Dostoevskii's *Brothers Karamazov*; and in the "philokalic asceticism" (139) of the pilgrim (*strannik*), popularized in Feofan (Govorov) the Recluse's "Tale of the Pilgrim." By the end of the nineteenth century, Orthodox asceticism, appealing to the "ascetic myth" (23) of the people, had effectively, in Michelson's view, become central to confessional and nationalist, even imperial, discourse, as seen in the writings of the Near East consular agent and Russian ascetic Konstantin Leont′ev. For Michelson, the Russian intelligentsia's neo-idealist turn, seen in the *Vekhi* anthology and specifically in the writings of Sergei Bulgakov, recaptured on the eve of WWI philokalic asceticism's focus on the inner self. Bulgakov's contribution to *Vekhi* ("Heroism and Asceticism") encapsulated the philosophic idealism and Slavophilism in Orthodox thought, centering it in asceticism discourse.

Michelson's epilogue takes this discursive account of asceticism into the emigration and post-Soviet period, adding an interesting discussion regarding "essentialism" (229). Has Michelson's account essentialized asceticism discourse as a definitional component of what it means to be Russian Orthodox? Michelson rejects that and adds, perhaps as evidence of diverging views, a commentary on Nikolai Berdiaev, who attributed responsibility for the "catastrophe of October 1917" to the "ethos of monastic-ascetic Orthodoxy" (219).

Readers will appreciate the breadth of Michelson's reading and the finely tuned interpretive force of his intellectual history. Occasionally, there are queries one might like to pose to the author. For example, did the discourse of asceticism and its inoculation against western, Protestantizing threats give privileged cover to conservative ideologues who sought a more pure Orthodoxy? Was there a more complicated politics of exclusion in the asceticism discourse? In the name of purity, Feofan the Recluse, who gave us "The Tale of the Pilgrim," later complained about Old Testament translation from the Hebrew Masoretic text, decrying Jews who had, in his view, intentionally introduced mistakes into the text to undermine Christianity's claim to inherit the Old Testament covenant. Alternatively, in reaction to monastic asceticism, the foremost early translator of Greek patristic texts in the Petersburg Theological Academy, Archpriest Gerasim Pavskii, refused to take monastic vows upon the death of his wife in 1824, saying of monastic clergy that they simply "wanted to hold everyone in their grasp" (N.I. Barsov, "Protoierei Pavskii," 510). Such probing of the politics of asceticism ultimately reinforces the importance of Patrick Michelson's ambitious contribution to modern Russian Orthodox thought. The book is attractively published but needs a bibliography.

Stephen K. Batalden
Arizona State University

Beyond Modernity: Russian Religious Philosophy and Post-Secularism. Ed. Artur Mrówczyński-Van Allen, Teresa Obolevitch, and Paweł Rojek. Ex Oriente Lux: New Perspectives on Russian Religious Philosophers, vol. 1. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016. x, 273 pp. Paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.358

This is the tenth book resulting from the "Krakow Meetings," a series of annual conferences on Russian religious philosophy held in Poland since 2010. The current volume inaugurates Pickwick Publications' *Ex Oriente Lux* series, which plans to publish future conference volumes. The book consists of an introduction and nineteen chapters. Some chapters are devoted to central concepts (modernity, secularism, post-secularism, personhood, divine-humanity, sophiology), others to Russian

religious philosophers (Vladimir Solov′ev, Viktor Nesmelov, Sergei Bulgakov, Nikolai Berdiaev, Semen Frank, Pavel Florenskii, Georges Florovsky). The overall aim is to demonstrate that Russian religious thought is a valuable resource for understanding secular modernity and for moving beyond it to the "post-secular." The volume has admirably met that goal. Most of the contributors are Polish or Russian scholars; the quality of the English prose varies but as a whole the volume is readable.

One of the problems with post-secularism is that it has multiple meanings, like secularism itself. To deal with these definitional and conceptual issues the contributors draw on leading social theorists such as Jürgen Habermas and Charles Taylor. In his monumental book *A Secular Age* (2007), Taylor emphasizes one sense of secularism: the modern condition in which religious belief becomes a personal option, rather than being axiomatic and inevitable. A related sense of the term is separation of church and state, and more generally the delimitation of religion from other areas of human life (morality, philosophy, science, politics, economy, art); the recognition of the relative mutual autonomy of all these areas. In these senses secularism has often been seen as actually benefiting religion, since faith, according to this approach, comes from inner conviction and is incompatible with external coercion. Thus secularism has been closely associated with respect for freedom of conscience (the free inner recognition of ideals, truths, and values). Solov′ev understood secularism in this way and gave it "a positive religious meaning," as Konstantin Antonov writes in his chapter (36), among the best in the book. Berdiaev followed Solov′ev in this respect, as other chapters also show (Olga Tabatadze deals specifically with his defense of freedom of conscience).

Of course secularism also has a quite different meaning: the marginalization of religion as something opposed to reason, science, progress, and modernity. Terms such as "secular humanism" generally imply an irreligious outlook or even atheism. Post-secularism has emerged mainly in response to the anti-religious senses of secularism. In general it maintains that religion is an essential aspect of being human, that it ought to be cultivated (even in the public sphere), and that it can legitimately provide a higher unity among the distinct spheres of intellectual, cultural, and social activity. Few post-secular theorists reject freedom of conscience, but many believe that relegating religion to the private sphere has led to its decline, and some wish to restore religion to all aspects of life, "that God may be all in all" (1 Corinthians 15:28). The last position is associated with John Milbank and the "Radical Orthodoxy" movement, which is Augustinian in inspiration and has nothing specifically do to with Eastern Orthodoxy. Several contributors to this volume are sympathetic to it or some similar vision.

A dissenting voice to the vision of universal religious synthesis is Grigory Gutner, whose chapter, "Post-Secularity vs. All-Unity," explores the various projects to restore wholeness to person and society after the fragmentation of Christendom and the modern secular division of thought and life into separate spheres. The Enlightenment project to forge a new wholeness through secular reason and science failed. But Gutner is also skeptical of religious projects at wholeness, though he respects the modern sophistication of Russian religious philosophers, even remarking, "they never deny liberal ideas of free personality and human dignity" (42). According to Gutner's conception, post-secularity rejects any kind of totality, whether based on scientific reason or religious faith. Rather it seeks complementarity and equality of discourses—the conditions of consensus, which "is not forever and about everything" (47).

In general the contributors to this volume are convinced of the truth of Christian theism. Their conviction is based largely on their philosophical understanding of human nature. In this respect they closely follow the Russian religious philosophers who are their subjects and who thought that religious experience was natural to human beings. Such experience comes in many varieties, but it involves consciousness of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2018.358 Published online by Cambridge University Press

infinite and absolute, or God. Accordingly, it is precisely *persons* who are capable of such experience and of self-determination. Several chapters of the book are devoted to Russian theories of personhood and theological anthropology, as expounded by such figures as Nesmelov, Bulgakov, Frank, and Sergey Khoruzhii. Other chapters are devoted to the closely related topic of Russian sophiology, especially in Bulgakov's thought, where Sophia designates the divine wisdom and love by which God created the world and gave it "personal" potential, or made it the matrix for the emergence and development of persons: "The hypostasizing energy of divine love, the uncreated life of God, is that out of which creation is drawn; while it is not a person or hypostasis, it is somehow 'personalizing,' it is the capacity of all being to be enfolded in love," as Aaron Riches expresses it in his chapter (75). Following Milbank, the volume presents Russian sophiology as a rich resource for post-secularism.

Another such resource, more generally, is Russian "theological philosophy" as it developed from Ivan Kireevskii to Georges Florovsky. As Paweł Rojek explains in his long programmatic chapter, this approach to philosophy is grounded in religious experience and the faith that both comes from and deepens such experience. Theological philosophy takes religious experience as a legitimate source of truth about reality, which is precisely contrary to the scientistic claim that nothing can be determined to be true or real unless it is positively given in sensory experience and subject to the scientific method. This type of radical rejection of reductive positivism is itself a good way of conceptualizing post-secularism. Clarifying that is not the least of this volume's merits.

Randall A. Poole
College of St. Scholastica

Russian Orthodoxy and the Russo-Japanese War. By Betsy C. Perabo. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. viii, 232 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. £76.50, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.359

Betsy Perabo's book discusses the challenges which the Russo-Japanese War presented to Christian morality and the national feelings of Russian Orthodox subjects of both empires involved in the conflict. Can a Christian Church justify a war? Is there a holy war? Are Christians allowed to kill non-Christians? To answer such questions, the author draws upon the western just war tradition and James Turner Johnson's definition of holy war. Yet, she does not employ these concepts mechanically but takes into consideration the absence of a systematically elaborated just war theory in Eastern Orthodox Christianity (4). In this way, Perabo's analysis successfully reveals the historical development of "elements of the just and holy war traditions as they appear in Russia" (6).

Conscious about the shortage of knowledge about Eastern Orthodox Christianity outside Russia and eastern Europe, the author familiarizes the reader with the features of this branch of Christianity that distinguish it from the Catholic and Protestant denominations. She also informs her audience about church-state relations in Russia and the history of the Russian Orthodox Mission in Japan. According to Perabo, Russian Orthodoxy has developed its own justification of war on the grounds of the Old Testament and the Eusebian influence on Orthodox political theology (66–67). In this regard, she pays special attention to the Russian notion of the Christ-loving military which stems from the veneration of warrior-saints and which is present in Orthodox liturgical texts, prayers, and theological treatises.