

a reflection of Dostoevskii's suffering, and of the mock execution, and compares this experience with that of Blanchot, who narrowly escaped execution by the Nazis. Fung also draws on Victor Hugo's story "Le dernier jour d'un condamné." Should one look for "the epileptic mode of being" in the last two examples? Fung wants to convince us that we should. The fourth chapter is titled "The Will to Epilepsy: Suicide, Writing, and Modernity," while the fifth focuses on the "shriekers," as hysterical peasant women were called in those days.

The conclusion has more to do with the expectation of death than with epilepsy as an illness, even understood metaphorically. It might best be expressed in Blanchot's words in *L'instant de ma mort*, rephrased here: "The instance of my death is always pending, just as the process in the court" (133). Fung tries to give to the medical term *epilepsy* a philosophical meaning by interpreting it as "caesura," "rupture," or "suspension." It is for the reader to judge how successful that is.

IRINA SIROTKINA

Institute for the History of Science and Technology, Russian Academy of Science

The Way: Religious Thinkers of the Russian Emigration in Paris and Their Journal, 1925–1940. By Antoine Arjakovsky. Trans. Jerry Ryan. Ed. John A. Jillions and Michael Plekon. Foreword, Rowan Williams. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013. xiv, 766 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. \$65.00, paper.

This is a remarkable but demanding, even daunting, history of the Russian religious-philosophical emigration in interwar France. Antoine Arjakovsky is a French professor of ecumenical theology at the Ukrainian Catholic University. His subject is the Paris school of Russian émigré religious thought. The school consisted of several institutions: the Academy of Religious Philosophy (founded in 1922), the YMCA Press (founded in 1923), the Russian Student Christian Movement (founded in 1923), the journal *Put'* (The Way, founded in 1925), and the St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute (founded in 1925). The YMCA generously supported all these institutions, which helps account for their ecumenical spirit. Paul Anderson, an American who became director of the YMCA mission to Russian immigrants in Europe, played an indispensable role. In Arjakovsky's judgment, he "deserves to be canonized today by the universal church" (579). But the figure who looms largest in the book is Nikolai Berdiaev, director of the Academy of Religious Philosophy (which he founded in Berlin before moving to Paris, in 1924) and editor of the YMCA Press and of *The Way*. Though Berdiaev is probably the best-known Russian philosopher in the west, this book adds to our knowledge of him. It also sheds light on many other prominent Russian religious thinkers, including Sergei Bulgakov, Georgii Fedotov, Georgii Florovskii, Semen Frank, Lev Karsavin, Vladimir Losskii, Lev Shestov, Lev Zander, and Nikolai Zernov.

Arjakovsky divides his book into three parts, corresponding to his periodization of *The Way's* history: its modernist phase (1925–29), nonconformist phase (1930–35), and spiritual phase (1935–40). The logic behind the periodization and labels is not always clear, and there is some overlap and repetition. For example, nonconformist intellectuals, whether French or Russian, defended what Jacques Maritain and others called the "primacy of the spiritual," so it is not immediately obvious what distinguishes the journal's second and third phases. The author's painstaking method is to survey many of the journal's 400 articles and 206 reviews, highlighting the various themes, problems, and controversies that emerge along the way. It would have been better, perhaps, to organize this sprawling book more tightly according to its three

major themes: the Paris school's religious modernism, neotraditionalist challenges to it, and the school's involvement in the ecumenical movement.

In a 1935 editorial, Berdiaev used the term *modernism* to characterize Russian religious thought as it had developed from Aleksei Khomiakov and Ivan Kireevskii to Vladimir Solov'ev and the Silver Age. *The Way* was established to preserve and develop the rich modernist heritage, which (no less than traditional Orthodoxy) faced destruction in Bolshevik Russia. Russian religious modernism was a type of "religious humanism," the notable phrase with which Frank concluded *Vekhi* (1909). This tradition drew strength from the Christian revelation or myth of divine humanity (*bo-gochelovechestvo*), but it developed this myth philosophically. Hence the modernist combinations "religious-philosophical," "faith and reason," and even Arjakovsky's hyphenated "mytho-logy," which designates "the living relationship of myth and thought, that is, an event, or in Russian, *so-bytie*—'a being-with,' an encounter" (32). Modernists recognized Christianity's social responsibilities and tasks, and they generally followed Solov'ev in advocating a "Christian politics." They were progressive in seeking to build the kingdom of God on earth.

The "old" religious modernism of the Paris school immediately came up against the new religious climate in Europe. The sharpest confrontation may well have been with the dialectical theology of Karl Barth, whose 1922 *Epistle to the Romans* "denounced the continuity between the human being and the divine reality championed by the liberal theologians of the nineteenth century" (170). Or, as Sergei Bezobrazov put it in 1936, "unlike Barthianism, contemporary Orthodoxy has a vision of a rehabilitated world" (511). The Paris school faced another, more direct and primitive challenge from the Russian Orthodox Church outside Russia, which accused the YMCA of being a Masonic organization, condemned the St. Sergius Institute for its modernism, and charged Bulgakov with heresy for his sophiology. In the "Sophia affair of 1935," the Moscow Patriarchate added its voice to the accusations, based on a report written by Losskii: "The entire immigrant community, from Harbin to Berlin, from Riga to Warsaw, was caught up in a violent polemic" (386).

The most serious and long-term challenge to modernism came, however, from a younger generation of theologians within the Paris school itself. This was the neopatristic movement, led by Florovskii and Losskii, which would achieve prominence in Orthodox theology by mid-century. It began, according to Arjakovsky, as early as 1929, with a review article by Florovskii on St. Simeon the New Theologian, several years before his major work, *Ways of Russian Theology* (1937). The neopatristic school largely rejected the relevance of modern philosophy to patristic theology and of theology to law, society, culture, and politics. Instead, it felt tradition-bound to take an apophatic (negative) or mystical approach.

The Paris school was committed to ecumenism. For Florovskii, this meant trying to convert other Christians to Orthodoxy, but for modernists like Berdiaev, Bulgakov, Fedotov, Zander, and Zernov, it meant genuine dialogue and engagement. One important relationship was with the Anglican Church, resulting in the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. Another was between those "two great Christian intellectuals" Berdiaev and Maritain (146). Their profound personalist defense of human dignity and human rights is a legacy that Arjakovsky rightly deems worth remembering (not least in Putin's Russia). *The Way* as a "locus of memory" (Pierre Nora) forms yet another conceptual layer of this rich, rewarding, and complex book.

RANDALL A. POOLE
College of St. Scholastica