# Thinking Orthodox in Modern Russia

*Culture, History, Context*

*Edited by*
PATRICK LALLY MICHELSON
*and*
JUDITH DEUTSCH KORNBLATT

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS

82. Nadieszda Kizenko, *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000); Vera Shevzov, *Russian Orthodoxy on the Eve of Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Manchester, *Holy Fathers*; Jennifer Hedda, *His Kingdom Come: Orthodox Pastorship and Social Activism in Revolutionary Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008).

83. Martin Malia, *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812–1855* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961).

84. Alexander M. Martin, *Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries: Russian Conservative Thought and Politics in the Reign of Alexander I* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997); John Randolph, *The House in the Garden: The Bakunin Family and the Romance of Russian Idealism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007); Andrei Zorin, *Kormia dvuglavnogo orla* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2001).

85. For an early and unsuccessful attempt to complicate the history of the intelligentsia, see Franco Venturi, *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, trans. Francis Haskell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983). For the American editor's decision to give the English translation a teleological title contrary to Venturi's intention, see Franco Venturi, *Studies in Free Russia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), xi–xii, 216–87.

86. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Istoriia russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli: Individualizm i meshchanstvo v russkoi literature i zhizni XIX v.*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1908).

87. Gregory L. Freeze, "Handmaiden of the State? The Orthodox Church in Imperial Russia Reconsidered," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 1 (1985): 82–102, esp. 84.

88. Reinhart Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. Keith Tribe (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

*Chapter 5*

# The Struggle for the Sacred

## *Russian Orthodox Thinking about Miracles in a Modern Age*

VERA SHEVZOV

In 1912, a group of parishioners from the church of Saint Nicholas in the Siberian diocese of Eniseisk embarked on a year-long campaign against local diocesan and central Church authorities in Saint Petersburg to prevent the removal of an icon of the Mother of God named "The Joy of All Who Sorrow" from their parish church. That year, a young peasant girl and her uncle had found this icon in a freshwater spring, where the two had stopped to drink. Many of the local faithful interpreted the finding of this icon as a sign of divine blessing during a particularly difficult period in the region's history. Because of drought and insect infestations, residents had been deprived of normal harvests for more than four years. Seeing the icon as a sign of hope, believers embraced its appearance as nothing less than a miracle.[1]

In the history of lived Orthodoxy in modern Russia since the time of Peter the Great, this case was in many ways routine. On the one hand, Orthodox believers—laymen and women and often parish clergy—made frequent reports of miracles, in which they identified certain icons with such words as "grace-filled light," "heavenly blessing," divine goodwill, and mercy. Insisting that their sentiments were based not on a "fleeting passion" but on a "solid and conscious conviction in the truth of [their] beliefs," believers often associated such signs with turning points in their personal or collective lives and sought them out as sources of joy and strength.[2] At the same time, diocesan and central Orthodox Church officials routinely attempted to neutralize the awe-inspiring character

of certain events by insisting that such perceived "extraordinary" occurrences were, in fact, "ordinary." Guided by existing Church and civic legislation codified in the eighteenth century—whose purpose in large part was to clean up Orthodoxy's early modern image vis-à-vis its Western European Christian counterparts—nineteenth-century Church bureaucrats routinely initiated formal investigations into reported miracles in order to curtail "unfounded speculations" and to control the fate of the objects, sites, and, in cases of perceived healers, even people, that stirred believers' sacred sensibilities. Parish priests, in turn, often attempted to dispel grassroots claims about the miraculous, maintaining that such incidents involved little more than the "charlatanism of dishonest people."[3]

In the past two decades, scholars of Orthodox Christianity in modern Russia have turned primarily to such grassroots reports in order to determine Orthodox views on the phenomenon of miracles. Given that such exploration of the "theology of the streets" is conditioned in large part by available sources and the context from which these sources arose, scholars interested in Orthodox thinking about miracles have often been forced to consider Church institutional-related issues.[4] Having taken place on a local parish level and in the offices of consistory and Synodal officials, discussions about miracles in the "lived" context of nineteenth-century Russian Orthodoxy often digressed into statements and ideas concerning institutional authority, politics, power, and control. Notions concerning the workings of the "spirit" inherent in the phenomenon of miracles inserted a strong democratizing subtext into a hierarchically organized institutional world, often empowering the conventionally marginalized constituents within the faith community—especially common laymen and women. Consequently, debates regarding miracles often dovetailed with politically charged discussions concerning the relationship between clergy and laity, the source of authority within the community, especially episcopal authority, the relationship between local, diocesan, and national Church governance, and the image and role of laity in Church life.[5]

Furthermore, Church and civil legislation that guided nineteenth-century discussions about miracles were composed during the reign of Peter the Great, whose primary concerns led to the ill-defined project of freeing Orthodoxy from all that was "superfluous and not essential to salvation."[6] Inspired by a mixture of Counter-Reformation sentiments that sought to bring credibility to devotional practices in the face of corruption and Enlightenment rationalist sensibilities that tended to dismiss miracles as signs of ignorance, this legislation begged questions regarding the differences between "true" and "false"



miracles and between superstition and religion. Tracing Orthodox thought on miracles based on these sources, consequently, has often left contemporary scholars of modern Orthodoxy attempting to define the parameters of "Orthodoxy" as well as of "popular" and "official" religious cultures in any particular period.[7] Finally, the persistent phenomenon of reported miracles in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia has challenged scholars of Orthodoxy to question the conventional wisdom on modernity, progress, and secularization that foresaw an inevitable decline in religion.[8]

Orthodox thinking about miracles in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russian Orthodoxy, however, was not limited to priests and peasants or to consistory and Synodal bureaucrats. The subject of miracles surfaced in other Orthodox quarters, namely among a group whose impact on modern Russian religious thought has yet to be fully appreciated: professors and graduates of Russia's leading theological academies. As the essay by Sean Gillen about V. D. Kudriavtsev-Platonov in this volume indicates, far from being "deaf to all practical demands of life" and, hence, removed from society and from matters of concern to Orthodox faithful at large, many of the graduates of Russia's Orthodox academies embarked during this period on a conscious mission to make Orthodoxy relevant in the modern world.[9] That relevance was being tested in Russian society wherever modernity seemed to find its most eloquent and persuasive expression: in the rise of science and the entrenchment of a world view grounded in positivism, in the idea of progress, and, for Orthodox Christians in particular, in the rise of critical historicism and Biblical interpretation, which challenged the relationship between faith and history.[10] In short, these thinkers sought to meet the philosophical challenges wherever doubt, materialism, and secularism seemed to dismiss the credibility of Orthodoxy as an all-encompassing world view suited to the demands of the times.

The subject of miracles was no minor matter in these endeavors. Academically trained Orthodox thinkers struggled to assert the viability of an Orthodox world view and the integrity of an Orthodox identity in an age where not only miracle-working icons and healings were considered hindrances to progress, but where the very foundational tenet of that world view—the resurrection of Jesus—was no longer tenable.[11] While some Christians in the West, namely German liberal Protestant theologians, actively embraced modernity and attempted, as one Orthodox academic theologian maintained, to celebrate the resurrection of Christ without believing in the resurrection, Orthodox theologians resisted the rift between faith and science or knowledge (*nauka*) that modernity had perpetuated.[12] Echoing the view of the apostle Paul in the first

century, the priest and graduate of the Moscow Spiritual Academy, Stefan Ostroumov, reminded his readers, "if Christ was not resurrected . . . then the religious relationship to him of millions of those living today and in the past has been in vain and futile."[13]

Recognizing the centrality of the "fact" of the resurrection for the Orthodox world view, Russia's Orthodox academic theologians actively engaged in Western debates about the resurrection during this time period.[14] At the same time, some Orthodox academics also turned to the living nerve underlying belief in the resurrection—namely, the notion of miracle. Insofar as the resurrection was an event that was understood as "genuinely miraculous, as actually having occurred, and irrefutable," the resurrection begged the question of the very possibility of miracles—revelatory acts of God in nature, in the psychological nature of humans, and in the history of nations and peoples.[15] Aware of modern prejudices against miracles that came with the processes by which doubt and atheism were gradually becoming "speakable" among all segments of Russian society, many of Russia's Orthodox academic theologians considered it imperative to address the topic;[16] they sought to dispel reigning stereotypes that had contributed to making the miracle "the phantom of this age," more despised among certain segments of the population, as one priest noted, than religion as a whole.[17]

This essay offers an overview of the Orthodox exposition of the subject of miracles in the face of modern skepticism in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia. Unlike in modern Western thought where the topic of miracles immediately brings to mind such luminaries as John Toland, David Hume, Immanuel Kant, and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, except for Feofan (Tuliakov), who authored the most comprehensive apologetic work on Orthodoxy and miracles in prerevolutionary Russia, no single thinker or group of Orthodox thinkers stood out for their work on miracles. Instead, Orthodox discourse on miracles dovetailed with authors' other academic interests—dogmatic theology, moral theology, history, or biblical scholarship. Focusing in particular on understandings of God and creation, nature and free will, as well as on the epistemic quality of miracles in the Orthodox world view, Orthodox thinkers expanded upon and problematized the discourse about miracles as it tended to surface in the lived context of local church life. In doing so, Russia's Orthodox academic thinkers offered theological, philosophical, and epistemological credence to sensibilities that they considered essential to an Orthodox world view, and which, in modern times, otherwise remained conflated with notions of superstition, ignorance, and deception.



## The Thinkers and Their Sources

In his introductory lecture in a course on dogmatics at Moscow Spiritual Academy in 1914, professor of theology Sergei Glagolev reviewed briefly the history and purpose of the school, whose origins dated to the mid-seventeenth century, concluding that its ultimate purpose through the decades had been "the struggle for the sacred" (*bor'ba za sviatoe*). This was not a struggle primarily for churches, icons, or dogmas, he explained, but primarily against various world views that "attempt to empty our souls."[18] In large part, a similar sentiment motivated some other graduates from theological academies in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century to write in defense of miracles. Far from being esoteric works aimed at other scholars, as had generally been the case regarding academic theological work prior to the mid-nineteenth century, these essays were existentially motivated and spoke to contemporary intellectual and philosophical challenges facing Orthodox Christians in a modernizing society.

The authors on whose work this essay is based enjoyed diverse vocations and fates. Often graduates of the Saint Petersburg, Moscow, or Kiev Spiritual Academies, the majority of the Orthodox thinkers who wrote about miracles at this time were born in the second half of the nineteenth century. They were raised in a society and a Church environment influenced by the reforms initiated during the reign of Emperor Alexander II (ruled 1855–81). Several writers, such as Grigorii D'iachenko (1850–1903), Ioann Orfanitskii (b. 1854) and Stefan Ostroumov (d. after 1918), were ordained to the priesthood and served in parishes after graduating from the academy.[19] Others, such as Evgraf Loviagin (1822–1909) and Sergei Glagolev (1865–1937), chose to retain their lay status and became professors at the Saint Petersburg and Moscow Spiritual Academies, or in the case of Pavel Svetlov (1861–1945), at Kiev University.[20] Petr Smirnov (d. 1906) and Andrei Predtechenskii (d. 1893) served as editors of prominent ecclesiastical journals, *Tserkovnye vedomosti* (*Church News*) and *Khristianskoe chtenie* (*Christian Reading*).[21] Two authors—Nikolai Dobronravov (d. 1937) and Feofan (Tuliakov) (1864–1937)—became bishops. At least five of the authors were arrested and executed for anti-Soviet activity following the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution.[22]

Some academically trained authors penned essays that were edifying descriptions of the Orthodox understanding of miracles and did not explicitly engage or draw upon any particular sources.[23] Most authors, however, actively engaged modern, Western attitudes toward miracles, inspired by such philosophical luminaries as Baruch Spinoza (1632–77), David Hume (1711–76), Immanuel

Kant (1724–1804), G. W. F. Hegel (1770–1831), I. H. Fichte (1797–1879), Herbert Spencer (1820–1903), and William James (1842–1910) in order to counter views and assumptions that were becoming increasingly more common in Russia. Occasionally, the ideas of less well-known Western theologians and philosophers, such as the German theologian Hermann Olshausen (1796–1839), the Anglican bishop Richard Trench (1807–86), the English mathematician and liberal theologian Bladen Powell (1796–1860), and the geologist and president of Amherst College Edward Hitchcock (1793–1864), also appeared.[24] Since miracles, including Jesus's miracles and resurrection, were also discussed in the context of modern biblical criticism and the resulting quest for the historical Jesus, Orthodox academic writers knew well the works of H. S. Reimarus (1694–1768), and the lives of Jesus by David Strauss (1808–74) and Ernest Renan (1823–92). Less frequently, authors tapped literature from the sciences, drawing on the work of geologists, physicists, physicians, and psychologists, including the work of French neurologist Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–93).

Orthodox academics also drew freely on a wide array of traditional Orthodox and more modern Russian religious sources for their explication of miracles. They drew on biblical texts, especially when engaging modern biblical scholarship on New Testament miracle stories or on the resurrection. In addition, modern Orthodox academics routinely cited patristic authors in their defense of miracles, but generally not more so than contemporary Western Christian authors whose views they shared, or, occasionally Russia's religious philosophers such as Vladimir Solov'ev, Sergei Trubetskoi, and Sergei Askol'dov. Sergei Glagolev's essay, "Miracle and Science," is particularly noteworthy since it did not draw on traditional sources. Instead, reflecting his conviction that truths of faith could be scientifically justified, his essay turned to logic and recent scientific discoveries in the realms of physics and thermodynamics to illustrate its points, thereby challenging common assumptions about the "mystical" quality of all Orthodox theology.[25]

The Orthodox defense of miracles before modern skeptics, however, did not suggest an uncritical approach to the subject matter. Indeed, when discussing miracles, authors routinely turned to the Gospel texts to show Christianity's own nuanced understanding of them. Authors shared the assessment of Bishop Ignatii (Brianchaninov) earlier in the century that in the Gospel texts "signs" and "wonders" were secondary to the proclamation of the teachings of Jesus, or the Word of God. A learned monk and spiritual writer who had received his education at the Military Engineering School in Saint Petersburg, Bishop Ignatii (1807–67) had provided what he considered a synthesis of patristic



views on miracles. His series of three talks on the subject—first published in a collection of sermons in 1863 and then separately (and posthumously) in 1870—offered what might be seen as patristic justification for the guarded approach to miracles as described in the *Spiritual Regulation* and subsequent institutional policies.[26] Despite this tradition of restraint toward miracles, however, Russia's Orthodox thinkers did not believe that miracle stories were superfluous to the Gospel accounts or that they could be extracted from the texts without endangering the Gospels' integrity.[27]

While the authors' broad level of intellectual engagement with modern Western trends was in large part textually based, it also reflected their living contact with Western Europe and their own lived experience of Orthodoxy. Institutional reforms within Russia's theological academies in the mid-nineteenth century encouraged professors to travel abroad to further their academic work. As Nataliia Sukhova, a historian of Russia's theological academies has noted, such travel became a notable feature of academic life in Russia's theological schools beginning in the 1870s and was reflected in the scholarship that the academies' graduates produced.[28] Some academic theologians, such as Sergei Glagolev, who in 1900 was invited to be vice-president of the International Congress of the History of Religions, became internationally acclaimed figures.

## Miracle and Agency

In a widely discussed essay on the resurrection of Jesus, academic theologian and professor of moral theology at Moscow Spiritual Academy Mikhail Tareev noted how, dogmatically speaking, the resurrection had often been reduced simply to "the miracle of miracles," which, in turn, served as proof of the divinity of Jesus and the foundation of the Christian faith. In his estimation, however, there was more to the resurrection than simply a display of divine power.[29] Similarly, Orthodox thinkers in the late nineteenth century did not look to miracles as arguments for the existence of a God. Many of the most ardent, modern European detractors of miracles believed no less in the existence of a higher power, a "Supreme Architect." Rather, Orthodox thinkers focused on miracles as affirmations of the presence and agency of a personal God in the world in contrast to an impersonal metaphysical naturalism that denied the very possibility of a miracle. In response to a world view that understood the physical world as governed exclusively by rational, eternally existing, self-sustaining laws, mechanically predictable once discovered and known, and independent of any "supernatural element," Orthodox thinkers insisted on a more personally interactive universe.[30]

Orthodox thinkers as a rule agreed with the modern view that the universe is guided by impersonal natural laws. They welcomed scientific investigation and maintained that people of faith should support such investigation since Christianity embraces what is "true."[31] Yet authors hesitated to embrace the manner in which those scientific laws were broadly understood and imagined at that time. According to Glagolev, humans were limited in their knowledge and simply did not know nature, including the human body, in enough depth to master its laws. Similarly, Andrei Predtechenskii, professor of history at Saint Petersburg Spiritual Academy, argued that, when pressed, many modern thinkers defined the "laws" of nature as little more than "the way things are."[32] Consequently, Orthodox thinkers did not agree with the modern argument that miracles were contrary to reason because they apparently presupposed either a suspension in or a violation of the natural order.[33]

Orthodox thinkers, like some of their Western Christian counterparts, saw no opposition between the laws of nature and the notion of a miracle. In their estimation, a given act might find its cause or impulse in a divine source but the resulting activity or action did not inevitably contradict or suspend the laws of nature. As Predtechenskii noted, "That which is higher than and external to nature is not necessarily opposed to it."[34] Similarly, he along with other Orthodox thinkers distinguished between the notions of augmenting and opposing powers. The phenomenon of a person returning to life after death did not, in his view, necessarily oppose nature. While such a phenomenon did not conform to the conventional laws or patterns of nature, it did not necessarily contradict them either. He maintained that no laws of nature necessarily precluded such a phenomenon from occurring, should nature be enabled to do so. "Nature may not possess enough power to return a person to life," he stated, "but such a [life-giving] power at the same time may not be opposed to nature."[35]

The graduate of Moscow Spiritual Academy Stefan Ostroumov expressed a similar idea when he maintained that even in day-to-day life laws of nature often serve as a foundation upon which others act in order to produce new results. Physicians, for instance, routinely reverse the processes of nature through medicine, but generally no one considers laws of nature in such instances to be disturbed or violated. Instead, humans routinely make use of laws of nature in order to overcome them by means of other laws. Laws of a higher order can use and interact with laws of a lower order without violating or destroying the latter.[36]

Orthodox thinkers, therefore, attempted to balance a teleological view of nature with a sui generis understanding of miracles for which no law of nature could ever account yet that were not contrary to nature as such. According to



Predtechenskii, it would be more scientifically accurate to acknowledge that the laws that scientists recognize as governing nature do not necessarily exhaust the body of all laws governing the physical world. He urged his readers to think in terms of coexisting bodies of laws: the laws governing nature and those governing the phenomena of miracles.[37] Perhaps, he mused, if humans were able more deeply to understand the physical world, they would be able to discover a link between circumstances demanding a miracle and the "event" of a miracle. Miracles, noted Grigorii D'iachenko, designated those unusual moments when the divine activity that is usually cloaked by the laws of nature "reveals itself" and "exposes a guiding hand."[38]

While the philosophes and their philosophical descendants opposed the notion of miracle on the grounds that it presupposed imperfection and flaws in God's creation, modern Orthodox thinkers embraced it for precisely those reasons. From the Orthodox perspective, however, these flaws were not inherent in God's work but the result of the exercise of human free will. Therefore, it is not God's work that miracles "fix," in their estimation, but the work of free creatures. The Orthodox defense of miracles, consequently, was linked to a defense of both divine and human agency.

According to Orthodox authors, miracles were not arbitrary displays of divine power but free, purposeful acts of God.[39] God acted in the world, according to Orthodox academic thinkers, because God chose to do so. His acts had an aim and a moral purpose. Miracles were acts of divine love and mercy whose purpose or meaning, Glagolev insisted, could be identified in two contexts: in critical historical periods when miracles usually signaled a new phase in human development or in cases where humans, exercising their free will, created circumstances that needed to be set aright.[40] Other thinkers maintained that miracles facilitated the development of human mind and will.[41] According to the graduate of Moscow Spiritual Academy Petr Smirnov, the moral aspect was so significant in defining a miracle that even "ordinary" phenomena or events—entirely explainable by the laws governing nature—might be deemed miraculous given the power of their perceived meaning and their edifying quality.[42] The essential purpose of miracles in any case, according to the graduate of Moscow Spiritual Academy and priest Ioann Orfanitskii, was the renewal or restoration of creation, whose fate was continually being challenged by the misuse of human free will.[43]

Orthodox defense of miracles, consequently, rested on beliefs in the reality of personal human agency as much as personal divine agency. According to Glagolev, despite all of the psychological, physical, and circumstantial constrictions

placed on humans, in the Orthodox world view they nonetheless retain freedom of will and creativity that can direct existing forces of nature. Since the consequences of their actions can be and often are detrimental to society and nature, and since often these consequences lie beyond the scope of human ability to control or reverse them, God, in the Orthodox world view, can choose to respond through miracles. Miracles, in this understanding, can block evil or "redirect evil to positive outcomes" in nature, in personal lives, and in entire societies.[44]

Indeed, the bishop of Kronstadt, Feofan, author of the most comprehensive Orthodox study of the phenomenon of miracles, insisted that "the reality of human free will is logically linked with the reality of Divine Providence in peoples' lives."[45] Affirming the reality of human freedom yet recognizing human limitation, Bishop Feofan agreed that humans have the capacity to act in ways that do not conform to goals of salvation. For this reason, miracles were indeed "natural" and "necessary" in the Orthodox world view since they enabled humans individually and collectively to stay "on course" with respect to the economy of salvation, while insuring the integrity of human freedom and the free path of personal self-determination.[46] In contrast to modern enlightened rationalists and Deists who denied miracles and revelatory acts of God in the name of freedom of spirit and independence of thought, Orthodox thinkers argued that those who embrace the notion of divine revelation "know that they do not lose freedom but discover it."[47]

## Miracle and Sight

While Orthodox thinkers maintained that the reality of miracles was dependent on the existence of a God that was both wholly transcendent and wholly immanent, faith in that God was not necessary for miracles to occur. God was not bound by unbelief or lack of faith. As the prolific writer, bishop of Kostroma, and graduate of Moscow Spiritual Academy Vissarion (Nechaev) noted, "Miracles take place entirely by the grace of God," a grace that not even all believers enjoyed.[48] Examining the miracles of Jesus as reported in the Gospel texts, the graduate of Moscow Spiritual Academy and professor of theology at the University of Kiev Pavel Svetlov noted that people who were healed by Jesus were not always people of faith.[49] Faith, however, did matter in the process of *identifying* a phenomenon or event as miraculous. The miraculous, in this sense, lay in the eye and spiritual disposition of the beholder.[50] Miracle was to a large extent a matter of perception.[51]

The notions of discernment and perception were intrinsic to Orthodox discourse about miracles, although the tenor of that discussion depended to a large extent on the faith orientation of a given audience. As indicated in the 1912 case regarding believers from the church of Saint Nicholas in the Siberian diocese of Eniseisk at the outset of this essay, many church officials were exceptionally cautious when it came to the proclamation of miracles among Orthodox believers, often marginalizing the significance of such supposed "signs" with regard to salvation. In his essay, "Thoughts about Miracles," the priest Stefan Ostroumov acknowledged, along with his modern detractors, that not every event or phenomenon that might initially appear miraculous to believers truly is so.[52] Similarly, Sergei Glagolev admitted that historically Christians had often deemed occurrences miraculous that, in fact, were not. Sight, in the Orthodox understanding, was a subtle notion. Authors noted that the lack of its proper cultivation and conditioning among believers often precluded the quality of vision necessary to discern genuine miracles. Consequently, while academic theologians wholeheartedly defended the reality of miracles in the face of modern philosophical skepticism, they also drew on an Orthodox intellectual and spiritual heritage that was nuanced when it came to the proclamation and recognition of miracles.



Perhaps the most detailed consideration of this complex heritage belonged to the bishop and well-known spiritual guide Ignatii (Brianchaninov), who in the mid-nineteenth century articulated what might be deemed a modern Orthodox apology for skepticism. Drawing on a detailed reading of New Testament texts, along with writings of such Eastern Christian luminaries as Macarius of Egypt, Ephrem the Syrian, and John Chrysostom, Bishop Ignatii distinguished between sight conditioned by "a mind that is set on the flesh" (*plotskoe mudrovanie*) and sight enlightened by spiritual reason (*dukhovnyi razum*).[53] A "mind set on the flesh," in his view, reflected a false consciousness of life, guided as it was by a sense of self-sufficiency and self-importance.[54] It oriented itself primarily to the human condition and to worldly concerns. Such a mindset was little moved by longer-term moral or spiritual considerations.[55] Since the body was the barometer of life in this world view, those guided by a "mind set on the flesh" usually considered bodily illness as a calamity and healing a marker of unqualified well-being. Ironically, although those conditioned by such a mindset usually had little sense of the holy or an awareness of the divine, in Ignatii's estimation they nevertheless were among those who most desired and sought signs and miracles. Such people, in his view, tended to understand miracles in terms of demonstrations of power and were captivated by the performative aspect of what might appear to them as miraculous. According to Ignatii, their search for signs and miracles often resulted only in mishap and ruin.[56]

The sight of those who were enlightened by spiritual reason, in contrast, was more restrained with respect to "seeing" miracles. Oriented in life to both body and soul, those guided by spiritual reason saw beyond the mere physical aspects of life. In Ignatii's view, such people embraced virtues—especially patience and humility—that "a mind set on the flesh" usually could not recognize or appreciate. Accordingly, those who were enlightened by spiritual reason did not react to bodily illness as a tragedy, but were aware of the virtues that illness might cultivate. Hence, a miracle would not necessarily be sought in or perceived as an unexpected or unexplainable cure—in the marvel or in the display of wondrous power. Instead, the miracle, in the eyes of those enlightened by spiritual reason, would be found in the salvific consequence of an act, event, or phenomenon. For Ignatii, genuinely miraculous events or phenomena were replete with meaning; their primary purpose was to guide a person toward the Word of God as communicated in Scripture—a function they served, in his estimation, even in the Gospel narratives. Never an end in themselves, miracles were above all meant to be contemplated, and for this reason were sometimes referred to as "signs."[57] Since those guided by spiritual reason were acutely aware of the power of a living God, maintained Ignatii, they resisted seeking "signs," since they understood the risks of deception involved in doing so. Indeed, as Ostroumov and other Orthodox thinkers maintained before their fellow believers, the seeking of miracles was a sign of a misguided religious consciousness and suggested unbelief rather than belief.[58]

While Ignatii's observations were addressed primarily to fellow monastics and Orthodox Christians at large, the discussion of perception and discernment with regard to miracles was somewhat different when addressed to nonbelievers. According to Glagolev, divine causality and activity within the world could be perceived only if a person was open to its existence. If a person remained deaf and mute to God's "good callings," he maintained, such divine activity, though objectively present, would remain beyond a person's field of vision. In other words, to an untrained eye, a miracle appears as an "ordinary" natural phenomenon. It remains "hidden" and "inaccessible."[59] A "trained eye"—cultivated in part by faith—however, sees the world in qualitatively different terms. In an attempt to articulate for the modern mindset the sensibilities associated with the experience of a miracle, Bishop Feofan of Kronstadt compared these sensibilities with those that inspired artists and composers in their work, where an enigmatic "special gift" accounted for a special "sight" or "perception." No less of "genius" was at work, in Bishop Feofan's estimation, when the matter came to genuine religious experience.[60] In other efforts to explain the



character of perception that lent itself to discernment of miracles, Orthodox authors spoke about the "moral-psychological sensibility" and the "disposition of the soul" that conditioned and allowed a person to see the miraculous.[61]

The well-known theologian, philosopher, priest, and graduate of Moscow Spiritual Academy Pavel Florenskii addressed the issues of perception, faith, and miracles in an essay entitled "About Superstition and Miracle," penned in 1903, the year before he enrolled at the Academy and during his final year as a mathematics student at Moscow State University. Writing in reaction to the popularity of spiritualism and occultism in Russian society at that time, Florenskii maintained that neither superstition nor miracle lay in the "fact" of a phenomenon or event, but in the mode of their apprehension, in a person's relation to the fact.[62] Florenskii identified three such modes or "world views" (*mirovozrenii*)—religious, scientific, and superstitious. A person with a religious world view, Florenskii argued, often perceived things and events as "transparent" to divine activity. A person envisaged a thing as a "transparent membrane" through which he or she would claim to behold the working power of God. Such a religious mode of perception, he maintained, resulted in the assertion of miracle. Miracles are dependent on faith, in Florenskii's estimation, insofar as "faith" was understood to relate to the working power of the Good (*Blagoi Sily*).[63]

According to Bishop Ignatii, the ability to perceive genuine miracles was linked not merely to faith, but also to a particular level of spiritual development. He considered the notions of "true" and "false" miracles in terms of the development of a "spiritual" in contrast to a "fleshly" sight. Florenskii was no less interested than Ignatii in matters of inner development and human constitution that accounted for different modes of apprehension of the world. Instead of characterizing sight in terms of "spiritual" and "fleshly," however, Florenskii distinguished between "religious" and "superstitious" world views. In his estimation, miracles were inherent to the religious world view, while "anti-miracles" (*otritsatel'nye chudesa*) characterized the superstitious world view. The distinction between the two—miracle and anti-miracle—lies in a person's inclination to discern the power of good or the power of evil.

According to Florenskii, a person who held a religious world view "saw" a miracle when he or she discerned the will of "Him through whom all things came into being" within a seemingly arbitrary event or phenomenon.[64] Addressing primarily those involved in spiritualism, Florenskii maintained that those who held a "superstitious" world view, in contrast, operated with a different vision, and saw things in terms of evil or impure forces. Whereas a person with a religious world view perceived a "divine moment" in the miracle, a person

with a superstitious world view experienced a heightened perception of "an evil moment," with a resulting sense of dread, aversion, and disgust once the "moment" has passed. Other authors, such as the priest Petr Smirnov, conceived of false miracles as those "unusual" and "supernatural" events or acts whose results were destructive, false, and impure.[65]

Florenskii acknowledged that not all people conceived of the world in such enchanted terms. Between the religious and the superstitious world views, therefore, he proposed a third, more neutral mode of comprehending the world—the scientific. According to a scientific mode of perception, as Florenskii defined it, things are distinguished from their causality and are considered in and of themselves, in value-free terms. In such a world view, insofar as they are attributed to a divine cause, miracles lay beyond the scope of interest and perceptual range.[66] Indeed, as the anonymous priest P-skii maintained, inasmuch as miracles might be a part of nature but did not belong to nature, they remained outside the bounds of strictly scientific explanation.[67] On the other hand, Florenskii agreed with other Orthodox thinkers that just because a person deemed an occurrence a miracle did not mean that it necessarily defied rational, scientific explanation. The two were not mutually exclusive. Faith and reason and faith and knowledge, insisted Florenskii, were not antithetical categories.[68] As Pavel Svetlov maintained, it was neither science nor knowledge that was at odds with the faith, but "bad philosophy that cloaks itself in the name of science."[69] Not only did phenomena deemed miraculous not detract from the sciences, but, as Glagolev maintained, in some cases they helped to further scientific inquiry.[70] Indeed, according to Florenskii, even the resurrection was a natural phenomenon since all eventually would be subject to its law; as yet, however, it was a lone example thereof. In Florenskii's estimation, simply because something may not be rationally demonstrated or ever rationally explained does not lead to the conclusion that it was impossible and held no place in the scientific world view.

## Conclusion

Frustrated by the continued efforts on the part of diocesan officials to convince them of the "ordinary" (*obyknovennaia*) nature of their newly found icon of the Mother of God named "The Joy of All Who Sorrow" and to thwart their veneration of it, peasant parishioners from the Saint Nicholas church in the diocese of Eniseisk in 1912 penned a letter to the ober-procurator of the Holy Synod calling for what can be read as a philosophical truce with their detractors: "Let the icon for some be ordinary," they wrote, "but we cherish it as a blessing."[71] It is impossible to know with which group Orthodox academic thinkers who wrote about miracles and modernity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century would have sympathized in this particular case or in numerous other cases like it. Conditioned by the Orthodox spiritual heritage to avoid "rumors of miracles," as expounded by Ignatii (Brianchaninov), and aware of the Christian responsibility to "dispel superstition and false beliefs and to explain the seemingly miraculous quality of natural phenomena," Russia's academic theologians were potentially no less critical than their modern European counterparts of claims about the miraculous.[72]



At the same time, by defending the notion and possibility of miracles against modern detractors, Russia's academic theologians pushed the boundaries of the debates surrounding them. In addition to political issues of authority, power, and control already embedded in institutional discourse about miracles, academic theologians shed light on the other, more foundational epistemological, anthropological, and historical issues at stake. In doing so, they offered intellectual and conceptual credibility to a host of sensibilities found among the Orthodox faithful that otherwise could easily be dismissed by modern standards as obscurantist and steeped in "the murk of ignorance."[73] In particular, since miracles begged the definition of knowledge as much as understandings of God and nature, and since, as the priest and graduate of the Kiev Spiritual Academy Petr Linitskii recognized, knowledge is power, the subject of miracles—and the experiences reportedly associated with them—remained tenaciously relevant in the modern world.[74]

Insofar as they have considered Russian religious thought in terms of "contemporary philosophical expression of the ideals of the culture of Russian Orthodoxy," most twentieth-century historians and intellectual historians of Russia have tended to focus on the rich intellectual heritage left by such luminaries of Russian society as Sergei Askol'dov, Sergei Bulgakov, Vladimir Solov'ev, and Sergei Trubetskoi.[75] Russian religious thought has tended to be identified primarily with thinkers who received their primary education in secular institutions of higher learning. Despite the fact that many such religious thinkers were active Orthodox believers, students of Russian history often conceived of their thought as part of an intellectual community distinct from the Orthodox Church both as an institution and as a community of faith. Consequently, in the past two decades, in order to understand the culture of Russian Orthodoxy as it was lived and practiced, historians of Russia have broadened their conceptualization of what constitutes "thought" and have sought the voices of those, such as the parishioners from the Saint Nicholas parish in the Eniseisk diocese,

whose beliefs and rituals defined lived Orthodox culture at any given time. Conspicuously absent for the most part from both lines of investigation has been in-depth consideration of the voices from the theological academies and their graduates. As the subject of miracles indicates, many Orthodox academically trained thinkers were deeply steeped in tradition yet actively engaging the modern cultural and philosophical trends influencing all levels of Russian society. Their voices, no less than those of their university-trained counterparts, seminary-trained consistory bureaucrats, and parish priests, monastic guides, and ordinary laymen and women, belong to the rich legacy of modern Russian religious thought.

## NOTES

1. The record of this case can be found in Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA), f. 796, op. 195, d. 1430, ll. 1–175.
2. RGIA, f. 796, op. 195, d. 1436, l. 60.
3. Ibid., l. 7.
4. For the notion of "theology of the streets," see Robert Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880–1950* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 219.
5. As examples, see Gregory L. Freeze, "Institutionalizing Piety: The Church and Popular Religion, 1750–1850," in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 210–49; Vera Shevzov, "Icons, Laity, and Authority in the Russian Orthodox Church, 1861–1917," *Russian Review* 58 (January 1999): 26–48.
6. Alexander V. Muller, ed. and trans., *The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1972), 15. See also P. V. Znamenskii, "Zakonodatel'stvo Petra Velikago otnositel'no chistoty very i blagochestiia tserkovnago," *Pravoslavnyi sobesednik*, no. 12 (December 1864): 290–340. For more recent discussion, see Paul Bushkovitch, "Popular Religion in the Time of Peter the Great," in *Letters from Heaven: Popular Religion in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. John-Paul Himka and Andriy Zayarnyuk (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 146–64; Simon Dixon "Superstition in Imperial Russia," *Past and Present*, Supplement 3 (2008): 209, 218; Eve Levin, "False Miracles and Unattested Dead Bodies: Investigations into Popular Cults in Early Modern Russia," in *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West*, ed. James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 260.
7. As examples, see Himka and Zayarnyuk, *Letters from Heaven*; Eve Levin, "*Dvoeverie* and Popular Religion," in *Seeking God: The Recovery of Religious Identity in Orthodox Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia*, ed. Stephen K. Batalden (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1993), 29–52; Stella Rock, *Popular Religion in Russia: "Double Belief" and the Making of an Academic Myth* (New York: Routledge, 2007); Vera Shevzov, "Letting 'the People' into Church: Reflections on Orthodoxy and Community in Late Imperial Russia," in *Orthodox Russia: Studies in Belief and Practice under the Tsars*, ed. Valerie A. Kivelson and Robert H. Greene (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 59–77.



8. For a good overview of the genesis of this thesis, see Gordan Graham, "Religion, Secularization, and Modernity," *Philosophy* 67, no. 260 (April 1992): 183–97. As examples, see Gregory L. Freeze, "Subversive Piety: Religion and the Political Crisis in Late Imperial Russia," *The Journal of Modern History* 68, no. 2 (June 1996): 308–50. Robert H. Greene, *Bodies Like Bright Stars: Saints and Relics in Orthodox Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010), 55–64; Nadieszda Kizenko, *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 281–85; Christine D. Worobec, "Miraculous Healings," in *Sacred Stories: Religion and Spirituality in Modern Russia*, ed. Mark D. Steinberg and Heather J. Coleman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 22–43.
9. For articulation of this sentiment, see E. Smirnov, "Slavianofily i ikh uchenie v otnoshenii k bogoslovskoi nauke," *Strannik*, no. 2 (February 1877): 203. While virtually absent from Western historiographical treatment of Russian religious thought until relatively recently, Russia's spiritual academies and their theologians, historians, and philosophers have been gaining increasing attention, especially in post-Soviet Russia. For examples, see V. A. Tarasova, *Vysshaia dukhovnaia shkola v Rossii v kontse XIX–nachale XX veka* (Moscow: Novyi khronograf, 2005); Paul Valliere, *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 35–106; Vera Shevzov, "The Burdens of Tradition: Orthodox Constructions of the West (late XIX–early XX cc.)," in *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, ed. George Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013), 83–101; N. Iu. Sukhova, *Vertograd nauk dukhovnyi: Sbornik statei po istorii vysshego dukhovnogo obrazovaniia v Rossii XIX–nachala XX veka* (Moscow: PSTGU, 2007); N. Iu. Sukhova, *Vysshaia dukhovnaia shkola: Problemy i reformy vtoraia polovina XIX v.* (Moscow: PSTGU, 2012).
10. Orthodox academic thinkers often outlined the tenets of modernity's challenges in essays that broadly discussed the "philosophy of the times." See, for example, P. Linitskii, "Filosofiia nashego vremeni," *Vera i razum*, no. 11, bk. 1 (October 1891): 287–304.
11. As examples, see Gotthold Lessing, *Lessing's Theological Writings*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957); David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, 2 vols., trans. George Elliot (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
12. A. Kriazhimskii, "Vozmozhno li razgranichenie sfer religioznoi i nauchnoi?" *Strannik*, no. 11 (October 1915): 121–22. See also S. S. Glagolev, "Bor'ba za sviatoe: Vstupitel'naia lektsiia po osnovnomu bogosloviiu, prochitannaia v Moskovskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii 9 sentiabria, 1914," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 9 (September 1914): 5; Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh* (Kiev: Khristianskaia mysl', 1916), 35. This essay was originally published in the journal *Khristianskaia mysl'* (Christian Thought), which was conceived as a journal of "Orthodox self-awareness." The journal sought to track religious trends in Russia and abroad.
13. Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 36. See also Glagolev, "Bor'ba za sviatoe," 5.
14. As examples of this voluminous literature, see A. Bronzov, "Znachenie voskreseniia Khristova dlia nashei nravstvennoi zhizni," *Khristianskoe chtenie*, no. 4 (April 1900): 523–50; A. Druzhinin, "Uchenie Fikhte mladshego o voskresenii i iavleniiakh Khrista," *Vera i razum*, no. 6, bk. 1 (June 1884): 41–58; no. 7, bk. 2 (July 1884): 112–30;

E. I. Loviagin, "Sobytie voskreseniia Iisusa Khrista," *Khristianskoe chtenie*, no. 4 (1869): 527–61; M. M. Tareev, "Voskresenie Khristovo i ego nravstvennoe znachenie," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 5 (May 1903): 1–45; no. 6 (June 1903): 201–17.

15. N. Dobronravov, "O voskresenii Gospoda nashego Iisusa Khrista i ego iavleniiakh po voskresenii," *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*, April 1891, 679–95; I. A. Glebov, "Kakaia dolzhna byt' apologiia very v Khristovo voskresenie?," *Khristianskoe chtenie*, no. 5 (May 1908): 779–92.

16. Victoria Frede, *Doubt, Atheism, and the Nineteenth-Century Russian Intelligentsia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011), 11.

17. Loviagin, "Sobytiia voskreseniia," 559. For similar observations, see I. P-skii, "Vera v chudo," *Dushepoleznoe chtenie*, no. 11 (November 1879): 341; Sergei Glagolev, "Chudo i nauka," *Bogoslovskii vestnik*, no. 6 (June 1893): 479; I. A. Orfanitskii, "Chto takoe chudo?," *Vera i tserkov*, no. 1 (January 1902): 66; Aleksandr Vvedenskii, *Religioznye somneniia nashikh dnei*, 2 vols. (Odessa: Tip. L. Nitche, 1914), 1:161.

18. Glagolev, "Bor'ba za sviatoe," 20.

19. Aleksandr Bertash and A. A. Naseko, "D'iachenko," in *Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia* (Moscow: Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia, 2007), 19:518–20; "Orfanitskii, Ioann Alekseevich," *Bogoslov.ru*, http://www.bogoslov.ru/persons/46309/index.html; "Ostroumov, Stefan Ivanovich," *Novomucheniki i ispovedniki Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi XX veka*, http://www.pstbi.ru/cgi-htm/db.exe/ans/nm/?HYZ9EJxGHoxITYZCF2JMTdG6XbuCs S9UfiCgfe6UYS8Zt8oh66WWc8qiceXb**. For details concerning Ostroumov's arrest, see V. A. Korostelev, "Krest'ianskie vosstaniia v Riazanskoi gubernii v 1918," *Istoriia, kul'tura, i traditsii Riazanskogo kraia*, http://www.history-ryazan.ru/node/7495.

20. "Loviagin, Evgraf Ivanovich," *Biograficheskii slovar'*, http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/biograf2/8146; "Sergei Glagolev," *Biograficheskii slovar'*, http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/biograf2/3786; "Pavel Svetlov," *Biograficheskii slovar'*, http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/biograf2/11424.

21. "Predtechenskii, Andrei Ivanovich," *Biograficheskii slovar'*, http://www.biografija.ru/show_bio.aspx?id=109084. Occasionally, as in the instance of his essay on the meaning and significance of miracles in Christianity, Predtechenskii wrote under the pseudonym A. Ramushevskii.

22. These include Nikolai Dobronravov, Pavel Florenskii, Sergei Glagolev, Stefan Ostroumov, and Feofan, the bishop of Kronstadt (Vasilii Stepanovich Tuliakov).

23. I. M. Bogoslovskii-Platonov, "O chudesakh," *Dushepoleznoe chtenie*, no. 6 (May 1871): 34–38; P-skii, "Vera v chudo," 341–56; Petr Smirnov, *Chudesa v prezhnee i nashe vremia*, 2nd. ed. (Moscow: Tip. I. D. Sytina, 1895); Platon Tarnavskii, "O chudesakh v nashe vremia," *Strannik*, no. 12 (December 1864): 118–22.

24. See, in particular, A. Ramushevskii, "Mesto i znachenie chudes v sisteme khristianstva," *Khristianskoe chtenie*, no. 3 (September–December 1863): 410–61; and the comprehensive work of Feofan, Episkop Kronshtadtskii, *Chudo: Khristianskaia vera v nego i eia opravdanie* (Petrograd: Sinodal'naia tip., 1915). The essay by Ramushevskii was also published under the author's real name, A. Predtechenskii, as an appendix to his *Chto razumnee: Vera ili neverie* (St. Petersburg: Tip: Departamenta udelov, 1864).

25. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, "A New Spirituality: The Confluence of Nietzsche and Orthodoxy in Russian Religious Thought," in Steinberg and Coleman, *Sacred Stories*, 331.



26. Ignatii (Brianchaninov), *O chudesakh i znameniiakh* (Iaroslavl: Tip. Gub. zem. upravy, 1870). Initially, the talks were directed at his fellow monastic brethren and published in a volume entitled "Ascetic Sermons"; in an introduction to their publication in 1866, however, Bishop Ignatii noted that these sermons were intended for all Orthodox Christians who desire "to familiarize themselves with the ascetic life according the mind of the Fathers and the Church." Ignatii's views will be discussed in more detail below.

27. Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 35.

28. Sukhova, *Vertograd*, 172.

29. Tareev, "Voskresenie Khristovo," 1–2.

30. Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 412. For overviews of the debates concerning miracles in modern Western thought, see Colin Brown, "Issues in the History of the Debates on Miracles," in *Cambridge Companion to Miracles*, ed. Graham H. Twelftree (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 273–90; Colin Brown, *Miracles and the Critical Mind* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1984); Ralph Del Colle, "Miracles in Christianity," in Twelftree, *Cambridge Companion*, 235–53; Mary Hesse, "Miracles and the Laws of Nature," in *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History*, ed. C. F. D. Moule (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965), 33–42.

31. Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 19.

32. Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 427.

33. P-skii, "Vera v chudo," 356; Feofan, *Chudo*, 167–76; Glagolev, "Chudo i nauka," 479; Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 21; Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 419.

34. Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 424–25; P. Svetlov, "Izlechenie psikhicheskim vliianiem i chudesnye istseleniia: Bibleisko-apologeticheskii ocherk," *Khristianskoe chtenie*, nos. 7–8 (July–August 1896): 53–54.

35. Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 424.

36. Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 8–9; Grigorii D'iachenko, *Dukhovnyi mir* (Moscow: I. D. Sytin, 1900), 134–35, 210–11.

37. Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 427–28. For parallel views, see Bogoslovskii-Platonov, "O chudesakh," 36; Feofan, *Chudo*, 106; Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 4.

38. D'iachenko, *Dukhovnyi mir*, 209; Feofan, *Chudo*, 105.

39. S. Ostroumov, "O chudesakh, kak priznak istinnoi tserkvi," *Vera i razum*, no. 6, bk. 1 (May 1896): 490.

40. Glagolev, "Chudo i nauka," 484.

41. I. Nikolin, "O sverkhestestvennom otkrovenii," *Dushepoleznoe chtenie*, chast' 2 (1902): 65.

42. Smirnov, *Chudesa*, 4; D'iachenko, *Dukhovnyi mir*, 209.

43. Orfanitskii, "Chto takoe chudo," 80.

44. Glagolev, "Chudo i nauka," 511; D'iachenko, *Dukhovnyi mir*, 136–37.

45. Feofan, *Chudo*, 314.

46. Ibid., 316–18.

47. Nikolin, "O sverkhestestvennom otkrovenii," 63.

48. Vissarion, "Znachenie chudes v dele very vo Khrista i khristovu tserkov," *Dushepoleznoe chtenie*, chast' 2 (1902): 14.

49. Svetlov, "Izlechenie psikhicheskim vliianiem," 37.
50. Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 5.
51. Nikanor, Arkhiepiskop Khersonskii, "Protiv otritsaiushchikh dostovernost' chudes," in *Sovremennye religioznye i tserkovno-obshchestvennye voprosy v reshenii ikh vydaiushchimisia dukhovnymi i svetskimi pravoslavno-russkimi pisateliami* (St. Petersburg: Slovo, 1903), 110–11.
52. Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 5; Ramushevskii [Predtechenskii], "Mesto i znachenie chudes," 411.
53. Ignatii (Brianchaninov) borrows the notion of "a mind that is set on the flesh" from the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. See Romans 8:8.
54. Ignatii, *O chudesakh*, 9.
55. Ibid., 6–7, 23–24.
56. Ibid., 46.
57. Smirnov, *Chudesa*, 4.
58. Ostroumov, "O chudesakh," 493–94.
59. Glagolev, "Chudo i nauka," 484; Feofan, *Chudo*, v; Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 5.
60. Feofan, *Chudo*, iv. The priest I. A. Orfanitskii made a similar comparison between religious and aesthetic sensibilities. Orfanitskii, "Chto takoe chudo?," 89.
61. Orfanitskii, "Chto takoe chudo?," 87; Glagolev, "Bor'ba za sviatoe," 20; Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 6.
62. Pavel Florenskii, "O sueverii i chude," *Novyi Put'*, no. 8 (1903): 61–121. For a reprint of this essay, see Pavel Florenskii, "O sueverii," *Filosofskie nauki*, no. 5 (1991): 87–108. For an overview of the history of spiritualism and the occult in modern Russia, see Maria Carlson, *"No Religion Higher than Truth": A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia, 1875–1922* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 3–38; Ilya Vinitsky, *Ghostly Paradoxes: Modern Spiritualism and Russian Culture in the Age of Realism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).
63. Florenskii, "O sueverii," 93.
64. Here, Florenskii draws on John 1:4.
65. Smirnov, *Chudesa*, 5.
66. Florenskii, "O sueverii," 95–96; Ostroumov, *Mysli o chudesakh*, 10.
67. P-skii, "Vera v chudo," 356.
68. Kriazhimskii, "Vozmozhno li razgranichenie sfer," 1115–27.
69. Pavel Svetlov, *Religiia i nauka* (St. Petersburg: Tip. Aleksandro-Nev. o-va trezvosti, 1912), 4.
70. Glagolev, "Chudo i nauka," 495; P-skii, "Vera v chudo," 356.
71. RGIA, f. 796, op. 195, d. 1436, l. 17.
72. Ostroumov, "O chudesakh," 494.
73. P-skii, "Vera v chudo," 341.
74. Linitskii, "Filosofiia nashego vremeni," 287.
75. Judith Deutsch Kornblatt and Richard F. Gustafson, eds., *Russian Religious Thought* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 3.