the heart of any Old Believer community’s self-image and the core symbols of their communal bonds: their churches.\(^{231}\) In 1826, and again in 1827, Nicholas approved regulations suggested by the Ministry of the Interior to prohibit Old Believers from repairing old churches or building new ones.\(^{232}\) While only legally recognized as chapels and therefore restricted to only serving Vespers, Matins, and Hours and forbidden from performing the Divine Liturgy within the structure, the church buildings still served as a foundation for Old Rite communities such as Rogozhskoe. The church represented the embodiment of the Old Rite itself in terms of its faith and the immediate community that used this holy ground. For Old Rite communities, and especially for Old Believers in urban centers like Rogozhskoe, the church structure was means to separate themselves from the outside world – ands Rogozhskoe had worked hard to make the interior of their churches an embodiment of pre-Nikonian Orthodox Christianity.

In the case of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, the community’s wealth allowed them to create some of the most beautiful and elaborate church decorations in Moscow, inspiring awe in even a few of the community’s greatest detractors, such as Nikolai Subbotin.\(^{233}\) For Orthodox spiritual leaders such as Filaret, the visible grandeur of Rogozhskoe Cemetery in elements such as its churches and priests’ vestments was cause for concern. Amongst the Holy Synod and Russian Orthodox clergy, there was a fear that the visible wealth and majesty of Rogozhskoe Cemetery would “confuse” and attract those faithful

---

\(^{231}\) Paert, *Religious Dissent*, 193 – 204.
to the mainstream church to the Old Rite.\textsuperscript{234} Forbidding repairs or building new churches directly attacked the physical image of many Old Rite communities. Furthermore, tsarist authorities eventually continued their assault on Old Rite churches by ordering all crosses removed from the exteriors of Old Rite churches.\textsuperscript{235} The new laws ensured that without joining \textit{Edinoverie} or the Russian Orthodox Church, these symbols of Old Believer piety and wealth could not create even the outward appearance of a holy site and would eventually crumble to ruins rather than the grand representations of their faith and dedication to the Old Rite. Furthermore, in the case of Rogozhskoe, it provided a means to combat both the majesty and the financial support to maintain the splendor of the community’s religious structures.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers found themselves as targets of not only empire-wide legislation aimed at restricting the rights of Old Believers but also attempts by tsarist authorities to regulate their community specifically. Of immediate concern to the likes of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Russian Orthodox Church was Rogozhskoe community’s influence both in and outside of Moscow – particularly through its various charitable institutions such as its almshouse, hospital, and orphanage.

In 1831, in order to maintain a close government presence and gather information on Rogozhskoe Cemetery (as well as the \textit{bespopovtsy} community at Preobrazhenskoe Cemetery) Nicholas approved the formation of the Moscow Secret Committee. The main task of this committee was to provide a uniform means of government and Church
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regulations involving anyone in Moscow deemed a schismatic with as acceptable a level of tolerance “as possible to guide them towards a rapprochement with the Church.”

The Secret Committee, then, would serve as the tsarist governing body over its interactions with Rogozhskoe Cemetery while taking steps to push the community toward rejoining the Russian Orthodox Church. Furthermore, in 1836, the Secret Committee established a post of superintendent of Rogozhskoe Cemetery. The superintendent’s duties included keeping census figures on the population of Rogozhskoe as well as providing monthly reports to the Secret Committee to ensure that Rogozhskoe remained within the laws – primarily ensuring that Rogozhskoe did not bring in any new priests or renovate their buildings.

Since its founding in 1771, one of the major characteristics of Rogozhskoe Cemetery was its ties to charity. While initially created to provide charity, religious services, and care for popovtsy Old Believers during the outbreaks of plague in Moscow, Rogozhskoe eventually expanded and opened its charitable influence to members outside of its immediate community. Particularly after 1812, Rogozhskoe’s almshouse grew to become one of the largest charitable centers in all of Moscow. Furthermore, as the historian E. M. Yukhimenko argues, even in the eyes of tsarist authorities, the existence of charity institutions such as Rogozhskoe’s almshouse justified the community’s necessity for churches and religious services to provide spiritual comforts for those
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staying at the almshouse. However, these were not the only means of charity provided by Old Believer merchants, as even families such as the Morozovs funded the creation of a hospital within Rogozhskoe Cemetery. As Irina Paert suggests, “Charity enhanced the status of Old Believer merchant men; it provided them with symbolic capital and created the public persona of a paterfamilias.” The concern for tsarist authorities, and particularly the Russian Orthodox Church, was that Rogozhskoe not only provided charity to Muscovites, but also took in any elderly, orphans, or the sick regardless of their adherence to the Old Rites or the mainstream Church.

Not only did the fact that the Orthodox turned to Old Believers for aid in their times of need speak poorly about the state of Orthodox charities, but caused concern that Old Believers openly proselytized to the wards of their almshouses. Through the Ministry of Internal Affairs, tsarist authorities enacted legislation through the 1830s and 1840s to regulate and restrict Old Rite charities. Tsarist authorities insisted that authorities ascertain that the wards of Old Rite almshouses and hospitals were only the genuinely ill or destitute. This meant passing regulations that restricted the ages of the wards, and the Rogozhskoe almshouse could not house anyone younger than fifty. The goal of placing age restrictions was two-fold: First, limit the ability of communities such as Rogozhskoe to potentially attract almshouse wards to the Old Rite; Second, ensure that
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the wards, particularly men, were not trying to escape other duties such as conscription to the military.\textsuperscript{243}

Of similar concern to state and Church authorities was the issue of orphans under the care of the Rogozhskoe almshouse. The primary issue regarding orphans was the need on the part of tsarist authorities to determine the age of any orphans living in Rogozhskoe, the orphan’s parentage (if possible, in order to determine if an orphan in question was born to Orthodox parents), and how to transfer any orphans to become wards of the state or Russian Orthodox Church. Beginning in 1834, and similar to the restrictions on the wards of Rogozhskoe’s almshouses, the Ministry of Internal Affairs passed regulations restricting Rogozhskoe’s orphans. Under the new laws, Rogozhskoe could not house orphans over the age of three, orphans between three and fifteen were forcibly removed from Rogozhskoe and taken to the Moscow Foundling Hospital, and any male orphans sixteen or older would be taken into the military.\textsuperscript{244}

Regulations regarding childrearing in Rogozhskoe did not end with orphans. In March 1835, under advice from Filaret and the Holy Synod, the Ministry of Internal Affairs ordered Rogozhskoe’s school closed for “teaching in the schismatic way” and all enrolled students transferred to a new means of education – noting that parents could take their child’s education upon themselves or have them sent to Orthodox or military schools.\textsuperscript{245}
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Similar to the concern with Rogozhskoe’s orphans, the Ministry of Internal of Affairs drew particular note that Rogozhskoe’s almshouse and orphanage served as a means of harboring boys who “were more or less adults” and hiding them from possible conscription. While presented as measures to prevent the Rogozhskoe community from circumventing laws that forbade Old Believers from taking in the children of Orthodox parents (seen as an attempt to “corrupt” the children), and ensure that able-bodied boys were registered for possible conscription, in its actual outcome the regulations on Rogozhskoe’s orphans and schools endangered Rogozhskoe’s identity and its future.

First, these regulations called into question the nature of Rogozhskoe’s “charity” (which was at the heart of their understandings of how best to lead a Christian life) – such regulations were designed to present Rogozhskoe’s charity as an ulterior motive to weaken and corrupt those faithful to the Church through clandestine conversions of the sickly and orphaned. Second, the closure of Rogozhskoe’s school was designed to ensure that all but the children of the wealthiest families attend tsarist schools – thereby challenging the Rogozhskoe’s community to educate the next generation of their community as they saw fit in order to preserve the community and the Old Rite.

As Nicholas and Filaret’s reigns progressed, oppression against the Old Rite, and especially against Rogozhskoe, grew increasingly more invasive and restrictive. One of the most serious blows against the Rogozhskoe community and its ties to the popovtsy Old Rite was the new state regulations regarding fugitive priests. Rogozhskoe, and likewise the vast majority of popovtsy Old Believer communities, relied on priests
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ordained in the Orthodox Church, who later converted to the Old Rite, to serve as their clergy. Since the Raskol, tsarist authorities continually sought a means to prevent Orthodox priests turning to the Old Believers. Yet it was under Nicholas that tsarist authorities took a much more active approach, forbidding Rogozhskoe from taking in fugitive priests in 1827.\textsuperscript{247} It is quite clear that tsarist authorities assumed that without any access to priests that the Rogozhskoe community would have no choice but to either join Edinoverie or convert to the Russian Orthodox Church upon the death of the last surviving priest.

However, events outside of the Russian Empire provided a grand alternative for Rogozhskoe with the founding of an Old Rite bishopric, the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, in the territories of the Austrian Empire in 1846. Rogozhskoe’s adoption of priests from the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy sparked a new wave of fury amongst government and Church leaders, especially for Nicholas and Filaret.\textsuperscript{248} For Nicholas, Austria’s permission for the establishment of an Old Rite Metropolitanate meddled in Russia’s domestic affairs. Only under increased pressure by Nicholas did Austria close the Belo Krinitza monastery and force Metropolitan Amvrossi, the founder of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, into exile in 1848. Yet the monastery reopened in 1849.\textsuperscript{249} To Filaret, Rogozhskoe’s acceptance of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, and more importantly the role played by families such as the Morozovs and the Riabushinskiis in sponsoring the Old Rite hierarchy both abroad

\textsuperscript{247} Rogozhskoe was allowed to keep any priests currently living and serving the community. However, any fugitive priests discovered in Rogozhskoe after 1827 would be forcibly exiled. This left Rogozhskoe with only five priests in 1827 and only four priests, all elderly, by 1841. \textit{SobranieMVD}, 95 and Mel’nikov-Piercheski, \textit{Ocherki popovshchini}, 215 – 17.

\textsuperscript{248} \textit{SobranieMVD}, May 13, 1847.

\textsuperscript{249} N. I. Subbotin, ed., \textit{Materiali dla istorii tak nazivaemoi avstriisko-i ili belokrinitskoi ierarkhii} (Moscow 1897), 250 – 97.
and in Russia, only proved that the authorities needed to increase their pressure on Rogozhskoe to bring the community to Edinoverie or back into the Russian Orthodox Church.

**The Path to an Old Rite Hierarchy: The Rogozhskoe Old Believers and the founding of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy**

The early 1820s proved to be a moment of unprecedented religious freedom, increased local and Empire-wide influence, and economic prosperity for the Rogozhskoe community. In return for the role that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers played in rebuilding Moscow following the events of 1812, tsarist authorities often turned a blind eye toward regulating the community. While the Holy Synod and Church authorities in Moscow resented Rogozhskoe’s burgeoning status as a religious center for the priestly Old Rite and its new status as a major social and economic influence within Moscow, secular authorities often saw little reason to disrupt the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. In the eyes of the Moscow authorities and police, any perceived threat linked to Rogozhskoe’s ties to the Old Rite appeared negligible when compared to the community’s significant economic influence.

Because of this, Rogozhskoe proved to be quite resilient in protecting its unity and identity against the increased state and Church animosity beginning at the very end of
Alexander I’s reign. The immediate impact of state interference often proved to be a moderate inconvenience for the community. For example, even after authorities investigated and found no evidence to support the claims made in 1823 that the Rogozhskoe parishioners illegally participated in the Divine Liturgy in the Church of the Nativity, tsarist authorities permitted the community to continue their way of life.\textsuperscript{250} However, adding to the same decree, the Emperor Alexander seemed to foretell of Rogozhskoe’s coming tribulations over the course of the next decades, noting to the Rogozhskoe trustees, “If they want to preserve the [Church of the Nativity] at Rogozhskoe Cemetery, then their path is to join Edinoverie, but if [the Synod] does not agree – send in the Church.”\textsuperscript{251} The Rogozhskoe trustees, however, turned away the idea of joining Edinoverie and instead pledged to not serve the Divine Liturgy.\textsuperscript{252}

One of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ key elements to protect their identity during the first decades of this trying period was the community’s close ties to an Old Rite priesthood. Rogozhskoe built much of its spiritual influence throughout the Russian Empire off of the community’s ability to attract, house, and provide its parishioners with access to priests. It would, in fact, be the Rogozhskoe priesthood that rallied the community to remain strong in their allegiance to the Old Rite and resist the advances of Edinoverie and the Orthodox Church.

Rogozhskoe’s growing economic, spiritual, and charitable influence as well as its security provided the opportunity for the community to attract priests to live and serve at

\textsuperscript{250}“Delo Sinoda 1823 g. o Rogozhskom kladbishe.” Quoted in, Makarov, \textit{Ocherk istorii}, 42.
\textsuperscript{251} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{252} Makarov, \textit{Ocherk istorii}, 43.
Rogozhskoe. Ultimately, the community did attract members of the priestly Old Rite from throughout the Russian Empire seeking the opportunity for training under Rogozhskoe’s priests, or in the hopes of serving the community as spiritual leaders. However, as was the case for many priestly Old Rite communities, Rogozhskoe’s greatest advantage in maintaining its own priesthood was the community’s ability to attract disillusioned or defrocked Orthodox priests.\textsuperscript{253}

While tsarist authorities implemented measures to punish priests for turning to the Old Rite, little could be done to punish a given community as most runaway priests maintained a mobile lifestyle and traveled between Old Rite communities. However, more prominent communities such as those found in Rogozhskoe—as well as other cities and regions with larger Old Rite populations such as Nizhnii Novgorod, Saratov, Tula, and Orenberg—held advantages, such as the ability to hide their priests amongst their larger populations (or the ability to move priests from household to household as needed). Another method to protect these runaway priests from tsarist and Church authorities commonly employed by larger Old Rite communities, and particularly by Rogozhskoe, included using the financial backing of wealthier members to bribe officials to leave their priests in place.\textsuperscript{254} Such circumstances, then, created a situation that allowed for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to attract and maintain a functioning priesthood within the community.

\textsuperscript{253}Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadcheski cent}, 21 – 22.  
\textsuperscript{254}Mel’nik-Piercheski, \textit{Ocherki popovshchini}, 211 – 13.
It appears, however, that without question, Rogozhskoe’s most influential spiritual leader of the first half of the nineteenth century was Ivan Matveevich Yastrebov. As stated by one parishioner, “Father John remained the most strong and solid in the ancient faith… with just one word, or even with a single glance, everyone obeyed him without question.”\footnote{Quoted in Makarov, Ocherk istorii, 44.} Beginning as an Old Rite priest in the diocese of Vladimir, Yastrebov arrived in Rogozhskoe in 1803 at the age of 33 and soon took on the role of abbot of the entire community.\footnote{RGADA, F. 1183, Op. 11, D. 61, 27 – 27ob.} In this role, Yastrebov enjoyed an enormous amount of prestige amongst his fellow Old Believers. Of particular note is that the community credited Yastrebov with formulating the plans to save or bury Rogozhskoe’s icons and relics in the face of Napoleon’s capture of Moscow.\footnote{Tserkov’, 1908, No. 18, 655.} Through his career, Yastrebov served not only as a spiritual leader for Rogozhskoe, but came to embody the community’s spiritual strength and devotion to the Old Rite and their ideal of their Holy Moscow in the face of the era of oppression beginning in the 1820s.
With leaders such as Yastrebov, and Rogozhskoe’s influence, stability, and economic power, Rogozhskoe’s congregation continued to grow rapidly in 1820s, thereby requiring the need for more priests. By 1822, Rogozhskoe served as the home for twelve priests and four deacons.\(^{258}\) While Yastrebov appeared as the most outspoken authority, the most senior priests at Rogozhskoe were Alexander Arseniev, Peter Ermilovich Rusanov, and Ivan Maximov.\(^{259}\) Unfortunately, many of the priests were elderly thereby requiring the community to continually seek new sources and new candidates to serve as their priests. Furthermore, Rogozhskoe’s need for priests continually returned the community to the debates regarding *Edinoverie*.\(^{260}\) Essentially,

\(^{258}\) Mel’nikov-Piercheski, *Ocherki popovishini*, 215.
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the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced three scenarios: The first option was that Rogozhskoe could accept the terms of Edinoverie, and thereby gain official recognition of their churches as legal Orthodox churches, have access to priests, and place their community under the authority of the Holy Synod. Second, Rogozhskoe could hope to use its newfound economic and spiritual influence as a bargaining tool to possibly negotiate for special terms for joining Edinoverie, such as renewing the effort for the establishment of an Old Rite Bishopric or the ability to put their own candidates forward as priests rather than accept an appointed Edinoverie priest by the Holy Synod (as described in the previous chapter). Or finally, Rogozhskoe could continue to exist as it had and seek out or provide shelter for Old Rite spiritual leaders or Orthodox priests willing to administer services in the Old Rites.

The issue of the priesthood and the ability to maintain a spiritual leadership for the community remained central to the ideal of Rogozhskoe as Holy Moscow. As E. M. Iukhimenko argues, Rogozhskoe’s prestige and identity as a spiritual center for the Old Rite was partially due to their ability to attract and maintain a priesthood in their community even while existing in plain view of tsarist and Church authorities.\textsuperscript{261} If Rogozhskoe truly was the embodiment of the community’s ideal of Holy Moscow and the period before the Raskol, then one of the greatest needs for the community was to have access to not only a stable priesthood, but also its own Church hierarchy to emulate Orthodoxy before the rise of Nikon to Patriarch. Not only would a hierarchy and steady priesthood strengthen Rogozhskoe’s ideal of its community as a return to Holy Moscow,

\textsuperscript{261}Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadcheskii tsentr}, 21 – 22.
but it would also legitimize the Old Rite and allow it to flourish throughout the Russian Empire, as it would allow for the ordination of priests for any Old Rite community that desired one.

Interestingly, Rogozhskoe’s self-identity as an Old Rite Holy Moscow was not lost on Filaret upon his appointment to Metropolitan of Moscow in 1821. It is apparent that Filaret fully understood that Rogozhskoe’s prestige, influence, and presence in Moscow proved problematic:

…the first chapel at Rogozhskoe Cemetery, as it is known, was built with government permission along with the requested almshouses, but after time they opened a chapel with a large structure and dome, the church is there to this day …, even though this capital has long been a strong hotbed for the raskol, consequently, the assumption of a pseudo-holy church of the raskol is in this place, a center near the old Orthodoxy, this would be the triumph of the raskol and more harmful to Orthodoxy than many of those churches created somewhere away from the capital at the whim of many raskolniki.\(^{262}\)

Filaret’s diatribe against Rogozhskoe proves significant on a number of levels. First, Filaret reveals his great concern with Rogozhskoe’s seemingly unchallenged influence. Second, the Metropolitan understood and feared the spiritual link between the Old Rite and Moscow as “this capital has long been a strong hotbed for the raskol.”\(^{263}\) Most importantly, however, Filaret’s letter reveals that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers successfully projected their ideal of their community as the embodiment of a new Holy Moscow beyond the audience of fellow members of the Old Rite. Filaret’s concerns

\(^{262}\) RGADA, F. 1183, Op. 11, D. 1, 8 ob – 9.
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suggest that Rogozhskoe’s variation of Holy Moscow spread outside the community. They had truly succeeded in presenting the community as a return to pre-Nikonian Orthodoxy which “would be the triumph of the raskol and more harmful to Orthodoxy than many of those churches created somewhere away from the capital at the whim of many raskolniki.” Filaret, then, specifically feared that Rogozhskoe’s desire to recreate their Holy Moscow as a direct challenge to the established Russian Orthodox Church.

Ultimately it was Rogozhskoe’s large number of priests that attracted Filaret’s further ire because it blatantly mocked Synodal and tsarist restrictions on Old Rite communities harboring runaway priests. In a letter to the Secret Committee in the mid-1820s, Filaret referenced laws passed in 1817 targeting Old Believers in Saratov as precedent for illegalizing the priesthood within Rogozhskoe. Yet most importantly, to Filaret, the presence of a strong priesthood in Rogozhskoe appeared to be the only influence preventing the community from going through a “natural” transition to Edinoverie.

Rogozhskoe’s priesthood first faced the earliest challenges to maintaining the community’s identity in the early 1820s. Under increased pressure from Filaret, the Church, and Holy Synod, and with the approval of Alexander, the Ministry of the Interior passed legislation that targeted Old Rite communities that harbored runaway Orthodox priests in 1822. The purpose of the new law essentially was to bring the end to the Old
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Believer priesthood. First, the law did allow for Old Believer communities to keep any “established” priests, so long as they had not left the Orthodox Church to escape a criminal record in another diocese. However, the law forbade any communities to take in new fugitive priests or continue to harbor “criminal” priests under the threat of penalties including fines, loss of property, the closure of chapels, or even imprisonment or expulsion for anyone harboring the runaway priests.  

Believing that without any access for Old Believer communities, such as Rogozhskoe, to obtain new priests, Filaret envisioned communities leaving the Old Rite for the Orthodox Church or Edinoverie en masse—because without priests there could be no religious life for the priestly.

Not one Old Believer in Rogozhskoe was more adamant about rejecting any compromise with the Orthodox Church than Father Yastrebov. Filaret and the Moscow Secret Committee personally viewed Yastrebov’s presence and influence as the greatest threat to his designs for the community’s conversion to Edinoverie. As noted in 1837 by the Moscow Secret Committee:

...among the dissenters of Rogozhskoe cemetery there was an expressed desire to apply to join the Glorious Church, while others remained in their long-held evils and unconformity and invited them to pray before making their final decision. They held an all-night vigil, and in the morning held a service and procession of the icons around the chapel. At the end their priest, Ivan Matveev, stood before the entire congregation and insisted that they all stand firm in their faith until the last drop of blood, and then kissed the Gospel, which was soon followed by all in attendance.
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As revealed by the account of the Secret Committee in 1837, Yastrebov remained adamant that Rogozhskoe continue to reject *Edinoverie* in favor or maintaining their spiritual and community identity. As the *edinovertsy* placed themselves under the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod, individuals such as Yastrebov realized that Rogozhskoe still needed to address the issue of maintaining their priesthood.

As the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced increasing oppression under the combined assault of Nicholas and Filaret, the dwindling priesthood became a severe concern for the community. By 1841 the number of priests at Rogozhskoe dropped from twelve in the 1820s to four, mostly due to death of elderly priests and leaving only Yastrebov, Alexander Arseniev, Peter Ermilovich Rusanov, and Ivan Maximov to serve the community.²⁷⁰ As the number of priests dwindled, Rogozhskoe’s members debated over which path to take – petition the state to allow for Rogozhskoe to take on Orthodox priests who desired to leave the mainstream Church, or to seek new terms for Rogozhskoe joining *Edinoverie*.²⁷¹ Ultimately, the decision was made by Rogozhskoe parishioners and trustees to send delegations to seek out a bishop willing to either ordain Old Rite priests or convert to the Old Rite himself.²⁷²

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers risked increased harassment and severe punishment for actively seeking a bishop for the Old Rite within the Russian Empire. The

²⁷⁰ Mel’nikov-Piercheski, *Ocherki popovshchini*, 215.
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community, particularly its wealthier parishioners, supported the search for a bishop by funding the travels of Old Believer monks living outside of the Empire. As much of the Orthodox world found itself under the control of the Ottoman Empire, Old Rite monks travelled throughout the Ottoman territory in hopes of finding and convincing a bishop unhappy with his situation living under Muslim domination. Eventually, the Old Believer monks Pavel Velikodvorsky and Alimpii Milorad, while travelling through Constantinople found Ambrose Pappa-Georgopoli, the future Metropolitan of the first Old Rite Hierarchy.

Greek by birth, Ambrose served as the Metropolitan of Bosnia-Sarajevo from 1835 until 1840. Due to Ambrose’s open encouragement for Serb insurrections against the Ottomans, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimus IV, deposed Ambrose to appease the Ottoman Sultan. Ambrose then went to live with his son’s family in Constantinople. In 1846, the monks Pavel and Alimpii arrived in Constantinople and began negotiations with Ambrose, explaining the history of the Old Rite, and asking him to become their new Church Father and establish an Old Rite hierarchy at the newly established Belia Krinitsky Monastery, founded in 1838 in the Austrian Empire by priestly Old Believer monks. Initially, Ambrose proved hesitant but eventually notified the envoys:

Yesterday, after speaking with you, I was busy thinking, what would I have to offer to you. With this thought, I prayed to God, and I laid down. But before I could even fall asleep, when suddenly appeared before me in a great holy

274 N. I. Subbotin, Istoriiia Belokrinitskoii ierarkhii, (Moscow, 1874), 378.
light and a voice said, "Why do you sweat with so much thinking. This is a great thing that God has destined you to fulfill and to aid those who suffer under the Russian Tsar." At the last word "suffer", I shuddered and looked around, but no one was visible and only light remained in the room, which gradually disappeared, just as if someone left a lighted candle. My heart turned, with fear and joy, so that in delight I spent the whole night without sleep in prayer to God, and decided to give you my full consent for if this is God's grace, and I am obliged to perform it with joy.275

On October 28, 1846, shortly after his arrival at the Belia Krinitz Monastery, Ambrose ordained two bishops, five priests, and three deacons, thereby establishing the Belokrinitskaya Old Believer Hierarchy.276

III. 7: Metropolitan Ambrose, Russkiaia Pravoslavnaia Staroobriadcheskaia Tserkov'
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Ambrose’s conversion, then, proved to be the miracle the Rogozhskoe Old Believers not only hoped for since the community’s founding, but also answered the community’s spiritual needs for the foreseeable future. With the community’s acceptance of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, then, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers filled a glaring absence in their re-creation of their ideal Holy Moscow by reestablishing their own Holy Church and ties to the greater Orthodox World. The Rogozhskoe community’s role in the founding and eventual acceptance of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy not only fulfilled the community’s desire to establish an Old Rite Church hierarchy, it also ensured that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could actively combat the increased pressure by tsarist and Russian Orthodox authorities for Old Believers to join Edinoverie. Even under threat of punishment for harboring or housing priests, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers proved more than willing to aid Belokrinitskaya priests both to serve the community and avoid detection as they remained on the move both within Moscow and throughout the Empire.  

The Rogozhskoe community proved so determined to express their ties to the new hierarchy and willingness to subvert tsarist legislation that on June 19, 1850 the newly ordained first Belokrinitskaya Bishop for Old Believers in the Russian Empire, Sophrony, secretly celebrated the services and the Divine Liturgy in Rogozhskoe Cemetery in order to celebrate the momentous occasion. But, just at the moment of their greatest triumph, the Rogozhskoe community also faced its most palpable attack from mainstream Russian society.

278 Mel’nik-Piercheski, Ocherki popovishchini, 230.
The Apex of Oppression: Rogozhskoe in the 1850s

By 1850 government officials praised Nicholas’ policies against the Old Rite as a success. The total number of converts to Edinoverie or the Orthodox Church according to officials throughout Russia totaled over one million.\(^{279}\) Furthermore, these officials claimed that only 750,000 dissenters remained throughout the Russian Empire.\(^{280}\) However, officials within the Ministry of Internal Affairs provided the more appropriate, yet still low, estimate in 1852 that the number of Old Believers living in the Russian Empire to be closer to nine to ten million.\(^{281}\) With such a vast discrepancy between estimates on the population figures of Old Believers, tsarist authorities in the 1850s knew they still faced a significant challenge in combating the Old Rite.

Furthermore, the regulations and restrictions placed on communities such as Rogozhskoe and Preobrazhenskoe in Moscow did not force these communities to completely give up their devotion to the Old Rite. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers, in particular, still prospered economically. They witnessed a new surge in spiritual influence throughout the popovtsy as Rogozhskoe acknowledged the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy as the Episcopal authority over Rogozhskoe Cemetery in 1850 and began actively transporting
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priests into the community and throughout Russia. It appeared, then, that the repressions introduced by the likes of Nicholas and Filaret failed (in that Rogozhskoe did not convert to either Edinoverie or to the Orthodox Church) in one of the most crucial and visible battles between the tsarist state and the Old Rite in Rogozhskoe Community.

However, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers still found themselves in a precarious position in regard to their priests. While Rogozhskoe families often housed and hid travelling priests belonging to the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, the community still faced the challenge of maintaining a permanent priesthood in the community. Of the priests who served Rogozhskoe legally under the law of 1827, only two remained. The relationship between Rogozhskoe and tsarist Russia came to a critical point with the death of the community’s elder priest, Ivan Yastrebov in December 1853. With only one remaining priest, Rogozhskoe petitioned the Military Governor-General of Moscow, Count A. A. Zakrevsky, for permission to bring in new priests stating “The one remaining priest, who advanced in years, cannot perform all of the duties needed in Rogozhskoe… he may die, and end the service of all sacraments and rites of worship.” However, before Rogozhskoe received any response, a series of events led to actions by state and Church officials in 1854 that would forever change Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a community both culturally and spiritually.

Early in 1854, a Rogozhskoe merchant, V. A. Sapelkin, approached Metropolitan Filaret with the offer that he and “a significant number” of other members of the
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Rogozhskoe community were ready to accept *Edinoverie* without any additional conditions. Filaret seized on the opportunity and immediately sent word to Nicholas and the Holy Synod about how best use the offer presented by Sapelkin in order to bring the entire Rogozhskoe community under the control of *Edinoverie* or the Orthodox Church. Convinced that Sapelkin spoke for a large following of like-minded individuals from Rogozhskoe, Filaret believed that Rogozhskoe’s conversion to *Edinoverie* would be a natural process once a portion of the community converted. Determining that the most effective means for introducing *Edinoverie* to Rogozhskoe was “compromise,” Filaret decided to place the new Rogozhskoe *Edinoverie* congregation directly in the community through the government confiscation of one of Rogozhskoe’s three churches. However, “to avoid any animosity or resentment toward *Edinoverie* or the *edinovertsy*,” Filaret concluded that the confiscated new *Edinoverie* church in Rogozhskoe should be the “lesser of the three” churches, St Nicholas, rather than the larger, and more richly decorated churches. With the consecration of St Nicholas as an *Edinoverie* church in September 1854, the Holy Synod, and by extension Metropolitan Filaret, now had a foothold in the physical boundaries of the Rogozhskoe community and would use their opportunity to place even greater pressure on the remaining Rogozhskoe Old Believers. However, the introduction of *Edinoverie* to Rogozhskoe Cemetery never produced the success in the community that Filaret believed it would when approached by Sapelkin earlier in the year. Rather, the new *Edinoverie* congregation numbered only
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about one hundred individuals: a small fraction of Rogozhskoe’s registered congregation of nearly two-thousand. To Filaret, the fact that the vast majority of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers not only refused to turn to Edinoverie, but turned to “abuse” and to “harass” Sapelkin and the other edinoverts was evidence that the state needed to take even more drastic action to ensure that Edinoverie had “the chance to sow good seeds in the ground of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, in where so many bad weeds have grown.”

In August of 1854, immediately prior to the consecration of St Nicholas as an Edinoverie church, the Moscow Secret Committee appointed State Counselor Mozzhakov as superintendent over Rogozhskoe Cemetery. With the introduction of Edinoverie to Rogozhskoe Cemetery, and under instructions from the Minister of Internal Affairs Dmitri Bibikov and Metropolitan Filaret to send his reports directly to them rather than the Secret Council, Mozzhakov’s primary task as superintendent was to pressure the remainder of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to join Edinoverie. Nikolai Subbotin later championed Mozzhakov as a man of “incorruptible probity, an energetic and skilled performer of any police duties entrusted to him… [who] fulfilled his duties to the government with honesty and energy.” Once in his post, Mozzhakov, and the police serving under him, relentlessly and severely persecuted anyone they believed to be harboring runaway Orthodox priests or priests belonging to the Belokrinitskaya
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Under severe harassment from Mozzhakov, the last remaining priest in Rogozhskoe, Peter Yermilov, turned to Edinoverie, leaving the larger Rogozhskoe Old Believer community without any legal priests. The situation, then, for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was dire. As argued by Nikolai Subbotin, “Deprived of the last permissible priest, and the loss of access to new priests [from the Belokrinitskaya Metropolitans], Rogozhskoe Cemetery completely lost its religious character and its significance in the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy.” With the loss of the last, legal priest in the Rogozhskoe communities, parishioners now faced the choice of accepting Edinoverie or risk challenging the laws (and inviting Mozzhakov’s persecution) to take in and hide priests to conduct services in private homes. Therefore, Yermilov’s defection disrupted and challenged not only the religious life of the Rogozhskoe community, but the community’s self-identity as a physical recreation of the ideal Christian community devoted to the Old Rite.

Filaret and Nicholas’ apparent victory with the introduction of Edinoverie not only split the Rogozhskoe Old Believers in their understanding of their faith and community, as was the intent of tsarist officials, but also Rogozhskoe’s use of physical spaces as well. The edinovertsy, who once belonged to and helped fund and establish the structures used by the Rogozhskoe community demanded equal use and access to institutions such as the almshouse, hospital, and even disputed ownership of private buildings. Most importantly, the demand for equal access by the edinovertsy directly
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challenged the Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s definition of both public and sacred space. The greatest concern for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was a guarantee for the protection of what they viewed as either a boundary or as sacred – specifically any structure, icon, etc. that was accepted as owned by the community as a whole. Ultimately, however, the dispute over the definitions and use of public or private spaces allowed tsarist authorities to take even greater direct control in the affairs of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers.

The main dispute between the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and the edinovertsy concerned roughly fifty buildings constructed in the first quarter of the nineteenth century (prior to the government ban on the construction of new buildings by Old Believers), located in the southern portion of Rogozhskoe’s territory, adjacent to the Church complexes. Due to the restrictions on repairing buildings, many of the structures were dilapidated, yet the fight over ownership to the buildings in question drew the attention of Mozzhakov and the authorities since a number of the buildings housed wards of the almshouse and other charities of the community. The main discrepancy over the status and rights to usage of the structures was whether or not members of the Rogozhskoe community could provide proof of private ownership rather than communal ownership since the state did not recognize private property as part of Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Tsarist authorities intervened in the dispute primarily for two purposes: support for the edinovertsy and to increase pressure on the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to convert; and to
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display the state’s direct authority over Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Due both to the passage of time since their construction and that the owners of many of the structures in question left the buildings to the Trustees of Rogozhskoe Cemetery in wills, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could provide little proof of ownership for the structures to deem them private property. Ultimately, after two years, the Moscow Secret Committee ruled all of the structures in question public property and soon transferred control of twenty-two of the buildings to the Edinoverie congregation and ordered the rest destroyed. For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, losing control of these structures to the edinovertsy proved that the state and Church would intervene and forcefully redefine the ideas of public and private property—and secular and sacred spaces—within Rogozhskoe. However, eventually tsarist authorities would prove that they could also attempt to redefine the livelihoods of many of the Rogozhskoe Old Believer merchants as well.

The number of wealthy Old Believer merchant families that made up the Rogozhskoe community guaranteed that Rogozhskoe maintained a well-endowed financial foundation for generations. The Rogozhskoe merchant families never hid their ties to the Old Rite as the merchants proudly wore their beards and traditional garments in public. To tsarist authorities, then, the Rogozhskoe Old Believer merchants were by far the most visible and public target they could use to increase the oppression against Rogozhskoe as a whole. In October 1854, Nicholas placed new restrictions on the manchery, requiring that all merchants must register as members of the Orthodox Church or as part of Edinoverie by the start of 1855. Such a law struck straight at the
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heart of not only the Rogozhskoe community as a whole, but also was a direct attempt on the part of tsarist authorities to force each individual Old Believer merchant to redefine themselves and their ties to their faith and how it affected their livelihood as merchants.299

Such a move on the part of tsarist Russia seemed critical to the future of Rogozhskoe Cemetery as the merchants now had to choose which characteristic defined them more: were they more devoted to their lives as merchants, or determined to remain loyal to their Faith and the Old Rite and potentially lose all rights and privileges of their class? For Filaret the answer was clear as he proclaimed the ultimate victory of Edinoverie in March 1855 noting that from the passage of the law, and particularly in the last days of December, a grand total of 1,451 Rogozhskoe Old Believers joined Edinoverie.300 However, Filaret did acknowledge that the number of converts quickly overwhelmed the Rogozhskoe edinovertsy priests, thereby preventing the proper conversion or registration of many of the recent converts.301 Yet, in the end, Filaret was willing to overlook such facts and assumed that under combined pressure of the mass “conversion” and Mozzhakov’s oppressive restrictions and arrests of any of the “Austrian priests”, it was only a matter of time before the rest of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers converted to the Russian Orthodox Church or join Edinoverie.

299 Subbotin, “Iz istorii..”, 456.
300 Metropolitan Filaret, “Pis’ma k ober-prokuroru 4 marta 1855,” Sobranie mnienie i otsivov Filareta, mitropolita Moscovskago i Kolomenskago, po dielam pravoslavnoi tserkvi na Vostokie vol. 4, (Saint Petersburg, 1888), 8. Similarly, Alfred Rieber notes that between 1828 and 1855, roughly 350,000 Old Believers converted to either Orthodoxy or to edinoverie, yet he explains any precise number of merchant converts cannot be provided due to the difficulty of maintaining accurate records on the Old Believers. Rieber, Merchants, 141 – 42.
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However, with Nicholas’ death in March 1855, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers looked upon the reign of the new Tsar, Alexander II with hope for an end to tsarist oppression against their community. It was not long before the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sent petitions directly to Alexander and the Military Governor-General A. A. Zakrevski requesting that the state oppression against the community, specifically the ban on Rogozhskoe finding new priests, end and went on to detail the abuses experienced under Mozzhakov.  In response, Filaret claimed in a letter to the Holy Synod, and with some visible disgust, that the petitions did not reflect the true situation at Rogozhskoe:

It is an exaggeration to say that the written petition of the dissenters is not only false, but also unconscionable…. To collect these signatures, there had to be a great gathering of dissenters from the city and country, or they sent agents to the villages to get fellow dissenters to sign the petition. No good can come from such a rally by the schismatics, but to a similar effect, is it any less troubling that such a gathering was concealed from the government?

However, Filaret’s attempts to downplay the police’s, Church’s, and Mozzhakov’s abuse of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers did not sway his counterparts in the Secret Committee. Citing Mozzhakov’s hostility toward the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, Zakrevsky denounced Mozzhakov and, with approval from Alexander, removed him from his post based on Mozzhakov’s “suspicious nature, restless bile, and proving to be not only incapable, but even harmful as a demon… creating ceaseless claims and insults to put the

---

302 Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 35.
303 Filaret, Sobranie mnienie vol. 4, 45 – 47.
schismatics against themselves and against the government.”

Mozzhakov’s replacement, Mikhail Longinov, proved to be much more lenient toward Rogozhskoe, often siding with the Rogozhskoe Old Believers against the edinovertsy in the latter’s continued attempts to lay claim to more of Rogozhskoe’s property – much to the ire of the likes of Filaret. It appeared, then, that the darkness of Nicholas and Filaret would lift and a new age with endless possibilities, even possibly Rogozhskoe’s rebirth as the spiritual center for all popovtsy, under Alexander was at hand. In the immediate months after the appointment of Longinov, and also the more open policies of the Ministry of Internal Affairs under Sergei Lanskoi toward Rogozhskoe Cemetery, it appeared that the authorities would allow the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to rebuild their community spiritually and physically. Yet the Rogozhskoe community still did not receive permission from tsarist authorities to house new permanent priests, or to hold full services in their churches. Eventually, in 1856, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers received permission from Zakrevski to worship in their churches. The momentous return of religious services to Rogozhskoe led to a huge gathering of Old Believers in Rogozhskoe for services on January 21 and Sunday, January 22, 1856. The gathering only celebrated Matins, Hours, and Vespers with no special celebration or other disturbances.
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However, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers still had many enemies in both the tsarist government and the Russian Orthodox Church. In a letter dated January 30, 1856 a monk by the name of Parfeni composed a public letter claiming to witness much more than a peaceful gathering of faithful Old Ritualists:

We here in Moscow, the children of the One Holy Apostolic Greco-Russian Church of Christ, suffered a great, barely survivable anguish, as the Rogozhskoe schismatics offered up their great service in their chapel on 22 January, some simple peasants, and all the worshiping congregation, openly and brazenly mocked the Orthodox, especially those edinovertsy, who last year acceded to the Holy Church.  

While later proven that Parfeni never witnessed the events at Rogozhskoe\textsuperscript{307} the response to the claims against Rogozhskoe drew extreme criticism from the Holy Synod and Church leaders such as Filaret and Nikanor, the Metropolitan of Novgorod, St. Petersburg, Estonia, and Finland. Eventually, the rumors against Rogozhskoe mutated to claims that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers openly rioted against the edinovertsy and even subverted the law by performing the Holy Liturgy.\textsuperscript{309} Filaret in particular pounced at the opportunity to strike, once again, at the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. Writing to the Holy Synod on February 16, 1856, Filaret argued that all toleration toward Rogozhskoe needed to cease, stating that “Supporting the schism in Rogozhskoe Cemetery – is to support it even to the remotest parts of Russia, and, conversely, to weaken it in Rogozhskoe

\textsuperscript{307} “Pis’ma k gospodinu NN” Quoted in, Iukhimenko, Staroobriacheskii tsentr, 36.
Cemetery – means to weaken it everywhere.”

While initial investigations by authorities in Moscow revealed that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers neither rioted nor violated any laws, these events reshaped the community for the remainder of the nineteenth century.

Ultimately, the outcry against Rogozhskoe forced Alexander to intervene as he called for the formation of the Saint Petersburg Secret Committee to consider the best means to respond to the claims against Rogozhskoe and to “curb any possible criminal activities of the Rogozhskoe schismatics.” The committee consisted of nine members, six of which (mostly the clergy representatives) ruled to immediately close Rogozhskoe’s chapels. The only dissenters, Minister of State Property Count P. D. Kiselev, Minister of Internal Affairs Lanskoi, and Secretary of State Count V. N. Panin, first suggested continuing a proper investigation of the claims against Rogozhskoe. Later, they sided with the majority but offered a compromise to only seal Rogozhskoe’s altars. However, the ultimate decision in the matter was Alexander’s who sided with the decision to close Rogozhskoe’s churches completely, stating “priests at Rogozhskoe Cemetery are not and will not be tolerated; if they will not join the Orthodox Church or Edinoverie then they do not need altars or services.”
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On July 7, 1856, the Moscow police sealed the Rogozhskoe Old Believer churches.\(^{315}\) While the Saint Petersburg Secret Committee did begin a full investigation and found no evidence to support the claims against Rogozhskoe, even going so far as to chastise Metropolitan Filaret for falsifying his claims and creating unnecessary conflict,\(^{316}\) the churches remained sealed until 1905. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers were now left without their sacred temples. The action on the part of the tsarist authorities thereby forced the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to redefine their understanding of the holy place and how their new Holy Moscow could exist without a proper physical embodiment of their faith. Once again, the community would need to adapt as it maintained its goals of maintaining Holy Moscow and living a proper Christian life.

### Conclusion

The second quarter to the middle of the nineteenth century proved to be a period of trials and tribulations for Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the community’s self-identity, but with certain landmark triumphs. On one hand, this period proved particularly brutal as tsarist Russia and Rogozhskoe Cemetery came to direct conflict over not only the definition and identity of Old Believers, but also issues concerning the public, the private, and the sacred. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers found many willing enemies, particularly
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\(^{316}\) Reproduced in: Makarov, Ocherk istorii, 52.
Nicholas I and Metropolitan Filaret, who deliberately intruded and forcibly challenged the ideals that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers created for their community. Yet even in the face of oppression, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought to find a means to preserve their identity as the ideal, priestly Old Believer community. Furthermore, it was during the period of oppression that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers decided to take drastic action to ensure the survival of their priesthood through the creation of an entirely new, Old Rite Orthodox Church through their support for and vital role in helping to found the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. However, possibly the greatest tragedy for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers in the nineteenth century was the closure of their churches – the heart of the whole community. However, even as oppression against the Old Rite and Rogozhskoe Cemetery increased many Old Believers did not give into state demands for their conversion. As the Rogozhskoe Old Believers came to terms with the loss of their churches, they realized that they would once again need to redefine their understanding of how their community could embody and recreate their understanding of Holy Moscow.
Chapter 3:


The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ adoption and support of the Belokrinitzkaya Hierarchy in the mid-nineteenth century provided the foundations of an Old Rite Orthodox Church. The creation of a Moscow archbishopric in 1853 only furthered Rogozhskoe’s desires to fulfill their spiritual needs with their own hierarchy. However, the forced introduction of Edinoverie into Rogozhskoe Cemetery, the confiscation of Rogozhskoe buildings for the edinovertsy, the sealing of the Pokrovskii and Nativity altars in 1856, and increased government control over the use and displays of the community’s spiritual life and sacred spaces severely restricted the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ability to express the spiritual aspects of their Holy Moscow.

With such restrictions, the Rogozhskoe community needed to find a way to use their spirituality as a means to both maintain their ideal community and its unity to prevent conversion to the edinovertsy and Russian Orthodox Church. During the second half of the nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers responded to these challenges through two primary means. First, the Rogozhskoe community rallied around its ties to the Belokrinitzkaya Hierarchy as a means to maintain their ties to an Old Rite church and clergy to serve as spiritual leaders. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers also found
spiritual unity in their eventual success in establishing their own Russian Old Rite Metropolitanate. Second, this period also witnessed an increased role for the laity in the community’s affairs internally and externally through interaction with the tsarist state. While Rogozhskoe’s more affluent and successful business and merchant families still remained in high regard and held various leadership positions within the community, the general parishioners themselves ultimately became much more vocal and took on a much more participatory role in the community itself.

In turn, in meeting these spiritual needs of the community, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers reshaped their own interactions and views of their Holy Moscow in greater Muscovite and Russian society. Rather than serve solely as an Old Rite Third Rome, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought to use their spirituality in their daily lives and serve as an ideal Christian community to Old Believers and non-Old Believers alike. Their Christian ministry would be especially important in the social, economic, and political turmoil created by the introduction of the Great Reforms, emancipation of the serfs, and Russia’s drive to industrialization.

As before the period of oppression under Nicholas I, the Rogozhskoe community sought to use their skills, capital, and charity as a means not to flaunt their success but to present their ideal of a greater Christian and Orthodox society to stand against the corruptions of Western capitalism and Western industrialization. Ultimately, with such goals in mind, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers strengthened the spiritual embodiment of their recreated Holy Moscow in the face of the uncertain and chaotic period of the late nineteenth and first years of the early twentieth century.
This chapter explores Rogozhskoe’s response to the sealing of their temples and the impact made on the community’s internal, spiritual questions about their identity and their understanding of their Holy Moscow. It primarily explains how Rogozhskoe maintained its identity as a religious center for the priestly Old Rite in Moscow and the Russian Empire through the incorporation, funding, and support for the Belokrinitskaya Old Rite Hierarchy. Second, this chapter explores how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers responded to the dramatic period of the Great Reforms. Particularly, it explains how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers ultimately played a major role in efforts to incorporate their own community into the Great Reforms. Furthermore they also sought to incorporate the entire Old Rite into the greater drive for social, political, and religious reform throughout the empire. Third, this chapter looks at how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers maintained, presented, and rebuilt their ideals during the period of reforms in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century primarily through an increased public presence through patronage and philanthropy as well as a strong emphasis on the community’s loyalty to tsarist autocracy.

In the Era of Reform, then, the greatest challenge for the Rogozhskoe Old Ritualits, was to find a means to not only maintain their sense of community, but also find a way to redefine their Holy Moscow in light of the opportunities provided by the tsarist reforms. Spiritually, this included the ability to solidify the community’s place within the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy as the spiritual center for the new Old Rite Church in Russia. Yet the Rogozhskoe community also took the opportunities presented by the Great Reforms as a means to create a stronger link between their Holy Moscow and the
tsarist state by reaffirming the community’s dedication to philanthropy, patronage, and insistence on the community’s loyalty to the autocracy.

A New Church Hierarchy and an Ideal Community: The Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their Faith, 1853 – 1904

One of the greatest challenges created by the civil and religious repression against the Old Rite and Rogozhskoe Cemetery was the community’s ability to maintain its influence as a spiritual center for priestly Old Believers in Moscow and throughout the Russian Empire. The loss of their school, the eventual deaths of their elderly priests and illegality of finding new priests, as well as the increased tsarist presence in Rogozhskoe Cemetery, severely limited Rogozhskoe’s ability to reach out to other Old Believer communities and attract visitors and pilgrims as Rogozhskoe did in the first half of the nineteenth century. However, Rogozhskoe’s role in both aiding the foundation of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in the Austrian Empire and bringing in, housing, and funding travel of the newly ordained Old Rite priests and bishops in Russia allowed Rogozhskoe Cemetery to play an even greater role in the spiritual lives of priestly Old Believers.

Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s ties to the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy provided another means for the community to both maintain their spiritual community and practice their faith. One of the most important things that the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy provided to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was access to a clergy by ordaining priests in the Old Rite at the Belaya Krinitsa monastery in the Austrian Empire, since such action was illegal in
Russia. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers relied on their ability to clandestinely bring-in and house priests amongst the community’s wealthier members who used their social influence, or their financial wealth to bribe officials or the police to avoid detection by tsarist authorities. Yet, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers began questioning their own place within this Old Rite hierarchy. The Rogozhskoe community, then, predominately focused on two main issues. First was the concern regarding the hierarchy as both a substitute source of priests (instead of continuing to take in defrocked or runaway Russian Orthodox priests) and the hierarchy’s legitimacy within the greater Orthodox and Christian world. Second, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers began questioning their own place within the hierarchy itself, primary around the question of why did their community remain reliant on foreign Metropolitan to appoint their bishops and guide the spiritual life of their community instead of their own, Russian Old Rite bishop. These issues, then, forced the Rogozhskoe Old Believers into a series of internal spiritual debates concerning both the place of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy within the community’s identity as well as Rogozhskoe’s own place within Christendom.

In the mid-nineteenth century Rogozhskoe’s continued financial and spiritual support for the Belaya Krinitsa monastery in Austria allowed the community to play a significant role in developing the new hierarchy in the Russian Empire, as Rogozhskoe Cemetery became a stopover for Old Rite priests as they traveled from one community to
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the next. However, in order to expand the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, its new Metropolitan, Kirill, consecrated three Russian archdioceses in Vladimir, Kazan, and Moscow (based in Rogozhskoe) in 1853. Yet due to the heightened oppression against the Old Rite and Rogozhskoe Cemetery in the 1850s, the Old Rite archdiocese of Moscow remained vacant and under Metropolitan Kirill’s direct authority—who in turn recognized the newly ordained Bishop Antonii Shutov as Archbishop of Vladimir and the hierarchical authority of all Old Believers in Russia.

Born Andreii Shutov and raised in Kolomna into the Russian Orthodox Church, Antonii joined the priestless Old Rite Norskii Monastery in Starodub after the death of his father in 1828. However, needing to support his elderly mother and unhappy with monastic life, Antonii traveled to Moscow and came to work and befriend the Guchkov merchant family. This connection eventually gained Antonii recognition amongst the Preobrazhenskoe Cemetery Old Believers as he served as the community treasurer for seven years. After his time in Preobrazhenskoe, Antonii eventually returned to the Norskii Monastery and took his monastic vows. However, increased persecution against Old Believers in Starodub influenced Antonii to leave Russia for the Klimoutskii Monastery in Austria, very near Belaya Krinitsa. The close proximity to the Belaya Krinitsa monastery brought Antonii into contact with one of the monastery’s most
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\[\text{\footnotesize 319} \text{ In an attempt to both appease and encourage Nicholas I’s aid to put down the revolutions of 1848, Austrian authorities initially closed the Belaya Krinitsa Monastery and forced Metropolitan Ambrose into exile. However, the monastery reopened in 1849 with Kirill Timofeev as the new Metropolitan of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. However, while Kirill served as Metropolitan, Ambrose still played a significant role as a spiritual council and adviser for the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy until his death in 1863.}\]
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influential monks, Pavel Velikodvorski, who also played a vital role in convincing Metropolitan Ambrose to leave the Greek Orthodox Church for the Old Rite. After months of debate over the errors of the priestless views on clergy, Pavel eventually convinced Antonii to join the Belaya Krinitsa monastery in 1852. Following his appointment as Archbishop of Vladimir, Antonii immediately returned to Russia to begin ordaining priests to meet the spiritual needs of Old Believers throughout the Empire.\footnote{Ibid. and “Pervii moskovskii arkhiepiskop Antonii (Shutov).” \textit{Tserkov’}. 1907, No. 1. 23 – 24.}

With a 12,000 ruble reward for his capture and arrest, however, Antonii, relied heavily on the Rogozhskoe Old Believers for protection from authorities and spent most of his time in or near Moscow hiding amongst Old Believer families disguised as a failed businessman in Moscow to work off his debts.\footnote{Ibid.} Antonii’s difficulties, in turn, allowed him to establish a close personal relationship with the Rogozhskoe Old Believers as he ordained priests and held services for the community in secret.\footnote{Ibid.} Antonii’s position as an Old Rite Archbishop, his ability to provide spiritual services and priests, and his close relationship with the Rogozhskoe community and ties to Moscow, then, made Rogozhskoe Cemetery the de facto center of the belokrinitsky Old Believers throughout the Russian Empire in the 1850s. However, Antonii’s authority remained limited as Metropolitan Kirill still remained as the only bishop permitted within in the new Church to ordain new bishops, thereby making Antonii and Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s spiritual
authority within the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy still subject to Kirill in the Austrian Empire.\textsuperscript{324}

However, in the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ desire to prove their loyalty to the Russian Empire, part of the community questioned their own ties and spiritual subjugation to a \textit{foreign} Metropolitan.\textsuperscript{325} Furthermore, Kirill’s appointment of his own deputy and closest advisor, Onuphrius (Parusov), to serve as Archbishop of Moscow in 1861 (against Rogozhskoe’s expressed wishes) further angered the Rogozhskoe community who desired to elect their own, \textit{Russian} bishop, to serve the community and Russian Old Believers directly rather than continuing to rely on Kirill in Austria.\textsuperscript{326} With this, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also felt the need to legitimize their new Church hierarchy spiritually as part of both the Old Rite and Russian Orthodoxy as a show of their loyalty to their faith.

Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe community needed to resolve two major shortcomings in meeting the spiritual expectations of their Holy Moscow: First, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to respond to the continued criticisms by both the Russian Orthodox Church and other Old Believers, specifically the \textit{bespopovtsy}, who questioned and attacked the new hierarchy’s legitimacy. First and foremost, the

\textsuperscript{324} Antonii’s predecessor and first Old Rite bishop in Russia, Sophronii of Simbirsk (appointed as the Bishop of Simbirsk in 1849), attempted to create his own Old Rite hierarchy by ordaining his own bishops and naming himself Metropolitan of Moscow. However, Sophronii attracted few followers and Kirill excommunicated him and his bishops for simony in 1853. This eventually led to Kirill’s decision to create three Old Rite archdiocese for Russia and place Antonii as the Archbishop of Vladimir with spiritual authority of all Belokrinitski Old Believers in Russia while the archdiocese of Moscow remained under Kirill’s authority. N. I. Subbotin, “Istoriia tak nazivaemogo avstriiskogo, ili belokrinitskogo, sviachenstva,” in, \textit{Bratskoe Slov’}, 1895, Vol. II, 299.
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argument on the part of the priestless Old Believers was that any formal Church hierarchy ceased to exist in the immediate years following the raskol as many of the clergy who rejected the Nikonian reforms were imprisoned and usually killed for heresy thereby bringing an end to the last, legitimate Christian hierarchy. Second, to the priestless, the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy mirrored the events of the raskol in that the hierarchy itself was a foreign influence in Russian Orthodoxy – not only was its founder, Ambrose, Greek, but the Belaya Krinitsa monastery was located in the Austrian Empire. Ultimately then, beginning in the 1850s, a wave of apocalyptical writings spread throughout bespopovtsy communities throughout central and southern Russia proclaiming that the appearance of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and their clergy finally signaled the impending End Times and Antichrist’ attempt to corrupt the Old Rite disguised as an attempt to restore a full Church hierarchy for the Old Believers.

The second major shortcoming that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers hoped to resolve was that they felt that their role in founding, funding, and aiding the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy required that the Archdiocese of Moscow finally receive its own bishop. In the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ eyes, this bishop should have equal clerical authority with the Metropolitan of Belaya Krinitsa with the ability to ordain bishops and establish new bishoprics within the Russian Empire. Ultimately, then, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to legitimize their new hierarchy against continued criticism and shortcomings saw the community both redefine their understanding of their
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place within the Old Rite movement and led to Rogozhskoe Cemetery establishing itself as the unquestioned spiritual authority of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in Russia.

The result of the gathering of the “Rogozhskoe Spiritual Council,” the publication of the “Okruzhnoe poslanie Rossiiskikh arkhipastirei Belokrinitskoi ierarkhii” (or, “The Encyclical of Russian Archbishops of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy”) on February 24, 1862 proved to be a major turning point in the history of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, the Old Rite, and the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. Authored by one of Rogozhskoe’s librarians and celebrated dogmatists, I. G. Kabanov under the pseudonym “Xenos,” the Okruzhnoe poslanie legitimized the authority and sanctity of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy through two key themes. The first half of the Okruzhnoe poslanie directly responded to the criticisms against the Old Rite hierarchy by criticizing and pointing out the scriptural errors of ten popular apocalyptical writings against the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy that appeared in the mid-nineteenth century. The Okruzhnoe poslanie denounced all of the works as “false and fabulous works... dangerous corruptions of scripture” serving to “stumble gentle and guileless children of the Church.”

Particularly, “Xenos” noted that the priestless Old Believers’ criticisms were not based in scripture but rather their own contempt toward clergy in general stating, “Such obscure and ridiculous sophistry is maliciously planted in the darkened conscience of the priestless and inconspicuously painted the minds of these Christian people, in their simplicity, to where they cannot distinguish the truth from falsehood.”
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However, the second half of the Okruzhnoe poslanie proved to be the most controversial and important for defining Rogozhskoe’s spirituality and understanding of their Holy Moscow in the history of Christianity and Orthodoxy. Following his denunciation of the apocalyptical writings, “Xenos” provided ten detailed explanations of the spiritual legitimacy of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy by explaining the spiritual foundations for the universality and eternity of the priesthood and placing the Old Rite in the universal dogmas of Orthodoxy and Christianity.

The Holy Orthodox-Catholic Church and the priesthood will continue to the end of time and until the Judgment of the Lord… The current dominant Russian Church, as well as the Greek one, do not believe in a different God, but are in communion with us: “The Maker of Heaven and Earth, of all things visible and invisible” [The Creed]. They believe in the Holy Trinity, consubstantial and undivided: the Eternal Father, the Eternal Son and Holy Spirit. [Their priests] take confession and teach about Christ’s redemption for the deeds of mankind. They honor and celebrate the same holidays as us on the same old calendar: Christmas, the Epiphany, the Crucifixion, the Burial, the Resurrection, and the Lord’s glorious ascension into heaven, and the other holidays of the Immaculate Virgin and the holy saints. They honor and pray to the holy icons of images of Christ with the writing of his names: IC XC. They kiss the holy and miraculous icons, saints’ relics. And with these all clearly prove, that they believe in the one, same, and true God as us, with us confess Christ…So while there was born schism and discord, we are still children of the one holy, catholic, apostolic, ancient Orthodox Catholic Church.  

However, what proved to spark the greatest controversy was the Okruzhnoe poslanie’s apparent attempt to reconcile the Old Rite and the Russian and Greek
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Orthodox Churches. In the attempt to legitimize the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and its reliance on former Greek and Russian bishops, “Xenos” seemingly dismissed many of the Old Rite’s core rituals and symbols, such as the use of two fingers to make the sign of the cross, the use of pre-Nikonian spelling in liturgy and scripture, and the use of eight-pointed crosses. While these issues played a significant role in the very cause of the raskol, “Xenos” presented them as secondary issues when compared to Orthodox dogma and spirituality and were yet another just another part of the universality of the Christian Church. First, the Okruzhnoe poslanie explained the history of the use of different spellings of names and terms in Orthodox scripture, pointing out that by 1646 the Old Rite spelling of Jesus (Isus’) and the “Greek” spelling (Iisus’) were, in fact, used interchangeably in Russian spiritual texts. Furthermore, “Xenos” pointed out that all Orthodox Churches used the same spelling (IC XC) in their icons, regardless of their pronunciation and that, “Thou name Iisus’ carries the name of God and there is no given name of the enemy of Christ.” The Okruzhnoe poslanie also explained the confusion over the use of two or three fingers in the sign of the cross as based more on tradition as ancient Christian texts varied on the dominance of one form over the other. The Okruzhnoe poslanie also dismissed Old Rite issues with the use of non-Byzantine Crosses, noting that:

“The image of the Cross is not the image of the Antichrist and is not a godless idol, and is not an abomination by standing in the holy places, as noted in the evil notebooks, but the image of the Cross is the image of Christ, from the
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days of the Apostles to the present day the Cross is acceptable to the Orthodox-Catholic Church.”

Ultimately, the message created by the *Okruznoe poslanie* clearly reveals the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ understanding of their Holy Moscow in the history of Christianity and Orthodoxy.

From the *Okruznoe poslanie*, it can be argued then that “Xenos” viewed the creation of the Belokrinitetskaya Hierarchy as mirroring the original Baptism of the Rus’. Just as Vladimir borrowed and introduced Orthodoxy to the Russian people with the aid of Greek priests, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers too “borrowed” Ambrose from the Greek Church to reestablish a legitimate Orthodox hierarchy for Russian Old Ritualists and thereby recreate a hierarchy for the Old Rite’s Third Rome. Showing their approval for the *Okruznoe poslanie*, Archbishop Antonii and the Russian Belokrinitetskaya Bishops, and priests of Moscow all signed and endorsed the document.

However, the *Okruznoe poslanie* and Antonii’s endorsement created confusion and division within Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the Belokrinitetskaya Hierarchy. Antonii’s supporters (who became known as *okruzhniki*) viewed the *Okruznoe poslanie* as a demonstration of Rogozhskoe’s spiritual authority in defining dogma for the Belokrinitetskaya Hierarchy in Russia. Caught off guard by such a proclamation of beliefs, Russian Orthodox theologians such as the historian N. I. Subbotin, and N. Popov, questioned whether the *Okruznoe poslanie* represented Rogozhskoe’s true desire to
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return to the Russian Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{337} However, the \textit{Okruzhnoe poslanie}’s opponents (the \textit{neokruzhniki}), led by Onuphrius, saw the document as heresy against both the Old Rite and the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. The primary disagreement amongst the \textit{neokruzhniki} was that they believed that the \textit{Okruzhnoe poslanie} negated many of the concerns that were central to Old Rite identity, such as the issue over the sign of the cross and spelling in liturgical books. Furthermore, the general consensus amongst the \textit{neokruzhniki} was that they argued “Xenos” appeared as a Russian Orthodox apologist who dismissed the nearly two centuries of persecution against the Old Rite at the hands of the Russian Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{338} As debate between the two sides continued, the \textit{neokruzhniki} soon appealed directly to Kirill to intervene in Rogozhskoe Cemetery.\textsuperscript{339}

Hoping to restore spiritual and hierarchical order in Rogozhskoe Cemetery, Kirill arrived in Moscow in January 1863 and openly denounced the \textit{Okruzhnoe poslanie}. However, shortly after Kirill’s arrival, the Polish Uprising put both the \textit{okruzhniki} and \textit{neokruzhniki} into action to see Kirill not only dismissed from Moscow, but relinquish his authority in Moscow and Russia out of fear that his presence would draw the ire of tsarist authorities who viewed him as a foreign, “heretical” bishop and thereby undermine Rogozhskoe’s attempts to prove their loyalty to the state, as described later, in order to obtain greater attention in the Era of the Great Reforms.\textsuperscript{340} Even though the a small majority of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers presented themselves as \textit{neokruzhniki}, with
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such pressure from his supporters and opponents alike, and desiring a means to restore spiritual harmony, Kirill found himself with little option but to meet Rogozhskoe’s demands for a bishop elected by a Rogozhskoe Spiritual Council. Furthermore, Kirill also guaranteed that the elected Archbishop would also carry the authority as the Archbishop of all Old Believers within the Russian Empire and have the ability to ordain and consecrate new bishops and dioceses. Ultimately, Kirill hoped that his concessions, combined with the large numbers of neokruzhniki in Rogozhskoe, would guarantee Onuphrius’ election as Archbishop of Moscow.

However, a stunning turn of events only enflamed Rogozhskoe’s spiritual situation and the issue of the Okruznoe poslanie. First, as a sign of his support and recognition of Kirill’s authority and “his desire to restore peace in the Church,” Antonii renounced his support for the Okruznoe poslanie. However, Antonii did still urge that the Belokrinitskaya bishops in Russia, and particularly Rogozhskoe Cemetery, did need to establish a closer, and more positive relationship with the Russian state. Antonii’s new position on the Okruznoe poslanie and his understanding of the political, civil, and religious situation of Old Believers in Russia undermined Kirill’s desires as the
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Rogozhskoe Spiritual Council elected Antonii as the new Archbishop of Moscow and All Russia in 1863.\footnote{With Antonii’s election, his old position as Archbishop of Vladimir became part of his jurisdiction in Moscow until 1876 when Vladimir was placed under the authority of the Bishop of Nizhny Novgorod and Kostroma. “Pervie godi suchestvovania Belokrinitskoj ierarkhii,” 106.}

While the majority of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers celebrated Antonii’s election, the conflict between the okruzhniki and neokruzhniki proved to be far from over. Appalled by Antonii’s election, the response of some of Rogozhskoe’s most ardent neokruzhniki and Metropolitan Kirill threw Rogozhskoe and the Belokrinitskaya

\textbf{Ill. 8}: Antonii, Archbishop of Moscow and All Rus’ and deacon, 1870s, Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadicheskii tsentr}, 92.
hierarchy into further disarray as they refused to acknowledge Antonii’s election. Instead, Kirill reclaimed his authority over the Moscow diocese and reinstated Onuphrius as Archbishop while declaring Antonii and all okruzhniki heretics.\footnote{Ibid.} However, as Antonii’s election revealed his level support amongst the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, Kirill’s actions, in fact, backfired and resulted in the decision of the council of Russian Belokrinitskaya bishops to expel the Metropolitan from Moscow, and ordered him to return to the Belaya Krinitsa monastery and to cease interfering in the affairs “of all foreign bishops.”\footnote{Ibid., 106 – 07.}

Even though Antonii agreed to not abide by and made no attempts to enact the dogmas of the Okruzhnoe poslanie, Rogozhskoe’s new Archdiocese and rebirth of their Holy Moscow still remained in spiritual turmoil. Kirill, Oruphrius, and their neokruzhniki supporters demanded Antonii’s removal and refused to acknowledge his authority. Ultimately, then, Kirill excommunicated Antonii and his supporters. With a new contest for the legitimate Archbishop of Moscow, Antonii and Kirill both sought a final decision in the matter directly from the exiled Metropolitan Ambrose in October 1863.

Even while on his deathbed, Ambrose’s council and decision would determine Antonii and his supporters’ spiritual and hierarchical legitimacy or return Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the Archdiocese of Moscow and All Russia to Kirill. Yet, Ambrose only added to the state of confusion as on October 25, 1863, Ambrose heard arguments from
Kirill’s supporters and in turn issued his decision to side with the neokruzhniki and called upon Antonii to give up his office. However, two days before his death, in a letter dated October 28, 1863 Ambrose’s fully acknowledged not only Antonii’s legitimate election to Archbishop of Moscow and All Russia, Ambrose also fully acknowledged and supported the Okruzhnoe poslanie while denouncing Kirill for his “deceptions” in regard to the document. As stated in Ambrose’s letter to Antonii:

I gave all my consideration of the rules and teachings of the Holy Fathers and do not find [the Okruzhnoe poslanie] against doctrine… I beseech that all of you responsible for the message through the admission of your pen, will not overturn it. I agree with all the humility of our fraternity and fasten you all to act bound by your signatures. And that you teach this as a blessing…. I, the humble, Metropolitan Ambrose, ask all of the Sanctified church for forgiveness for wrongfully giving my approval for Metropolitan Kirill’s message, as I am at such a great distance, I did not hear or know about this case…But upon arrival of your ambassadors to me, who personally and verbally explained all of your actions and I could see that that he (Kirill) deceived me….And by this, I destroy and renounce all of my signatures to Kirill. And as for the “Okruzhnoe poslanie,”…every Christian can understand and should be convinced that it is nothing harmful to the Holy Church. And for my part I acknowledge the “poslanie” as it is very helpful, and thank all of those who labored on it and the unity and shared opinion of the bishops. Please continue to remain in agreement and abide by these sacred canons unquestionably and unshakable.

With his final act, Metropolitan Ambrose’s open support for Archbishop Antonii and the Okruzhnoe poslanie seemingly established an autonomous Russian Old Rite Church with
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Rogozhskoe Cemetery as the seat of the Archbishop of Moscow and All Russia.
Furthermore, Ambrose’s support also saw the vast majority of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers give their support for both Antonii and the Okruznoe poslanie and thereby providing a dogmatic and spiritual foundation for their new Holy Moscow and new Church.

However, Ambrose’s decision did not mean an end to the spiritual divide between the okruzhniki and neokruzhniki or between Moscow and Kirill. Dismissing Ambrose’s final letter as a forgery because of its completion so close to Ambrose’s death, Kirill took steps to reaffirm his authority. In July 1864, Kirill once again excommunicated Antonii and ordained a Belaya Krinitska monk, Antonii Klimov, as bishop of Moscow for the neokruzhniki.351 However, due to Klimov’s failure to combat the okruzhniki’s growing popularity Kirill eventually reversed his excommunication on Antonii and the okruzhniki in 1869. The following year, Kirill also dismissed Klimov and declared his own support for the Okruznoe poslanie in order restore peace within the Old Rite Church.352

The full support from the Belaya Krinitsa Metropolitan did not completely heal the spiritual divide within Rogozhskoe Cemetery as those who refused to accept either the Okruznoe poslanie or Antonii’s authority joined the ranks of the beglopopovtsy Old Believers who continued to accept runaway priests from the dominant Russian Orthodox Church. However, the debates over the Okruznoe poslanie proved to be far more significant to the Rogozhskoe community’s ability to achieve their ideal Third Rome.
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After nearly a century of maintaining a semblance of a church hierarchy by taking in former Orthodox priests, Rogozhskoe Cemetery was now home to the head of the entire Russian Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, then, their new Holy Moscow moved closer to reality as the community took on a new role as the spiritual center of an Old Rite Church Hierarchy.

**Maintaining Holy Moscow in Rogozhskoe Cemetery, 1856 – 1905**

As throughout Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s history, the community’s parishioners and its clergy took their idea of Rogozhskoe as a Third Rome Holy Moscow to heart. This view instilled a sense within the Rogozhskoe Old Believers a duty to present this image and reality both to members of the community and the rest of Muscovite and Russian society. The civil, social, religious, political, and economic reforms of the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, presented new opportunity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to redefine their understanding and definition of their Holy Moscow as well as their presentation of their ideal Christian community.

One of the key elements of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ideal of their Holy Moscow was the role of the general population of parishioners. This remained a constant throughout Rogozhskoe’s history, and as described in the introduction reflected a common characteristic of the laity’s significance in both the Russian Orthodox Church
but particularly amongst the Old Rite. However, Rogozhskoe had two key factors that shaped the community’s ability to organize itself and the role of its parishioners.\textsuperscript{353} First, the community’s official recognition as an Almshouse and charitable foundation granted the community the right to hold elections for community leaders, the Rogozhskoe Trustees. Second, Rogozhskoe Cemetery maintained an active population of clergy, and as previously described eventually served as the spiritual center for the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in all of Russia.

However, the legal and spiritual restrictions placed on Rogozhskoe’s clergy, that Old Rite clergy and the Belokrinitskaya hierarchy remained illegitimate under civil and spiritual law, required that the Rogozhskoe parishioners participate both in such affairs as community organization and participate in the community’s spiritual affairs and decisions. As witnessed in numerous Orthodox, Old Believer, and sectarian communities in Late Imperial Russia, it therefore was up to the Rogozhskoe laity to ensure that their community remained in compliance with all laws and restrictions both domestically and religiously to the satisfaction of both tsarist and Russian Orthodox authorities.\textsuperscript{354}

The Rogozhskoe laity vested their trust and authority through direct election of their trustees. During the selection of the trustees, parishioners initially voted for
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members of an election committee. Following the demands of the Ministry of the Interior Alexander Timashev, this process changed in 1869 in which only parishioners who owned property in Moscow elected a committee of thirty members of the community to elect the trustees.\footnote{RSL. F. 246, K. 2, Ed. 2, L. 26 – 26v, and K. 2, Ed. 5, L. 97 – 98.} In turn, this committee then elected Rogozhskoe’s trustees who served for three years.\footnote{Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadecheski tsentr}, 63 – 64.} The election of community leaders remained an important part of the Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s understanding of their Third Rome. The trustees were to embody the community’s core ideals: devotion to the Old Rite; devotion to Rogozhskoe Cemetery; successful personal lives in terms of their businesses or relationships with the authorities; and, the ability to properly express the community’s ideals of Christian charity and Christian community. Through their election, then, the trustees took on the community’s trust to guide Rogozhskoe Cemetery both domestically and spiritually to maintain their Holy Moscow.

As the trustees often became the primary intercessors between Rogozhskoe Cemetery and tsarist authorities, the community relied on the election of two trustees to represent and protect Rogozhskoe’s worldly and spiritual interests. Under the new terms of 1869, and with the community’s spiritual matters determined by the new Belokrinitskaya clergy and the Rogozhskoe spiritual board, the community limited the trustees’ authority “exclusively and purely to economic actions” to maintain Rogozhskoe’s symbols of their Holy Moscow – their sacred spaces and almshouses.\footnote{RSL. F. 246, K. 2, Ed. 5, L. 141 – 43.}
With each election, the Rogozhskoe trustees took it upon themselves to not only use community funds to maintain the community but often used their own private wealth for restoration projects as a sign of their gratitude for their election.\textsuperscript{358} For example the merchants Dmitri Osipovich Milovanov and Peter K. Melnikov served as trustees for the periods from 1873 – 1876 and 1882 – 1885 –, two periods coinciding with Rogozhskoe’s renewed hope of state reforms for the community and the Old Rite. As a reflection of this mood, Milovanov and Melnikov used their personal finances to fund extensive restoration and repairs of Pokrovskii Cathedral and its icons.\textsuperscript{359} For their part in restoration of Rogozhskoe’s sacred spaces and icons, Milovanov and Melnikov became two of the community’s most celebrated trustees and in a community thanksgiving address both were recognized:

\begin{quote}
Elected by the parishioners of Rogozhskoe Almshouse, your services as trustees will always be remembered. For your selfless work for the benefit of our community, your care for the beautification of the Church of God and the beautification of the cemetery, and for your high respect for your true Christian love of peace we thank you for your pious care for the public good.\textsuperscript{360}
\end{quote}

The community then awarded Milovanov and Melnikov icons of St. Peter and St. Dmitri Donskoy bearing commemorative plaques to be placed in Pokrovskii Cathedral in their honor.\textsuperscript{361}
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Even city authorities such as Prince Dolgorukov took great interest and pride in the Rogozhskoe’s trustees’ efforts for their community. When Ivan Butikov announced that he would not accept reelection as a trustee in 1878 in order to prepare his son to take over the family textile empire, both the community and Dolgorukov urged him to reconsider:

I regret very much that you would refuse election, and I hope that this is not your final word. You have great influence with the people…. You have done a lot of good for the [Rogozhskoe] community, you have ensured that the people remained safe, and when I confided in you, you always spoke to me sympathetically. You sacrificed for the Serbs, for the wounded, and for the fleet in the last war. No Sir, I beg you to stay and continue to serve your community and society.

While Butikov still turned down reelection, the community’s and Dolgorukov’s appeal reveals the influence that effective trustees held with the Rogozhskoe Old Believers.

As seen, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers placed great value on their trustees’ ability to promote and embody their Christian and community ideals. All trustees made great efforts to ensure that the Rogozhskoe almshouse and sacred spaces remained proud physical and ideological examples of their Old Rite Holy Moscow. Under the instructions for Rogozhskoe’s trustees, the primary concern for the trustees was to maintain the Rogozhskoe almshouse. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers placed such a strong emphasis on the trustees’ control over the almshouse simply because throughout Rogozhskoe’s history, even during the height of oppression in the mid-nineteenth
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century, Rogozhskoe’s almshouse justified the existence of the community’s temples and the right to hold religious services to provide spiritual comfort to the wards of the almshouse.\textsuperscript{363} However, by the end of the nineteenth century, the almshouse and medical facilities (all constructed out of wood in the first quarter of the nineteenth century) required extensive restoration and repair.\textsuperscript{364}

In order to maintain the almshouse, the Rogozhskoe trustees often appealed to the community itself to fill the financial needs of the almshouse through charity. As revealed by Rogozhskoe’s accounting, throughout the end of the nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers not only donated increased amounts of money to their almshouse, but also spent more money to update and maintain their facilities as well. For example, in 1873, community donations for “the construction and improvement of the cemetery’s almshouse” totaled 20,808 rubles and 89 kopeks, of which the community spent 14,784 rubles and 31 kopeks.\textsuperscript{365} Remaining funds were often invested in banks, bonds, and deeds.\textsuperscript{366}

By 1872 the Rogozhskoe almshouse remained the largest in Moscow, housing 558 people (83 men and 475 women) and continued to grow to house 730 people (114 men and 616 women) by 1877 of which the elderly and infirm made up the majority.\textsuperscript{367} Only four stone buildings made up part of the fifty-eight buildings of the almshouse.\textsuperscript{368}

Furthermore, as almshouses did not fall under the same legal and religious restrictions as

\textsuperscript{363} Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadcheskiy tsentr}, 71.
\textsuperscript{364} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{365} RSL. F. 246, K. 2, Ed. 5, L. 186 – 186ob.
\textsuperscript{366} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{367} RSL. F. 246, K. 3, Ed. 3, L. 68ob and 79
\textsuperscript{368} Ibid., L. 68
Old Believer chapels, each building of the almshouse contained its own iconostasis and the right to conduct specific church services such as Matins and Vespers – a right that was not removed with the sealing of the Nativity and Pokrovskii Cathedrals. Therefore, as the almshouse not only played a significant role in defining the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ public identity, it also played a role in the community’s spiritual identity to allow the almshouse wards and members of the community the ability to fulfill their spiritual needs.

Because of the almshouse’s size, amenities, and age, then, trustees displayed their commitment to Rogozhskoe’s community ideals of their Holy Moscow by renovating and improving the almshouses. One of the most visible means to maintain the almshouse and its prestige was to update and rebuild buildings rather than simply funding simple maintenance. However, Old Believers the community still needed permission from tsarist authorities to complete any major renovations or construction projects. Yet due to the Rogozhskoe almshouse’s notoriety, in the second half of the nineteenth century the community often found little or no resistance to their requests, even receiving permission in 1881 to replace a number of their more dilapidated buildings with a single, stone-building with running indoor plumbing and built-in hot water supply. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers ability to renovate and modify their almshouse also allowed the community to care for increased numbers of wards: registered dependents in the Rogozhskoe almshouse numbered 726 people in 1880, 828 people in 1882, 882 people in 1885,
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peaked at 934 people in 1888, and remained steady around 900 people until the end of the century.\textsuperscript{371}

Furthermore, the finances for the Rogozhskoe almshouse, at the turn of the century reveal both the level of financial success and the increased emphasis on charity amongst the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. Specifically, by 1889, the almshouse’s accounts totaled 173,498 rubles, of which charitable donations accounted for 74,005 rubles.\textsuperscript{372} By 1904, the estimated total of the Rogozhskoe almshouse’s assets and donations equaled 626,462 rubles.\textsuperscript{373} For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, then financial success provided both the opportunity and a sense of need to use their gains to spread their ideals and to further build their Holy Moscow as a bastion of Christian spirituality and Christian charity.

Along with the need to maintain the almshouse, one of the most important aspects of Rogozhskoe’s ability to uphold and display their Holy Moscow was through maintenance of their temples. However, legislation in place since 1826 forbade any repairs to any Old Believer religious structure that held any form of religious service, meaning that Rogozhskoe’s Pokrovskii and Nativity cathedrals approached fifty-years without any maintenance. Fortunately for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, by the 1870s their close relationship with Moscow authorities occasionally allowed the community to undertake restoration projects within their cathedrals. One such example being the
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restoration projects led by the trustees Milovanov and Melnikov from 1873 to 1874 discussed earlier. During this period, the crosses, 363 icons, and their covers and other vestments in Pokrovskii were all cleaned, “corrected,” and varnished or protected with linseed oil. The cathedral also underwent roof and floor repairs.  

Restoration remained a focus for the trustees and community throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century. For example, Rogozhskoe’s Nativity cathedral underwent extensive interior renovations from 1887 to 1890. During this time, all of the cathedral’s frescoes and walls were washed and restored along with the cathedrals’ iconostasises, gilding, and crosses. In total, the cathedrals’ 438 icons and images alone amounted to 3,530 rubles for restoration and 2,365 rubles for restoration of the cathedral’s wall murals. Eventually, Pokrovskii cathedral also underwent extensive restoration of its interior frescoes, murals, and restoration and repair of structural damage beginning in 1897. Ultimately, the restoration of Pokrovskii’s icons, walls, its iconostases, other vestments and decorations, and structural repair totaled nearly 60,000 rubles.

Charity and Philanthropy, 1856 – 1905

In the second half of the nineteenth century the Rogozhskoe Old Believers expressed their ideals of Christian community and Christian charity through two major means: investment (through expansion of their own businesses, factories, or providing
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loans for those wishing to start up new businesses) and donations or almsgiving to charitable institutions. Rogozhskoe’s wealthy families had long practiced both investment and charity throughout Rogozhskoe’s history. Yet the Great Reforms and their resulting social changes, particularly the growth in peasants arriving in Moscow following emancipation, only created greater opportunity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to share their Christian ideals on the use of capital (and expand their own businesses) by opening larger or new factories to provide work and wages, or donating to almshouses and hospitals. Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers efforts to either provide work or charity to the needed served the purpose of maintaining their ideal that they were the champions of Holy Moscow and the embodiment of Christian charity by placing greater emphasis on “living not for wealth, but for God.”

A major factor in Rogozhskoe’s expansion of its charity and patronage was the passage of administrative reforms for Moscow. While reforms such as the Municipal Statute of 1862 and Municipal Reform of 1870 allowed the merchantry to play a more active role in Moscow’s administrative bodies, non-ediniovertsy Old Believers still could not hold public office and therefore could not participate in the new governing bodies. However, the Ukaz of May 3, 1883, discussed in greater detail below, granted the right for all Old Believers to hold minor public offices in city and parish administrations (with both state approval and agreeing to having an Orthodox assistant), thereby allowing some
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of Rogozhskoe’s merchantry to participate in city administration and politics on some scale. However, while a number of edinovertsy Old Believer families such as the Khludovs and Guchkovs looked to advance themselves politically during this period, Rogozhskoe’s wealthy families increased their efforts to share their ideals of Christian charity and community economically, socially, and politically.

Rogozhskoe’s wealthiest members’ charitable efforts reached both within and outside of Rogozhskoe Cemetery. The municipal reforms of 1862 and 1870 created greater opportunity, and increased demand, for the Moscow merchantry to provide charitable donations directly to the new Moscow administrative bodies. The Moscow civil administration’s new ability to collect, allocate, and use its own charitable funding inspired a significant increase in donations for numerous charitable projects such as social welfare, medical assistance, and public education. Displaying their sense of Christian duty to provide for the needy, many of Rogozhskoe’s wealthiest families donated millions of rubles through the end of the Imperial Era to fund charities for their fellow Muscovites. Kozma Soldatenkov was one of the more prominent individuals who embodied Rogozhskoe’s charitable efforts for the good of Moscow. Upon his death in 1901, Soldatenkov bequeathed 2,081,581 rubles to the city of Moscow for the construction and maintenance of a free hospital for Moscow’s poor. Soldatenkov also donated 20,000 rubles to the Arnoldo-Tretyakov School for the Deaf, and over 67,500
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books (estimated at nearly 51,000 rubles) to be donated to Moscow schools and libraries.\footnote{386} 

By the 1890s, Rogozhskoe, as well as many of Moscow’s merchants, witnessed a generational change as the older generation of merchants who made their fortunes and maintained their livelihoods in the pre-Reform Era made way for their sons in the management of the family business and wealth.\footnote{387} This younger generation matured during the Great Reforms and often obtained their educations from European tutors or studied at the premiere university in Europe.\footnote{388} The direct exposure to European educations and culture did influence a number of Moscow’s merchant youth into adopting aspects of European culture, dress, and customs.\footnote{389} However, as noted even by one of the older generation’s critics, Prince Vladimir Petrovich Meshcherskii, the Old Believer merchants had little trouble combining their European educations and values with their religious and cultural ideals of their faith:

“[they] sent their sons to be educated in Bremen or Liverpool… these sons returned to the family nest with the faith of their fathers unshaken and brought back with them from England together with a superb knowledge of how to run a factory another conviction: relying on the Quakers and Dissenters in general, they said, ‘Why cannot people like us with our own religious beliefs not enjoy freedom at home.’”\footnote{390}
Eventually these sons would take over their family businesses with new ideas on how to use their family wealth in order to both advance their own influence, but also maintain and champion their ideals as Old Believers.

As Alfred Rieber argues, the younger Moscow merchants, and particularly Old Believer merchants, were able to combine their new European values and educations to become better businessmen without compromising their faith and ideals.\(^{391}\) As Rieber states, “Unlike the bulk of the merchantry [the Old Believers] were morally armed to resist interference by the bureaucracy and the police… they did not abandon their ethical norms and cultural identity but rather transferred them from [their] religious communities to the Great Russian people.”\(^{392}\) As the younger generation of Old Believer merchants took more prominent roles in managing their family businesses and finances, they too also brought with them the desire to use their wealth to express the ideals of their faith and Christian charity.

G. N. Ulianova explores this increased drive for charity amongst the Moscow and Old Believer merchantry and sheds light on the phenomenon amongst the Old Believer merchantry that the accumulation of wealth was a sin that could only be offset through charity. Of particular note, in her article “Not for Wealth but for God,” Ulianova places strong emphasis on the use of donations for commemoration of an individuals’ legacy. Rogozhskoe Old Believers such as Kozma Soldatenkov, and families such as the

\(^{391}\) Rieber, *Merchants and Entrepreneurs*, 147
\(^{392}\) Ibid., 143.
Morozovs often used charitable donations to commemorate either their own lives or of deceased loved ones.\footnote{Ul'ianova, “Not for Wealth but for God,” 46. One of the largest donations made to Moscow’s Old St. Catherine Church was by Sergei Timofeevich Morozov in memory of his younger brother Savva who died under mysterious circumstances while travelling in France in 1905 as described in T. P. Morozova and I. V. Potkina, Savva Morozov, 167 - 99}

**The Rogozhskoe Old Believers and the Era of Reform**

As described in the previous chapter, the increased oppression against the Old Rite in the 1850s greatly strained the Rogozhskoe community’s unity and self-identity, along with their ability to maintain their understanding of their Holy Moscow. Events such as the forced introduction of the *edinoverstsy* into Rogozhskoe cemetery and the state’s sealing the Rogozhskoe altars directly attacked the community’s understanding of their ability to champion their own Holy Moscow.

However, as the Russian Empire took its earliest steps into the era of the Great Reforms, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, too, hoped to reap rewards from change. Yet Rogozhskoe’s early attempts to sway Moscow and tsarist officials “in the spirit of reform”\footnote{Ibid.} to reopen their temples’ altars always met resistance from the Russian Orthodox Church. Filaret and his supporters in the Holy Synod still staunchly defended their convictions that it would only be a matter of time before the Rogozhskoe hold-outs
either converted to edinoverie or to the Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{395} It is clear that Filaret hoped to use Rogozhskoe’s piety against them in the long run: so long as Rogozhskoe’s temples remained closed and civil authorities actively restricted the community’s access to spiritual leaders, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, Filaret believed, could not maintain their ties to the Old Rite.

However, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers took to using private homes for their services, allowing for small groups from the community to come together in some of the wealthier merchants’ homes, such as those of Ivan Shibaev and K. T. Soldatenkov. However, such a situation forced the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ spiritual ties to their Holy Moscow to become a private expression rather than public expression of the piety of the Old Rite. Furthermore, as Old Believers, group expression and the community’s shared experience, and ability to practice their faith as a group, maintained many communal bonds to both their identity as Old Believers and Rogozhskoe’s understanding of its new Moscow.\textsuperscript{396} Such a situation, then, threatened not only Rogozhskoe’s spiritual unity, but also the very fabric that held Rogozhskoe together.

Most importantly, however, by restricting services to private homes the decree of 1858 still forbade the reopening of the Rogozhskoe altars. The heart of Rogozhskoe’s Third Rome remained sealed with no clear sign that they would ever reopen. This would prove to become one of the most important aspects in the relationship between the

\textsuperscript{395} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{396} Many other religious communities faced similar situations over questions and concerns regarding public and priavet forms of spiritual expression. See for example, Breyfogle “Prayer and Politics of Place,” Paert, Old Believers, Religious Dissent and Gender, and Peter Waldron, The End of Imperial Russia, 1855 – 1917 (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997).
Rogozhskoe Old Believers and Tsarist Russia for the next fifty years. So long as their altars remained sealed, thereby preventing the Rogozhskoe Old Believers from using their sacred space to openly practice their faith, the Rogozhskoe community could not meet the full potential of their ideal Third Rome. Therefore, as will be described, for the second half of the nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe leaders made it of the utmost importance to make reopening, or at least preserving, the altars and their treasures the ultimate goal of their interactions and relations with tsarist officials. Through this fight for their sacred space, the issue of public and private expressions of the Old Rite, then, became a central challenge not only for Rogozhskoe’s existence within the Russian Empire, but also a challenge to the very identity and unity of the community itself.

In response to these challenges the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, it can be argued that the community needed to answer and respond to two major questions: First, how could the ideal and identity of Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a sacred, Old Rite Holy Moscow persevere for the community as a whole? In response to this question, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to prevent a shift in the community members’ understanding of sacred spaces. Specifically, what needed to be answered was how could Rogozhskoe leaders prevent community members from viewing their private homes or private chapels as more sacred than Rogozhskoe itself – how could the Cemetery hold its position as sacred ground?

Second, with the inability to publically express their faith, or use the physical representations of Rogozhskoe’s sacred spaces in the community’s cathedrals, how could Rogozhskoe leaders maintain unity rather than seeing more of the community convert to
**Edinoverie?** Even as the Russian Empire reformed politically, socially, and economically it did not appear as though the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could expect a sudden change in their fortunes. First, Metropolitan Filaret continued his relentless harassment and persecution against the community and still urged the police and tsarist authorities to exile any priests, and the families harboring them, to snuff out any potential non-edinovertsy and non-Orthodox spiritual activity within the community.397 Second, the Rogozhskoe edinovertsy controlled and *actively used* the St. Nicholas Cathedral for their services while Pokrovskii and the Nativity Cathedrals’ altars remained sealed and in disrepair.398 Finally, even though in 1857 the Saint Petersburg Secret Committee determined that the claims against the Rogozhskoe Old Believers that led to the closure of the altars proved to be both slanderous and false, they refused to overturn their (and Alexander’s) decision to close the altars.399 In the face of such opposition, Rogozhskoe leaders needed to find a means to maintain the unity and identity of the greater community—to prevent more members from joining the Rogozhskoe edinovertsy or the mainstream Church.

The state’s refusal to unseal the Rogozhskoe altars, even after numerous “witnesses” retracted their accusations that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers committed any illegal actions, only confirmed that the community remained in a fight for its very existence. Furthermore the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, particularly its merchantry, quickly realized that their size and economic influence only offered a limited amount of
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leeway with Moscow and tsarist authorities in order to maintain and receive which favorable treatment they received such as the allowance of private services.

Rogozhskoe’s trustees and community leaders soon came to a single realization: as during Rogozhskoe’s early years under Catherine the Great the community, again, needed to redefine its place and self-identity both spiritually and within the Russian Empire. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to not only unify but now come to some understanding of how their community still represented their ideals and continued to serve as some semblance of the Third Rome in the face of the loss of their cathedrals and Russia’s rapidly changing society, economy, and politics. Even during this tumultuous period for the community, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers used the new economic, political, and social developments to their greatest advantage to place a greater emphasis on their self-identity and understanding of the Rogozhskoe Old Rite as the true embodiment of the Third Rome Doctrine and the very idea of Christian charity and philanthropy.

First and foremost, it was during this period that the Rogozhskoe community made the reopening of their cathedrals their top priority: the community still desired to maintain and provide sacred ground for its members. The problem was how to obtain the proper permissions from tsarist and Orthodox authorities. Some in the Rogozhskoe community refused to believe that their situation was the true will of the Tsar. Rather, as stated in anonymous pamphlets distributed throughout the community in the late 1850s and into the 1860s, Alexander II’s decision to close the altars and his successors’ refusal
to reopen the altars was due more to misinformation passed on by dishonest tsarist authorities and the Church officials:

In January 1856, the highest command allowed us to arrive in our churches to worship again. But in February of the same year, the missionary heriomonk Parfenii made up false slander against us, claiming that the occurrence of a public service in the temples made the Rogozhskoe cemetery and the raskol tempting for the Orthodox, even though there was no conflict with the Orthodox. And Filaret, the Metropolitan of Moscow, was not ashamed by this obviously false libel and provided it on his own behalf in the Synod and to the emperor, and so deceived the good king and father of the Russian people. And at his highest command before the investigation on July 7 in 1856 our altars were sealed. In March 1857, when by imperial order an investigation was assigned to look into the accusation, then as a result the missionary Parfenni appeared and positively renounced his shameful slander, and other witnesses confirmed and denounced the injustice that the altars still remain sealed. It can be assumed that the results of the investigation were not submitted to the superior view [of the Emperor]. We believe that if the good Emperor Alexander II, learned of this trick that you would not fail to remove these seals.\textsuperscript{400}

As the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought any outlet to appeal to the Tsar and other authorities, petitions such as this eventually became a vital tool for the community’s attempts to achieve greater social and spiritual freedom.

The ultimate result was a new emphasis on Rogozhskoe’s relationship directly to the Tsar and therefore the Russian Empire as a whole. Under Nicholas, the state and Church equated Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its members as a haven for heretical and disloyal subjects: heretical for their ties to the Old Rite and disloyal for their role in the

\textsuperscript{400}RSL, F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 50.
support for and spread of what tsarist and Church authorities viewed as the Austrian Belo
Krinitsy Old Rite Hierarchy. 401 Petitions during this period, then, often fell on deaf ears –
finding only rare support amongst few government individuals such as Mikhail Longinov
and Sergei Lanskoy.

However, Rogozhskoe leaders such as Ivan Shibaev, Peter Melnikov, Timofei
Morozov, and Kozma Soldatinkov came to realize that the community’s predicament was
not only due to religious intolerance and jealousy of Rogozhskoe’s economic and social
influence, but also preconceived notions about Rogozhskoe and the Old Rite by their
Orthodox counterparts. One such notion that Shibaev in particular sought to combat was
the Old Rite and its views of the Tsar – specifically the Old Believer notion of the tsar as
antichrist. 402 In the Era of Reform, under the influence of leaders such as Shibaev, the
Rogozhskoe Old Believers came to view the Tsar not as Antichrist, but as Russia’s
benevolent ruler who, like the Rogozhskoe community, was a victim of lies and other
misinformation at the hands of corrupt civil and Church officials. 403

As described earlier in Chapter 1, Rogozhskoe often sought and expressed their
gratitude for the favor of the Tsar, fully realizing that their community and influence
relied on maintaining a cordial relationship with key tsarist and other civil authorities.
However, the Saint Petersburg Secret Committee’s refusal to conduct full investigation
into the claims against the Rogozhskoe Old Believers 404 leading to Alexander’s decision

401 See for example the works of one of Rogozhskoe’s major critics the professor, N. I. Subbotin and his
work Istoriia Belokrinitskoj ierarkhii.
403 RSL, F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 50.
404 For details see, Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 38 – 45.
to close their altars suggested that the Tsar acted based on the inaction and intolerance of intermediaries. Therefore, the fact that the Rogozhskoe altars remained sealed was more due to the biases, jealousy, and malice of civil and Church authorities purposely betraying the Tsar to falsely portray Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its community as a danger to Russian religious life.

Rogozhskoe during the second half of the nineteenth century, then, can be placed within the greater context of “tsar-batiushka” mindset of the Russian populace. Better described as “naïve” or “popular monarchism” by historians such as Daniel Field, the idea that the tsar was the batiushka, or “benevolent father” of the people maintained that the Tsar always remained sympathetic to the sufferings of the oppressed; however it was the nobles and other authorities who corrupted any of the Tsar’s attempts to alleviate the peoples’ suffering. As Field argues in his work Rebels in the Name of the Tsar, in the mindset of the Russian peasantry and other oppressed classes, “The myth [of the tsar] held the promise that the tsar would deliver the narod from oppression, but it also laid the blame for this oppression on the tsar’s officials.” Fields goes on to highlight that, in fact, such sentiments occasionally led to civil disobedience and popular uprising not against the tsar’s policies, but to enact the tsar’s true will against the oppressive nobility and authorities.405

It was during this period, in contrast to the social and political confusion of late nineteenth-century Russia, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought to prove their loyalty to the tsar and portray themselves as grateful subjects in a time of turmoil. Guided by

leaders such as Shibaev and Soldatenkov, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers took on a new understanding and sense of shared victimization with the Tsar. Alexander II and his successors all became part of Rogozhskoe’s new understanding of their shared experience with the tsars. However, unlike their counterparts amongst the peasantry, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized that civil disobedience would only aid Rogozhskoe’s enemies in their claims against the community. In the minds of Shibaev and others, Rogozhskoe now needed to find a means to circumvent the malice of their detractors and attract the attention of the Tsar and the highest government officials to provide a more positive portrayal of Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its community. Primarily under Shibaev’s direction, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers utilized two key methods in their new approach to finding common ground with the tsars, their families, and closest advisors in Saint Petersburg and Moscow: petitions and displays of loyalty to the tsar and state.

**Petitions**

Petitions directly to the tsar and other authorities were by no means new for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. As shown in the previous chapters, Rogozhskoe had both successes and failures when using petitions to receive permission to meet some need of the community – the most notable successes being the very permissions for founding the community as well as the right to build stone cathedrals. However, following oppression under Nicholas I and the state’s closure of the altars, Rogozhskoe’s trustees and other leaders viewed the need of directly petitioning the tsar, his family, and closest advisers as
tantamount to alleviating their current plight at the hands of the edinovertsy and further abuses from the Synod and the likes of Metropolitan Filaret.\footnote{Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 46 – 47.}

As Imperial Russia entered the era of the Great Reforms, Rogozhskoe remained hopeful that it was only a matter of time before the tsar interceded to address the restrictions in place against the community and the Old Rite as a whole. However, despite Alexander’s “highest approval” in 1863 to then Minister of Internal Affairs P. A. Valuev to consider revisions to all statuettes concerning Old Believers, reform for the Old Rite moved slowly than Rogozhskoe and other Old Believer communities desired.

Furthermore, there had been no progress between the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and tsarist authorities on addressing the issue of Rogozhskoe’s altars. Nearing the twentieth anniversary of the altars’ closure in 1874, some Rogozhskoe members’ concerns moved from regaining control of their cathedrals to simple preservation of the cathedrals and their treasures. Realizing that time, not religious intolerance, was the greatest enemy to their sacred spaces at the moment, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers petitioned Alexander directly to allow them to rescue their sacred icons and other relics:

On the orders of the local administration the altars at the chapels were sealed with all of their sacred treasures, icons, gold and silver utensils, the Gospels in their rich coverings and vestments stored inside. One of the altars, is the altar of the heated temple,\footnote{Due to its smaller size, the Nativity Cathedral served as the Rogozhskoe community’s heated or “winter” cathedral as it proved easier and less expensive to heat in winter than the larger Pokrovskii Cathedral.} heated from inside by two furnaces, now left without heating for the duration of 18 years, the temple and its holy, rare, and ancient icons and other items have been subjected to dampness and damage- and the Old
Believers, gather in their chapels for prayers, condemned with a serious sense of inexpressible grief with the daily contemplation of the gradual destruction of their cherished shrines... without reopening the temples, we can neither save our churches, nor escape the ruin and damage of the temple’s accumulated treasures and relics of ancient Russian piety.\footnote{RSL, F. 246. K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 28 – 30.}

This petition reveals both the frustration and urgency Rogozhskoe experienced during the Great Reforms. While tsarist Russia underwent sweeping reforms, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers felt that the reforms did little to alleviate the injustices against the community. Furthermore, as tsarist Russia showed no signs of greater reforms for the Old Rite that would allow Rogozhskoe to reopen their altars, the community now viewed the issue as a race against time – the longer authorities delayed reform or reopening the altars, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could only wonder, and fear, what remained of their altars in the first place.

After such a slow process for reform toward the Old Rite, and continued requests from communities such as Rogozhskoe to address the issue of reform, the Ministry of Internal Affairs realized that it needed to act. In 1875, the Ministry of Internal Affairs established an interagency committee chaired by the Deputy Ministry of Internal Affairs, Prince Aleksei Lobanov-Rostovsky, to address the critical issues of reforms for the Old Rite including: freedom of worship, civil rights, education, and community status. Specifically, the committee needed to figure out how to include, or justify exclusion, of the Old Believers in the Great Reforms. However, it was Lobanov-Rostovsky who eventually took the initiative and allowed for the eventual creation an official dialogue
with the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and through his contact with Ivan Shibaev, and eventually invited Rogozhskoe to elect a commission to participate in discussions with the Saint Petersburg Committee about reforms for the Old Rite.

The Saint Petersburg Committee’s formation and the request for Rogozhskoe’s participation was due primarily to the efforts of Ivan Shibaev who proved to be one of the most prominent leaders in Rogozhskoe’s extensive use of petitions and efforts to prove the community’s loyalty to tsarist Russia. Born into a wealthy merchant family in 1830, Shibaev rose to prominence not only in Rogozhskoe, but became one of the most influential champions for Old Believer legal and spiritual rites beginning in the 1860s until his death in 1908. Noted for his “keen intellect and knowledge” on numerous historical, political, social, and legal topics, Shibaev took it upon himself to attempt to serve as the primary intermediary between Old Believers and the tsar, either travelling to or living in Saint Petersburg. While hailing from Rogozhskoe, Shibaev grew to prominence throughout the Old Rite in the early 1860s for his attempts to seek the liberation of imprisoned Old Rite monks from the Evfimiev Monastery in Suzdal’; after the Ministry of Internal Affairs became aggravated by his presence in Saint Petersburg, Shibaev’s reward was two years in Peter and Paul Fortress.

However, after his release, Shibaev spent his time building close relationships amongst Rogozhskoe’s leading families and within the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Moscow authorities. Shibaev’s own relationship with Prince Vladimir Andreyevich
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Dolgorukov, the Governor-General of Moscow (1865 – 1891), proved to be very beneficial for both Shibaev and Rogozhskoe but Old Believers in Moscow as well. First, after requests from Shibaev, Dolgorukov took it upon himself to petition the tsar and Ministry of Internal Affairs to remove the identifying term “raskolniki” (once again popular under Nicholas I) in favor of staroobriadtsy in all government documents and correspondence.\(^{411}\) Second, the relationship with Dolgorukov afforded Shibaev a great amount of leniency with Moscow’s authorities. For example, due to his ties to Dolgorukov, Shibaev’s private home and chapel came to serve as a de facto church for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. Such a fact only antagonized Rogozhskoe’s critics such as Nikolai Subbotin who later wrote in 1889, “In the chapel, Shibaev put a new carved iconostasis and hung an expensive chandelier; they held the feast for the Nativity of the Virgin as a solemn consecration for this schismatic church. All of this happened, of course, in front of the police, who did not even think to ask their good friend Ivan Ivanovich, what kind of work he produced and why he needed such a magnificent iconostasis and huge chandelier.”\(^{412}\) With such influence, and favoritism, with the authorities Shibaev hoped to hold himself as an example of the potential for Rogozhskoe to achieve similar favors by building a strong relationship with tsarist authorities and particularly the tsar.

Shibaev and the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could not turn down the opportunity presented by the Saint Petersburg Committee. Rogozhskoe’s participation guaranteed that the Committee would hear, first-hand, the community’s grievances for greater
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spiritual freedom and the need for the reopening of their altars. However, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers understood that their participation held even greater meaning for the Old Rite as a whole throughout the Russian Empire. Shibaev and the Rogozhskoe Old Believers viewed the Ministry’s invitation as a sign that it was Rogozhskoe’s duty to champion the cause of all Old Believers:

“[The invitation to elect a commission] which grants the right to care "about the benefits and needs of the public" and work together with the committee to this subject as to the cumulative effects on other Old Believers, and it would not even hurt to consider the bespopovtsy in this subject. And in this order, we call upon God to help, start the process now as the time is convenient, so we do not repent later.”

Due to his own previous experience, both in Saint Petersburg and in his efforts on Rogozhskoe’s behalf, Shibaev, then, played a vital role in establishing a direct dialogue between Rogozhskoe, the Old Rite, and the tsarist authorities.

With such an opportunity, and living nearly full-time in the capital, Shibaev took it upon himself to establish a strong presence with the Lobanov-Rostovsky commission. Shibaev believed that the primary obstacle that undermined Old Believer petitions was a general misunderstanding about the Old Rite based off the state’s long-held fears about Old Believers, and particularly Rogozhskoe Cemetery, fueled by the Holy Synod and Russian Orthodox Church. Shibaev, then, believed that such a difficulty could be overcome by establishing a direct dialogue between Old Believers and the commission and urged the Lobanov-Rostovsky commission to allow Rogozhskoe’s leadership to
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represent themselves and their petitions. However, fearing that he was increasingly less welcome at the commission meetings, Shibaev eventually appealed to the Rogozhskoe Trustees in his report from May 17 – 20, 1875 to elect their own commission of petitioners to travel to Saint Petersburg and make their case to the authorities:

They tell us that we need to take care of ourselves in the situation of our affairs and seriously. First of all, we must rely on God, but let us take care of ourselves and our serious work. As I tell you that from this it will depend a great deal to a successful completion of our business ....It is positively and morally impossible for one or two [petitioners] to take this matter upon themselves, and I personally consider that I have become a burden, in this important and serious case.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers accepted that it was in their best interest to head Shibaev’s plea. To fulfill Shibaev’s request for support, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized that their petitioners needed to serve as representatives of Rogozhskoe’s dual identity as a center for the Old Rite, and the community’s spiritual, economic, and philanthropic influence in Moscow and the Russian Empire.

Therefore, on June 17, 1875 the Rogozhskoe Old Believers elected a representative commission to head to Saint Petersburg to champion their cause and petitions to the tsarist authorities. The commission consisted of some of Rogozhskoe’s most notable, and economically influential leaders, merchants, and industrialists including: Kozma Terentyevich Soldatenkov, Timofei Savich Morozov, Rodion Dmitrievich Martinov, Timofei Ivanovich Nazarov, Ivan Ivanovich Butikov, Dmitri
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Osipovich Milovanov, Peter Kirillovich Mel’nikov, and, due to his role in founding the commission, Ivan Shibaev.\footnote{RSL, F. 246, K. 3, Ed. 3, L. 23 – 23ob.}

At the very first meeting of the Rogozhskoe commission on July 24, 1875, Shibaev noted the significance that their election and duty held for both the Old Rite throughout Russia and even Rogozhskoe’s significance to the Old Rite movement:

> We have assumed so serious a case involving everyone in the Russian Old Ritualist faith, we must by all means, with all of our forces and capabilities perform the mission entrusted to us, this performance must be regarded as a sacred duty, and in particular (although unfortunately) all Old Ritualists in Russia, look to and nourish their hope on Moscow. They say: “In Moscow there is a great community and there are people that can make and do.” They are convinced of this. I say this on the basis of letters from many parts of Russia.\footnote{Ibid., L. 24.}

Due to the community’s prominence in Moscow and their strong influence and relationship with the tsarist government, the Rogozhskoe Cemetery now viewed themselves as intercessor for an entire faith. Essentially, it can be argued that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers hoped that the meaning and ideal of Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow could now serve far more than the immediate community.

The Rogozhskoe petitioners’ and Lobanov-Rostovsky commission’s combined efforts worked toward the issue of including the Old Believers into the government’s reform efforts. However, outsiders such as the Holy Synod continually pressured the
commission not to give too much to the Old Believers.\textsuperscript{418} Pressured to act by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and wanting to appease the Synod and Orthodox Church, the commission released its first draft of reforms in December 1875. Under the proposed reforms, Old Believers could use their houses for worship (but would not be allowed to have or build structures designated as churches or cathedrals); buildings used for worship could not have permanent icons or crosses; and Old Believer communities could establish their own primary schools.\textsuperscript{419} The Rogozhskoe petitioners quickly deemed the suggested reforms as “insufficient”. However, as noted by Shibaev, rather than outright reject the draft or demand greater reform immediately it was more beneficial to see the drafted reforms as a step in the right direction:

\begin{quote}
We are set, which is good because it is better to have something than nothing, as we did not have anything before the law. We were just not intended. But as I said, it is good to have not only a little freedom, but freedom, authorized by the law, and for this initial recognition by the law of our rights, we should be thankful to the government. It is our sacred duty to achieve gradually more and more satisfactory outcomes, and not only for us, in Moscow, but for the whole of Russia.\textsuperscript{420}
\end{quote}

Shibaev’s stance highlights the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ efforts to forge a working relationship with the tsarist authorities. Rogozhskoe’s leadership could help prove their loyalty, and by extension the entire community’s loyalty, by showing they were willing to accept gradual rather than immediate and radical reform. As Shibaev suggested, Rogozhskoe’s greatest hope for further reform for Rogozhskoe and the Old Rite in
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matters such as freedom of worship (which would guarantee the reopening of Rogozhskoe’s altars and full control of their sacred spaces) was time.

On August 3, two days after they received the reform draft, Shibaev suggested that the Rogozhskoe commission petition the tsarist and Moscow authorities to allow the community to photograph the interiors of their cathedrals and altars reasoning that: “[if we] have photographs from our churches in the cemetery they would serve as a visual reference for the commission members, who will discuss the issue of worship.” As elaborated further, Shibaev and the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could hope that the use of visual aids would actually help make their case for greater freedom of worship:

If we take [photographs] from both the outside and interior of the temples at Rogozhskoe Cemetery and present them to the same senior government persons so to familiarize them of the temples which were built with the permission of the government in the old days and our Old Rite churches that exist to the present day for their consideration for granting freedom of worship for the Old Rite. With this purpose and photographs...will be a benefit in discussing the issue of freedom of worship, as well as inspire greater interest in the issue and community for many years.

It was the hope, then, that photographs of the Rogozhskoe cathedrals would aid the Rogozhskoe petitioners in their attempts to convince the tsarist authorities to consider freedom of worship for both their community and the Old Rite as a whole. Inspired by the idea, the Rogozhskoe petitioners gathered a list of thirty-nine prominent Rogozhskoe
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families and individuals (along with numerous other parishioners) who were willing to help fund the photography project.\textsuperscript{423}

Ultimately, the idea of photographing the Rogozhskoe cathedrals, particularly their interiors, proved to be a very significant moment in the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ self-identity, maintenance, and restoration of their Holy Moscow in terms of the community’s relationship with the state and their own understanding of their spirituality and ideas of the sacred. First, the idea that Rogozhskoe should present photographs of their cathedrals reveals a new approach to the Rogozhskoe methods and goals behind their petitions. Essentially, the goal behind the photography project would be to make Rogozhskoe a much more real community to tsarist agents living and working in Saint Petersburg – many of whom may only have known about Rogozhskoe though their superiors or the biased agendas of anti-Old Rite statesmen and representatives for the Russian Orthodox Church. The photographs then put Rogozhskoe on display – the size of the community, the grandeur of their cathedrals and buildings, but most importantly – an attempt to share their sacred spaces with the outside world. Upon viewing the photographs of Rogozhskoe’s cathedrals it becomes clear that they revealed the very heart of their community and identity. But rather than emphasize a greater sacredness than that of the mainstream Church, the Rogozhskoe photographs instead reveal grand sacred spaces that could not fulfill their true purpose due to the injustice of the spiritual and legal restrictions put in place against the community and Old Rite throughout the Russian Empire. It can be argued that rather than reveal a holy space where Old

\textsuperscript{423}RSL, F. 246, K. 3, Ed. 3, L. 70 – 70ob, 72.
Believers could gather to sing praises and prayers for the tsar and Russia, the photographs would instead emphasize the emptiness and despair of a law-abiding, and very loyal community of Old Believers who invested time, effort, and capital into charities, the economy and efforts at industrialization.

Completed by photographers from Sherer, Nabgolts, and Company in March 1876, the project composed of ten photographs of the elaborate interiors of the Intersession and Nativity cathedrals. Ultimately, the photographs also came to serve as a point of unity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. First and foremost, the Rogozhskoe leadership realized that prominent families and other parishioners most likely would either want to donate for the costs of the project or purchase their own copies of the photo albums created by the project. As noted by Shibaev, this would most likely cover any costs for the photographs:

Except for the 22 copies for senior government officials it is assumed other elected, as well as honorable parishioners would ask to be invited to aid the completion of this project’s costs, and meet any additional prices at least ...for instance… the parishioners’ donations could cover the cost of this project.425

Knowing that the purpose of the photographs was to aid their petitioners’ efforts in raising the issue of freedom of worship for the Old Rite, the Rogozhskoe community proved more than willing to meet any financial requirements for the project.

424Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 50.
Secondly, the photographs became a means to share and visualize Rogozhskoe’s sacred spaces outside of the cathedrals. While the Lobanov-Rostovskiy commission disbanded on December 26, 1875, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers fully believed that it was only a matter of time before discussions of greater reforms for the Old Rite took place. Therefore the Rogozhskoe community forwarded their photograph albums to members of the commission and other government officials “in memory of and as signs of deep gratitude for their supporters and benefactors.”


426 RSL, F. 246, K. 3, Ed. 3, l. 86.
Initially following the end of the Lobanov-Rostovsky commission, it appeared that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ hopes for greater reform, and particularly freedom of worship would not go unnoticed. Upon receiving numerous letters of thanks, as well as the Rogozhskoe photographs, the Minister of Internal Affairs, A. E. Timashev, assured the Rogozhskoe petitioners on New Years’ Day, 1876 that the commission’s suggestions received his full blessing and would serve as the foundation of future reforms: “I have and will do all that I can for you and hope that you will not take any offense or remember any evil against me.”

However, Rogozhskoe’s hopes for a full restoration of their Holy Moscow remained unfulfilled as even in the minimal reforms suggested by the

---

Lobanov-Rostovsky commission met significant resistance within the Ministry of Internal Affairs itself. By March 1878, the Ministry of Internal Affairs still had not submitted the Lobanov-Rostovsky commission’s reforms to the State Council primarily due to the outcries of the Holy Synod and the Director of the Department of General Affairs, N. P. Mansurov who argued that:

…my friends, [the suggested reforms] at present cannot get through, as it may bring great harm to Orthodoxy, and therefore they must be decided under the general question of freedom of worship... [the Old Believers] are a danger if given broad freedom of worship in particular temples such as those at Rogozhskoe cemetery where there would be flocks not only thousands of Old Believers, but the sons of the dominant church, and then we can assume that the Old Believers will increase at the expense of the Orthodox Church.428

With continued resistance by officials such as Mansurov and the Russian Orthodox Church, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized that they could not sit back and wait for the state to present the next opportunity for Rogozhskoe to act. Therefore, as the state continually delayed reform for the Old Rite, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers took it upon themselves to further prove their loyalty to the Russian Empire as a sign of their devotion to the state and their own understanding of their Third Rome.

The Issue of Loyalty and Rogozhskoe’s Continued Hope for Reform

Even with the community’s role in providing charity and other aid to Moscow’s poor and growing working class, following the closure of their altars, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers continually made every effort to prove their loyalty to both the tsar and the Russian Empire. This overt display of loyalty became part of Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ new presentation and understanding of their Holy Moscow. Specifically, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers shifted their identity and ideals to serve as a beacon both for the Old Rite and Russia as a whole and challenge negative perceptions of the Old Rite and Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Leading by example through public displays of loyalty to the tsar and government officials, open support for tsarist policies against political and national enemies, and continued presence in charity and industry in Moscow all served as the Rogozhskoe community’s attempt to challenge the claims of their desires to subvert the Russian state and Russian Orthodoxy.

In regard to the issues of religious, civil, and legal reform for the Old Believers, communities such as Rogozhskoe continually faced challenges to any attempt to include the Old Rite into the discussion of the Great Reforms. First and foremost, the fact that these communities and their leaders retained, and refused to give up their devotion to the Old Rite automatically spurred enemies in the Russian Orthodox Church and other devout Orthodox government officials to continually question Old Believer loyalty to both the Tsar and Russian Empire – the embodiment of the Orthodox Sovereign and
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Orthodox state. Furthermore, Rogozhskoe’s rejection of Edinoverie and allegiance to
and role in not only founding the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in Austria, but propagating
the new hierarchy throughout Russia and setting up their own Old Rite Archdiocese in
Rogozhskoe Cemetery in the 1860s also provided greater opportunity to question the
community’s loyalty to Russia.

**Loyal Subjects of the Tsar**

One of the key elements in Rogozhskoe’s attempts to rebuild and redefine their
Holy Moscow in the second half of the nineteenth century was to redefine the
community’s relationship with the tsar, the royal family, and their closest advisors. Not
only did the Rogozhskoe Old Believers come to view the sovereign as the embodiment of
tsar batiushka, but the community took steps to prove their devotion to the Emperor
through public proclamations and displays of loyalty. Therefore, the Rogozhskoe Old
Believers’ began their first steps to incorporating the tsar into their own Holy Moscow,
regardless of the sovereign’s personal choice in Russian Orthodoxy.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers displayed their loyalty to the tsar and autocracy at
any opportunity, regardless of how minimal or grand. The Rogozhskoe trustees
continually offered their congratulations to the tsar, members of the imperial family, and
other key officials for wedding and coronation anniversaries, births, awards, promotions,
and other festivals throughout the final decades of the tsarist period.\(^{429}\) One such example
was the Rogozhskoe Old Believers participation in the jubilee festivals for one of their

\(^{429}\)RSL. F. 246, K. 4, Ed. 3, L. 568.
strongest supporters, the Governor General of Moscow, V. A. Dolgorukov, in 1879, 1885, and 1890 with some of Rogozhskoe’s key leaders such as Shibaev attending celebrations on Dolgorukov’s personal invitation. While offering congratulations to the imperial family and other high officials was not a new practice, by the second half of the nineteenth century, such offers of congratulations took on greater meaning and purpose for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. The community’s experience under Nicholas I only antagonized preconceived jealously and hostility amongst non-Old Believers toward Rogozhskoe and the Old Rite throughout Orthodox Russia – leaving Rogozhskoe, and Old Believers throughout the Russian Empire, facing even greater suspicion of their loyalty to the Russian Empire and Russian society as members of a dissident Orthodox faith. Therefore even small gestures of congratulations to tsarist officials and the imperial family reaffirmed Rogozhskoe’s loyalty to both the state and their own understanding that Holy Moscow still needed some tie to an Orthodox state and Orthodox ruler.

Religious holidays and traditions also played an important role in Rogozhskoe’s open displays of loyalty to the Romanovs and tsarist authorities. One of Rogozhskoe’s annual and most popular practices in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the community’s gift of Easter eggs for high-ranking officials. Beginning in 1874, twenty six of Rogozhskoe’s leading families participated in distributing Easter eggs to the imperial family, high-ranking tsarist, and Orthodox Church officials as “displays of our congratulations and reverent allegiance to Russia and the traditional Holy Easter

---

430RSL. F. 246, K. 4, Ed. 1, L. 46.
greetings. Rogozhskoe’s initial recipients of their gifts included the Emperor, Empress, Tsaresевич Alexander Alexandrovich, and benefactors within state and government authorities who often interceded on the community’s behalf such as V. A. Dolgorukov and Alexander Abramovich Suvorov, the grandson of General Suvorov. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers also sent Easter eggs to high-ranking clergy in the Orthodox Church including Metropolitan of Saint Petersburg Isidore, Archbishop of Vilnius and Lithuania Macarius, and Metropolitan Innocent of Moscow, the successor of the Rogozhskoe’s nemesis, Filaret.

With each successive year, more-and-more of Rogozhskoe’s families participated in sending Easter eggs to the imperial family and Russia’s high ranking officials. The

---

432 The Rogozhskoe Old Believers had an established relationship with A. A. Suvorov. In one paragraph the minutes of the community election of Trustees held in late 1875, were written: "As we all know that we have repeatedly asked His Serene Highness Prince Alexander Suvorov to intervene in our affairs, and he always had full sympathy for our cause and to the most useful extent possible. On January 1, 1876 Duke Suvorov, will celebrate 50 years of service in the officer ranks. On this occasion, some supposed to celebrate its 50 anniversary,… and therefore, we should acknowledge and commemorate this event.” At the meeting it was decided to provide Suvorov with a gift of an icon of St. Alexander Nevsky (RSL. F. 246. K. 3. Ed. 3. L. 15ob). The Old Believers delegation at the anniversary reported to the elected assembly on Jan. 15, 1876: «January 1, the day of the Grand Duke Suvorov’s anniversary we handed him the holy image... He kissed us repeatedly, and was very pleased and said: "I would like to say a few words, but cannot: I am terribly excited! But I heartily thank you for your well-wishes and memories. I am very grateful!” (Ibid. K. 3. Ed. 3, L. 33).
433 Ibid. K. 3. Ed. 3, L. 93-104. The Apostle of America, St. Innocent (Benjamin), in contrast to his predecessor Filaret approached the Old Believers with compassion. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers acknowledged innocent’s kindness in a memorandum to members of the State Council on February 9, 1883: "When our most loyal petition to the late Emperor Alexander Nikolayevich, submitted in 1878, concerning the reopening of our altars by the chief prosecutor [the petition] was assigned for preliminary consideration by the Moscow Spiritual Consistory, most memorably the Metropolitan of Moscow Innocent afterward told our deputies with words of truth: "I find myself in this issue in a painful situation: if I say that I agree on the freedom of your service, then I will be the focus of great criticism, and if I said that this should not be allowed, it would be against my conscience. And therefore I tell you only that it would be better for this government [to grant your freedoms] but I cannot ask for it." (Ibid. K. 6. Ed. 1, L. 6 – 6ob).
434 The Rogozhskoe Trustees also kept records of the cost for these eggs, for example: 537 rubles and 60 kopeks in 1885 (RSL. 246, K. 6, Ed. 4, L. 45); 610 rubles and 80 kopeks in 1886 (Ibid., L. 46); 654 rubles in 1887 (Ibid., 133); 651 rubles in 1888 (Ibid., K. 7, Ed. 4, L. 51); 710 rubles and 40 kopeks in 1889 (Ibid., L. 76); and 1155 rubles and 60 kopeks in 1890 (Ibid., L. 99).
eggs themselves were wood, varying in size and often depicted images of the Resurrection of Christ and other saints.\textsuperscript{435} Due to the tradition’s success, in 1888 the Rogozhskoe Trustees eventually commissioned the well-known icon painters, and brothers, Yakov Vasilevich and Aleksei Vasilevich Tyulin to fulfill their orders for Easter eggs.\textsuperscript{436} Hoping to not only show their loyalty through the Orthodox traditional exchanging of Easter eggs, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ choice to exchange eggs with both tsarist and Orthodox authorities emphasized the community’s ties to the Russian Empire through the dogmatic unity of Orthodoxy.

Yet even as the Rogozhskoe Old Believers attempted to draw closer to the tsar and government authorities through public displays of loyalty, the Old Rite’s opponents delayed the Lobanov-Rostovsky commission’s reforms from reaching the State Council. Ivan Shibaev continually travelled to Saint Petersburg to speak on behalf of the Rogozhskoe community and urge passage of the Lobanov-Rostovsky resolutions. Shibaev happened to be in Saint Petersburg on the fateful day, March 1, 1881 and shortly after learning of Alexander II’s death, Shibaev saw an opportunity to both finally prove Rogozhskoe’s loyalty to the tsarist state and restore religious services in Rogozhskoe. Shibaev quickly dispatched a telegram to his close friend, Ivan Butikov, at Rogozhskoe: “I will arrive there tomorrow, after breakfast, and gather yourselves to discuss [the election of] representative deputies. They will arrange for our oath of loyalty this very moment by our clergy in our churches, and ask Prince Dolgorukov to report and request

\textsuperscript{435}Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadcheskii tsentr}, 61. 
\textsuperscript{436}RSL, F. 246, K. 7, Ed. 4, L. 35.
Simply put, Shibaev saw Alexander II’s assassination as a moment that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could prove, once-and-for-all, their loyalty to new tsar, Alexander III, and the Russian Empire (and thereby further distance themselves and the Old Rite from radical political and social groups, and other subversive elements of society) by publically pledging the oath of loyalty to the tsar.

A notion such as officially pledging their loyalty to the tsar and offering prayers for the tsar would completely change the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ understanding of their Holy Moscow. While throughout Rogozhskoe’s history, the community viewed the tsar as the ultimate source of all civil, religious, and social regulations and laws and therefore their potential benefactor or oppressor, the community’s ties to the Old Rite also brought with it stigmas as to the true spiritual authority of the Tsar. One of the defining traits of the Old Rite as a whole was the question of the place of the tsar in Orthodox Christianity following the *raskol*. Since Alexis not only supported, but enacted the Nikonian Reforms, the office of the tsar was therefore tainted as it no longer followed the proper form of Orthodoxy. Furthermore, by siding with the Nikonian Reforms, Old Believers questioned whether the tsar, in fact, was an agent of the Anti-Christ.

The reign of Peter the Great and his rejection of traditional Russian culture and customs in favor of Western culture and forced Westernization only solidified the Old
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437 RSL, F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 38.
438 Leonid Heretz and Nicholas Breyfogle both point out the relationship between religious communities in Russia and their conceptualization of their place within the Russian Empire based on their understanding of the authority and rule of the tsar. See Breyfogle, *Heretics and Colonizers* and Leonid Heretz, *Russia on the Eve of Modernity: Popular Religion and Traditional Culture Under the Last Tsars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2008).
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Rite’s perception that the tsar no longer truly represented the ideal Orthodox sovereign and they therefore refused, en masse, to take oaths of loyalty to the tsar.\footnote{See for example, James Cracraft. *The Revolution of Peter the Great*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 123.}

In turn, the Old Believers refusal to take oaths of loyalty only created greater resentment and accusations against the Old Rite of its adherents disloyalty amongst Russia’s highest state and Church officials throughout the Imperial Era. For example, in a number of laws passed throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries directly questioned and restricted the Old Believers due to the question of their loyalty to the state.\footnote{PSZ Ser I, vol. 6, 169, and SppcrSVS, vol. 1, 185 – 86, 231 – 38.} Furthermore, individuals such as one of Russia’s most influential statesmen in the middle of the eighteenth century, V. N. Tatishchev, openly rejected any notion that contradicted their beliefs that Old Believers could be anything but disloyal simply because of their refusal to adhere to the mainstream Church.\footnote{V. N. Tatishchev «O soderzhaniem kveiishkol,» quoted in Hudson, “Religious Persecution and Industrial Policy,” 27 - 29} The Old Believers’ history of refusing to take the oath of loyalty with each successive ruler therefore remained a strong factor in many officials’ preconceptions about the Old Rite well into the early twentieth century.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ offer to take the oath of loyalty in 1881, then, proved to be a revolutionary and controversial idea for a community of Old Believers. By offering to take the oath of loyalty to the future Alexander III, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers would restore their connection to the Orthodox sovereign and full recognition of the tsar’s place in their Third Rome. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers would therefore
re-recognize the tsar as the historical tie to the secular authorities of Byzantium and the Roman Empire. It can be argued then that Rogozhskoe’s offer to take the pledge of loyalty, then, was a major adaptation of their Holy Moscow in an attempt to potentially achieve full restoration of the community’s sacred spaces, the freedom to practice Old Rite religious services, and full recognition of a secular Orthodox authority in the tsar.

However, what made Rogozhskoe’s actions unique was that they represented the first non-*edinoverstsy* Old Rite community to take the oath of allegiance. Since the *raskol*, Old Believers and the tsarist state remained in a relationship in which tsarist policies allowed individual Old Believer families and other communities to flourish economically, and spiritually, within the Russian Empire so long as they remained productive and valuable to the goals of the state. For example, Peter the Great’s war efforts required a strong military which in-turn required tax revenue and a stable supply of resources and supplies such as iron for weapons. Fortunately for Old Believer communities such as those located in Vyg and entrepreneurial families such as the Demidovs who founded numerous mines and metallurgical facilities throughout the Urals, Peter the Great realized that such groups could contribute to the overall goals of the state while remaining Old Believers.444 This relationship allowed Old Believer families and communities to become productive members of Imperial Russia which in return provided some protection for their ways of life so long as they met all duties

---

expected of them such as meeting all tax obligations and maintaining their economic output in their areas of expertise.

Yet even with this symbiotic relationship between various Old Believers and the tsarist authorities, many Old Believers simply refused to make the oath of allegiance to the tsar. Due to the legal restrictions placed on Old Rite religious services, particularly the inability of Old Believer priests to conduct the Divine Liturgy during oath services, required Old Believers to give the oath to Orthodox Priests. Such measures, Old Believers feared, open themselves up to registration as Old Believers (and also military conscription), collection of any back taxes, or even (what some feared) forced conversion to the Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{445} Therefore, Rogozhskoe’s oath of allegiance proved very significant as a means to build a new relationship with the tsarist state.

Upon receiving Rogozhskoe’s offer to pledge their allegiance to the tsar, Dolgorukov immediately granted his permission for the community to petition the Ministry of Internal Affairs since the Rogozhskoe Old Believers requested to construct temporary altars in the Rogozhskoe temples. Likewise, the Minister of Internal Affairs, Mikhail Loris-Melikov, eventually granted his permission and approval for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to erect portable altars and use Old Rite priests to administer the community’s oath of allegiance to the tsar in Rogozhskoe’s temples.\textsuperscript{446} After achieving approval for their petition from the highest authorities, the Rogozhskoe trustees installed a temporary altar and folding iconostasis, both donated by K. T. Soldatenkov, in

\textsuperscript{445} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{446} RSL, F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 51.
Pokrovskii Cathedral. In Rogozhskoe’s following report to Dolgorukov and Loris-Melikov, the community stated:

In our church we positioned a collapsible altar and iconostasis, and performed the Divine Liturgy and prayer service of Thanksgiving to God for the health and welfare of the Emperor, Empress and all the royal family in the presence of the nominated police officials, local police chief and others, and before the holy altar our clergy officially administered our oath of allegiance the Emperor.

The oath of allegiance to Alexander III ultimately established a new relationship between Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the tsarist state. By giving their oath, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers took great steps to negate long-held negative perceptions of the Old Rite and their very community. Furthermore, Rogozhskoe’s proof of loyalty did achieve a major goal in that following Alexander III’s coronation on May 15, 1883 the portable altars remained in place, and useable for the community to perform services, until November 1885.

Wishing to ensure the safety of Alexander III and the imperial family during his official coronation in Moscow, tsarist authorities reached out to prominent citizens of Moscow to organize squads of “volunteer protectors” to patrol the streets and squares in their districts as a show of loyalty and force against anyone wishing harm on the tsar. As drafted by A. A. Kozlov, the Moscow Chief of Police, in January 1882, “the voluntary protectors … [will be made up of] the greatest number of people devoted to the throne.

447 Slovo tserkvi’, 1915 No. 12, 292.
448 RSL. F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 51.
and committed to make its every effort to prevent any attacks by any villainous person against the sacred person of His Majesty and his August family, and to prevent anything that might disturb the peace of the sovereign at His appearance among his people.\textsuperscript{450}

Seeing yet another opportunity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to demonstrate their loyalty, this time in the presence of the Tsar, Ivan Shibaev became one of the strongest proponents of the volunteer force. Furthermore, Shibaev’s strong relationship with Dolgorukov and Kozlov allowed him to serve as one of the head organizers of the entire volunteer force.\textsuperscript{451} With his authority, Shibaev selected a number of Rogozhskoe’s prominent leaders to serve as his captains including: Ivan Butikov, P. K. Mel’nikov, F. Ya. Sveshnikov, G. I. Kleimenov, K. T. Soldatenkov, T. C. Morozov, and N. I. Olenev.\textsuperscript{452} Under the Rogozhskoe captains, community volunteers from Rogozhskoe Cemetery would eventually patrol the Lefortovo and Nizhegorodsky (Karacharovo) districts of Moscow, just southeast of the city center.\textsuperscript{453} For the community’s participation and efforts, Alexander III showed his thanks through the gift of commemoration medals for Rogozhskoe’s Pokrovskii Cathedral engraved with a message of special thanks to the volunteers who sought to protect the safety of the imperial family.\textsuperscript{454}

While preparing for Alexander’s coronation, Shibaev and the former Rogozhskoe commission remained adamant in their petitions for reopening their permanent altars as well as enacting the reforms promised by the Lobanov-Rostovsky commission over a

\begin{flushright}
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\textsuperscript{451}Ibid., L. 244. \\
\textsuperscript{452}RSL. F. 246. K. 5, Ed. 5, L. 6. \\
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\textsuperscript{454}RSL. F. 246, K. 6, Ed. 1, L. 60. 
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half-decade earlier. Rogozhskoe’s first petition followed soon after the community took their oath of allegiance and stated their long-held respect and devotion to the sovereign even prior to their oath: “We, the Moscow Old Believers, of the priestly denomination, not only lived by the ancient faith and the ancient traditions, but also kept a deep loyalty and devotion to the ancient Russian throne and ancient Russian monarchy for centuries.”

Rogozhskoe’s request, again, received little attention due to continued pressure on the Ministry from the Church, and after the role Shibaev and Rogozhskoe took in developing the plans for the Tsar’s coronation, the Rogozhskoe Trustees appealed directly to Minister Loris-Melikov in January 1883 to “to consider granting the long-awaited civil and religious liberties.” On February 9, 1883 Loris-Melikov responded to Rogozhskoe’s petition, stating that the State Council and Alexander would now consider the issue of reform for the Old Rite.

The ultimate result was Alexander’s Ukaz of May 3, 1883. On the surface, the new law represented a sweeping attempt to grant numerous civil and spiritual rights to the Old Rite. These reforms lifted numerous bans placed on Old Believers since the raskol: the legal formation and recognition of Old Believer parishes (which thereby allowed for full recognition of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy in Rogozhskoe); the lifting of the ban on restoration of Old Believer Churches; and Old Believers could now hold public office. The Ukaz also granted significant religious rights such as the right for Old Believers freedom of worship, the freedom to perform the Divine Liturgy in their churches, and for all Old Believer communities to legally seek the reopening of any sealed temples or
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455 RSL. F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 1, L. 57.
456 RSL. F. 246, K. 5, Ed. 8.
Such offers for reform appeared to be exactly what Rogozhskoe and other Old Believer communities waited for so long, leading to significant celebration amongst Rogozhskoe itself and invigorating the community for the role that they were about to play in Alexander’s coronation at the end of the month. It finally appeared that with such reforms the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could fully immerse themselves in their Holy Moscow with the freedom to follow and practice their faith and livelihoods legally.

However, while accepted as a triumph and proof of Alexander’s benevolence for his loyal subjects, the Ukaz often proved to be hollow and, in fact, allowed for oppression against the Old Believers to continue. First and foremost, many of the new “freedoms” carried the stipulation that Old Believer communities first needed to petition the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Holy Synod, local authorities, or all of these departments in order to receive permission for the right to restore their sacred buildings, or reopen any sealed churches. With such restrictions many communities, and Rogozhskoe in particular, found it nearly impossible to obtain the necessary permissions to fully realize their long-held goals. Rogozhskoe’s influence, and now its recognition as the center of an Old Rite Hierarchy only drew greater ire from the Holy Synod, now under the control of Konstantin Pobedonostsev, Alexander’s former tutor and closest advisor. Pobedonostev, as described later in the chapter, became a thorn in Rogozhskoe’s side as he ensured that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers never fully benefitted from the new reforms until Nicholas II’s granting of full religious freedom in April 1905.

Furthermore, while granting extraordinary new freedoms such as the right to hold full religious services for the Divine Liturgy and funeral processions, and the ability to repair or build new temples, and the reopening of churches and altars, the new stipulations in the new laws prevented any public or outward display of the Old Rite faith. In this regard, all religious services could only be performed in the privacy of properly designated Old Rite religious buildings and private homes. Furthermore, the *Ukaz* did not grant recognition of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and thereby making it illegal for any Old Rite clergy to use titles such as “priest” or “bishop.” Also, Old Believers faced two major roadblocks in the law regarding the restoration, construction, or reopening of Old Rite churches and temples. The first issue was that the structures could not “imitate” Orthodox Churches. For older structures such as Rogozhskoe’s cathedrals, this meant that they could still not replace their crosses or bells; new structures could not have cupolas, crosses, or bells. Second, any request for restoration, construction, or reopening of Old Believer structures must first be approved by the local civil and religious authorities, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Holy Synod.\(^\text{460}\) This stipulation often led to any Old Believer community’s petition regarding their sacred spaces to face a long process in which at any stage could be rejected by the authorities, or more often, simply ignored, thereby requiring an entirely new petition.\(^\text{461}\)

Ultimately, the situation created by the 1883 reforms only reconfirmed Rogozhskoe’s perception of the tsarist state in which nefarious government officials corrupted the tsar’s true intentions. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers took great steps to

\(^{460}\text{PSZ, Ser. III, Vol. 3, 219 – 221.}\)
\(^{461}\text{Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 53 – 55.}\)
prove their loyalty to the state and sovereign through their oath of allegiance. Furthermore, Rogozhskoe continued to adapt their ideal of Holy Moscow to place greater emphasis on the community’s relationship to the tsar and the Russian Empire. Rather than serve as an isolated, Old Rite Third Rome, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers hoped to create an ideal community that interacted with the rest of the empire and challenge negative perceptions of the Old Rite and Rogozhskoe Cemetery.

Yet another example of this continued bias concerned the community’s continued use of temporary altars after Alexander III’s coronation. Even after pledging their loyalty to the tsar, the community’s continued efforts to provide charity and aid to Moscow and Russia’s needy, the Russian Orthodox Church still viewed Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its influence within the Old Rite as a direct spiritual threat to the Church and the Empire as a whole. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ community and their ties to the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy became the target of Konstantin Pobedonotsev, the Ober-Procurator of the Holy Synod.⁴⁶²

Beginning in 1884, Pobedonotsev argued that the, “blatant indulgence of the raskol, threatens state security… [and] humiliates the Orthodox Church.” He eventually convinced the Ministry of the Interior, Dmitri Tolstoy, to force the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to remove the temporary altars, thereby again challenging Rogozhskoe’s use of their sacred space.⁴⁶³ Pobedonotsev again intervened against Rogozhskoe in 1896 when he demanded that the Ministry of Internal Affairs refuse to even consider the

community’s petition to reopen their altars or erect temporary altars to make the oath of allegiance to Nicholas II, arguing that any measure in favor of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers guaranteed near collapse of the entire Russian state.\textsuperscript{464}

\textit{Ardent Patriots}

Throughout the community’s history, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers adapted their Holy Moscow in order to display the community’s patriotism for the Russian Empire. As described earlier in Chapter 1, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers became one of the primary forces and influences in the efforts to rebuild Moscow following the devastation of 1812. Furthermore, the first half of the nineteenth century also saw the Rogozhskoe Old Believers send aid for the wounded or take in wounded soldiers in all of Russia’s military conflicts. However, as the second half of the nineteenth century witnessed a surge in open political opposition to tsarist policies and the autocracy, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ desire to prove their loyalty took on new meaning. Specifically, with the rise of democratic and revolutionary groups throughout Russia, Rogozhskoe’s open support for tsarist policies firmly placed Rogozhskoe in opposition to these movements.\textsuperscript{465} For example, following the Polish Uprising in 1863, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers quickly issued an open letter addressed directly to Alexander II proclaiming the community’s full approval and support for the tsar’s actions against the insurgents.\textsuperscript{466} Beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow, then, was not just a beacon of Russian patriotism, but also became a means to champion political and
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autocratic stability against the increased influence and political hostility of the growing
democratic and revolutionary movements in Russian politics and society.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers also put forward great efforts to aid Russia’s, and
their allies’, war-efforts during times of conflict. Rogozhskoe’s wealthy merchants and
the community leadership regularly sent monetary donations to Russia’s front-line efforts
and offered care and supplies for any soldiers, Russian and allied, sent back to Moscow.
For instance, some of Rogozhskoe’s more prominent families such as the Morozovs often
donated funds to the Slavic Benevolent Society of Moscow following its founding in
1858, and contributed greatly to the group’s humanitarian efforts throughout the
Balkans.467 Yet the Rogozhskoe Old Believers did not limit their loyalty to donations to
the Slavic Society, as even before the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War in 1878,
Rogozhskoe sent money directly to the Serbian Red Cross to establish a soldiers’ hospital
in Smederevo after the outbreak of war between Serbia and the Ottoman Empire in
1876.468 Following an extremely gracious letter of thanks from the Serbian Red Cross,
the Rogozhskoe trustees even applied to the Ministry of Internal Affairs to establish a
branch-office for the Slavic Society in Rogozhskoe Cemetery.469 While the Ministry
ignored Rogozhskoe’s request, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ actions to aid Serbia (and
later the community’s aid in Russia’s war effort in the same conflict), yet again provided
the opportunity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to put their patriotism on display as a
means to maintain their own ideal of Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow which fulfilled its
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international duty as the champion of devout Orthodoxy for the Old Rite’s fellow Orthodox.

The Rogozhskoe community also displayed their patriotism and loyalty to commemorate anniversaries and other events in the life of the tsars. For example, to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of Alexander II’s reign in 1880, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers constructed a thirty bed addition to the Rogozhskoe almshouse to which the Tsar personally responded with his “praise and thanks for Rogozhskoe’s display of loyalty.” Rogozhskoe also commemorated the imperial family’s miraculous survival following the Borki train disaster on October 17, 1888 with prayer services. On October 27, an assembly of the Rogozhskoe community addressed a letter to Alexander offering to construct a stone hospital for Old Believers named for the Emperor and Empress, with an eternal flame, and commemorative icons – a project estimated at 100,000 rubles. However, due to the what the Ministry of Internal Affairs deemed as the “difficulty” of the hasty nature of Rogozhskoe’s decision, the Ministry rejected Rogozhskoe’s petition to construct the hospital. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers also faced similar difficulties with their petition to lay a wreath at the funeral for Alexander III and offer gifts for Nicholas II’s wedding in November 1894. Only after obtaining strong support from the Governor-General of Moscow Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, the Moscow Chief of Police, and Minister of Internal Affairs Ivan Durnovo, did
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Pobedonostsev consent to allow Rogozhskoe to send representatives (which Pobedonostsev limited to three) to take part of the funeral and wedding ceremonies.  

The outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War became yet another moment for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to display both their charity and patriotism. As news reached Moscow of the Japanese attack on Port Arthur, Rogozhskoe Cemetery held special services in the Nativity Cathedral in order to “Ask God to grant victory to the Emperor and his pious troops over the enemy” and to take a special collection to raise funds to aid the sick and wounded Russian soldiers in the Far East.  

From this first service, Rogozhskoe raised 2,133 rubles which the trustees delivered to the Grand Duchess Elizabeth Feodorovna to send on the funds with the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ blessings.  

Throughout the duration of the war, the Rogozhskoe community continued to champion Russia’s war effort and finance numerous opportunities to aid Russia’s troops. The Rogozhskoe trustees eventually called for a collection to erect a hospital for wounded and sick soldiers, as well as fully equip the new hospital with doctors and medical equipment – a project fully funded from the 7,100 rubles collected from the community.  

Over the duration of the war, Rogozhskoe continued their efforts to aid Russia’s war effort, ultimately contributing an additional 31,798 rubles and 25 kopeks “to help the wounded Russian soldiers and strengthening the Russian Fleet.”
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Rogozhskoe’s efforts to aid Russian forces in the Russo-Japanese War served as yet another example of the community’s devotion to the Russian Empire and attempts to challenge any question of Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s loyalty.

Conclusion

The end result of the opportunities presented by the Era of Reform was that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers firmly established themselves as a communal and spiritual authority within the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, even leading the theological drive to define the new hierarchy in relationship to other Old Believers and Christendom with the Okruzhnoe poslanie. Concurrently, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also sought to better define their place, and their Holy Moscow, within the Russian Empire. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers reaffirmed their identity through more traditional means such as charity, but also actively sought to establish a new relationship with the tsarist state by participating in the Great Reforms and even taking the oath of allegiance to the tsar. Yet even after responding to such critical moments, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers still found themselves as an oppressed religious minority yearning for greater opportunities to build and define their Holy Moscow.
Chapter 4:  
A Brief Triumph: Rogozhskoe’s Unfettered Holy Moscow, 1905 – 1918

The beginning of the twentieth century found the Russian Empire strained politically, socially, economically, and, very soon, militarily. The popular uprisings of 1905 beginning with Bloody Sunday on January 9 and its aftermath eventually redefined life in the Russian Empire for all of society as the tsarist autocracy fought to maintain any semblance of its authority while conceding to numerous social, civil, political, and religious demands of the populace.479 Within that, 1905 proved to not only become a momentous year for the Russian Empire and its people, but the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their Holy Moscow as well. Following Nicholas II’s Ukaz “On Beginning the Improvement of Religious Toleration,” the Rogozhskoe Old Believers suddenly found themselves as the masters of their own community and full control of how they shaped their Holy Moscow.480

Out of the chaos of 1905, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers again redefined their Holy Moscow as a beacon of their ideal Christian community. It was to serve as an example of the triumph of the Old Rite and of their community’s continued efforts to

play a role in Russia’s economic, social, cultural, and political progress. With the *Ukaz* on toleration in April, and the aftermath of the October Manifesto, the Rogozhskoe community adapted their Holy Moscow in two key areas. First, they asked themselves how religious freedom would (and should) shape Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow and the community’s ability to express their faith and ideals. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers still viewed their community as the spiritual center for the entire priestly Old Rite and, after 1905, they needed to now define how best to express their place within the greater context of both the *popovtsy* movement as well as the Old Rite as a whole. Second, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found even greater opportunity to contribute economically, culturally, and even politically in the Russian Empire. The challenge of adapting to post-1905 Russia was complicated by the fact that many of Rogozhskoe’s wealthier merchant families experienced dynastic changes as sons took over their family businesses. Yet, this younger generation of merchants, such as Riabushinskii brothers carried new ambitions and goals on how best to use their wealth, economic influence, and values toward patronage and charity to shape both Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the Russian Empire.

This chapter, then, will explain how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers upheld and adapted their Holy Moscow in response to religious toleration and changes within the Russian Empire beginning in 1905 and until the first Bolshevik interference in the community in 1918. While brief, this period allowed the Rogozhskoe community to fully express their understanding and present their ideal community as the embodiment of Moscow as the Third Rome physically, ideologically, and spiritually. First, this chapter
will look at how religious toleration directly affected Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its community physically and spiritually. With religious toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers not only legally reopened their altars and practiced a full spiritual life within their community and also took measures to fully manifest their ideal Holy Moscow through more construction projects. A second focus of this chapter will explore how religious toleration and laws allowing Old Believers to legally form community councils affected the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ efforts to organize their spiritual and community life. A major influence on community organization was the issue of control and leadership within Rogozhskoe Cemetery between the laity and the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. Before 1905, when imperial law did not recognize the legitimacy of any Old Rite clergy, Rogozhskoe’s laity played the leading role in spiritual decisions and the place of the clergy and Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy within the community. This chapter, then, explains how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers approached the issue of community leadership and ultimately chose to keep a lay leadership for their community. Finally, this chapter explores how the Rogozhskoe Old Believers spread their ideals and influence outside of the community. Individuals and families in Rogozhskoe participated in the broader world both through traditional means such as charity, industry, as well as using new opportunities, such as Ivan Shibaev, to legally publish through mass media and Old Rite newspapers. The period from 1905 to 1918, then, ultimately became a brief moment in which the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found even greater outlets to express their ideals in response to the many opportunities created by post-1905 Russia.
As described in the previous chapter, by the early twentieth century the Rogozhskoe community and the Old Believers throughout Russia remained socially, politically, and spiritually restricted in the Russian Empire. While over the course of the two centuries following the raskol Old Believers proved resilient in maintaining their faith and livelihoods, they still remained at the mercy of tsarist agencies, particularly the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Holy Synod.

Rogozhskoe Cemetery, in particular, remained as a constant reminder of the state’s ability to interfere in the spiritual and daily lives of Old Believers throughout the Russian Empire. Even while Rogozhskoe’s most influential leaders played a continuous role throughout the second half of the nineteenth century in mending the relationship between the tsarist state and the Old Rite, Rogozhskoe’s prominence as an Old Rite spiritual and economic center only contributed to the prejudices against the community held by Church and state officials. This in turn ensured that any spiritual or civil gains the Rogozhskoe Old Believers obtained met with outcries within state agencies amongst its most ardent defenders of Russian Orthodoxy, such as Pobedonostsev, who saw Rogozhskoe and its influence as a cancer that threatened the very foundations of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Russian Empire. In the eyes of some tsarist and Church officials, then, Rogozhskoe Cemetery remained as the crucial battleground in maintaining authority over the Old Rite and ensuring that the Old Believers could not
challenge the Orthodox Church spiritually or influentially amongst the Empire’s population. For example, following Nicholas II’s coronation in 1896, State Comptroller T. I. Filippov considered sending the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ petition to reopen their altars to Nicholas for his approval, yet upon hearing of this, Pobedonostsev rejected the petition on the grounds that “indulgence of these schismatics threatens state security… and would potentially contribute to the collapse of the Russian state.”

However, by the early twentieth century, the Russian Empire found itself in a precarious position as tensions continued to grow between the autocracy and the Russian people. Russia’s continued drive toward industrialization and struggles in the Russo-Japanese War put the populace on edge under economic and social strains. As Russian workers took to strikes in December 1904 in protest over the poor working conditions created by the increased demands of wartime industry, tsarist authorities began consideration of legislation aimed at quelling the general discord growing amongst the populace. One such piece of legislation, drafted on December 12, considered declaring religious freedom for all Christian denominations throughout Russia, including the Old Rite. However, the Holy Synod, and Konstantine Pobedonostsev in particular, urged Nicholas to reconsider, reminding him of his earlier claims that support for the Old Rite weakened the state as a whole. Pobedonostsev feared that full religious toleration of the Old Rite and other denominations would weaken the Orthodox Church, either through conversion to the minority religions (and the loss of conversions to the Orthodox
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Church), or through the loss of the Russian Orthodox Church’s ability to maintain control over the population as the only legal form of Orthodoxy in the Empire. Therefore, due to continued protests amongst Nicholas’ advisors themselves, the autocracy delayed considering the issue of religious toleration.

However, tensions between the tsarist government and the populace finally came to a head following the aftermath of Bloody Sunday on January 9, 1905. As the Russian Empire spiraled into anarchy, Nicholas and his ministers sought to find any means of pacifying the growing number of strikes and uprisings – especially following the outcry over the proposed, consultative State Duma which while offering the election of representatives still kept tsarist absolutism intact. Seemingly with all legislation that compromised the absolutist reign of the tsar off of the table, the government once again looked to appease the populace through granting greater civil rights. This in turn once again brought up the issue of religious freedom. The tsarist authorities now needed to answer a series of questions such as: what would religious toleration look like? Who would receive religious freedom? How can the autocracy grant religious freedom and protect the Russian Orthodox Church? How could Russia define “Orthodoxy” if it allowed for Orthodox pluralism?

The end result became Nicholas’ Ukaz of April 17, 1905 “On the Strengthening of Religious Toleration.” As social unrest continued to dominate Russia’s social and political landscape, the ukaz itself, the autocracy hoped, would help quell some of the
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unrest by granting concessions to its people. On the whole, the *ukaz* lifted the prohibition on leaving the Russian Orthodox Church and allowed “schismatic sects” to build their own temples and hold services. Therefore, the *ukaz* promised that religious minorities could now openly practice their faith rather than registering as Orthodox while practicing their true faith only in private.\(^{486}\) Released on Easter, the decree finally granted the long-awaited reforms for the Old Rite by legally recognizing the movement’s place in relationship to the Russian Empire and the Orthodox Church. First, and foremost, the *ukaz* granted the Old Believers the right to openly practice their faith free from harassment to join or convert to the Russian Orthodox Church.\(^{487}\) The *ukaz* also granted numerous new religious rights for Old Believers, such as: the right for Old Believer communities to elect their own clergy; the right to maintain or build Old Rite monasteries, convents, and hermitages; the right to freely repair or build churches and religious structures; and ordered the unsealing of all closed Old Believer religious structures.\(^{488}\) Second, Nicholas’ *ukaz* legally granted the Old Rite a number of civil rights. Such new rights included the right to legally publish literature and religious books. Spiritually, the *ukaz* granted the right to convert to the Old Rite from the Russian
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Orthodox Church and the right of children of mixed-faith marriages to adopt the Old Rite. Members of the Old Rite also gained the right to build and fund Old Believer primary schools with education on the Old Rite added to their curriculum; and the right for Old Believers to keep their own records on births, marriages, and deaths rather than registering them with the Orthodox Church.  

The *ukaz* on religious toleration also acknowledged the historical legacy of the Old Rite as separate from other sectarian movements. Specifically, the *ukaz* defined the Old Rite and Old Believers as a distinct movement related to the Russian Orthodox Church stating:

“The name of Old Believers, now used instead of *raskolniki*, recognizes the followers of all persuasions and consents who accept the basic tenants of the Orthodox Church, but do not acknowledge the adoption of specific practices into their worship and continue to use the original spelling of early Russian books.”

The *ukaz*, then, served not only as recognition of the religious rights for the Old Believers, but also (re-)defined the movement’s legality in Russian society but also its place within Russian and Christian History.

Rogozhskoe Cemetery itself served as a major focal point for the new tsarist policies toward the Old Rite. The evening prior to Easter, April 16, Nicholas II himself directly issued telegrams to the Rogozhskoe trustees and Moscow Police ordering:
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Today, prior to the upcoming holiday, take my order to unseal the altars at the Old Believer chapels at Rogozhskoe Cemetery and grant permission to the Old Believer clergy to resume performing their church services. This will achieve their long desired removal of the long-term ban against the Old Believers and be a new expression of my confidence, goodwill, and love for the Old Believers and their community.\footnote{Nicholas II, quoted in: A. V. de Shamborant, Raspechatanie altarei v khramakh staroobriadcheskogo Rogozhskogo kladbisha 16 apr. 1905 g. (Moscow 1905), 11.}

Removing the seals on Easter eve from the Rogozhskoe altars ultimately heralded one of the most important events in both Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s history and the community’s portrayal of its Holy Moscow.

By the afternoon before Easter Sunday, hundreds of Old Believers gathered in Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Three-hundred of the Old Believers crammed into Pokrovskii Cathedral to hear Prince Dmitrii Borisovich Golitsyn read the Decree on Religious Toleration. Once Golitsyn finished, witnesses stated the crowd remained in dead silence as the authorities unlocked and removed the remaining barriers. As the altars opened for the first time in nearly forty-nine years, one of the witnesses, Count A. V. de Shamborant, noted that, “The Old Believers’ hearts trembled with the first ray of light rushing [into the altars]. Their emotions gave way, and sobs were heard from excessive joy on all sides.”\footnote{de Shamborant, Raspechatanie, 11 – 12.}

Golitsyn then moved on to the Nativity Cathedral, once again reading the decree to another crowd.

The reopening of Rogozhskoe’s altars remained a monumental moment in the identity and mentality of the entire community as well as the Old Rite. One of the
eyewitnesses who best recorded the event on that Easter Sunday was one of Moscow’s most famous poets, journalist, and essayist, Vladimir Gilyarovsky. Well noted for his poems and stories of his personal accounts detailing his interactions with people from his experiences in Moscow and his travels, including one of the most detailed eyewitness accounts of the Khodynka Field disaster during Nicholas II’s coronation in 1896, Gilyarovsky’s account of Rogozhskoe Cemetery perfectly captured the Old Believers’ emotions to the reopening of their altars. In his work “Reopening the Altars at Rogozhskoe Cemetery,” Gilyarovsky described the community’s reactions to the events in great detail:

And so it happened. By two o’clock in the afternoon, the 16th of April, the Moscow Cemetery gathered to hear the good news that all four altars would be opened... All of the clergy and over three hundred people crammed to the end of the temple, and when those present heard the first sounds of a hammer on the locks of altar’s door – the keys had been lost – tears of joy welled up and gleamed in the eyes of the worshipers...

Gilyarovsky’s essay continues with a vivid description of the Pokrovskii Cathedral’s altars following their opening, highlighting, and in ways symbolizing the devastating effect tsarist regulation of Rogozhskoe Cemetery had on not only the altars themselves, but the whole community and its very identity.

The doors opened.
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There was a smell of dampness, even though [the interior] was lit, as the windows were not boarded over. Forty-nine years took their toll.

Here and there icons had fallen, on the floor, covered with dust, littered with the skeletons of pigeons and jackdaws, who forced their way in here through the broken glass and missing frames. The walls are moldy.

… Many, many icons were spoiled, and the wall paintings disappeared under the mold. Only two Gospels remained on their thrones, shining with gold and silver. One Gospel in particular was well-preserved, large, and according to tradition, donated by Catherine II.\textsuperscript{495}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Ill_11_12.png}
\caption{Ill. 11 & 12: Images of the damage to the Pokrovskii altar space after their reopening, April 16, 1905. N. D. Zenin.}
\end{figure}

In describing the opening of the Nativity Cathedral, Gilyarovsky reveals further devastation at the hands of time:

\textsuperscript{495} Ibid.
Again, they banged their hammers, they chiseled, gnashed, and the doors creaked under the pressure of their shoulders – and when the door opened after great difficulty, all eyes present only appeared gaping darkness. With candles, they could barely make their way through the rubble. At the risk of falling into one of the many holes or the floor failing, the commission removed the seals and opened the gates of the royal and the southern doors.

Gilyarovsky continued with his own invaluable impressions of the state of the altars:

We went in [the Winter temple] and stopped. “Be careful, the floor will fail!” It is dark and musty – the darkness of the grave and the smell of a tomb. For half a century the altar did not see sunlight – the windows were barred by iron and the doors sealed. In the Summer Church, the windows were not blocked, and there almost everything remained. Light gives life. The darkness is of the dead.

The darkness of bigotry and ignorance shut the altar doors, but disappears before the light of freedom of conscience. – Be careful, the hole! – A member of the clergy, E. I. Usov, very kindly helped me. I had stumbled upon the remains of the iron church chairs, the wood rotted, and I nearly fell into a deep hole in the collapsed floor.

… The floor is littered with icons and other debris – they collapsed a long time ago and now are covered in thick dust. To the right is the altar. What we see in the candlelight is not ordinary gray dust. This kind of dust has an unprecedented fervor, the color of darkness. A living, malevolent darkness.

Shaggy, plump dust, giving the impression of something living! Looking further into it, the more it breaths before the eyes, it rises, rising, and as if it is about to stir, continues to rise – I think – and something terrible, very terrible, is about to crawl out from under it. As if from under the dust would come a monstrous wail, as if countless demons and monsters gathering their strength will climb and burst from the wreckage… it diseases the
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imagination to think that it was this countless multitude and its power that required so many to smash-in and break the doors open.

…We go into the altar. Our candles do not tremble, they do not flicker… And our footsteps become the voices of the dead as the dust muffles our steps. …The altar miraculously holds on to something… From a thick layer of dust, dressing it all, you can only guess at the contours of objects…. As we surround it the heart muscles tighten, the soul hurts from this “Blasphemy of God’s Holiness!” And now – Christ is risen! 497

Ill. 13: Damage to a portion of the Nativity Cathedral’s altar upon its reopening. N. D. Zenin, 1905
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Gilyarovsky’s essay highlights many of the first images the Rogozhskoe Old Believers experienced once the Pokrovskii and Nativity altars opened. It was an image of destruction – the state’s sealing of the altars ruined numerous treasures. Therefore it was not just Rogozhskoe’s understanding of their Holy Moscow that suffered from the losing their altars, but the community’s history and claims to protect the treasures of ancient Russian Orthodoxy. Yet, reopening the altars provided hope for the community and Rogozhskoe’s very ideal and presentation of their Holy Moscow.

Gilyarovsky’s essay also provides an excellent account of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ mindset following the altars’ reopening. The community wasted no time in their attempt to clean and repair the altars in order to make the altars a working part of their cathedrals, and therefore their whole community as quickly as possible. As Gilyarovsky states:

As the day went on, more people, learning about the events, came to visit and arrived [at the temples]. They had questions, conversations, and shared their joy and jubilation.

Up to forty people immediately began working to clean the altars of the churches, trying to ready them in any possible order for the Easter services, which would take place at the altar for the first time after almost half a century of gloomy silence.

Hastily they threw out the debris and decayed matter. The people took for their memory small fragments, scraps of matter, scraps of paper. And now before me a blackened piece of paper with a clearly written: “For the repose of Ivan. Remember for the Forty Day Mass.”
side an inscription in pencil: “Vostryakov.” And all of these pieces, were reminders of verses for these people.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ decision to immediately begin repairing the altars in order to hold any semblance of proper Easter service reflected the significance of both the moment and the sacredness of their spaces. Returning the altars to the community for full religious services returned the altars as a sacred space to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. As revealed by the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ shouts of “Christ is Risen… Now we have a Church!” just as Easter celebrates Christ’s Resurrection, so too did Easter 1905 celebrate Rogozhskoe’s resurrection as a true embodiment of Holy Moscow.

Most importantly, however, Gilyarovsky’s essay reveals how monumental the unsealing was to the entire Rogozhskoe community. The efforts to ready the altars for Easter services proved successful in Pokrovskii Cathedral. Gilyarovsky described the scene as:

The people gathered in unprecedented numbers. The church was filled, and crowds gathered all around the outside. There was a bright illumination from the outside. Even though bells were still prohibited, there was a solemn Easter ringing in the air, as it was in Macedonia and in Bulgaria before the wars of liberation.

The procession moved inside the church, but could not move around it outside. “This was our most desired temptation” – said one of the Old Believers, when I asked him about the grand illumination and the procession.

Prince Golitsyn, Count Sheremetev, and E. Volkov all attended the midnight liturgy. The service was extremely solemn and intimate. The mood was majestic. The persons
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joyful. The procession was over… they sang “Easter is Sacred,” and sang out “Christ is Risen!” And all began to triple kiss.

The Old-timers do not remember having such high spirits, such happy tears and warm embraces. The Easter greeting lasted about an hour.

Soon all began repeating – Now we have a Church! Now we have Complete Services! 499

Gilyarovsky’s account reveals not only the significance of religious toleration, but the very emotions felt by the entire Rogozhskoe community. Religious Toleration not only reopened Rogozhskoe’s altars but also guaranteed the rebirth of the community both physically and spiritually. As the Rogozhskoe historian Makarov noted about the reopening of the altars, “The day of April 16, 1905 will forever remain in the memory of the Moscow Old Believers as it completely shifted their history as it laid to rest their sad past of suffering, and brought on a new era to freely practice their religion.” 500 Just as the community upheld their ideals and identity in the face of continued oppression and legal restrictions, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized just how monumental this moment proved to be as Nicholas’ Ukaz granted de facto recognition of everything Rogozhskoe Cemetery represented to its members – an Old Rite community, and an Old Rite Church that bound the community together in its attempts to fully embody the spiritual and communal ideals of Third Rome Moscow.

While the Rogozhskoe Old Believers celebrated their new-found religious freedom and the reopening of their altars, they soon elected a commission to send to the
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Emperor on behalf of the community. Arriving at Tsarskoe Selo on April 19, the Rogozhskoe deputies met with Nicholas and shared their tearful yet “joyful and heartfelt thanks on behalf of [their] Moscow Old Believer community for the kindness bestowed upon Rogozhskoe Cemetery with the reopening of their holy shrines” and the “mercy of religious toleration.” For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, then, as throughout their history, the Tsar remained the true source of any mercy. Their batiushka finally intervened on their behalf and undid the injustices of the past to not only return their altars but grant them the freedom to fully express their Faith.

In this grand moment in 1905, the Easter greeting that “Christ is Risen” took on an even greater significance for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. For the first time in Rogozhskoe’s history, and the history of the Old Rite, the community and Old Believers throughout Russia could legally perform and attend a full Old-Rite Orthodox service, and they could legally refer to their sacred spaces as Churches and Cathedrals and thereby publically display their faith and spirituality. For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, Easter 1905 not only allowed them to celebrate Christ’s Resurrection, but the very Resurrection of Old-Rite Russian Orthodoxy and the ability to fully achieve their ideal Holy Moscow and build their Third Rome without spiritual restriction.
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Envisioning a New Holy Moscow: Rogozhskoe Cemetery after Religious Toleration

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers wasted no time in making numerous efforts to use their new freedom to reshape their community and Holy Moscow in response to religious toleration. Physically, the greatest concern of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was restoring and renovating their cathedrals to once again serve both the community as well as symbols of Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s grandeur. Along with this, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also incorporated new construction projects into Rogozhskoe Cemetery, primarily a new belltower. Furthermore, with the community’s new ability to fully practice and realize their ideals, for the first time in its history the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to define and organize their community and their representation of a Holy Moscow both for themselves and the rest of Muscovite, Russian, and Orthodox society in response to the changes of post-1905 Russia. Ultimately this led to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers replacing their Trustees with a governing body that would lead and organize the community to best develop their Holy Moscow for the era of Religious toleration in Imperial Russia.

Restoring Rogozhskoe Cemetery

As unsealing the Rogozhskoe altars revealed the devastation of forty-nine years with no maintenance, nothing was of more greater, immediate concern to the whole community who gathered together on April 29, 1905 to discuss how to restore and
renovate both of the cathedrals’ altars as well as the cathedrals themselves. On April 30 the community elected a commission of some of their most esteemed and influential members to determine how to move forward with restoration of the altars. The final commission included I. K. Rakhmanov, G. K. Rakhmanov, Matvei Sidorovich Kuznetso, Ivan Pugovkin, Pavel Riabushinski, P. S. Rastorguev, E. T. Malyzhev, Pavel V. Fedotov, and the priests Ioann Vlasov, Elisei Melekhin, and Prokopii Sorokin. Over the course of the next months, the committee focused on the costs of not only restoring the altars themselves, but also the numerous damaged icons and wall frescos throughout the cathedrals and the structures themselves.

In the first meeting alone, on May 25, the committee took its first steps toward the restoration of many icons and the altar of Pokrovskii Cathedral: 5,600 rubles for the restoration of the altar’s iconography which included cleaning and repairing any damage to the icons’ images or bases and 8,000 rubles for the cathedral’s “wall iconography and painting” to be completed by the iconographer Nikolai Safonov, who was well knowing throughout central Russia for his work restoring frescos and icons in churches and cathedrals throughout Moscow, Vladimir, Novgorod, and Saint Sergius Trinity Lavra. The committee also considered a complete restoration of the dome for the Nativity Cathedral, but determined to postpone any work on the dome. The
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committee’s second meeting discussed restoration of the Nativity Cathedrals icons as well as “washing” the iconostasis and wall icons.\textsuperscript{507}

It becomes clear then that the Rogozhskoe committee fully anticipated a strong resurgence of the Old Rite and the community’s focus as a spiritual center for the immediate community and popovtsy pilgrims. Ultimately, the final total for restoration of both cathedrals proved staggering and reveals both how devastating oppression proved to be on the physical embodiment of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ faith as well as the community’s determination to rebuild and restore their very ideals. For the Pokrovskii Cathedral, the grand total of restoration and other work tallied to 38,100 rubles. Along with the original restorations for the altars (5,600 rubles) and wall iconography (8,000 rubles) renovation of the Pokrovskii Cathedral also included costs for the construction of a new, gilded iconostasis (8,000 rubles) and new iron frames for the church (1,500 rubles).\textsuperscript{508} The greatest expense, however, reflected the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ desire to use Pokrovskii Cathedral for services year-round as the Rogozhskoe committee voted to install a new, steam heating system for the cathedral – the final cost totaling 15,000 rubles.\textsuperscript{509} Installing a heating system for Pokrovskii Cathedral ensured that not only could services be held in winter, but therefore could also allow for more Old Believers to participate in services as both cathedrals could be used simultaneously throughout the year. Rather than relying on services held in private homes, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers hoped that Rogozhskoe’s spirituality would once again

\textsuperscript{507} Ibid., L. 129 – 129ob.  
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become a communal affair in which all parishioners should participate together and thereby reunite the community through the shared participation in the Old Rite.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers proved willing to spend any expense to restore their sacred spaces, not only to return them to reflect the community’s past grandeur, but also to update and make the cathedrals accessible for a new generation in a new era of Old Rite Orthodoxy. Of the two buildings, the Nativity Cathedral required even greater attention. Not only did the community find its altars nearly completely in ruin, but the interior also required basic renovations. In total, the Nativity Cathedral’s restoration totaled 43,100 rubles. Restoration of the altars’ salvageable icons was 850 rubles. However the altars themselves, and much of the interior iconography all needed to be completely rebuilt which included a new floor for the altar (10,000 rubles), a new iconostasis and wall paintings (13,750 rubles), and new sacred utensils such as candle holders, censers, and other materials (3,500 rubles). As part of the Nativity Cathedral’s renovation, the committee also paid for the installation of a new, steam heating system as well which also totaled 15,000 rubles.

While renovating the cathedrals played an important role immediately following religious toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized that their ensemble of religious structures remained incomplete. Since the earliest days of Nicholas I’s reign, Old Believers could not build nor use any belfries or bells in their services as law only permitted Orthodox Churches to use bell ringing. Rogozhskoe Cemetery itself had its
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bells confiscated under the same laws that prevented the community to repair their buildings. As bells and bell ringing play an important role in Russian Orthodox identity and the history of the Orthodox Church, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers wanted to restore this service to community’s spiritual life. The Rogozhskoe committee, in its meeting on June 16, 1905 unanimously decided to petition the Moscow authorities for permission to “erect a stone bell tower for our community, and while it is constructed, also build a temporary wooden belfry.” By incorporating bell ringing into the daily experience, the community could add yet another aspect of Orthodox religious services in order to create a complete Church and spiritual experience for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers.

However, even following religious toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced some difficulty in achieving complete and total freedom to express their faith. For example, some Moscow authorities such as the police and Governor General Alexander Kozlov continued to restrict the Rogozhskoe Old Believers ability to publically display their faith, and ordered that any religious processions remain within Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s walls. Particularly, as the ukaz on religious freedom did not dictate how Old Believer communities could build new structures. For example, in response to the Rogozhskoe committee’s request for a bell tower Kozlov, dismissed the petition stating “why would [you] build a temporary belfry and bell tower without the discretion of the
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As no new regulations dictating the legality of Old Believer construction existed, it appeared that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers would continue to wait indefinitely to build their bell tower.

Yet, even while the remnants of prejudice amongst various officials kept their plans in check, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers still planned for the future construction of their new bell tower. It can be argued that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers desired a grand bell tower, something designed to not only represent the freedom to express themselves as Orthodox Christians, but to also serve as a symbol for the entire community to celebrate the era of religious toleration as it would be the first new, religious structure in Rogozhskoe in nearly a century. Furthermore, following the arguments of Roy Robson on Old Believer construction projects after 1905, such a construction project also served as a symbol for the community’s Holy Moscow as the ability to construct any religious structure helped Old Believer communities affirm the Old Rite as a legitimate religion in the period after toleration. Designed by the architects Fyodor Gornostaev and Z. I. Ivanov, the original project estimates for the stone bell tower would total 155,847 rubles. Therefore, the community needed to raise the necessary funding to build such a structure.

517 Ibid.
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Beginning in 1906, even before receiving permission for the bell tower’s construction, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers openly sought “voluntary donations for the construction of a bell tower for Rogozhskoe Cemetery.”  Many of Rogozhskoe’s most influential families and wealthiest individuals, as well as many of Rogozhskoe’s parishioners donated vast sums of rubles or building materials for the project over the next three years. By the end of 1906, the community raised 2081 rubles and 40 kopeks. By the end of 1907, the Rogozhskoe parishioners donated a grand total of 82,438 rubles and 53 kopeks. In 1908 – 52,692 rubles and 11 kopeks. And through 1909, an additional
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60,903 rubles and 77 kopeks.521 While a number of Rogozhskoe’s most prominent individuals contributed vast sums of their own wealth, such as M. S. Kuznetsov (10,000 rubles) and Stepan Riabushinski (9000 rubles),522 no other rivaled the donations of the Morozov family.

Fedosiia Ervilovna and Maria Fedorovna, sisters-in-law married to (and widows of) the brothers Ivan Savvich and Timofei Savvich Morozov respectively, contributed the largest donations for Rogozhskoe’s bell tower. In memory of her recently deceased son, Sergei, Fedosiia donated 30,000 rubles in 1907 and “vast amounts of building materials including scaffolding, beams, and the entire fixture for the bells – all so the bells could ring in the memory of Sergei.”523 Maria, who owned and managed her family’s various textile factories and other businesses following Timofei’s death in 1889, eventually devoted herself, and her wealth, to both Rogozhskoe Cemetery and numerous charities throughout Moscow and the Russian Empire – especially following the sudden death of her youngest son, Savva in 1905.524 Already one of Moscow’s most notable and revered philanthropists, Maria now desired to not only continue her own charitable donations, but also to build Savva’s legacy.525 Rogozhskoe Cemetery in particular

522 Ibid., L. 29.
524 See for example, Ulianova, “Not for Wealth, but for God.” For a further analysis of the general approach toward private charity and philanthropy in Late Imperial Russia see, Adele Lindenmeyr, Poverty is Not a Vice: Charity, Society, and the State in Imperial Russia (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
525 The questionable nature of Savva’s death in Cannes, France not only led numbers of Savva’s friends, such as Maxim Gorky, Savva’s wife and family, and even the Moscow Governor-General Kozlov to reject the Cannes police’s ruling of suicide, eventually allowing Savva to receive a Christian burial at the Morozov family crypt in Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Yet hoping to maintain Savva’s “good name,” and also theorized to distance Savva’s legacy away from his original public and financial support for the growing Revolutionary movement of the Social Democrats (for which Maria suspended Savva from managing any of the family’s factories following strikes at the Morozov’s Nikol’skoi plant in February 1905 and later
received numerous, very generous donations from Maria, including 20,000 rubles in 1908 and yet another 45,000 rubles in 1909 all for constructing the Rogozhskoe belltower.

Ultimately, Fedosia and Maria’s generosity served as a great reflection of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ devotion to building their Third Rome. Maria in particular received great praise directly from Archbishop Ioann who deemed her Rogozhskoe’s “great benefactress” during one of the earliest ceremonies commemorating the groundbreaking for Rogozhskoe’s bell tower in 1908.

It was not until late 1907 that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers finally received permission from the Moscow authorities to construct their bell tower. Consecration for the site and first construction of the bell tower began on April 20 drew in large crowds of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers estimated in the thousands gathered to celebrate the Divine Liturgy in commemoration of the event. Coming together, many watching the services held under a large, white tent, the community celebrated not only the blessings of the authorities, and Nicholas, who allowed them to begin construction, but also the culmination of a new era for Rogozhskoe Cemetery.

blamed the Social Democrats as her son’s killers for his refusal to continue funding the party or their newspaper Iskra), Maria and her surviving son, Sergei took great efforts to maintain many of Savva’s charities and other organizations to preserve his memory. For greater detail, see T. P. Morozova and I. V. Potkina, Savva Morozov.
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Located between the Pokrovskii and Nativity cathedrals, the Rogozhskoe bell tower was designed to serve as a symbol of the Rogozhskoe community. As stated by the Old Believer Newspaper *Tserkov’,* founded by Rogozhskoe’s Ivan Shibaev in 1908, “The Bell Tower’s grand size and original, beautiful architecture in the Russian style, will, no doubt, belong amongst the most prominent buildings in the area and one of the grandest examples of church architecture in the ancient capital.”\(^{529}\) Designed as a four-tier tower, the community intended to use the bell tower for multiple purposes. The first tier was designated for a small Church of the Resurrection, intended to allow services for up to 200 people.\(^{530}\) The bell tower’s second-tier would serve as the community’s library and archives, housing both documents and correspondence from and to the community, as

\(^{529}\) Ibid.
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well as holding many of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers oldest and most valuable manuscripts and other antiquities.\textsuperscript{531} The third and fourth tiers housed the new bells, which following the rapid construction of the basic structure, were finally mounted in October 1908.\textsuperscript{532}

Architecturally, however, Rogozhskoe’s new bell tower served as a symbol of the community’s recreated Third Rome. While the community already restored the bells in Pokrovskii and the Nativity cathedrals thereby allowing the community to use bells prior to the tower’s completion, the bell tower, and the Church of the Resurrection added to Rogozhskoe’s physical embodiment of their Old Rite Moscow. The Rogozhskoe bell tower served two symbolic purposes. First, it represented the first structure that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers constructed purely in old Russian architectural styles since the original Pokrovskii Cathedral which was demolished by tsarist authorities in 1791. Unlike the Pokrovskii and Nativity cathedrals, which mixed and matched the popular architectural styling of their day, the Rogozhskoe Bell Tower maintained a purely Russian architectural style, specifically that of the Early Muscovite Period of the late 15\textsuperscript{th} and early 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{533}

\textsuperscript{531} Tserkov’, 1908 No. 17, 622.  
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The bell tower then served as Rogozhskoe’s ability to produce a physical structure that truly reflected the artistic and architectural styles of Pre-Nikonian Russian Orthodoxy, thereby allowing the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to produce a structure that completely represented the history of the Old Rite and their faith.

Second, and most importantly, the bell tower played an important role in the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ attempts to physically recreate their Holy Moscow. As
designed, the Rogozhskoe Belltower measured 80 meters tall upon its completion, only one meter shorter than the Ivan the Great Bell Tower in the Kremlin. For centuries, the Ivan the Great Bell Tower stood as the tallest structure in Moscow, until 1883 when upon completion of the Cathedral of Christ the Savior surpassed the bell tower. Just as the Rogozhskoe Old Believers designed the original Pokrovskii Cathedral as a larger replica of the Kremlin’s Dormition Cathedral in 1791, the new Rogozhskoe bell tower served as yet another moment for the community to both symbolize and reconnect themselves to an idealized period in Russian Orthodoxy and Russian culture through physical mediums.

While the Rogozhskoe bell tower was not a direct copy of the Ivan the Great Bell Tower, it still served as a symbol for the community’s ties to Russian and Orthodox history, as well as the legacy of the Old Rite as upholding traditional Russian culture and Orthodoxy free of foreign spiritual or cultural influence. It can be argued then that just as the Pre-Nikonian Church held the Moscow Kremlin’s Cathedral Square as the seat of the Russian Orthodox Church, so now the Rogozhskoe Cemetery “cathedral square” served as the seat of the Old Rite Holy Moscow.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers in turn continued to build upon the symbol of their bell tower, continually improving and adding to the structure until 1913. The bell tower took on a central role in the community’s identity and activities. Upon completion of the interior wall paintings of the Church of the Resurrection on August 18, 1913 a
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number of important figures from Moscow and throughout Russia attended Rogozhskoe’s
celebrations or sent congratulatory telegrams – including either visits or recognition from
the likes of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers V. N. Kokovtsev, Minister of
Internal Affairs Nikolai Maklakov, Director of the Department of Religious Affairs E. V.
Menkin, Chairman of the State Duma Mikhail Rodzianko, and Count Sergei Witte.  
While Witte did not attend the ceremonies, he sent a telegram to the Rogozhskoe Old
Believers and acknowledged that as one of the architects of Nicholas’ ukaz on religious
toleration, he was “filled with extreme joy and sadness” to be invited to attend the
community’s commemorations.  
In his telegram Witte stated:

I feel joy, as your activities reveal the full vision of the
extent of freedom by the decree, and even if it was applied
to a smaller degree, this is a great benefit to all of Russia; I
am saddened because for so long you had to remain
relatively insignificant and could only rely on your hope.
But without hope one could not live, but because of your
continued hope we can give thanks to God and the Tsar for
the passing of [religious toleration] so that you may receive
full freedom.

Ultimately, Rogozhskoe’s bell tower became yet another identifying symbol of the entire
community’s self-identity and their ideals. Not only did the bell tower become one of the
most visible structures in all of Moscow in the early 20th century due to its height, but
also became yet another visible symbol of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ devotion to the
Old Rite and the grandeur and wealth of the community.
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Governing the Community: The Moscow Old Believer Community of Rogozhskoe Cemetery

As religious toleration legitimized the Old Rite as a religion, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers now needed to determine how to shape their community in response to the changes in post 1905 Russia. Particularly, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to answer questions about the place of the Old Rite in the contemporary world, and how an Old Rite community should organize itself in response to the political, social, cultural, and economic changes around them now that they could freely express their faith without fear of retribution. Furthermore, as home to the Archbishop of Moscow and all Rus’ of the Belokrinitiskaya Hierarchy in Russia, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also needed to determine their relationship to and the place for their Church Hierarchy in the community itself. Ultimately then, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers needed to determine how to organize and maintain their own community in order to redefine their own identity and understanding of Holy Moscow in light of the drastic changes in Imperial Russia after 1905.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ first opportunity to approach organizing their community for the post-1905 world came in October 1906 when the Governing Senate issued a decree on procedures for Old Believers to form and operate their communities. More importantly, however, the decree officially recognized the legality for Old Believer
communities to exist and organize their own governing bodies. Taking the reins of this new project, Stepan Riabushinskii organized what became the *Moskovskaya Staroobriadcheskaya Obshina Rogozhskogo Kladbisha* (MSORK, or The Moscow Old Believer Community of Rogozhskoe Cemetery), to serve as the new organizational and political body for Rogozhskoe Cemetery and officially registered the organization with the Moscow authorities on January 25, 1907.

The first community meeting for MSORK came together on February 24. At this first meeting the community discussed issues such as: the election of clergy offices; determining the number of members serving on the MSORK council; electing members to manage the Rogozhskoe community’s charities; determining how to manage immovable and movable community property; and to elect a council to set regulations for Rogozhskoe Cemetery and MSORK. Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers established a Council of 40 members to serve in MSORK. Under its governing documents the primary duty for the MSORK Council was to “take care of the beauty and prosperity of the community and its churches, maintain order of the cemetery, and perform all duties to maintain the regular life of the charities and schools.” The MSORK Council directly managed all of the affairs for the entire community and served for a duration of three years. The head of the Council served as Chairman. Other officers included two Deputy Chairmen, a treasurer, and Caretaker of the Churches.
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MSORK also maintained the position of Rogozhskoe Cemetery Trustee as two officers serving on the MSORK Council.\textsuperscript{545}

While not only adding a number of officers and more elected positions than the earlier organization under the Trustees, MSORK also took on more duties and control to manage Rogozhskoe Cemetery, particularly in regard to the spiritual life of the community.\textsuperscript{546} However, just as with the community’s previous organization under the Trustees, the Rogozhskoe parishioners highly favored the community’s most successful and prominent businessmen to serve as MSORK officers. Particularly, the Kuznetsovs (Matvei Sidorovich and his sons Sergei, Georgii, and Nikolai), two of the Riabushinskii brothers (Stepan and Pavel), Arseni Morozov, and Ivan Pugovkin all played prominent roles in shaping Rogozhskoe over the following decade as each served multiple terms in various high ranking MSORK offices.\textsuperscript{547} Similar to the former Trustees, the MSORK officers controlled and invested the Rogozhskoe community’s capital and maintained Rogozhskoe’s numerous charities – a role reserved for the MSORK officers specifically because of their personal business success. The MSORK officers proved themselves very effective as even with the various improvements to community buildings such as the hospitals, almshouses, hotel, schools, and even the expenses for renovating the

\textsuperscript{545} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{546} The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ organization under a larger governing body in MSORK shares in the trend within Russian society for institutionalization amongst various groups, associations, and even religious sectarians in order to participate in Russia’s public sphere. See for example, Joseph Bradley, \textit{Voluntary Associations in Tsarist Russia: Science, Patriotism, and Civil Society} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009). Nicholas Breyfogle also looks at similar organization amongst the sectarian group of Molokans through efforts such as church building in Late Imperial Russia in “Prayer and the Politics of Place: Molokan Church Building, Tsarist Law, and the Quest for a Public Sphere in Late Imperial Russia,” in \textit{Sacred Stories: Religion and Spirituality in Modern Russian Culture}, ed. Heather Coleman and Mark Steinberg (Indiana University Press, 2007), 222-252.
\textsuperscript{547} A chart of all Rogozhskoe Trustees and later MSORK leadership is provided in Iukhimenko, \textit{Staroobriadcheskii tsentr}, 163 – 65.
Rogozhskoe cathedrals and building the new bell tower, by January 1, 1915

Rogozhskoe’s capital and investments totaled 2,487,881 rubles and 21 kopeks.548

One of MSORK’s most important duties, however, was also its direct influence over the spiritual organization for Rogozhskoe Cemetery. While clerical decisions such as ordaining priests or consecrating bishops remained under the Archbishop of Moscow’s authority, MSORK regulated the active spiritual life for the community and including the duties for Rogozhskoe’s clergy such priests’ workloads, the requirements for serving as a deacon, and even the requirements for serving in the community’s choir.549 MSORK also held authority over who could serve as priests within Rogozhskoe Cemetery, or who amongst the Belokrinitskaya clergy could visit, attend, or conduct services within Rogozhskoe, both of which would be determined based on recommendations from the Archbishop of Moscow himself and later approved by the MSORK Council.550

The primary purpose behind MSORK’s regulations for Rogozhskoe’s clergy directly stemmed from some limitations in regard to religious organization in the decree on religious toleration. First, the ukaz on religious toleration initially did not officially recognize the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy’s legitimacy in that Old Believer clergy could still not use titles such as “priest” or “bishop.” The Rogozhskoe Old Believers had to, in fact, sign specialized documents guaranteeing that they would still not allow their clergy to use official titles or conduct public displays of the Old Rite outside of the community.
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itself.\textsuperscript{551} However, the \textit{ukaz} did recognize the right for Old Believer communities to control and organize their own clergy as they wished.\textsuperscript{552} Secondly, as the tsarist authorities gradually lifted such restrictions and eventually recognized the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy’s right to use clerical and Episcopal titles in 1910,\textsuperscript{553} the Rogozhskoe Old Believers desired to firmly establish themselves as the spiritual center for not only the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy, but all priestly Old Believers. It can be argued then that the MSORK officials, then, took it upon themselves to shape exactly how the Rogozhskoe Holy Moscow would conduct its spiritual life by not only determining the number of clerics that Rogozhskoe required, but also the clerics’ duties as well as who could perform services in Rogozhskoe Cemetery. Initially, the process for selecting priests relied solely on Rogozhskoe’s Trustees, and later the MSORK Council, approving recommendations from the Old Rite Archbishop Ioann (Kartushin) of Moscow and All Russia.\textsuperscript{554} However, as MSORK desired to take greater control and better organize the community itself, the Council took it upon itself to determine a set of regulations to guide Rogozhskoe’s spiritual life from its clergy to its choristers. Not completed until 1913, MSORK finally issued its “Internal Regulations for the Churches of Rogozhskoe Cemetery” listing the nine guidelines for spiritual duties within the community. Summarized, these regulations were as follows:

1. Two priests must be present at all Sunday services
2. Two deacons must be present at all Sunday services
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3. Priests must conduct services on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Every priest will give services for four days and alternate who may take Sunday off.

4. Deacons must attend services for Vespers, Matins, and Hours on weekdays.

5. Widowed priests must attend services on weekdays for Vespers, Matins, and Hours at least every other week.

6. Choristers should be in ready no later than ten minutes before services, without exception, when it is their turn to serve in the choir. If a member fails to attend the service, they will receive a warning the first time, the second time they will be punished for two weeks without performing, and the third time they will be dismissed from their post.

7. Choristers are selected by year. No chorister may be absent for more than fifteen days, and if they miss more should be replaced.

8. Any choristers dismissed or who lose their materials shall be fined.

9. The elder clergy and elder community members may recommend priests and deacons, but they must be approved by the governing Council.

Similar to the arguments by historians such as Crummey, Paert, and Robson on Old Believer community organization, by creating regulations for the church life at Rogozhskoe Cemetery, the MSORK Council not only established a uniform understanding of the spiritual experience for the community but also ensured that the laity remained an active part of the community’s spiritual life. Ultimately, such control ensured that MSORK could maintain a high standard and expectations of the community’s clergy to meet the spiritual standards for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their identity and ideals.
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The MSORK Council, as well as all Rogozhskoe Old Believers, therefore upheld a specific standard for their clergy. As these clergy not only administered and maintained the community’s spiritual life, but as clergy of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy (and serving in the seat for the hierarchy in Russia) also embodied the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ spiritual aspect of their Holy Moscow. Therefore, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and MSORK often commemorated outstanding clergy for their service to the community. One such example was Prokopii Sorokin.

First arriving at Rogozhskoe Cemetery in 1883, Father Sorokin became one of the most influential priests in the community. Sorokin, even served as both a spiritual council and personal confessor for many of Rogozhskoe’s most notable parishioners and leaders such as Matvei and Sergei Kuznetsov, Stepan and Sergei Riabushinskii, Ivan Pugovkin, and Ivan Novikov.\(^{557}\) For his service, MSORK held a grand jubilee in Sorokin’s honor for 25 years of service on May 6, 1908.\(^{558}\) As this celebration was the first to commemorate a priest’s service following the *ukaz* on religious toleration, Father Prokopii’s jubilee served as a means to celebrate his perseverance and devotion to both the Rogozhskoe community and the Old Rite even while under religious oppression. The service itself included a prayer service in the Pokrovskii cathedral and messages of congratulations of which a number compared Prokopii’s career to the life of Job for experiencing the hardship of oppression, yet persevering until the onset of toleration. After receiving a number of valuable icons for his service, Sorokin reminded his parishioners that his experience was merely the shared experience of the community

\(^{557}\) *Tserkov’,* 1908 No. 20, 716 – 18.
\(^{558}\) Ibid.
stating that, “Although we have experienced much grief, we eventually received an ineffable joy with the reopening of the holy shrines and the freedom for our faith.”

MSORK even further rewarded Sorokin’s service by establishing a new educational scholarship in his name for the orphans and wards in Rogozhskoe’s almshouses in October 1908.

The formation of the MSORK ultimately established a governing that ensured that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ needs were met for both the community and to guide their Holy Moscow in post 1905 Russia. As explained later, MSORK, and many of its prominent members, continued to play a very important role in shaping and maintaining both Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the community’s very ideals for building and presenting their Holy Moscow. Under the leadership of MSORK, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers ultimately built off of their history and recognition as one of the wealthiest and most charitable communities in Moscow and their new spiritual freedom to finally create their idealized Third Rome to serve as a standard for both the Old Rite, and Early Twentieth Century Russia.

---
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The Rogozhskoe Old Believers after Religious Toleration

As throughout their history, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers developed a specific identity and ideal that they presented to world outside Rogozhskoe Cemetery as one of true Christian piety to contrast against what they viewed as the moral, religious, and economic corruptions of a westernized society. For starters, individual families and Rogozhskoe Cemetery itself still maintained a very active role in Muscovite and Russian society through various philanthropic work and charities in Moscow.

With religious toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought, above all else, to present their community as a spiritual and cultural center for the priestly Old Rite. This required that the community increase their participation and interaction with both Muscovite and Russian society, as well as the Old Rite as a whole. For the first time in the community’s history, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could fully use their economic and charitable influences to reaffirm their self-identity as defenders of the ideals of the Third Rome Doctrine without fear of jealous retribution of the Russian Orthodox Church and Orthodox officials. Furthermore, Rogozhskoe Cemetery and a number of its more prominent members such as Ivan Shibaev, Sergei Morozov, and the Riabushinskii brothers, all became major influences not only economically but also culturally. They concentrated their efforts as major collectors and patrons of the arts and even publishers as a means to share their own personal ideals with fellow Old Believers and the public.
Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ efforts to expand their influence became part of their attempt to define their post-1905 Holy Moscow. First, following religious toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers sought any means to affirm their prominence to the outside world primarily through a close relationship with the Tsar and tsarist authorities, as well as the community’s role and place within the Old Rite and Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy. Second, a number of prominent families and individual parishioners, as well as the community itself not only continued their role as philanthropists and major sources of charity, but also took great efforts to present themselves and Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a major cultural influence within the Russian Empire. Above all, charity and philanthropy continued to dominate the mindset of both the Rogozhskoe community in general and its wealthiest families, merchants, industrialists, and entrepreneurs as the primary means to reaffirm the community’s commitment to true Christian piety and use of capital. However, these same groups also made every effort to present Rogozhskoe Cemetery, and many private collectors amongst the community, as establishing the foundation of a natural, Russian cultural center unrivaled in the Russian Empire. They did so primarily through the community’s patronage of the arts such as folk crafts, donating to art galleries, such as the Tret’iakov gallery, and the theater, as well as Rogozhskoe’s own collection of ancient Russian icons and manuscripts. Through such efforts, then, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers ultimately hoped to not only restore and maintain their own Holy Moscow, but to share their ideal and spread their influence throughout the Russian Empire.
Legitimizing Rogozhskoe Cemetery to the Old Rite and the Outside World

Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers came to the conclusion that just as Nicholas granted religious toleration, it would be the Tsar who legitimized Rogozhskoe’s claim as the spiritual, cultural, and influential center of the Old Rite Holy Moscow. While Rogozhskoe Cemetery solidified its position within the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy as the seat of the Old Rite Archbishop of Moscow and All-Russia in the late nineteenth century, the ukaz on religious toleration allowed for Rogozhskoe and its clergy to freely conduct any services using Pre-Nikonian rites and spiritual books. However, as previously stated above, the Belokrinitskaya hierarchy remained illegitimate and while Old Rite clergy could use the title “priest” Old Believer bishops did not hold any true authority with their position outside of ordaining other Old Rite clergy. Therefore one of the earliest efforts on the part of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers was to seek greater recognition both for Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and the community’s place as seat of the Old Rite Archbishop of Moscow and All-Russia

While the Belokrinitskaya clergy freely conducted religious services and ordained new clergy, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers continuously sought a means to gain legal recognition for their Church hierarchy. Therefore, the MSORK council, in particular, made efforts to maintain a close relationship with the Tsar and the Royal family – continuing traditions such as gifts for holidays and special occasions. For example, the MSORK Council constantly petitioned to send delegations to celebrate Easter services with Nicholas and his family. Ultimately, in 1910, MSORK received permission to send

561 RSL, F. 246, K. 6, Ed. 6, L. 99 – 99ob.
a delegation to Tsarskoe Selo for Easter. The final delegation was comprised of one of
Rogozhskoe’s priests, Father Ioann Vlasov, and a number of MSORK’s officials
including Ivan Pugovkin, Sergei Solovyov, Peter Rastorguev, and Ivan Petrovich
Tregubov.\textsuperscript{562} Following a private exchange of Easter greetings with the Nicholas,
Alexandra, their children, and Maria Fedorovna, Father Ioann, by all accounts of his own
volition, extended an invitation “on behalf of Archbishop Ioann” to visit Rogozhskoe
Cemetery.\textsuperscript{563} In response, Nicholas graciously accepted the invitation and “with his
supreme command expressed his highest gratitude and returned his highest and warmest
greetings to the Archbishop” and acknowledged the Archbishop’s position by his
command.\textsuperscript{564} While it was not until Easter 1913 that Nicholas briefly visited Rogozhskoe
Cemetery\textsuperscript{565} the relationship between the community and the Tsar reaffirmed
Rogozhskoe as a major influence as a religious, cultural, and social epicenter of the Old
Rite and as a major force in Late Imperial Russia. Conversely, the outreach and
recognition of his authority on the part of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers can be seen as
important for Nicholas as in the aftermath of 1905 as he sought support for his rule from
any corner of the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{566} Furthermore, maintaining a relationship with the
Tsar, buttressed the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ideological and physical Holy Moscow

\textsuperscript{562} RSL, F. 246, K. 17, Ed. 12, L. 13.
\textsuperscript{563} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{564} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{565} As relayed in the MSORK Council minutes of April 22, 1913: Upon Nicholas’ arrival, Ivan Pugovkin,
as representative of MSORK, and Archpriest Procopius, acting on behalf of the elderly and ailing
Archbishop Ioann, welcomed Nicholas on behalf “of the entire Rogozhskoe community” and exchanged
the traditional Easter greetings with the Emperor and his delegation. While both Pugovkin and Procopius
both continually invited and implored Nicholas to tour the Rogozhskoe Cathedrals, Nicholas declined
stating that the next time he was in Moscow, and “had the time, [he] would willingly and gladly visit
\textsuperscript{566} For greater detail, see Richard Wortman, \emph{Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian
that both co-existed within contemporary Russian, Orthodox society that recognized the place and authority of an Orthodox monarch as their sovereign.

However, following religious toleration the Rogozhskoe Old Believers still needed to reaffirm their position as the spiritual center for the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and the priestly Old Rite. The potential problem for Rogozhskoe Cemetery was that the *ukaz* on religious toleration allowed any Old Believer communities to select their own clergy and religious leaders, thereby potentially weakening the spiritual authority of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy to train or dispatch clergy of their own choosing.\(^{567}\) First and foremost, not all priestly Old Believers fully adhered to the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy as it existed in 1905 and immediately afterward. Following religious toleration priestly Old Believer groups such as the *beglopopovtsy*, priestly Old Believers who rejected the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and still accepted defrocked or runaway Orthodox priests, and remainders of the *neokruzni* groups within the Hierarchy witnessed spiritual resurgences alongside Rogozhskoe Cemetery.\(^{568}\) However, while such movements could pose a moderate challenge to Rogozhskoe’s attempts to establish itself as the dominant ideological and physical spiritual center for priestly Old Believers, they could not match the Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s legacy and resources.

As Old Believers could practice their faith freely, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers realized that many communities would seek spiritual guidance, most likely through training of their own spiritual leaders or even require experienced clergy from larger

---


communities such as Rogozhskoe, as well as require clergy to administer services. Just as in the early nineteenth century, Rogozhskoe Cemetery, then, sought to fulfill the spiritual needs of priestly Old Believers throughout the Empire.\textsuperscript{569} Therefore, over the years immediately following the \textit{ukaz} on religious toleration, just as in the years after 1812, Rogozhskoe Cemetery took in and trained priests for Old Believer Communities spread throughout the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{570}

However, MSORK limited the number of potential visiting priests to ensure that the Rogozhskoe clergy upheld their own duties,\textsuperscript{571} and needed to respond to a desire amongst Old Believer communities from throughout Russia to have their spiritual leaders or even children educated at Rogozhskoe.\textsuperscript{572} In 1911, seeking to meet the growing demand for spiritual training at Rogozhskoe, MSORK received permission from the Moscow Authorities to build a new theological institute. Opened on September 10, 1912 the Old Believer Theological Institute offered five-year courses for 200 hundred students and “Old Believers who hold an ardent desire for both their faith and higher education.”\textsuperscript{573} While at the Institute students participated in classes in catechism, liturgy, choir singing, Church Slavonic, Greek, icon painting, history of Orthodoxy and the Old Rite, pedagogy, and scripture. Students also studied other subjects such as geography, physics, and mathematics so that they could “be a benefit to both the parish and development of the Old Rite” and “provide enough practical training so that they may

\textsuperscript{569} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{570} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{571} RSL, F. 246, K. 6, Ed. 6, L. 39 \textendash; 39ob.
\textsuperscript{573} RSL, F. 246, K. 6, Ed. 6, L. 2, \textit{Russkoe Slov}, 1914 No. 17 (May 4), 131, and Urushev, “Nuzhno nam staroobriadcheskogo uchitelya.”
participate in Church social activities, become candidates for the priesthood, deacons, etc. and prepare them for responsible work in Russian society.”

The formation of the Old Believer Theological Institute at Rogozhskoe Cemetery serves as yet another example of the community adapting its identity and ideals to reflect trends in Russian society. Late Imperial Russia witnessed a growing debate how to adapt educational institutions to best serve Russian society in the face of drastic cultural, economic, and civil changes such as the growth of the working class and increased urbanization. Various institutions and groups all offered their own answer to questions

Ill. 17: Students of the Old Believer Theological Institute, 1913. Urushev, “Nuzhno nam staroobriadcheskogo uchitelya.”
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regarding the place of education in late tsarist Russia. For example, as historian Jennifer Hedda reveals in her work *His Kingdom Come*, some Orthodox Church institutions such as the Saint Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy not only instructed their students in religious and theological studies, but also encouraged students to actively use their training by preaching in the city’s working class neighborhoods. The purpose of this was not only to encourage the students to connect with their audience, but also to help advance the spiritual education of workers and other lower classes.\(^575\) In contrast to the educational efforts by Orthodox parish clergy, in his work *Civil Society and Academic Debate in Russia, 1905 – 1914*, David Wartenweiler explores the efforts of professional academics and universities to shape Russia’s educational system in the aftermath of 1905. As Wartenweiler reveals, both individuals and academic institutions began to place and emphasis on curriculums that emphasized technical skills, politics, and civics to allow Russian society to truly participate in post 1905 politics and economics.\(^576\)

While the Old Believer Theological Institute served as the Rogozhskoe Community’s attempt to provide formal education for young Old Believers, the Institute also reflected the community’s dedication to charity and education as the Institute initially became one of the greatest financial burdens for the community to maintain. Construction and materials for the Institute initially cost 300,000 rubles. Furthermore, housing, feeding, and even stipends and educational grants for the students totaled

\(^{575}\) For greater elaboration on the role of the Russian Orthodox parish clergy in social activities in Late Imperial Russia see, Jennifer Hedda, *His Kingdom Come: Orthodox Pastorship and Social Activism in Revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008).

between forty to fifty thousand rubles annually. Ultimately, the MSORK leadership turned to the community stating, “Our community of Rogozhskoe Cemetery is already burdened by many other needs that require fixed costs, and they are gradually increasing. If we wish to ensure the existence and development of our Institute and its dedicated students, we need to raise more finances. To fully provide for and meet the Institute’s requirements, we will need to raise a minimum of one million rubles in currency or other capital.”

As with previous projects such as Rogozhskoe’s Bell Tower, the Rogozhskoe community responded with continuous donations of both money and materials to the institute. Arsenii Ivanovich Morozov proved to be one of the most significant patrons of the Institute as in 1914 he purchased and donated the extensive library and icon collection from the family of Elisei Melekhin, one of Rogozhskoe’s longest serving priests. Also, in 1916, Morozov purchased and donated a lavish collapsible iconostasis and altar from the descendants of one of Rogozhskoe’s parishioners, Nikolai Yazinin.

The Institute allowed Rogozhskoe Cemetery to play a vital role in educating young Old Believers who, it was intended, would return to their villages throughout the Russian Empire. Unfortunately, however, the Institute did not have many years to truly develop its status or curriculum to attract greater attention. The outbreak of the First World War placed a great strain on the Institute. Financially, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers shifted their focus to supporting the war effort and contributing capital and

---
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finances to the state.\textsuperscript{581} Furthermore, over the years from 1914 – 1916 student enrollment diminished due to enlistment or conscription into the military until finally, in 1917, the Institute canceled all classes indefinitely due to extremely low enrollment and lack of funding.\textsuperscript{582}

The First World War also put a hold on MSORK and the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ attempts to elevate the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy within Orthodoxy and Christendom. Specifically, since the \textit{ukaz} on religious toleration, all Rogozhskoe Old Believers hoped to gain the approval of both the Tsar and the Russian Orthodox Church to recognize the Belokrinitskaya Archbishop of Moscow and All-Russia as a new, Old Rite Metropolitanate. Archbishop Ioann in particular remained adamant that following religious toleration the Old Believers not only needed the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy legitimized, but also a \textit{Russian} Metropolitanate of their own.\textsuperscript{583} However, it was not until after Ioann’s death on April 24, 1915 that MSORK successfully brought a petition in August of the same year to the Holy Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church to consider the new Archbishop of Moscow and All-Russia, Meletii, as an Old Rite Metropolitan of Moscow.\textsuperscript{584} However, it was Melitii who eventually approached MSORK and the Holy Council of Bishops to delay a decision due to the need to focus on Russia’s war efforts, stating: “We appeal to the love of the Holy Council of Bishops and request that, in view of the war and the Belokrinitskaya Archdiocese’s devotion to the

\textsuperscript{581} For example see, \textit{Slovo Tserkvi}, 1915 No. 9, 207 – 10, and No. 10, 230 – 31,
\textsuperscript{582} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{583} Archbishop Ioann first publically expressed his desire for an Old Rite Metropolitan in a public letter to Rogozhskoe Cemetery on September 26, 1906. He later repeated his stance in similar letters from June 25, 1907 and continued to seek recognition of a new Old Rite Metropolitanate until his death in April 1915. RSL, F. 246, K. 6, Ed. 6, L. 39 – 39ob.
\textsuperscript{584} Ibid.
Russian state, that the council defer any decision on the elevation of Archbishop Meletii as a Metropolitan until a more favorable time.  

While the war, and eventual rise of the Bolsheviks, delayed the creation of the Old Rite Metropolitanate until 1988, Rogozhskoe’s desire for a Metropolitan served multiple purposes. First and foremost, the creation of an Old Rite Metropolitanate by the Holy Council of Bishops would establish the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy as a legitimate Church within the Russian Empire. Second, within the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy itself, the formation of an Old Rite Metropolitanate in Moscow would elevate Moscow to equal status with the Metropolitan in Belaya Krinitza and thereby strengthen Rogozhskoe’s position within the Old Rite Hierarchy. Finally, a Metropolitan of Moscow would not only solidify Rogozhskoe Cemetery as the spiritual center for the Hierarchy in Russia, but also further legitimize and bring the community closer to their idealized Old Rite Holy Moscow. As with the community’s attempts to restore a relationship with the Tsar, recognition of a Metropolitanate would fully legitimize the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy as an Episcopal Church in communion within the greater Orthodox and Christian worlds, and ultimately allow the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to once again claim the legacy of the Third Rome Doctrine. However, even while such a decision remained delayed, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers continued to champion their own ideals to further portray the community as a true return to Third Rome Moscow.
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A New Generation and New Opportunities for a New Era in Rogozhskoe Cemetery

Concurrently with the new era of toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also experienced a generational changing of the guard amongst many of the community’s most prominent families. Many of Rogozhskoe’s more influential and established families such as the Morozovs, Riabushinskiis, and Kuznetsovs underwent such changes as the elder merchants, businessmen, and industrialists handed over their companies, family fortunes, and legacies within Rogozhskoe Cemetery to their sons. This new generation of Old Believer businessmen ultimately not only proved themselves as successful financially as their predecessors, but also took on new approaches of how best to promote their own individual business and moral ideals as new leadership for Rogozhskoe Cemetery.

Following a growing trend amongst the Moscow merchantry, both Old Believer and non-Old Believer alike, the new generation of industrialists took their positions in their family businesses and Russian society under very different circumstances than their elders. First, the new generation matured and witnessed first-hand the tumultuous political and economic atmosphere the Russian Empire experienced as it tried to industrialize at the end of the nineteenth century. Second, the older generation of Old Believer business families ensured that their children received thorough educations not only about their faith and history, but in business as well. As Alfred Rieber points out, the older generation of Old Believer merchants and entrepreneurs spared no expense in
seeking the best tutors and education for their heirs – ensuring that both sons and daughters could continue their family’s legacy.\footnote{Rieber, \textit{Merchants and Entrepreneurs}, 146.}

A common characteristic amongst this younger generation of entrepreneurial families was their extensive education in foreign languages as well as attending business academies and universities throughout England, France, and Germany after similar educations in Russia.\footnote{Ibid, 146 – 47.} However, even with direct exposure to Western European society, the younger generation still maintained not only their devotion to the Old Rite, but also inherited their families’ approach toward the use of capital and wealth as an outlet of Christian charity instead of individual frivolity.\footnote{A number of historians have often compared a number of Old Believer communities and individuals to the idea of the Protestant Work Ethic. See for example: Crummey, \textit{Old Believers and the World of Antichrist}; Hudson, “Lords of the Urals;” Michels, \textit{At War with the Church}; Rieber, \textit{Merchants and Entrepreneurs}; and Ruckman, \textit{The Moscow Business Elite}.} Furthermore, many in the younger generation used their training and educations to promote their own approach of both how to advance their own families’ dynasties economically, but also, particularly following October 1905, but how to use their social and economic influence to shape Russian culture and politics as well.\footnote{See for example, Z. V. Grishina and V. P. Pushkov, “Moscovskii nekropol’: o staroobriadcheskom kypechestve kontsa XVIII – nachala XX vekov.” in, \textit{Mir staroobriadchesva}, Vol. 2 (Rossiiskoe universitetskoe izdatel’ctvo, Moscow 1995), 75 – 96.}

As noted in the introductory chapter, historians such as William Blackwell and Jo Ann Ruckman see the generational divide between the older and younger generations of Old Believer entrepreneurs in their approaches toward business, appreciation for popular culture, and politics as signs of the decline of long-held family and communal traditions
and devotion to Old Believer ideals and morals. Instead, they argue in-favor of what Blackwell describes as “The communal solidarity of Preobrazhenskoe and Rogozhskoe giving way to the spirit of capitalist individualism and materialism.” On the contrary, in regard to Rogozhskoe’s most prominent families such as the Riabushinskiis and Morozovs, evidence suggests that the younger generation remained very devoted to both the moral and social ideals shared by the Rogozhskoe community, and continuing their predecessors’ approach toward upholding the Old Rite and views on the ideal Christian use of capital through patronage and charity. Specifically, the younger generation of the Old Believer merchant elite still very much followed in their predecessors’ footsteps and championed and maintained a life in which they understood capital as a gift from God meant to share with the rest of society rather than spend on individual frivolity. As stated best by Vladimir Riabushinskii, “The Lord hath sent three gifts. Yea, the first gift is the cross and prayer. The second gift is love and charity. The third gift is the night orison.” Ultimately such views only upheld one of the primary ideals of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers as a whole.

What made the younger generation of Moscow Old Believers entrepreneurs different from their predecessors was their very approach toward business and capital, and how both combined with the shared ideal amongst the Rogozhskoe Old Believers of a proper Christian society to advance both their families’ and Rogozhskoe’s influence through continued efforts toward charity. Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers held
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this generation in high-esteem and as previously noted above, the community elected many of the individuals of Rogozhskoe’s most affluent business families such as the Kuznetsovs, Riabushinskiis, Morozovs, and Pugovkins to serve as officials on the MSORK Council regularly. Yet as previously described earlier in this chapter, the stipulations that governed MSORK reveal that while an individual’s business acumen did play a role in their election, the community placed greater value on that person’s ability to maintain and protect Rogozhskoe Cemetery itself and by extension the community’s very social and religious ideals. Ultimately, in the early twentieth century, this new generation of Rogozhskoe businessmen remained fully devoted to and played vital roles in shaping Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its community ideals, as proven by the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ election of many of these businessmen to serve multiple terms as leads of MSORK thereby guiding the very community itself, even while expanding their families’ economic dynasties.

The Morozovs and Riabushinskiis remained two of the most prominent and financially and socially influential families not only in Rogozhskoe Cemetery, but also in shaping Russian economics, industry, culture and politics in the last years of the Imperial Era. During this period, the Morozov dynasty saw the rise of the brothers Savva and Sergei Timofeyevich and their cousin Arsenii Ivanovich while the Riabushinskii family saw their fortunes and influence spread exponentially with the success of each of eight brothers. As some of Rogozhskoe’s and Moscow’s oldest manufacturing and industrialist families, the younger generation of Morozovs and Riabushinskiis found themselves in a

593 Iukhimenko, Staroobriadcheskii tsentr, 163 – 65.
unique situation at the time of the onset of religious toleration in 1905. Specifically, the new generations of these families not only took over well-established family factories and other business, primarily in textiles and paper mills, but found themselves in charge of vast sums of capital and family wealth, making the Morozovs and Riabushinskiis two of the most wealthiest families in the Russian Empire. With such wealth the younger generation of Morozovs and Riabushinskiis in ultimately serve as prime examples of the Rogozhskoe Old Believer entrepreneurs’ approach toward utilizing capital for both in Rogozhskoe Cemetery and Russian society and culture through methods such as investing in new businesses such as banks and railroads, and financial patronage for cultural outlets such as theaters and museums.

The Morozovs in particular continued their grandfather’s, Savva Vaslievich, legacy of building their economic success and influence based on a strong bond with their workers in the family factories and charity. Under the direction of Sergei and Savva (and with their cousin Arsenii Abramovich as their accountant), for example, beginning in the 1890s the Morozovs instituted a number of charity and welfare funds for their workers, including offering payment and leave for pregnant and new mothers. The Morozovs also took great care to educate their workers and managers, often paying for some to

594 One of the Morozov’s family-run factories, the Nikolskaia factory near Vladimir, alone produced an annual profit of between 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 rubles a year since the early 1890s. Ruckman, The Moscow Business Elite, 65 – 66. The Riabushinskiis also accumulated much of their fortune in textiles and Pavel Mikhailovich Riabushinskii, the father of the more famous Riabushinskii brothers, alone held a personal fortune of over 20 million rubles, which he left to his sons, before his death in 1899. Violetta Sedova, “‘Vse dla dela – nichego dla sebia’ : Brat’ia Riabushinskii,” In, Tret’iakovskaya Galereia, 2003 No. 1, 110 – 111.

either be trained in technical universities in Russia or sent for training abroad.\textsuperscript{596} Furthermore, it was during this period that due to the Morozov’s efforts to provide education for their workers their factory workers were noted as being far more literate than workers in any other Russian industrial enterprise.\textsuperscript{597} Savva in particular took great interest in the wellbeing of the Morozov factory workers insisting that all locations have on-site hospitals to provide aid to any sick or injured workers since “There are hardly any hospitals in Russia that uphold either the character or definition of such an institution.”\textsuperscript{598} Savva ultimately believed that under his guidance the Morozov workers would experience a new era of welfare and prosperity even going so far as to proclaim to his brother, “If I live another fifty years, our Nikolskii factory and its streets will be covered in gold!”\textsuperscript{599}

However, even while improving the lives of their workers, the Morozovs took particular interest in establishing themselves as patrons of Russian art and culture. Sergei and Savva in particular became major cultural influences in Moscow. Savva, for example, took great interest in the theater, donating vast sums to revitalize the failing Moscow Art Theater (now divided into the present day Chekhov Moscow Art Theater and Gorky Moscow Art Theater). He donated 10,000 rubles for actor training. In 1902, Savva continued his patronage by financing the construction of a new theater designed by his close friend, and personal architect, Fyodor Shekhtel – Savva even participated in

\textsuperscript{596} Ibid, 58 – 59.  
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\textsuperscript{598} Savva Morozov, quoted in, Ibid., 66.  
\textsuperscript{599} Ibid.
construction by personally helping paint and decorate the interior.\(^{600}\) Sergei, on the other hand, became a great patron of Russian folk art and eventually purchased the Moscow Museum of Handicrafts in 1903.\(^{601}\) As with Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its collection of manuscripts and icons, under the management of Sergei Morozov, the Museum of Handicrafts would put on display the largest collection of folk relics, including numerous works by rural Old Believer communities, from throughout Russian history.\(^{602}\)

In regard to charity, all of the younger generation of Morozovs donated extensively to Rogozhskoe Cemetery – as previous described above, Arsenii Ivanovich in particular was well noted for his generous donations of both money and cultural goods such as icons, altarpieces, and manuscripts to fulfill Rogozhskoe’s various needs.\(^{603}\) Sergei Morozov also upheld the ideal that a primary use for wealth was the benefit of the less fortunate. In 1909, for example, Sergei and his mother Maria donated funds to build two new wards at Moscow’s St. Catherine’s Hospital, one donated as a memorial to Savva who passed away in 1905.\(^{604}\) Yet, even while the Morozovs obtained even greater wealth, the new generation remained devoted to upholding long traditions of emphasizing the need to use wealth for compassion and Christian charity – the very values that Rogozhskoe Cemetery championed as the basis for a strong, moral society that could once again push Russia toward its rightful place as the Third Rome.

\(^{600}\) See, Morozova and Potkina, Savva Morozov, 152 – 66.
\(^{601}\) P. V. Vlasov, Blagotvoritel’nost’ i miloserdie v Rossii, (Moscow, 2001), 76.
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Along with the Morozovs, the Riabushinskiis also experienced a generational change in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Particularly under the management and business genius of the sons of Pavel Mikhailovich Riabushinskii—Pavel, Sergei, Vladimir, Stepan, Nikolai, Mikhail, and Dmitri— the family gained unprecedented wealth and influence economically, socially, and politically in Late Imperial Russia. Pavel Mikhailovich took great care to ensure that his sons obtained extensive educations in business, sending his five eldest sons (Pavel, Sergei, Vladimir, Stepan, and Nikolai) to the Academy of Commercial Sciences. He founded the P. M. Riabushinskii and Sons Manufactory Association to manage the family’s cotton dynasty—giving each son a stake in the family business before his own passing in 1899.605

What ultimately made the Riabushinskii brothers so financially successful was their willingness to invest in and create new businesses. While the Riabushinskiis’ textile factories remained the heart of the family fortune, the brothers soon used their entrepreneurial skills to respond to many of Russia’s newest manufacturing and economic needs such as a need for financial institutions such as banks or even new opportunities to develop new industries. For example, Sergei, Vladimir, Stepan, and Mikhail founded the Riabushinskii Brothers’ Bank in 1902 (later renamed Moscow Bank in 1912).606 In 1916, Vladimir, Stepan, Pavel, and Sergei founded Russia’s first automobile plant, the Moscow Automobile Plant (now the present day Likhachev Plant)
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to provide cars for the tsarist government and army.\textsuperscript{607} And immediately prior to the end of the First World War, with the help of their brother Dmitri, a professor and member of the Moscow Mathematical Society, the Riabushinskiis prepared to develop an aircraft factory, yet gave up on the plans with the outbreak of revolution in 1917.\textsuperscript{608}

Like the Morozovs, the Riabushinskiis also gained notoriety in Moscow and Russia as patrons of art. Each of the brothers collected works of art. Mikhail, for example, held one of the largest private collections of Russian and European art in all of Russia.\textsuperscript{609} Sergei himself took up sculpting, even becoming a close associate with the artist Ilya Repin.\textsuperscript{610} However, most of the Riabushinskiis eventually collected some of the most valuable collections of ancient Russian icons, particularly Stepan and Vladimir. With Old Rite communities able to freely acknowledge their faith, the brothers purchased icons from Old Believers and Orthodox alike from throughout Russia with the express intent of restoring and donating many icons to Rogozhskoe Cemetery and also the Tretiakov Gallery – providing the largest icon collection in the museum to this day.\textsuperscript{611} These icon collections, then, ultimately reveal that the Riabushinskii family remained connected to the Rogozhskoe community, especially in regard to an emphasis for preserving the icons for their spiritual, cultural, and historical value. For example, Vladimir in particular equated collecting icons as preserving the very essence of Russian spirituality stating: “Icons blossomed in Russia… nowhere have there been more zealous
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icon lovers… they remind us that God’s presence is all around… that is why we, the Russian people, easily and joyfully pray with holy icons.”

However, what set the new generation of Riabushinskiis and particularly Savva Morozov apart was their active, and very influential participation in Late Imperial Russian politics following the Revolution of 1905. Whereas the previous generation took strides to affirm their loyalty to the Russian autocracy, they could not actively participate in any political forum due to continued legal restrictions on schismatics.

The turmoil of the early twentieth century provided a new outlet for the younger generation of entrepreneurs to establish themselves as a political influence both in Moscow and the Russian Empire. Ultimately, this is one reason why historians such as Blackwell and Ruckman see the younger generation, particularly the Riabushinskiis, breaking away from their ties to their family and Old Believer traditions due to their more liberal political leanings.

While in ways more radical than their predecessors, many of the ideas held by the younger Riabushinskiis and notably Savva Morozov actually reflect a changing attitude amongst of some of the wealthiest Rogozhskoe Old Believers that their moral and civic duties needed to go beyond local charity and into national politics. The political leanings of the younger generation of Rogozhskoe entrepreneurs shifted to incorporate many of the same communal ideals and morals that were a part of Rogozhskoe’s own ideal of a
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proper Christian society that emphasized providing aid and comfort to the needy. For example, as stated earlier, Savva Morozov upheld a family tradition with his care and bond with the workers at his family’s factories. Savva’s own approach toward providing for his workers led him to adopt new ideas on how to use his own wealth and influence to better the lives and organization of his workers, going so far as to distribute pamphlets and encourage workers at the Morozov’s Nikolskoi factory to organize. Savva even promised to personally take up labor issues, even suggesting that he would discuss profit sharing for the workers with his family following the onset of strikes following Bloody Sunday in 1905.\textsuperscript{614} However, once the Nikolskoi workers joined the strikes in February, his mother removed Savva from his post as Directing Manager of the factory for his role in inciting the workers. In response, Savva eventually cut his ties, and more importantly his funding, to the Social Democrats and travelled to France three months before his death.\textsuperscript{615} However, while he distanced himself from his family politically, Savva’s intentions toward the family’s workers still followed a tradition begun under his grandfather to use family wealth to better the lives of those in need work, charity, or both.

Whereas Savva Morozov used his influence to enter into politics and affect the lives of the Morozov workers, the Riabushinskii brothers looked to use their influence to enter into politics on behalf of the Old Rite. As noted by Alfred Rieber and James West, the Riabushinskiis’ upbringing and experience as social and religious outsiders as Old

\textsuperscript{615} Ibid. Savva losing his post at the Nikolskoi plant is often cited as beginning a mental breakdown that eventually led to his committing suicide three months later in France. However, it is well noted by Savva’s granddaughters, and family historians, T. P. Morozova and I. V. Potkina that Savva quickly became an enemy of the Social Democrats for his refusal to continue funding them, leading some to assume that he was murdered in retaliation. See, Morozova and Potkina, \textit{Savva Morozov}, 167 – 99.
Believers before 1905 greatly shaped their outlook on politics following the Revolution of 1905. Also, as noted by Rieber, the Riabushinskiis also realized that in Russia’s new political atmosphere following 1905, political movements on both the extreme left and right would seek to rally the Old Rite to their cause to bolster their own political support. Ultimately, Pavel and Vladimir realized that all Old Believers therefore needed to unify and organize themselves politically to avoid exploitation at the hands of extremist political to gain support for their own political agendas, rather than actually aid the Old Rite.

As James West argues, the basis for the Riabushinskiis’ drive into politics was “the incentive of being an outsider” and a desire to unite all sects of the Old Rite to “join in the struggle for political and religious freedom.” The true problem for the Old Rite as a political interest group, as noted by West and historian Alexandra Korros, in the political atmosphere in post 1905 Russia when Old Believer political leaders such as the Riabushinskiis did attempt to seek political alliances with other groups they were, in fact, often left isolated in the political center. For groups to the left such as the Constitutional Democrats the Old Rite held “far too narrow class interests” to be of any support to their cause. Conversely, individuals on the right, such as T. I. Butkevich, still maintained their view that the Old Rite remained as a subversive entity both to the stability of the state and, especially to the Russian Orthodox Church. Since 1906, Butkevich even
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appealed directly to Nicholas and eventually the State Duma for the need to rescind all of
the rights granted to Old Believers since the 1905 ukaz on religious toleration stating later
in 1909 that: “The essence of the raskol is not in its religious foundations, but in its
sociopolitical motivations, in its permanent opposition to government power.”621

As West argues, the issue for the Riabushinskiis and their efforts to bring the Old
Rite into national politics ultimately was the need to present the Old Believers as a
legitimate political entity.622 Initially, then, the Riabushinskii brothers organized mass
meetings of fellow Old Believer merchants and later, in 1906, called for an All-Russian
Congress of Old Believer Peasants in Moscow.623 Unfortunately, little came of such
gatherings due to the diversity of the Old Believers themselves along spiritual lines (such
as between priestly and priestless), or even social and cultural differences (such as
between Old Believers from the city or rural areas).624 However, Vladimir in particular
took it as his personal duty to not only help organize Old Believers, but also bring the Old
Rite out of social and political obscurity. In his efforts Vladimir, portrayed the Old Rite
and its traditions as the defenders of true Russian identity and culture and presented Old
Believers and his fellow merchants as muzhiks. In Vladimir’s eyes the muzhik was the
most ardent of Russian patriots for their devotion to their faith traditional Russian culture
stating:

621 T. I. Butkevich, quoted in, Alexandra S. Korros, “Nationalist Politics in the Russian Imperial State
Council: Forming a New Majority, 1909 – 1910,” Emerging Democracy in Late Imperial Russia, Mary
622 West, “The Riabushinskii Circle,” 44 – 47.
623 Rieber, Merchants and Entrepreneurs, 295 and West, “The Riabushinskii Circle,” 45
The well-read, rich merchant-Old Believer, with a beard and long Russian dress, is a talented industrialist, the manager of hundreds, sometimes thousands, of working people, and at the same time, he is an expert on ancient Russian art, an archeologist, a collector of icons, books, manuscripts, he is greatly versed in historical and economic issues, he loves his job, but he also strives to meet his spiritual needs – this person is a *muzhik*.  

Vladimir placed the Old Believer *muzhik* in contrast to the *barin*:

The petty clerk, clean-shaven, in his western dress, seized some elite education but is essentially uncultured, he often takes bribes, and secretly criticizes and condemns those above him, he despises the *muzhik*, his ancestors created the intelligentsia, he is a *barin*.  

It can be argued then, that to Vladimir Riabushinskii, in post 1905 Russia the Old Rite needed to become a political entity not only for its own interests, but as an entity to defend Russia from the *barin* who knew nothing about, nor cared about Russia’s history, traditions, and culture. Ultimately, then, for the Riabushinskiis’ post-1905 Russia allowed the family to not only participate in politics, but attempt to use the Russia’s new political arena as a means to bring the Old Rite into the larger discussion of national politics.
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The Rogozhskoe Community in the Russian Empire after 1905

Along with the more prominent families such as the Riabushinskiis and Morozovs, the Rogozhskoe community also presented itself as an Old Rite and Russian cultural center. First and foremost, due to the community’s already close relationship with tsarist and other administrative officials, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers saw it as their duty to continually intercede for the Old Rite politically and socially. While prominent individuals, such as Pavel and Vladimir Riabushinskii as seen above, looked to express their morals and ideals through mass politics, the Rogozhskoe community sought to establish their community as a cultural center for both the Old Rite and Russian Empire. As Rogozhskoe Cemetery was home to one of the most valuable and extensive collections of ancient Russian icons and spiritual manuscripts in the Russian Empire, the community quickly presented itself as a champion of Old Rite, Orthodox, and Russian culture and identity.

Similar to the period of the Great Reforms, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers envisioned themselves as intercessors not only for their own community but the Old Rite in its entirety even after the ukaz on religious toleration. For example, Rogozhskoe Old Believers took roles in the Moscow city government as Ivan Pugovkin, Georgii Rakhmanov, and Petr Rastroguev were all elected to the Moscow City Duma. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers serving on the City Duma, working closely with the MSORK
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council, most often took up the issue of establishing proper schools for Old Believer children and orphans. It was under this same premise that the Rogozhskoe Old Believer petitioned and received permission to build the Rogozhskoe Theological Institute.  

However, while members of the Rogozhskoe community worked within Russian politics to influence the social development of the Old Rite, the greatest influence Rogozhskoe Cemetery held was as a center for Old Believer culture. Ultimately, this meant that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers not only sought to actively enrich Old Believer culture but also display it for the rest of Russian society. Some of the most common methods included Rogozhskoe continually hosting lectures, concerts for the community’s church choirs, and even held public debates about the state of the Old Rite, the Old Believers’ place in Russia, and even contemporary politics, economics, and other events. The expressed intent for these gatherings was to offer a chance for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to “put the community on display to the public” and share their history, knowledge, and faith with Old Believers as well as religious scholars, historians, and journalists from Moscow and the Empire.  

In August 1906, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers obtained permission to conduct religious processions and services outside of Rogozhskoe Cemetery, thereby offering another opportunity to share the community’s identity and culture. Such religious processions, however, remained under the authority of the MSORK Council rather than}
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the Archbishop or Rogozhskoe priests. Ultimately, the religious processions became a vital representation of not only the community’s devotion to the Old Rite, but also the community’s patriotism and emphasize the community’s connection to the Russian Empire as upwards of thousands of Rogozhskoe parishioners participated in grand processions around Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s walls, carrying with them religious banners and icons.\textsuperscript{632} Also, Rogozhskoe Old Believers often sent their own delegations and processions to participate in celebrations in other Old Believer communities. In particular, Rogozhskoe Old Believers often participated in religious processions with the Old Believer community in the near-by village of Borisovo (now part of Southeastern Moscow), bringing with them their priests and other religious relics such as selections of icons.\textsuperscript{633}

Similar to the late-nineteenth century the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also emphasized their ties to the Russian Empire through displays of patriotism. However, the key difference for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers since that time was that in post-1905 Russia they could now incorporate public displays of their Old Rite faith into their patriotism. For example, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers held public processions to celebrate important moments in Russian History. Some of the largest processions took place concurrently with celebrations throughout the Russian Empire in 1912 to commemorate the 100-year anniversary of Russia’s expulsion of Napoleon.\textsuperscript{634} Two years later, on August 17, 1914 the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and others from neighboring
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villages held one of the community’s largest religious processions which included thousands from the community to pray for Russia’s armed forces and to grant victory for the Empire. Rogozhskoe also held celebrations and public processions and sent letters and prayers of thanks to Nicholas for the Russian capture of Bukovina, the home region of the Belia Krinitza monastery, “from the hands of infidels, villains, and Russia’s and God’s enemies,” in early 1915. It becomes clear then that processions not only became a display of the community’s spirituality but also the Rogozhskoe Old Believers attempts to continue to tie their Holy Moscow to Imperial Russia socially, religiously, and historically.

As the Rogozhskoe community took a more active role in sharing its culture and ideals with other Old Believer communities and Russian society, a key new element was the community’s efforts at publishing. In regard to publications, Rogozhskoe Cemetery played a supporting role financially for individual enterprises, such as those of Ivan Shibaev in founding the journal *Tserkov’* in 1908 (and the journal’s later incarnation as *Slovo Tserkvi* beginning in 1914) to provide a medium for priestly Old Believers to publish articles and news about the Old Rite both historically and in contemporary Russia. However, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, particularly Archbishop Ioann, saw the need for the community to establish its own printing house in order to publish spiritual and liturgical books and pamphlets throughout Rogozhskoe and other Old Believer communities. Beginning in 1906, the Archbishop wrote to the Rogozhskoe Trustees, “Our Sacred Council believes it to be both useful and necessary to open an Old
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Believer printing house in Moscow to print ecclesiastical and liturgical educational books and reproductions of rare ancient Christian manuscripts of our fathers, kept in the library of the Rogozhskoe Almshouse. We beseech you gentlemen and proud Trustees: If you do not find it possible to open the mentioned printing house for use of the Holy Church and community at Rogozhskoe Cemetery, then consider it for God and to call upon and spread His Holy Word.”\textsuperscript{637} Finally approved by the MSORK Council in 1908, the Rogozhskoe printing house opened in 1910 with its first publications being a Psalter and beginners alphabet book in both Russian and Church Slavonic.\textsuperscript{638}

As stated in Ioann’s request for a printing house, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers also took great pride in the community’s collection of ancient Russian and Orthodox manuscripts, icons, and other religious relics. However, the contents of the community’s collection, for much of Rogozhskoe’s history, remained known only to the Rogozhskoe Old Believers themselves and the few outsiders who came to view the collections.\textsuperscript{639} In order to make Rogozhskoe’s collection more accessible, MSORK established the Commission for Protection of Antiquities headed by Stepan Riabushinskii in June 1907 to oversee proper cataloguing and maintenance of all collection materials. One of the earliest and significant moments in this process was the invitation for the photographer K. A. Fischer to take photographs of the community’s icons in their temples, almshouses, and private collections, later published in 1913.\textsuperscript{640} Wealthy families such as the
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Riabushinskiis and Rakhmanovs, also provided greater access for historians, theologians, and classes to view their private collections which also served as the basis of numerous articles in the journal *Tserkov*. 641

As home to some of the largest collection of ancient Russian manuscripts and icons as well as an extensive collection of Old Believer texts and literature, Rogozhskoe’s collection received extensive interest from art connoisseurs, historians, theologians, and others. It was such interest that inspired MSORK to incorporate a new library into their bell tower after hearing testimony from one of the community’s librarians, Iosef Khromov who stated:

> We have a large collection of valuable books and manuscripts which are still not published in any directory. At such a time as now when interest in all things old has awoken in broad sectors of society we need to open a library for use for those who wish to use it, and must strive to ensure that everyone knows about what is held within. It is hoped that such an initiative will serve as an impetus for the transformation of our book storage into one intact gathering, that is valuable for all in Russia, in the Old Rite, and in the memory of posterity and to our special treasures from antiquity, and therefore would not end up in foreign depositories. 642

By providing greater access to their collection, Rogozhskoe Cemetery ultimately became a research center on the history of the Old Rite – and remained so until continuous Soviet confiscation of materials from the collection throughout the 1920s depleted Rogozhskoe’s holdings. However, with greater organization and a new library and more
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open access to the community’s collections of antiquities, Rogozhskoe Cemetery ultimately played a vital role in shaping numerous academic works on the community and the Old Rite for the next twenty years. For example, much of Rogozhskoe’s materials provided the basis for numerous works by noted early twentieth century religious historians such as Vasily Druzhinin and Nikolai Nikolskii, as well as contemporary theologians such as Feodor Mel’nikov. For the immediate, post-toleration era then, it can be argued that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found themselves not only as the embodiment of an Old Rite Holy Moscow not only spiritually but culturally as well.

Conclusion

Nicholas II’s ukaz on religious toleration not only provided the Old Rite with the freedom to practice their faith, it specifically allowed the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to truly attempt to define themselves and their community free of outside interference. Under the guidance of their new governing board, MSORK, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers witnessed a grand resurgence of the community and their efforts to display
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their moral and cultural devotion to upholding their Holy Moscow physically, ideologically, and culturally. However, continued social and political discord, and the eventual outbreak of the First World War, hampered many of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers most ambitious goals – primarily the community’s desire to obtain legitimate recognition of the Belokrinitskaya Hierarchy and elevation of the Archbishop of Moscow and All-Russia as an Old Rite Metropolitan of Moscow. Yet even while faced with continued uncertainty, the period immediately following the *Ukaz* of April 17, 1905 provided the first opportunity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to fully realize and practice their idealized society and attempt to share their ideals of a restored Holy Moscow with the Russian Empire.
Epilogue and Conclusion: Tragedy and a New Beginning

I am confident that the Russian Orthodox Old-Rite Church and the Rogozhskoe Old Believers will continue to be a beacon for Russia as a testament of civility, peace, and of high spiritual and moral values.

Vladimir Putin (2005)\textsuperscript{644}

...History does not disappear. We cherish every brick.

Metropolitan Kornilii of Moscow and All-Rus’ (2009)\textsuperscript{645}

Like the rest of the Russian Empire, the events of the February and October Revolutions in 1917 forever changed Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its community of Old Believers. In a Russia without a tsar, and soon with the rise of the Bolsheviks, Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow faced an even greater uncertainty than it experienced in the community’s darkest days of the nineteenth century. However, yet again, the remainder of the twentieth century and early twenty-first century would prove to be another opportunity, albeit far more challenging, for the community to redefine itself. While keeping its core attachment to the Third Rome doctrine and the correctness of their rites, they once again adapted their approaches in order to persevere in an era of extreme
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persecution and direct attacks on the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ faith, ideologies, and self-identity.

It was during this period that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found that their desire to develop themselves into the ideal community and recreate Holy Moscow served as a double-edged sword. On one hand, with the rise of the Bolsheviks and under the Soviet Union, Rogozhskoe Cemetery was the target of severe persecution under the state’s anti-religion policies. On the other hand, the community’s history, and universal recognition as a spiritual and cultural center for the Old Rite, offered Rogozhskoe Cemetery some protection for the physical community and a handful of its structures. Ultimately then, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced the most trying period in the community’s history under the Soviet regime in their ability to practice the ideological and spiritual embodiment of their Third Rome. It appeared to them, as it did to Old Believers in 1666, that Russia of the Third Rome Doctrine had ceased to exist.

Yet the community would persevere even through the difficulties of twentieth century Russia and severe hostility of the Soviet state. While the Soviet world penetrated the Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s physical boundaries, and eventually surrounded the community on all sides with factories, highways, and apartments, enough of the Old Believer community remained devoted to Rogozhskoe, its identity, and its ideals to allow the community to survive into the present day. Rogozhskoe survived after a long and difficult period, remaining true to the community’s self-identity as the restored Third Rome in a new era for Russia.
The Rogozhskoe Old Believers, their Holy Moscow, and the Soviet State

As the tsarist regime and Russian Empire crumbled, 1917 found the Rogozhskoe Old Believers facing crises of their own. The community found itself in a financial crisis. Due to Russia’s continued struggles in the First World War, the poor economy, and dwindling donations due to financing the war effort, MSORK reported in its first meeting of 1917 a deficit of 279,400 rubles.646 By April, MSORK began requesting parishioners also donate flour to be able to bake prosphoras for services.647

As 1917 progressed, some families such as the Rakhmanovs responded to the growing civil and political discord by donating private collections of valuable icons, books, and manuscripts for protection.648 MSORK accepted the Rakhmanov collections and even placed them specially in the Pokrovskii Cathedral.649 On November 5, 1917 Agniia Karpovna Rakhmanov made the last recorded family gift to Rogozhskoe Cemetery with the donation of an early sixteenth century icon of Our Lady of Tenderness to be placed in Pokrovskii Cathedral.650 Seemingly foretelling Rogozhskoe’s troubles ahead, attached to back of the icon was a note stating:

This icon of the Holy Mother of God of Tenderness is a gift to the temple of the Intercession of the Holy Virgin and this community so that She may keep it in her memory and
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deliver it from the danger of the events from October 28 to November 3, 1917. 651

Unfortunately for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their idealized Third Rome, such prayers for the community’s salvation were soon undermined as the Bolsheviks took hold of the country.

Under the Bolshevik regime, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found themselves in yet another oppressive state, but with some great differences. First, whereas the tsarist state continuously struggled to define the Old Rite and its followers and how to place their faith into the greater Russian society in the centuries following the raskol, the Bolsheviks made no distinctions. In the Bolsheviks’ eyes, as a religious movement, the Old Believers and their communities were the same as any Orthodox community and deserved equal scorn, contempt, and destruction. 652

Yet, the Bolshevik takeover proved disastrous for Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the community of Old Believers far beyond issues of religious freedom. The Bolsheviks’ anti-religious legislation severely damaged the Rogozhskoe community’s spiritual, physical, and financial foundations and influence. Under legislation passed early in 1918, the Bolsheviks confiscated all property, schools, and vast sums of wealth, belonging to any religious organizations. 653 Then, due to the Bolsheviks’ hostility toward those they deemed the bourgeoisie, entire groups of Rogozhskoe’s wealthiest families,
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such as the Riabushinskiis, emigrated out of Russia to avoid persecution. The loss of property and wealth, then, directly reduced Rogozhskoe’s ability to not only function as a community but also their ability to protect their very identity and ideals.

Ultimately, the Bolsheviks did move on Rogozhskoe Cemetery. The first direct action against the community was the nationalization of the community’s library and most of the buildings and homes belonging to wealthy merchants, and and the permanent closing of Rogozhskoe’s Theological Institute in 1918. Eventually, the state confiscated all of the library’s materials, books, and manuscripts and all of the community’s records in 1923, placing them in the Rumiantsev Museum and later the Lenin State Library, eventually becoming the extensive Rogozhskoe Archive.

However, one action taken by the Soviet state not only ultimately preserved Rogozhskoe Cemetery physically, but also allowed the community’s history, identity, and essence of their Holy Moscow to eventually survive the coming decades.

In 1919, Bolshevik authorities took control of Rogozhskoe’s temples, and designated the entire community as a museum. Named the Museum of the Rogozhskoe Cemetery Churches, the new status proved to be a curiosity in the relationship between the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and the Soviet state. Specifically, while the Museum Division of the People’s Commissariat (Otdela muzeev Glavnauki Narkomprosa) took jurisdiction of Rogozhskoe’s temples, the state allowed the
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Rogozhskoe Old Believers to maintain a religious community, conduct religious services, and perform standard maintenance to their structures and icons so long as they accepted any terms created by the Commissariat.⁶⁵⁸ For example, under the terms of this arrangement, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers had to allow for the state to use their temples for tours, historical and cultural studies, and even conduct scheduled services for visitors to observe.⁶⁵⁹ Furthermore, the community received an annual fund from the state of 2,808 rubles to pay for heating and cleaning for the structures.⁶⁶⁰

However, with such a severely limited budget, and continued lack of funding from the Rogozhskoe parishioners themselves, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found their temples in severe disrepair by 1926. This ultimately put the community’s temples and icon collection, even recognized by the Soviets as “one of the most valuable monuments of historical art and culture,” at risk.⁶⁶¹ This, in fact, led the Museum Division to seek a means to receive funding to better preserve Rogozhskoe’s treasures. The Museum Division redefined Rogozhskoe Cemetery as the Museum of the Old Rite, a new designation as a museum for the entire Old Rite movement rather than the single community.⁶⁶² Along with this new designation, part of the community’s buildings also became storehouses for the Museum Division.⁶⁶³ This ultimately allowed Rogozhskoe to receive increased funding in order to maintain the religious structures and collections still

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid., L. 110 – 110ob.
⁶⁵⁹ Ibid.
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held by the community and continue to maintain some semblance of their communal identity and experience.

However, this minor shift in fortune proved short-lived. Beginning in August 1928, Narkompros questioned not only the increased finances for the Rogozhskoe “museum” but also the relationship between the state, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, and the state’s policy toward religious communities. First, the museum proved to draw very limited numbers of visitors. For example, for the entire year of 1926, only 140 people (including a tour by 14 scholars who studied Rogozhskoe’s icons, architecture, cemetery, and witnessed religious services held by the community) visited Rogozhskoe Cemetery for its museum. Narkompros, then, questioned the community’s usefulness and purpose as a museum, especially as the Rogozhskoe Old Believers still maintained two functioning churches. In a memo dated August 16, 1928, one of Narkompros’ financial officers, S. Mokeev, openly questioned the purpose of maintaining not only a museum but also preserving the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ community. In his memo, Mokeev stated:

“the plan to reorganize Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a museum of the Old Rite has ultimately prevented the liquidation of the community of Old Believers. As the churches have not been closed, this brings up a serious matter of policy since Rogozhskoe Cemetery is the center of the Old Rite in the USSR. From this, I think that it is not at all integral and it is premature to make any expenditure for Rogozhskoe Cemetery and hope that any domestic orders will bring the elimination of the community in the future. The museum
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very, very rarely conducts any tours and thereby in no way justifies the existence of Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a museum….With regard to the matter, I request that for the new fiscal year, Rogozhskoe Cemetery is eliminated as a museum so that the process of liquidation of the community of Old Believers can proceed.”

Mokeev’s memo suggests more than a concern about the feasibility for Rogozhskoe’s status as a museum. First, the memo reveals that, as for most of the community’s history under tsarist autocracy, the Rogozhskoe community continued to persevere even under the Soviet regime. Whereas the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ties to charity and economic success granted them some protection from tsarist authorities and the Russian Orthodox Church, Rogozhskoe’s status as a museum of the Old Rite and repository of ancient Russian icons and manuscripts gained the community some leniency from authorities in the first decade after the Bolshevik takeover. Second, Mokeev’s memo reveals that his greatest concern was the community’s resiliency. Mokeev realized that so long as the Rogozhskoe Old Believers maintained a thriving religious community, one that was allowed by the Soviet state because of the museum status, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers would remain as a beacon of religious expression both for the Old Rite and in the Soviet Union. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ idea of Holy Moscow survived and continued to thrive even under a new, hostile state.

However, Narkompros adopted Mokeev’s position and eliminated the Rogozhskoe Museum on October 1, 1928. The loss of the community’s museum status immediately opened the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to greater restriction and forced
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Rogozhskoe Cemetery to comply with all laws restricting religious expression. Shortly after Narkompros eliminated the museum, authorities confiscated the bells from the Rogozhskoe Bell Tower. In July 1929, authorities closed the Nativity Cathedral and began removing its dome. All of the icons and other materials held in the Nativity Cathedral were placed in storage in either in Pokrovskii Cathedral or the offices in Rogozhskoe’s old library. However, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers did still retain use of the Pokrovskii Cathedral, often holding services with a limited number or parishioners and clergy. Particularly during the drive for collectivization, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers faced a new crisis as Soviet authorities imprisoned or executed numerous Belokrinitkaya clergy from Rogozhskoe and throughout Russia.

The outbreak of the Second World War created new challenges and opportunities for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers. On one hand it was during the war that the state confiscated control of the cemetery grounds, ultimately using the cemetery for soldiers’ burials. However, Rogozhskoe benefited from the state’s permission for religious communities to openly practice their faith in order to pray for the salvation of Russia and an eventual victory over Nazi Germany. In 1941, Rogozhskoe successfully petitioned Soviet authorities to elect a new Archbishop for the Belokrinitka Hierarchy and restore his offices at Rogozhskoe Cemetery. The newly elected Archbishop of Moscow and All Russia, Irinarch, soon issued an open proclamation urging all Old Believers to support the fight against fascism by enlisting in the Red Army, joining partisan groups,
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and praying ardently for victory.\textsuperscript{670} One of Rogozhskoe’s own parishioners, Galina Marinicheva, noted in her memoirs the unwavering devotion the community had in ultimate victory in the war:

At the most critical moment for Moscow, in October 1941, when the enemy stood at the gates of the city and the residents of the capital fell into panic, and when the politicians and entire regiments made a mad, hasty flight out of the city, the majority of the Old Believers maintained order and tranquility. We took to our Holy Church for worship, and gave prayers, and heard sermons from the pulpit. As true believers with true Christian courage, we found the strength to withstand the ensuing panic and reassured one another of the victory to come.\textsuperscript{671}

Such devotion to a Soviet victory yet again revealed the resiliency of the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ understanding of their Holy Moscow. As seen prior to 1905, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers found another opportunity to prove that, even while oppressed, their community remained loyal to their homeland against outside threats. Eventually, in 1944, Soviet authorities even allowed the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to begin publishing calendars and pamphlets for the community, as well as returned a handful of buildings for the use of the Archbishop and community in 1948.\textsuperscript{672}

Ultimately, it would not be until four decades later that Rogozhskoe Cemetery experienced any new significant changes in the community. On July 24, 1988, to
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coincide with the celebrations for 1,000 years of Christianity in Russia, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers called for a council of Belokinitskaya Bishops with the sole purpose of elevating the Archbishopric of Moscow to Metropolitan of a Russian Orthodox Old Rite Church and electing Alimpii Gusev as the first Metropolitan of All Rus’. Under Alimpii’s guidance, the Rogozhskoe community experienced a significant resurgence as he sought to reestablish Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a spiritual center for the Old Rite. For example, Alimpii successfully negotiated with Soviet officials for the return of what remained of the Nativity Cathedral and the icons held in the community’s old library.

Following the Soviet Union’s collapse, Alimpii also negotiated with the new Russian state for the return of more structures to the community, expanding Rogozhskoe Cemetery to the largest it had been since before the October Revolution. Due to his poor health, however, the Metropolitan rarely traveled away from Rogozhskoe Cemetery, yet he regularly performed services for the community often disregarding those concerned about his health, one time noting “I hear what you are saying! But with every service I attend, I feel ten years younger.” Ultimately, Alimpii’s tenure as Metropolitan, until his death in December 2003, and his strong influence in rebuilding Rogozhskoe Cemetery allowed the Rogozhskoe Old Believers to transition through the Soviet collapse and helped usher the community and their Holy Moscow into the twenty-first century.
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Alimpii’s successors, Adrian (February 12, 2004 – August 10, 2005) and Kornilii (October 23, 2005 – Present), built off of Alimpii’s legacy. Each saw Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s resurgence tied to a stronger relationship with the Russian state and the Russian Orthodox Church. It was under Adrian, and later Kornilii that Rogozhskoe Cemetery ultimately received recognition for the community’s influence and role in the history of Orthodoxy and the Russian state. Coinciding with celebration for the 100th Anniversary of the *Ukaz* of 1905 on Religious Toleration, the community received special recognition as a National Heritage Site. Furthermore, the state also undertook an extended process of restoring the community’s structures that was to last until 2014. While the state-sponsored restoration ended in November 2011 due to increased economic hardships, the project called for the demolition a number of structures built on Rogozhskoe’s property since 1917 in order to restore the area to its “historical essence” including the rebuilding of Rogozhskoe’s hotels and charity offices. However, the restoration project did complete extensive restoration to many of the Rogozhskoe structures that remained, including completely rebuilding the dome on the Nativity Cathedral in 2008. Even with the challenges presented by the twenty-first century, Rogozhskoe Cemetery still thrives both as a community of Old Believers and as the spiritual center and symbol of an ideal Holy Moscow for Old Believers spread throughout the world.
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Over the course of the community’s history Rogozhskoe Cemetery developed and adapted both as a physical sanctuary from the outside world and as the opportunity to create new ideals of Christian identity and community. For Muscovite Old Believers living in Catherinian Russia, the ability to design and maintain their own community provided more than the ability to aid Old Believers affected by the plague of 1771, but to create a community that embodied and projected the Old Rite itself. Unlike Old Believer communities spread throughout the Russian Empire who escaped to the periphery and wilderness such as Vyg and in the Urals, the Moscow Old Believers decided to develop their community within the social world of Moscow and to define their own identity in
direct contrast to the “corrupt” world around them. The community that developed in Rogozhskoe Cemetery became an opportunity to build an entirely new understanding of the place of the Old Rite in Russian and Christian history. They developed a new (and evolving) understanding of the Third Rome Doctrine in the post-\textit{raskol} Russian Empire.

Moscow itself served as a unifying symbol for the community, as it was the old capital of the Russian Empire and the very focus of the Third Rome Doctrine. For the Old Believers, Moscow remained the antithesis to Saint Petersburg. Whereas Saint Petersburg represented the legacy of Peter the Great and his desires to drag Russia away from its traditions and culture in favor of Westernization, Moscow, for the city’s Old Believers, represented the glorious, yet unfulfilled (and threatened) destiny as the final true capitol of all of Christendom and beacon against Western and foreign heresies and corruptions. Rogozhskoe Cemetery, then, developed as an attempt to not only redefine the community’s understanding of the Third Rome Doctrine, but also to actually realize and practice an idealized understanding of the Doctrine to serve as an example in post-\textit{raskol} Russia.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believer’s Third Rome developed as the physical and ideological embodiment of their new, Old Rite Third Rome – a community attempt to build a Holy Moscow to create the ideal Christian community. This ideal presented itself in how the community organized itself and how it interacted with the outside world. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers need to prove to themselves that they could uphold their own, self-created identity as the ideal Christian community, as well as put those very same ideals on display in order to contrast themselves with contemporary Russian society. The
primary outlet for Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow, then, centered on connecting Rogozhskoe Cemetery and its parishioners (especially its wealthy merchant families) to charities for both Old Believers and Muscovites in general.

The Rogozhskoe Old Believers emphasized the role of Christian charity in their Holy Moscow in a number of ways. First, by building Rogozhskoe Cemetery as a charitable institution, the community of Old Believers also justified the formation of a spiritual community and physical sacred spaces in order to provide spiritual comfort for the community’s wards. This in turn allowed the community to build chapels in their almshouses and hospitals. Second, the Rogozhskoe merchant families’ use of their wealth and capital for charity as a means to set themselves apart from Russia’s more westernized nobility in turn aided in developing and sharing Rogozhskoe’s ideals. The economic influence held by Rogozhskoe’s merchantry allowed wealthy families such as the Morozovs, Soldatenkovs, Rakhmanovs, and Riabushinskiis to rise to prominence and leadership positions with the community. These families proved to be vital to the portrayal and understanding of Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow as in the process of building their dynasties they developed their own concept of a Christian capitalism that was at once successful in economic terms but also Christian in its redistribution of wealth, aid to workers, and vision of work and wealth as God-given. The Rogozhskoe Old Believers looked to these families not only in hopes that their economic acumen would aid the community’s finances, but also because these families served as the greatest symbols of Rogozhskoe’s ideals due to their extensive patronage and charity both in and outside of Rogozhskoe Cemetery.
Furthermore, the Rogozhskoe merchantry’s financial success, and their use of capital toward charity, directly provided the Rogozhskoe community the ability to physically build and maintain their Holy Moscow. Rogozhskoe’s financial success and recognition as the most charitable institution in Moscow granted the community significant leeway with tsarist authorities. For example, due to Rogozhskoe’s extensive influence as a charitable institution as well as the community’s growing population allowed the community to successfully petition for construction of a stone temple – a project strictly forbidden for Old Believers under the law. Yet with the community’s own extensive wealth, combined with the wealth of its merchant parishioners, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers constructed their very ideal of a sacred Moscow. However, rather than portray this new Holy Moscow exclusively as a testament to the community’s ties to the Old Rite, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers used their structures’ architecture to emphasize the community’s place as both a part of Imperial Russia and the Old Rite. By incorporating popular, contemporary architectural styles externally with interiors devoted to pre-Nikonian iconography and frescos, then, Rogozhskoe Cemetery’s physical structures and cathedrals not only served as a dividing point between their sacred spaces and the outside world. Such divisions also emphasized the dual nature of Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow: a Third Rome that championed “pure,” pre-Nikonian Russian Orthodoxy but remained an active part of contemporary Russia.

Ultimately, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ ideal of Holy Moscow found even greater meaning following the catastrophic events of 1812. It was at this point that the community could fully display their devotion to their own identity and ideals as the
champions of a true Third Rome for both the Old Rite and post-1812 Moscow. Rebuilding Moscow allowed the community to directly strengthen their own Holy Moscow. By providing financial aid to rebuilding projects as well as charity for Muscovites after the devastating fire, tsarist authorities granted the Rogozhskoe community greater leeway socially, economically, and religiously and thereby allowed the community to flourish. With this new era of greater freedom, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow witnessed an extensive expanse of their economic and religious influence as the community’s population skyrocketed, attracting the patriarchs of many of Rogozhskoe’s future merchant and industrial dynasties – thereby ensuring continued financial and spiritual success for the community.

It was in the post-1812 Moscow that Rogozhskoe Cemetery truly developed their idea of Holy Moscow as the ideal Old Rite and Russian community. For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their new Third Rome, financial gain was not for individual gain but for the good of the immediate community and Muscovite society as a whole. In Rogozhskoe Cemetery this meant building the community into a greater charitable institution and serving as a great sacred symbol for the Old Rite as a whole. The expansion of Rogozhskoe’s almshouses, hospital, and orphanages took in the needy regardless of their religious background. Simultaneously, with the financial success a number of Rogozhskoe’s families experienced, they in turn funded the community’s ability to continue to build the physical representation of Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow. This developed through the purchase of numerous old icons and manuscripts, as well as
housing a large number of priests and encouraging other Old Believer communities to send spiritual leaders for training, or attending services as part of a pilgrimage.

However, this same success eventually drew the ire of the tsarist authorities and Russian Orthodox Church. With the rise of the likes of Metropolitan Filaret and the strengthening of the autocracy under Nicholas I, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ success became a liability. Both Filaret and tsarist authorities eventually saw Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow as a direct threat to the very foundations of Russian society. For Filaret and the Russian Orthodox Church, Rogozhskoe’s grandeur, unmatched charity, and extensive spiritual influence could potentially lure away the Orthodox and thereby undermine the Church itself. To Nicholas and his supporters, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers could not be tolerated simply because they were *raskol’niki*. As adherents of the Old Rite, Rogozhskoe remained outside of acceptable Russian society and therefore needed more strict measures to weaken the Old Rite or outright force the community to give up their Holy Moscow and convert to the Russian Orthodox Church.

Even under the extreme oppression created by Nicholas and Filaret, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers and their Holy Moscow persevered. Even after the loss of their sacred spaces with the state sealing their altars, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers made every effort to redefine themselves and their community. Despite the obstacles, they strove to maintain their understanding of their Holy Moscow and present it as an integral part of late-nineteenth century Russia. The era of the Great Reforms provided such an opportunity. Under the leadership of some of Rogozhskoe’s prominent individuals, the community reshaped the ideal of their Holy Moscow to work actively and directly with
the tsarist authorities to incorporate both Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the entire Old Rite into the Great Reforms. Within this process, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers redefined their Holy Moscow as a community that interacted with the tsarist autocracy as loyal, yet influential, subjects. The ultimate change to Rogozhskoe’s Third Rome was the conscious decision to restore the place of the Tsar within Rogozhskoe’s own Third Rome Doctrine. Prior to the late-nineteenth century, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers remained some of Russia’s most loyal and patriotic communities. Yet, the restoration of a direct link to the Tsar not only redefined Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow, but changed the entire understanding of the Old Rite. Rogozhskoe had long viewed the Tsars since the seventeenth century as foundational opponents to the Old Rite because of the Tsar’s acceptance of the Nikonian Reforms and continued efforts to introduce Western customs and culture into Russia. By the latter half of the nineteenth century, however, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers fully accepted and publically declared their loyalty to both the Tsar and the autocracy, thereby restoring the Tsar’s place in the community’s own Third Rome Doctrine, and restoring the historical role of the Tsar as the protector of true Christian Orthodoxy.

Yet it was ultimately the autocracy’s own attempts to stave off the disturbances of 1905 that allowed the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ Holy Moscow to truly flourish, even if only briefly. With the Nicholas II’s ukaz on religious toleration, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers received not only legal toleration for their faith but also the return of full control of their sacred spaces. Once again, Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow could serve as both a spiritual and physical representation of the ideal Christian community and the
purity of the Old Rite. For the Rogozhskoe community, restoration of their sacred spaces became one of the earliest foci for the community following 1905. Furthermore, not only did the Rogozhskoe Old Believers seek to restore their cathedrals’ grandeur, but also completed their own version of the Cathedral Square of the Moscow Kremlin with the completion of the community’s bell tower.

At the same time, Rogozhskoe’s own influence continued to grow under the guidance of a new generation of merchants and industrialists in many of Rogozhskoe’s wealthiest families. Contrary to many historical interpretations of the Morozov and Riabushinskii brothers, this new generation not only continued to play a very active role in shaping the Rogozhskoe community in the period of religious toleration, but also continued to champion the community’s ideals in their approach to their own businesses, and extensive use of charity and patronage. Ultimately, in this process, they even developed and matured a very different idea and approach to Christian capitalism. Individuals such as Vladimir and Stepan Riabushinkii, for example, expanded and diversified their families business, becoming some of the wealthiest people in the Russian Empire. But, they also remained devoted to their Old Rite roots and more specifically loyal to upholding Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow by using their capital for the greater good of both the Rogozhskoe community and the Russian populace as a whole.

Yet the events of 1917 cut short Rogozhskoe’s newfound freedom, and once again directly threatened Rogozhskoe Cemetery and the community’s very ideals held in their Holy Moscow. However, as with tsarist oppression over the centuries before, Rogozhskoe’s influence and recognition granted the community some protection from the
Soviet regime, allowing Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow to continue to survive. Interestingly it would be under the Soviets that the Rogozhskoe Old Believers finally moved toward restoring the spiritual aspect of their Holy Moscow with the creation of their own Metropolitanate of the Old-Rite Russian Orthodox Church in 1988. Ultimately, the collapse of the Soviet Union and twenty-first century Russia once again provided the opportunity for the Rogozhskoe Old Believers’ to rebuild their physical and ideological Holy Moscow, this time for a New Russia.

For the Rogozhskoe Old Believers, then, their history is the story of a community devoted not only to the Old Rite but to an ideology that saw their physical and spiritual community as the embodiment of the true Third Rome Doctrine. They understood themselves as an Orthodox Christian community free of Western corruptions spiritually, socially, and economically and devoted to what they designated traditional Russian culture and values. This ideology was part of the shared identity of all members of the Rogozhskoe community, the general parishioners, the clergy who served the community, and Rogozhskoe’s wealthiest families and merchants. Yet while the Rogozhskoe Old Believers continually and stubbornly defended their Holy Moscow under the ebbs and flows of oppression by tsarist and Russian Orthodox authorities, the series of adaptations of their very understanding and presentation of their Holy Moscow reflected the community’s ability and desire to remain part of contemporary Russia. Rogozhskoe Cemetery, then, became its own divide between the physical and sacred for the immediate community. From the outside, the Rogozhskoe Old Believers upheld themselves as loyal, patriotic members of contemporary Russia with their Holy Moscow.
meant to serve as a beacon of true Christian piety and community, primarily through the use of charity. Inside the community’s walls and structures, their Holy Moscow remained devoted solely to championing the Old Rite. Ultimately, Rogozhskoe’s Holy Moscow and the community’s ability to adapt and participate in the world around them allowed the community to continue building and redefining their Holy Moscow to serve as a spiritual and moral ideal to guide the immediate community, other Old Believers, and Russian and Christian society as a whole.
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