

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Need for this Study

For decades we, Russian Evangelical Baptists, have often been simply referred to as Baptists. However, when the Iron Curtain fell down at the end of the 1980s and the Soviet Union opened up for foreign visitors, it became quite clear that Russian Baptists differ significantly both in theology and in Christian practice from those who call themselves Baptists in the West. Who are we? Where do we come from? And why are we what we are?

When trying to find answers to these questions concerning the identity of Russian evangelicalism I find myself thrown into studies of history and hermeneutics. One cannot understand the present without understanding the past. That is, firstly, I need to go back to the time when Russian evangelical theology was mostly shaped and defined and look for the theological influences that preconditioned the appearance of the evangelical movement in Russia.

Secondly, when I attempt to understand how Russian Evangelical theology was formulated methodologically, I find myself face to face with hermeneutics. In other words, I need to find an answer to the question of how our Russian Evangelical “founding fathers” were opening up the biblical text to their understanding and who taught them to do it in a certain way, and not another.

Obviously, the more importance is attributed to biblical texts by a theologian, the more important the study of his/her hermeneutical principles becomes. Russian Evangelicals positioned themselves as people of the Book. Thus, it is vitally important to find out how they treated the Book.

While there are a large number of descriptive publications about the history of the evangelical movement in Russia during the last decades of the nineteenth century and into the first decades of the twentieth century, there are hardly any detailed analyses of Russian evangelical theology including its hermeneutical principles. The present thesis is an attempt to partly fill this gap analysing the hermeneutical tendencies of Russian evangelicals on the example of I. V. Kargel’s writings.

1.2 The Purpose of this Study

The purpose of the study is closely connected with the need. In this study my purpose is to fulfil the need, that is, to find out what hermeneutical principles guided the reading and understanding of Scripture by Russian evangelicals, specifically by I. V. Kargel.

In order to do that I am first going to identify the Russian evangelical groups (with lower case “e”) of the chosen period and to point why they can be considered “evangelical”.

Second, I will provide a historical overview of the development of the Russian Evangelical movement during this period that will serve as a background for a better understanding of the development of Russian evangelical hermeneutics, since no views or ideas can be rightly understood without their historical context. I will be paying special attention to various influences that were experienced by Russian evangelicals. I will examine materials that were read, written, and published by the representatives of the movement.

Then I am going to analyse the hermeneutics of Russian evangelicals using the example of I. V. Kargel, who I consider one of the best representatives of the movement as a whole. In fact, his interaction with basically all evangelical groups during different periods of his life made Kargel almost a personification of the movement in the early stage of its existence. Therefore, I consider his writings the best place to start analysing Russian evangelical hermeneutics.

I do not want to start with a set of presuppositions concerning Kargel’s hermeneutics and then go looking for quotations in his writings to support those presuppositions. I am going to do what I called “inductive analysis”—working with large portions of his works line by line and providing a parallel Russian-English translation of his texts in the Appendix. Doing so, I want to rediscover the hermeneutical principles that governed Kargel’s interpretation of Scripture.

Finally bringing the results of the research together, I will try to discern the main hermeneutical factor that, in spite of their many differences, drew Russian evangelicals together into one brotherhood—the so-called Evangelical Christian Baptist Union—in the second half of the twentieth century.

1.3 The Scope of this Study

1.3.1 The period of the time under consideration

The author has chosen to limit this research to a forty-five year period (1874-1929) for the following reasons:

The year 1874 witnessed a very important development in the history of Russian Protestantism: the emergence in St. Petersburg of the Pashkovite movement. Although the gospel was preached and various Protestant churches existed in Russia prior to Radstock's 1874 arrival in the Russian capital St. Petersburg, it was his ministry that marked the beginning of the movement which eventually produced Evangelical (with a capital "E") Christian churches.

After the 1917 Revolution the Soviets gradually closed the country to influences from abroad. Theological interaction with Christians outside Russia became impossible. Bearing in mind that foreign theological influences on Russian evangelical hermeneutics play an important role in my research, the chosen time limit (1929) is nothing but logical. I believe that certain theological trends that had developed by the end of 1920s did not undergo serious changes in the following decades. The basic need to survive became the priority.

In 1929, under attack by the atheistic state, evangelical churches experienced severe persecution and had to learn how to function in new realities. The churches did not die away completely but continued underground, in prisons and labour camps, and in a very few officially sanctioned church buildings. Cases of heroism and betrayals are yet to be discovered after relevant archives become available.

Finally, the chosen time period corresponds with the most productive years of the ministry of I. V. Kargel, whose hermeneutical principles I am going to study.

1.3.2 Varieties of Russian evangelicalism

Although the author will be concentrating on the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg, this study will also consider other evangelical movements that appeared mainly in the south and southwest areas of the Empire. In order to avoid confusion the author has to specify that the Evangelical Christians (with a capital "E") is the name of particular churches and a union of churches

registered in St. Petersburg at the beginning of the twentieth century. However, evangelical Christians (with a small “e”) in Russia include a number of movements like Molokans, Stundists, Baptists, Mennonite Brethren, and Radstockists-Pashkovites, that were appearing throughout the nineteenth century. Thus, Russian evangelicalism of the nineteenth century was a multi-faceted movement.

These groups were somewhat connected with each other and had certain things in common. For instance, they rejected Orthodox rites. Naturally, these groups had their differences, but all were trying to return to the Christianity of the New Testament as they understood it from the reading of the Scripture. Sometimes these groups were even taken for each other. One can often come across the combined names like “stundo-baptism” or “baptisto-stundism”. All these groups share a number of essential features, those “marks of evangelical religion”, which actually allow one to consider all of them “evangelical”. The author will be operating with the criteria used by Quebedeaux and Bebbington.

The term “Evangelical”, used since the time of the Reformation with all its variety of meaning, “has most often been associated with the doctrine of salvation by faith in Christ alone” (Quebedeaux 1974:3). In the eighteenth century, Evangelicalism “was represented by pietism in Germany, Methodism in England, and the Great Awakening in America” (Quebedeaux 1974:3). This way being “concealed under different names and transcending denominational borders” it can be recognized by a few central features such as “the inspiration and authority of the Bible, man’s inherent depravity, and more or less symbolic nature of the sacraments. In its worship, moreover, heavy importance has been placed upon evangelistic preaching and the reading of Scripture” (Quebedeaux 1974:3).

Quebedeaux also clearly defines three major theological principles of contemporary Evangelicalism: “(1) the complete reliability and final authority of Scripture in matters of faith and practice; (2) the necessity of a *personal* faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour from sin and consequent commitment to Him as Lord; and (3) the urgency of seeking actively the conversion of sinners to Christ” (Quebedeaux 1974:4). He emphasised that for the Evangelical “knowing Christ, like knowing any person on a deep level, is an experience; and the new birth

which He provides marks the beginning of a growing experience” (Quebedeaux 1974:4).

When defining the word “Evangelical”, Bebbington, a scholar of English evangelicalism, suggests that it normally means something ‘of the gospel’ “in a non-partisan sense” (Bebbington 1989:1). This kind of definition would automatically imply a number of groups with different names. Bebbington also lists special marks of evangelical religion: conversionism (the belief that lives need to be changed), activism (the expression of the gospel in effort), biblicism (a particular regard for the Bible, devotion to the personal searching of the scriptures), and crucicentrism (a stress of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross) (Bebbington 1989:3). Those marks correspond well with the major theological principles listed by Quebedeaux.

I believe that these distinguishing marks are applicable not only to Evangelicalism in modern Britain and America but also to Evangelicalism in modern Russia. I am going to use these criteria as guidelines to determine whether certain groups or unions of believers in nineteenth century Russia could be considered evangelical. Further on, a more detailed discussion will show that Molokans, Stundists, Baptists, Mennonite Brethren, Radstockists-Pashkovites, and Evangelical Christians *per se* reveal these main characteristics and, thus, can be considered evangelical, making them legitimate objects for this study.

1.4 The Design of the Study: Brief Description of the Chapters

Chapter 1 presents introductory material, stating the problem and forming the theme of the following pages. It also provides an introductory guide to the available sources and literature on Russian evangelical movements.

Chapter 2 attempts to formulate the methodological strategy, to set the rules, and outline some presuppositions to which the author will adhere.

Chapter 3 is mostly concerned with providing a historical and theological background of the Russian evangelical movement. It analyzes both domestic conditions and foreign influences that were instrumental in shaping this movement. Special attention is paid to the Bible appearing in vernacular Russian and to a number of foreign preachers who laboured in St. Petersburg. The theological background including foreign influences is of special interest

indeed, because it helps to trace connections between the movement's roots and fruit.

Chapter 4 represents an overall review of the history and some theological tenets of St. Petersburg's group of Radstockists-Pashkovites-Evangelical Christians, from the beginning of its existence in the 1870s up to 1929. It traces the development of the movement as it underwent different stages in the context of a broader evangelical movement in the country.

Chapter 5 deals with the person and theological heritage of Kargel, who is a good representative of the Russian evangelical movement. In this chapter the emphasis is shifted from a general description of the movement to the description of one person's theological methodology—his hermeneutical principles—that very much determines the rest of his theology. Here the author will try to pick up the threads of different evangelical developments in the country as they were interwoven in the life of one person, Kargel.

Chapter 5 is a place for some general conclusions. It becomes clear that contrary to the common view, Russian evangelicals possessed a developed theological system. Theology not elaborately written out does not necessarily mean nonexistent theology. Although the Russian Evangelical movement falls well under the description of Western Evangelicalism with its specific marks discussed in chapter 1, it has its unique features as well.

1.5 Bibliographic Foreword on the History of Russian Evangelicalism

Why history and not history *and* hermeneutics? The state of the facts is that the bibliography on Russian evangelicalism is rather extensive. For instance, the bibliography compiled by A. W. Wardin, *Evangelical Sectarianism in the Russian Empire and the USSR: A Bibliographic Guide* (Scarecrow Press, 1995) contains 7,500 major entries and several thousand periodical references. However, the bibliography of Russian evangelical hermeneutics is basically nonexistent. One can hardly find a couple of articles and bits of the latest dissertations which deal with the subject. Therefore I will be reviewing materials that have to do with history.

The following is the survey of the historiography of the evangelical movement in Russia, which is in no way exhaustive or comprehensive. It is

written to introduce some sources and literature that the author intends to use in the present work.

When speaking of domestic studies one must observe that the pre-Revolutionary studies of the Russian evangelicals were mostly performed by the “enemies” of the movement. Then we have almost seventy years of silence. Since the late 1980s a stream of literature on the history of the movement has appeared. However, almost nothing has been written on the theology of Russian evangelicals, let alone the hermeneutics. Most books written in Russia and abroad represent a quest for historical understanding of Russian evangelicalism. Newest research shows that interest continues to grow, shedding new light on forces, influences, movements, and individuals that until recent times have been largely neglected.

1.5.1 Sources on the Russian Evangelical Movement

The following is the list of a few sources that deserve attention.

One of major sources on Russian religious nonconformists including Baptists, Stundists, and Dukhobors is a six-volume set *Materialy k istorii i izucheniyu russkago sektantstva i raskola* [Materials for the history and studying of Russian sectarianism and schism] edited by V. Bonch-Bruevich and published during the years 1908-1916.

Svedeniya o sekte Pashkovtsev [Information about the sect of the Pashkovites] includes K. P. Pobedonostsev’s “Humble Memorandum of the Chief Procurator of the Most Holy Synod to His Imperial Majesty” (May, 1880); “Note from the Chancery Office of the Chief Procurator of the Most Holy Synod Concerning the Danger to the Orthodox Church caused by the Activity of the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading, and from its Founder retired Colonel Pashkoff” (1884); Pavlov’s confiscated diary, etc. This collection contains precise and dependable information.

Hermann Dalton, a German Reformed pastor in St. Petersburg from 1858 up to 1889, who was also known as “a person of unassailably honest judgment and conscience” and who “enjoyed the trust of the highest circles in St. Petersburg” (Brandenburg 1977:127) wrote an “Open Letter to the Oberprokuror of the Holy Synod, Privy Councillor Konstantin Pobedonostsev” (1889) which stirred considerable polemic. Although the letter mostly deals with the oppression of the Lutheran Church, it also contains some apologetic for the

Pashkovites. Besides his pastoral duties in St. Petersburg he also had to oversee a few Reformed congregations in the southern Russia colonies, including the community of Rohrbach, located north of Odessa. Dalton personally stood by the Stundists. Actually, he was one of the few who openly defended them in the time of great persecutions. He left a report on Russian Stundism, which Brandenburg considers one of the best sources dealing with that early period (Brandenburg 1977:48).

In 1908 the Orthodox bishop Aleksii [Dorodnicyn] published “Materials for the history of the religious-rationalistic movement in the south of Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century”. It is a massive source of 700 pages that contains a copy of Russian police reports and other documents concerning the sectarians, minutes of the Baptist conferences in the 1880s (including the one in Novo-Vasilievka in 1884 with Kargel as a vice-chairman), and a number of confessions of faith. It also contains minutes of the meeting of Tiflis Baptist church on 10 and 17 August, 1880 (Aleksii 1908:640).

S. D. Bondar, in his official “note” *Sovremennoe sostoyanie Russkogo Baptizma* [Modern condition of Russian Baptism] (1911) written to fulfil the request of the Ministry of the Interior, presents a brief history of the Baptist movement both in Russia and abroad and a detailed report on the Russian Baptists of his day, including the All-Russia Baptist Congress that took place in St. Petersburg on September 1-9, 1910.

A collection of reports made at the Third Orthodox missionary congress on the Pashkovites was published in Kiev under the name *Pashkovshchina* [Pashkovism]. The participants of the congress came to the conclusion that Pashkovites are no different from Stundists and the same restrictive laws should be applied to them as well. Prozorov’s report contains the Pashkovites’ confession of faith, which circulated as a handwritten copy among St. Petersburg Pashkovites.

As for Pashkov’s correspondence, there exists a special collection at the University of Birmingham that includes the papers of Pashkov, only a few items of which are in Russian.

Evangelical periodicals are an excellent source for studying the movement. The earliest one, a Pashkovite monthly newspaper called *Russkiy Rabochiy* [Russian Workman] , was edited by Pashkovite Maria Grigorievna Peuker from 1875 until it was shut down by the authorities in 1886.

A monthly magazine *Khristianin* [Christian] was published by Prokhanov from 1906 to 1928 with a break for the revolution and the Civil War. Prokhanov also edited weekly newspaper *Utrennyaya zvezda* [Morning Star] published from January 1, 1910. In the same year he edited *Bratskiy listok* [Brotherly Leaflet], a monthly magazine for Christian youth *Molodoy Vinogradnik* [Young Vineyard], a monthly children's magazine *Detskaya biblioteka* [Children's Library], and a monthly magazine dedicated to Christian music *Novaya melodiya* [New Melody] (Prokhanov 1993:124, 143-144).

In 1907, D. I. Mazaev initiated the publication of a regular magazine *Baptist*. It was edited by V. V. Ivanov in 1913-1914, by S. V. Belousov in 1925, and by P. Ya. Datsko from 1927. In 1909, with financial help from M. Yasnovskaya, V. A. Fetler started the Baptist magazine *Vera* [Faith], then a year later *Gost'* [Guest]. In 1919 R. A. Fetler published the magazine *Blagovestnik* [Evangelist]. P. V. Pavlov published the magazine *Slovo Istiny* [The word of truth].

A. V. Karev, in 1915, edited the magazine *Prizyv* [The call], and after World War II he was the chief editor of the AUCECB magazine *Bratskiy Vestnik* [Brotherly Herald].

A number of primary sources on the history of Euro-Asian Evangelical movement, including copies of various Russian evangelical and Baptist periodicals, were transferred onto a series of CDs by the Euro-Asian Accrediting Association.

1.5.2 Pre-Revolutionary Orthodox literature

The schism in the nineteenth century was presented in major works of the Orthodox writers such as Subbotin, Novostruev, Shchapov, Ivanovskiy, Livanov, Dement'ev, Prugavin, Leskov, and Skrobotov. The books written by these authors appeared by 1876. Since Radstockism started spreading after 1874 the author will not be discussing these publications in detail, but will concentrate on later studies of the subject.

One of the most fruitful sources has been the antagonistic literature created by the Orthodox writers. I will be reviewing Orthodox literature on the Russian evangelicals under a few different categories:

First, a stream of hostile surveys was conducted by Orthodox writers before the revolution of 1917, not very scholarly but extremely emotional,

addressed against Stundists, Baptists, Pashkovites, and their teaching. The authors of these publications (Skvortsov, Ayvazov, Kushnev, Bogolyubov, etc.) viewed evangelical movements as nothing but heretical. They accused Stundists, Baptists and Pashkovites of preaching “easy” salvation by faith alone, of reading and interpreting the Scripture for themselves, of rejecting the Orthodox Church with its rites, services, and priesthood. Their style of writing is reminiscent of propaganda; still these books contain some material which is informative of the movements. I will point out a few titles.

Archpriest V. Sakharov in his *Pashkovtsy, ikh Izheuchenie i oproverzhenie ego* [Pashkovites, their false teaching and its denunciation] (1897) presents a brief description the Pashkovite history at the end of the nineteenth century. He points to Methodism and the Salvation Army as the main source of Pashkovism. The Pashkovite teaching discussed by the archpriest is derived from Pashkovite brochures, court procedures, and written reports of eyewitnesses of the Pashkovite meetings.

In 1903 the Orthodox Archpriest F. N. Ornatsky in *Sekta Pashkovtsev i otvet na “Pashkovskie voprosy”* [The Sect of Pashkovites and a response to “Pashkovite questions”] presented a brief history of the origin and development of the Pashkovite “sect” along with his critique of their teaching. In the end he adds Orthodox “answers” to the Pashkovite “challenges”.

An Orthodox critique of the Pashkovite doctrine can be also found in bishop Feofan’s “Letter to one person in S.-Petersburg concerning the appearance a new teacher of faith there” (1880).

D. Skvortsov in *Sovremennoe russkoe sektantstvo* [Modern Russian Sectarianism] (1905) tells the story of Stundism and the Pashkovites during the first decade of their existence. He lists some data from the court hearings against the Pashkovites and provides a list of the publications of the Pashkovite Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading. Other research by D. Skvortsov is *Pashkovsty v Tverskoy eparkhii* [The Pashkovites in Tver diocese] (1893). It tells a detailed story about the development of the Pashkovite views in Tver eparchy, showing how the “seed” of aristocratic Pashkovite preaching fell and grew among simple Russian folks. It also provides a list of publications of the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading and gives a brief analysis of those publications.

I. Ayvazov was one of the most productive Orthodox writers in the field of anti-evangelical propaganda. Some of the titles speak for themselves: “Baptism – a weapon of pangermanism” (1915) “Baptism – a weapon of the germanization of Russia” (1916). His book *Russkoe sektantstvo* [Russian sectarianism] (1915), although propagandistic in style, contains some information on Stundists, Baptists and the Pashkovites.

Some of Ayvazov’s publications shed light on the “sectarian” attitude towards the Scripture. *Beseda s sektantamy o Svyashchennom Pisanii i svyashchennom predanii* [A talk with sectarians about the Holy Scripture and the holy tradition] (1910) contains a dispute about “the Word of God” between an Orthodox missionary (the author) and a Baptist Anikitov who spoke on behalf of the Molokans, “evangelicals”, and Adventists. Needless to say, “sectarians” argued that the Word of God was Scripture; the Orthodox missionary argued that the Word of God was Scripture and tradition. In his book *O Slove Bozhiem ili ob istochnikakh khristianskago veroucheniya (V oblichenie russkikh sektantov)* [About the Word of God or about the sources of Christian doctrine (in denunciation of Russian sectarians)] (1914) the writer condemns Molokans, Stundists, Baptists, Adventists, Evangelicals, etc. for rejecting the “holy tradition” and for attempting to interpret the Scripture individually for themselves.

Orthodox priest and missionary I. A. Kushnev, in his book *Nemetskie very* [German faiths] (1916), presents an examination of Stundists, Pashkovites, Baptists, Evangelical Christians, Seventh Day Adventists, and Malevans. He also accuses various branches of “Stundism” of pan-Germanism and germanization of Russian people, as well as of holding radical “left” ideas. However, the book contains some valuable factual materials.

D. Bogolyubov’s writings on Russian evangelicals can be added to the same group as well, as his main goal is to reveal their “sectarian” nature. However, his “Pashkovtsy” [Pashkovites] in the collection *Russkie sektanty, ich uchenie, kul’t, i sposoby propagandy* [Russian sectarians, their teaching cult, and ways of propaganda] edited by M.A.Kalnev (Odessa, 1911), as well as *Kto eto Pashkovtsy, Baptisty i Adventisty?* [Who are those Pashkovites, Baptists, and Adventists?] (1912), certainly deserve attention.

Second, there were also more liberal and even sympathetic examples of Orthodox literature on Russian evangelicalism. These authors try to show more

objectivity. However, as these books were written for the broad public, they lack factuality and preciseness.

N. Zhivotov's *Tserkovnyy raskol Peterburga* [Church split in Petersburg] (1891) is a collection of sketches (previously published in the newspaper *Den'*) painting a general picture of a "sectarian" St. Petersburg by the 1890s. He writes of the groups that rose from the Old Belief including Molokans, and those of "foreign" origin such as Apostolic congregation, Baptists, Pashkovites, Kleterians, Herngutters, and other Protestants.

A. S. Prugavin's *Raskol vverkh. Ocherky religioznykh iskanii v privilegirovannoy srede* [Schism in the upper society. Sketches of religious searching in the privileged society] (1909) contains both historical material and descriptions of believers' meetings (e.g. Pashkovite meeting in Moscow) written as historical fiction. In the section on the St. Petersburg Pashkovites, Prugavin reprinted an article about Pashkov that appeared in a newspaper on January 10, 1880—a picturesque description of a Pashkovite meeting. Prugavin provides some material on persecution against the Pashkovites and continues their story to the time "after the Constitution" of 1905.

The third group of books has greater value as being more informative and scholarly. The Orthodox writers in this group are more interested in facts than in ideology and propaganda.

A detailed description of the Pashkovites is given by Terletsky in *Sekta Pashkovtsev* [The Pashkovite Sect] published in 1891. Terletsky views the Pashkovites as "a dangerous and strong enemy" (Terletsky 1891:139). Nevertheless, the book is quite informative concerning Radstock, Pashkov, the Society, and the spreading of the movement across Russia. It also contains information about the contacts of the Pashkovites with Stundists, Baptists and Molokans.

N. Kutepov in two works, following each other, and published in 1891 & 1910 provided a brief history and description of beliefs of various Russian "sects" starting with ancient Russ: Bogomily, Strigol'niki, Zhidovstvuyushchie, Dukhobory, Molokane, Baptisto-Stundisty, Pashkovtsy, etc.

One of the best detailed description of the history and doctrines of the Molokans is presented by archpriest T. Butkevich in *Molokanstvo* (1909). *Pashkovshchina* [Pashkovism], written by the same author as a part of *Obzor*

ruskikh sekt i ikh tolkov [Review of Russian sects and their various bodies] (Petrograd, 1915), also deserves attention.

1.5.3 Post revolutionary period

Clearly, the seventy years of Soviet rule did not create much opportunity for Russian evangelicals to do research or write history books. Some work was done abroad by Russian emigrants and their children. As to the history of Baptists in the former Soviet Union, volumes by Walter Sawatsky and Michael Bourdeaux remain classics. Sawatsky's work *Soviet Evangelicals Since World War II* was first published in English in 1981, and then in Russian in 1995. The writer used historical material written in Russian, English, and German. He also had access to a number of unpublished dissertations on the topic. Of books by Bourdeaux, I could get hold of *Religious Ferment in Russia: Protestant opposition to Soviet religious policy* (1968) and *Religious Minorities in the Soviet Union* (1977), a report prepared with K. Matchett & C. Gerstenmaier.

A few general histories written by representatives of the movement provide good summaries. V. G. Pavlov's *Pravda o Baptistakh* [Truth about Baptists] is a brief account of the origins and early history of Russian Baptists first published in the magazine *Baptist* no. 43-47 in 1911. A. V. Karev, General Secretary of the All Union Council, in about 1957 wrote a hundred-page summary of the Russian Evangelical-Baptist movement, which contains large quotations from Korff's *Vospominaniya* [Memoirs]. The more recent official history on the Baptists in the Soviet Union compiled by AUCECB *Istoriya evangel'skikh khristian-baptistov v SSSR* [The History of the Evangelical Christian Baptists in the USSR] was published in Moscow in 1989. It is based on several primary sources and tells the story from "inside," stressing the original Russian roots of the evangelical movement. Then in 1999 and 2001 one of the compilers of the "History," S. N. Savinsky, published two volumes of his own called "History of Evangelical Christian Baptists of the Ukraine, Russia, and Byelorussia" covering a period of one hundred years, 1867-1917 and 1917-1967.

Among Marxist-oriented studies there were a number of works on evangelicalism in Russia ranging from outright antireligious propaganda to attempts to give a fair treatment to the movement. The latter ones include a volume by a Marxist scholar, A. I. Klibanov, *Istoriya religioznogo sektantstva v*

Rossii (1965), translated into English as *History of Religious Sectarianism in Russia, 1860s-1917* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982), and L. N. Mitrokhin's *Baptizm: istoriya i sovremennost'* [Baptist movement: History and Contemporaneity] (1997).

1.5.4 Foreign literature

Interest in the subject has been seen in different parts of the world as well. Back in 1888, W. T. Stead, an English newspaper man, an opponent of social evils, and an apologist of Russia, wrote *Truth about Russia*, which became one of his chief books. In 1914, C. T. Byford, the first Baptist commissioner for Europe, appointed by the Baptist World Alliance in 1910, published *Peasants and Prophets* and *The Soul of Russia*. There are Russian chapters in the books on European Baptists written by J. H. Rushbrooke.

Important biographical material on foreign evangelists who laboured in Russia is presented by Trotter's *Lord Radstock*, Fountain's *Lord Radstock and the Russian Awakening* (1988), and Latimer's *Dr. Baedeker: and his apostolic work in Russia* (1908). The two latter books were translated into Russian and published in 2001 and 1913 respectively.

Among early German and French publications on Russian evangelicals one can mention Dalton's *Der russische Stundismus*, Godet's essay *Persecutions actuelles en Russie* (1896), Johannes Warns's *Russland und das Evangelium* (1920), and Jakob Kroeker's *Die Sehnsucht des Ostens*.

Waldemar Gutsche, who at the time of World War I was still living in Russian Poland and who as a Baptist preacher had close contacts with the revival, describes the arrest of preachers and the closure of meeting houses belonging both to the Baptists and the Evangelical Christians in *Religion und Evangelium in Sowjetrussland* (the Oncken Verlag, 1959).

There are also more general publications on religion under communism by Walter Kolarz, Gerhard Simon, Andrew Blane, and Trevor Beeson. More recently an English edition of a Dutch work by J. A. Hebly, *Protestanten in Rusland* (1973), appeared under the title *Protestants in Russia*. One must not forget M. V. Jones' *Pashkovites*.

In the West, two outstanding researchers on Russian evangelical sectarians are definitely William C. Fletcher and Paul D. Steeves. Unfortunately,

because of their dependence on Marxist writers, they “reflect their limitations” (Wardin 1994:52).

A special place in researching the beginning of the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg belongs to Professor E. Heier of the University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, who wrote an excellent study of Pashkovism, *Religious Schism in the Russian Aristocracy, 1860-1900: Radstockism and Pashkovism* (1970), which was translated into Russian in 2002. He tells the story of the mission of Lord Radstock to the drawing rooms of St. Petersburg in the 1870s and its lasting results, including Pashkov’s ministry. Heier points out that the movement which was intended as a renewal within the Orthodox Church ended in schism. He provides an interesting analysis of what Russian classical literature had to say about the movement, including such famous writers as Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Leskov, as well as a number of presently forgotten names.

Popular surveys from an evangelical perspective include Hans Brandenburg’s *The Meek and the Mighty* (1977)¹ and G. H. Ellis and L. W. Jones’ *The Other Revolution: Russian Evangelical Awakenings* (1996), translated into Russian and published in 1999. While *The Other Revolution* concentrates mostly on the movement in St. Petersburg, *The Meek and the Mighty* tells of different strands of the evangelical movement, beginning before the 1860s and continuing into the twentieth century. It is a study of the emergence of the evangelical movement in Russia. The author provides a sensible account of how various evangelical movements merged together, and shows this long and not always easy process of coming to the same theological and practical terms.

A more scholarly treatment of the rise of Russian evangelicalism is accomplished by Hans Christian Diedrich’s *Urspruenge und Anfaenge des russischen Freikirchentums* [Origins and Beginnings of the Russian Free Church Movement] (1985) and Wilhelm Kahle’s monumental work *Evangelische Christen in Rußland und der Sovetunion* (1978). The latter provides a deep and serious analysis of Evangelical Christians in Russia prior to the World War II, paying special attention to the life and ministry of Prokhanov.

Corrado mentions that Professor Robert Geraci of the University of Virginia while being a Ph.D. student at the University of California-Berkeley wrote on Pashkov. He described Pashkovism as “one way in which an elite group made sense of the critical changes occurring in Russian society” (Geraci, “The Reformation of the Refined”, 59, in Corrado 2000:184).

Of dissertations written on the subject, I will mention Samuel Nesdoly’s *Evangelical Sectarianism in Russia: A Study of the Stundists, Baptists, Pashkovites, and the Evangelical Christians, 1855-1917* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Kingston, Ontario: Queens University, 1971), and Alexander de Chalandeau’s *The theology of the evangelical Christians-Baptists in the USSR: As reflected in the Bratskiy Vestnik* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Strassbourg, Faculte de Theologie Protestante, 1978).

1.5.5 Periodicals

Much of anti-Pashkovite as well as anti-Stundist, anti-Baptist and anti-Evangelical articles were published in religious reviews or journals of the corresponding period of time, though not all are equally reliable. A partial list includes the following:

Grazhdanin [The Citizen] (1875 (16), 1876 (13,16)), as well as its publisher V. Meshchersky, was very negative towards Radstock and insisted on his banishment from Russia.

Tserkovno-Obshchestvennyy Vestnik [Church Community Messenger] (1874 (38), 1875 (30), 1876 (55), 1880 (35, 41, 146)) did not consider Radstock dangerous in the beginning but became more negative with time.

Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie [Orthodox Review] (1876 (1, 3), 1877 (1), 1878) wrote quite a lot on Radstock, as well as published N. Leskov’s sketch titled “Lord Radstock” in 1877 and other sketches in 1881. In 1878 Leskov published an article concerning the Pashkovite newspaper *Russkiy Rabochiy* [Russian Workman] in the same periodical.

¹ The book first appeared in Germany in 1974 under the title *Christen im Schatten der Macht*. It is particularly valuable for its account of the pietistic developments in St. Petersburg in the early nineteenth century.

Moskovskie Tserkovnye Vedomosti [Moscow Church News] (1886 (9, 13), 1887 (18, 38), 1880 (16)) and *Tserkovnyy Vestnik* [Church Messenger] (1883 (24, 36), 1886 (45)) showed a negative attitude as well.

Some information on the movement can be recovered from *Russkiy Vestnik* [Russian Messenger] (1886 (2)); *Vestnik Evropy* [The Messenger of Europe] (1886 (6), 1888 (3)); *Tserkovnye Vedomosti* [Church News] (1889 (40), 1890 (40)); *Drug Istiny* [The Friend of Truth] (1888 (8)).

As Pashkov's activity moved to Tverskaya gubernia there appeared an article in *Tverskoy Vestnik* [Tver Messenger] (1880 (20)).

Missionerskoe Obozrenie [Missionary Review] published a few articles on Pashkov and the Pashkovites: *Sluchaynaya vstrecha moya i beseda s Pashkovym (Iz dnevnika missionera)* [My accidental meeting and conversation with Pashkov (From a missionary's diary)] no. 1 (January, 1896); *Konchina osnovatelya sekty pashkovtsev* [Decease of the founder of the Pashkovite sect] (March 1902); S. Glebov's article *Polkovnik Pashkov* [Colonel Pashkov] (January 1904).

Istoricheskiy Vestnik: Istoriko-Literaturnyy Zhurnal [Historical Herald: Historical-Literary Magazine] published R. S. Ignatev's article *Pashkovtsy-Baptisty v Peterburge* [Pashkovites-Baptists in Petersburg] no. 4 (April 1909).

Religiozno-Obshchestvennyy Vestnik [Religious Community Herald] contains some of Leskov's articles.

There were articles written in defence of the movement as well. For instance, *Der christliche Orient* was a missionary periodical published by Lepsius with frequent news of Stundism. Pastor Hermann Dalton published in *Vera i Razum* [Faith and Reason] (1884 (II, Ja)) an article "Evangelical currents in Russian church of the present century." Emile J. Dillon's article "A Russian Religious Reformer" was published in *The Sunday Magazine*, no 4 (April 1902). Some results of recent studies have been published in the *Journal of European Baptist Studies*.

1.5.6 Memoirs

A few valuable memoirs were written by those who either personally played an important role in the movement or were eyewitnesses.

In 1906 Hermann Dalton wrote his memoirs *Lebenserinnerungen* far away from the banks of the Neva.

Kargel's *Zwischen den Enden der Erde* (Wernigerode, 1928) contains a number of facts from his early life as well as detailed accounts about his travels across Siberia with Dr. Baedeker.

Modest M. Korff, one of the pioneers of the St. Petersburg evangelical revival, wrote his memoirs *Am Zarenhof*, which was published in Giessen in 1956.

Sophy Lieven, Natalie Lieven's daughter, wrote about the development of the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg, which prior to the revolution was developing right in their mansion in Morskaya Street. The book called *Dukhovnoe probuzhdenie v Rossii* [Spiritual revival in Russia] (1967) is one of S. Lieven's publications on the subject.

Prominent Baptist leader V. G. Pavlov wrote an autobiographical sketch *Vospominaniya ssyl'nogo* [Memoirs of an exiled one] in Romania where he moved after his second exile. The approximate date of writing is 1899.

I. S. Prokhanov's autobiography *V kotle Rossii* [In the Cauldron of Russia] cannot be underestimated. It is a first-hand source on the evangelical movement in Russia written by the first president of the All-Russia Union of Evangelical Christians. However, the book is mostly dedicated to his own achievements and does not provide much information concerning other important figures of the movement. For example, there not a single word about Kargel. Prokhanov also avoids some difficult issues concerning his relationship with other evangelical leaders, the Orthodox, and the authorities. For instance, he presents a detailed description of the conditions of prison life, but does not mention the conditions under which he got released by the GPU. An interesting detail that Prokhanov did not omit: the number of hymns that he wrote or translated (exactly 1037).

As for the nonconfessional evangelical Christian student movement around the turn of the twentieth century, one can read Yu. Grachev's *Studencheskie gody* [Student years] based on the memories of his mother. The book contains a lot of information about the movement among students in St. Petersburg from 1907 through 1924 and its leaders P. Nikolay, V. Martsinkovsky, and J. Mott. *A believer's notes* by V. Martsinkovsky, first published in Prague in 1929, is a source of valuable firsthand information on the movement up to the author's banishment in 1923.

1.5.7 Fiction

There is a body of fiction works both in Russian and other languages from which the widespread character of the movement can be deduced.² It must be said that Russian evangelicals attracted a great volume of contemporary criticism. Russian classical writers accused them of hypocrisy, whether through V. P. Meshchersky's shallow caricature of Lord Radstock under the name of Lord Gitchick in a voluminous novel, "Lord-Apostle in High Petersburg Society" (1876) almost forgotten nowadays, or in L. N. Tolstoy's portrayal of Radstock under the name "Sir John" in *Anna Karenina*.

As for Dr. Baedeker, whom Tolstoy met personally and with whose prison work he seemed to be quite impressed, Tolstoy, nevertheless, described him rather negatively in *Voskresenie* [Resurrection] under two distinct characters, Kiezewetter and the Englishman. The prototype of Nekhlyudov was Tolstoy's friend Vladimir Chertkov (Elizaveta Chertkova's son), and the prototype of Nekhlyudov's aunt Charskaya was Chertkov's aunt E. I. Shuvalova.

Dostoevsky wanted to be critical of a movement that seemed to endanger Russian Orthodoxy, but he was too honest not to admit some good effects of Radstockism.

The year after Meshchersky's novel was published, Russian novelist N. Leskov wrote *Velikosvetskiy raskol* [The Schism in High Society], in which he tried to do justice to Lord Radstock and a circle of new converts. Besides this novel, Leskov wrote a number of articles and sketches about the Radstockists. Meaning good and desiring to protect them from unfair rumours Leskov actually criticized because he never embraced the idea of salvation by faith through grace. The persons involved in the movement were sometimes presented in a rather sarcastic light. However, in general his approach was generous and fair.

Thus, the Radstockist-Pashkovite group was honoured with "attention" of such giants as Leskov, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy who in fiction vividly portrayed resistance to evangelicalism. One must remember that these classical writers were considered the "conscience" of Russian society, its pride and honour. One should be aware that English evangelicals experienced similar criticism as well,

² A detailed and comprehensive study of the traces left by the Russian evangelical movement in contemporary fictional literature is accomplished by E. Heier in *Religious schism in the Russian aristocracy 1860-1900: Radstockism and Pashkovism*.

for instance, in Dickens' *Bleak House* or George Eliot's *Middlemarch* and *Janet's Repentance*.

A sympathetic and trustworthy description of Radstockists-Pashkovites is found in the now forgotten novel *Serge Batourine. Scenes des Temps Actuels en Russe* written by Elisabeth Ward (1879), first published in French and later in German. The author was born in St. Petersburg and lived in the Russian capital up to 1881 (Heier 2002:85).

One more Russian novelist who wrote about the movement of Radstockists-Pashkovites in St. Petersburg was the prolific writer P. D. Boborykin (1836-1921). His novel *Ispovedniki* [Confessors] (1903) presents a picture of different Russian nonconformists including Stundists and Baptists from among the south Russian peasants as well as the aristocratic Pashkovites.

Unlike the early Pashkovites who were Russian aristocrats and belonged to the same "class" as many Russian novelists, Stundists experienced considerable sympathy at all levels. They were hard workers and farmers, sober and thrifty. Their genuine piety impressed many devout Orthodox believers. Even Leskov, who was rather critical of the pietists of the St. Petersburg salons, found warm words of recognition for the Stundists,³ who were exemplary husbands and fathers. It seems that it was easier to sympathize with those who stood much lower on the social ladder. Besides, it is true that Stundists experienced greater persecutions. S. M. Stepnyak-Kravchinskiy's novel, *Stundist Pavel Rudenko* [Stundist Pavel Rudenko], the story of a Stundist suffering for his faith, was first published in 1890.⁴

Samuel Keller, who originally wrote under the pseudonym of Ernst Schroll, lived for a while in southern Russia and the Crimea, where he wrote a short story called *Das Salz der Erde*. An English writer, Hesba Stretton, also wrote a story, *The Way of Great Suffering*, and a subsequent story, *In the Hand of the Lord*, where she described the suffering of women and children in the time of Pobedonostsev's persecution. Both authors wrote about historical events.

³ For example, in Leskov's sketch "Dva svinopasa" [Two swineherds] (1884).

⁴ The copy kept in the Public library in St. Petersburg is marked by 1990.

1.5.8 Recent Studies of the Subject

The present decade is revealing growing interest in the history of Russian evangelicalism and particularly in Kargel both in Russia and abroad.

Sharyl Corrado's thesis titled *The Philosophy of Ministry of Colonel Vasilii Pashkov* (2000) is a fundamental research on the history of the Pashkovites. In 2005 the dissertation was published in Russian. That, along with Gregory Nichol's thesis *Pashkovism: Nineteenth century Russian Piety* (1991), takes studies of Russian evangelicalism to a new level. Nichols and Corrado both point to the connection of the St. Petersburg Pashkovite movement with British evangelicalism. Both authors worked with Pashkov's archive, which makes their research especially valuable. Ian Randall, in *Evangelical experiences: A study in the spirituality of English evangelicalism 1918-1938* (1999), also writes about the involvement of the Evangelical Alliance with Eastern Europe and the Russian Empire. The master's thesis of S. Samoilenkov, *Missionary activity of I. S. Prokhanov* (2001), is another step in studying Evangelical Christians and their leaders.

G. Nichols's article, "Ivan Kargel and the Pietistic Community of the Late Imperial Russia" (2007), filled in a number of blanks in Kargel's biography and provided valuable support for the idea that Kargel's theology is rooted in the pietistic movement. The article was also published in Russian as a part of the fourth edition of *Al'manakh po istorii russkogo baptizma* [Almanac on the history of Russian Baptism]. As a matter of fact, all four editions of the Almanac appeared within the last ten years.

Another article on Kargel, "Russian evangelicalism revisited: Ivan Kargel and the founding of the Russian Baptist Union" (1992) by Lawrence Klippenstein, a historian and archivist at Mennonite Heritage Center in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, proved to be very useful as well. In addition to citing many important facts from Kargel's life, it quotes one of his letters to Colonel Pashkov.

The master's thesis of I. Makarenko written in 2006, *Osnovnye voprosy bibleyskoy germeneytiki v bogoslovskikh rabotakh I. V. Kargelya* [The main issues of the biblical hermeneutics in theological works of I. V. Kargel], is the first scholarly attempt to analyze the hermeneutics of a Russian evangelical theologian. It also contains information on Kargel's life, a review of his writings, and a chronology of Kargel's life. The author concludes that Kargel was

searching for the spiritual sense of the text, had Christological orientation, and firmly believed in the authority of the Scripture and the mystical work of the Holy Spirit. According to Makarenko, Kargel uses an allegorical as well a typological method of interpretation. He finds Kargel's hermeneutics rather "primitive".

The fourth edition of Almanac on the History of Russian Baptism, published in 2009, is fully dedicated to the life and ministry of I. V. Kargel. Its articles written by M. S. Karetnikova, D. Ya. Turchaninov, and D. Miller fill the gaps in Kargel's biography. M. S. Karetnikova's article "Reading Kargel" is an attempt of rethinking Kargel's theology as presented in his Commentary to Romans, chapters 5-8. The almanac contains a translation of the above-mentioned article by Nichol on Ivan Kargel and the Pietistic Community.

Two serious publications concerning the history of sectarianism after the Revolution and through the 1930s were undertaken by the State University of St. Petersburg in 2003 and 2005. The authors – Krapivin, Dalgatov, Leykin and Makarov – although arguing mostly from the Marxist theory of formations – present volumes of valuable information (much of which is based on archive materials) about the contacts of the Orthodox and evangelicals as well as the relationships of the evangelicals and the state.

Finally, it should be mentioned that in the past ten years, Kargel's collection of writings has been published and reprinted. Works that were thought to be lost continue to be found and published. In 2006, a 400-page volume of Kargel's lectures, discourses, and letters was published in St. Petersburg.

1.6 The Research Problems

One of the major difficulties of the research is in the lack of Russian Evangelical scholarly publications on the topic of its hermeneutics. For decades after the revolution the evangelicals in Russia faced the danger of physical extinction. The burning issue was survival. The believers who did not die in prisons and labour camps, mostly women, were concerned with preserving their faith, not writing theology. Russian Evangelical theology continued in simple unscholarly sermons and prayers. Thus, much of what was believed in terms of theology and Christian practice was passed on in the form of oral tradition.

For decades the authorities continued to search believers' homes, confiscating all Christian literature including Bibles, any handwritten and

typewritten materials that mentioned God or religion. For instance, at Kargel's arrest in 1937, two cartloads of manuscripts were taken away and disappeared in KGB's "depths" (Karetnikova 2009:190). So, not all of Kargel's writings survived the Soviet regime. Not all that survived have been found and published.

Some confiscated materials were destroyed, yet some may have survived in official archives, including massive archival material culled from interrogations and court hearings of arrested believers. Unfortunately, the archives in Russia are still difficult to access.

Thus, in Russia historical and theological research was hindered due to political and atheistic pressures. Research abroad had to rely either on the literature produced by atheistically trained scholars or on spare sources that somehow became available in spite of the Iron Curtain. Persecutions and emigration further scattered bits and pieces of historical evidence around the world, making it hardly accessible.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGICAL STRATEGY

2.1 History

2.1.1 Philosophy of History: Definition and Epistemological Basis for Historical Studies

Every historian works in accordance with certain epistemological principles and has a philosophy of history, whether or not he/she recognizes it. Under philosophy of history, I understand universal problems of methodology which affect every piece of historical work. Therefore before I start investigating a chosen period of Russian Evangelical-Baptist history, I shall try to formulate my own philosophy of history. What are some general assumptions, premises, and values that govern my historical work? What is “history” for me?

History, by definition, is a discipline that deals with that part of the objective reality that took place in the past. Hence, there are two very general philosophical questions to be answered. Do I acknowledge the existence of objective reality? Granted that I trust my senses, the next question comes up. How can I know the truth about the past or, more specifically, human past as “history” was understood by Herodotus, the so-called Father of History?

One of the main sources of acquiring truth concerning human past is historiography, the record of human past. Since the original events no longer exist, a historian has to deal with statements saying that those particular events took place (Nash 1984:96). Clearly, there is no such thing as a full and absolutely true record of everything that happened in human history. What we have is fractional and selective products of historical enquiries left by various historians who recorded and interpreted series of past events.

Thus, a great degree of selectivity and subjectivity immediately comes into play. Yes, there is certain empirical evidence, such as oral witness, written documents, material objects, and archaeological finds, but working “from scratch” is not an average historian’s destiny. A historian has to go with a certain amount of somebody else’s conclusions, opinions, choices, and biases, even when it comes to so-called “facts”. Even those historians who work mostly

with “sources” as opposed to “literature” come to a point when they have to select and interpret, thus, creating selective and subjective products.

On the one hand, it is obvious that there is no such thing as one hundred percent objective historiography. Any honest historian would admit that history is vulnerable in the areas of objectivity and explanation. Unlike natural sciences, in inquiring for truth and explanation history cannot offer universal truths or laws as a result. Whatever comes out of the pen of a historian is subject to his/her underlying presuppositions and human error. Even in the seventeenth century Descartes pointed out the impossibility of having "scientific" history. The most genuine historical study assumes the autonomy of the historian in selecting from the enormous scope of data available to him/her, not to mention the even greater scope of data which remains unknown or unavailable. It is not surprising that “some impatient scholars take refuge in scepticism, or at least in the doctrine that, since all historical judgments involve persons and points of view, one is as good as another and there is no ‘objective’ historical truth”⁵.

On the other hand, as Garraghan points out, “it is folly to leap thence to the conclusion that nothing can be absolutely known about the historical past” (Garraghan 1946:78). For instance, “that Napoleon Bonaparte existed can be known absolutely. On the other hand, that his personality was such and such is a matter about which we probably cannot have knowledge that is final and irreversible” (Garraghan 1946:78). Hence “history as record is therefore part absolute and part relative” (Garraghan 1946:78).

Another objection to the “lawfulness” of historical enterprise lies in the area of interpretation. Hardly any historian would limit himself/herself to writing a modest account of past events. The questions generally asked by historians do not end with exploring what happened, but go on to explaining causes and effects of different historical events. Thus, studying history involves interpretation of causality and searching for patterns (sometimes even attempting to discover some "objective" historical laws, as is the case with the Marxists' approach). Obviously, interpreting is even more subject to one's major presuppositions and beliefs than is the mere recording of past events. Thus, from the methodological point of view there exist great limitations on historical

⁵ The New Cambridge Modern History, I (1957), pp. xxiv-xxv, in Carr 1961:2.

studies due to the very nature of the subject. This inbuilt historical ambiguity makes one sceptical.

However, as Carr rightly points out, “it does not follow that, because interpretation plays a necessary part in establishing the facts of history, and because no existing interpretation is wholly objective, one interpretation is as good as another” (Carr 1961:21). He even insists that a key to writing good history, history worth the name, is in keeping the “dichotomy of fact and interpretation” (Carr 1961:23) in proper balance. A historian is “navigating delicately between the Scylla of an untenable theory of history as an objective compilation of facts, of the unqualified primacy of fact over interpretation, and the Charybdis of an equally untenable theory of history as the subjective product of the mind of the historian” (Carr 1961:23).

How can one distinguish “bad” history from “good” history? What are some canons that would ensure a trustworthy degree of historical truth? How should a historian deal with a variety of historical material and find right ways in which historical material should be handled?

2.1.2 History and Objectivity: Canons of Evidence and Truth

I see historiography as a spectrum. On one side we have good and trustworthy (although not perfect) historical accounts and interpretations. On the other side we have intended falsehood. I agree with Carr, that “scissors-and-paste history without meaning or significance”, propaganda, or historical fiction have nothing to do with history (Carr 1961:23). That is why a historian’s integrity is so crucial in his/her historical work. “Study the historian before you begin to study the facts” (Carr 1961:17). However, even a “good” historian is a subject to subjectivity and mistakes. But, as Nash argues, “unavoidability of the historian’s own subjectivity does not necessitate his inability to write a true historical account” (Nash 1984:69). Further on he adds, “History is subjective but need not be arbitrary” (Nash 1984:80). And what is most important, “history can avoid being arbitrary by remaining open to evaluation by objective canons of evidence and truth” (Nash 1984:81).

Similar ideas were expressed by different thinkers who wrote on the topic of objectivity in history. It is true that history cannot be “an objective factual

science, like the physical sciences”⁶. “The historian can never attain the same certainty which is attained by the mathematician... nevertheless, especially in the case of converging lines of evidence, he is able to reach such moral certainty as is the basis of nearly all our actions”⁷. The same idea is supported by Geisler, who wrote that “perfect objectivity may be practically unattainable within the limited resources of the historian on most if not all topics. But... the inability to attain a hundred percent objectivity is a long way from total relativity. Reaching a degree of objectivity which is subject to criticism and revision is a more realistic conclusion than the relativist’s arguments. In short, there is no reason to eliminate the possibility of a sufficient degree of historical objectivity”⁸.

History as a discipline is one of the human sciences, a “distinct and irreducible branch of knowledge” (Nash 1984:30), with its own guidelines that provide grounds of historical certainty. Unlike natural scientists, a historian has the privilege of accessing his/her subject matter – the actions of other human beings – from the inside, and “to ‘relive’ or ‘rethink’” them in his mind (Nash 1984:30-32). Another difference between natural sciences and history is that “the events of history occur only once” (Nash 1984:30-32). A historian cannot repeat “an experiment”. With these differences in mind, one should understand that “the historian certainly has to do something different from the scientist”⁹.

As we well know, the scientific method relies on logic and experiments, developing a hypothesis from a number of observations and other “true” theories and then testing it against observable evidence. Similarly, a historian needs “to bring isolated observations together by some hypothesis that applies to all of them” (Nash 1984:43). However, a historian develops his/her hypothesis using mostly other people’s observations about the past. He/she also uses “true” theories and/or historical narratives. Since “the discipline of history doesn’t have the luxury of repeating an experiment” (Nash 1984:157), it is impossible to test his/her hypothesis against observational evidence. A historian resorts to other sources of evidence beyond the strictly observational that allow him/her to indicate truth. A historian in his study of history must use a coherence theory of truth. It means that a proposition is true when it coheres

⁶ Richardson A. *History, Sacred and Profane* 1964:185, in Nash 1984:26.

⁷ Freeman E. A. *The Methods of History*, p. 152, in Garraghan 1946:79.

⁸ Geisler N. *Apologetics* 1976, p. 297, in Nash 1984:88-89.

⁹ Walsh W. H. *Philosophy of History*, NY, 1960, p. 59, in Nash 1984:37.

with or fits in with everything else that we know (Nash 1984:108-109). A historian has to answer the question, “Is my hypothesis consistent with other data available?” According to Ladd, “A truly scientific method is the inductive method which accepts as a working hypothesis the best explanation of the known facts”¹⁰.

Hard relativism argues that all knowledge of the past is indirect, incomplete, an object to selection and prejudiced from the start. However, as Nash points out, most of any knowledge is indirect and incomplete. Incompleteness does not necessitate falsity. The mere presence of selectivity in an account does not by itself compromise the account. As to personal values, a historian’s work can always be challenged; and when it is, his evidence, reasoning, and interpretations will become subject to critical revision. Another hard relativism argument is that a historian must impose some kind of structure on history. But “what destroys objectivity is not the arrangement of data but the ignoring or twisting of data” (Nash 1984:83-88).

Since we cannot repeat an event which happened only once in the past and testability is impossible, criticism by other historians becomes especially important and even indispensable. Historical claims are objective in the sense that relevantly trained and interested scientists agree about them. The value of criticism in historical studies is constantly emphasised by those who write on the theory of truth in history. “History must be open to criticism and revision. Otherwise it is arbitrary, subject to every whim and caprice of the author” (Nash 1984:80). “Objectivity is... unreserved submission to further criticism, complete openness, withholding nothing from judgment”.¹¹ So, “to a certain degree, wishful thinking and subjective errors can be eliminated by methodically scientific work, when the will to truth is present. Scholars with different starting points co-operate and are able mutually to correct each other”.¹² Nash optimistically concludes, that “even if one historian succumbs to his own subjectivity and distorts the past, an available evidence can in principle enable other historians to point out his errors” (Nash 1984:105). Hence, an imperfect

¹⁰ Ladd G. E. *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus*, 1975, pp.12-13, in Nash 1984:91.

¹¹ Fisch M. *The Philosophy of History: A Dialogue*, 1959, p. 167, in Nash 1984:80.

¹² Dahl N. A. “The Problem of the Historical Jesus” in *Kerygma and History*, ed. C. Braaten & R. Harrisville, N.Y. 1961, p. 150, as quoted in Nash 1984:90.

account of an imperfect historian can still be of some use for recovering the past.

Criticisms of the soundness of a hypothesis, criticism of the consistency of a hypothesis with previously accepted theory, and criticism of the background assumptions in light of which evidence is accepted as being relevant to a given hypothesis would help to decide if a certain historical claim possesses a satisfactory degree of objectivity. According to Nash, “if a given historical event was witnessed and reported by reliable witness, one must believe it happened” (Nash 1984:157).

Criticism, in its turn, should lead to examination, cross-examination, and correction. “The work of every historian will reflect more or less the interests, values, and world view of the writer, but historical account is capable of being objective in the sense that it is correctable” (Nash 1984:81). At this point of historical studies, when mistakes need to be admitted and corrected, “a human factor” plays an important role again. A historian must possess not only integrity but also open mind and humility.

In general, the work of a historian is similar to that of a detective who is working on a case. The case is not repetitious. A particular crime happened once. However, there is certain evidence that allows a detective figure out what actually happened and who is responsible. “Converging lines of evidence,” mentioned above, is another check for evaluating evidence. It reminds cross-examination of witnesses in the court.

A good summary of how a historian should work (his\her method) is suggested by Almack,

The historian who selects all the sources, who subjects them to criticism after the approved tenets, who checks the testimony of one witness against the testimony of the others, who records all the facts of his subject faithfully, who reports his facts accurately, and who makes reasonable generalisations on the basis of his facts, runs no more risks of emotional upset than his fellows in experimental and nominative science¹³.

A conclusion is that there is no absolute or hard objectivity in historical accounts. But there is open-mindedness, critical investigation, openness to criticism, constant re-examination, and acceptance of results that are contrary to the initial hypothesis. These virtues, present in the work of various historians

¹³ Almack J. C. *Research and Thesis Writing*, 182 f, in Garraghan 1946:80.

who investigate the same subject, allow establishing a satisfactory degree of historical truth. Thus, another difference between history and natural sciences is that writing history is a cooperative enterprise.

2.1.3 The Author's Presuppositions

Since my own presuppositions, values, and beliefs inevitably determine historical studies it is important to state them as clearly as possible. A few basic questions should be asked. What is the role of evidence, reason, and divine revelation in obtaining historical knowledge? Obviously, while some things can be known through the five senses (natural knowledge), the rest require belief. The next question ensues: what is the source of my belief?

Following are some of my basic presuppositions. First, I believe that there is a personal almighty God who created all things visible and invisible. Historical process is a working out not of man's purposes but of God's. It is guided not by some "objective" impersonal laws but by the will of a personal God.

Second, this transcendent and imminent God did not withdraw Himself from His creation. His providence foresees and guides the universal process to a predestined end bringing good out of all apparent evil. Every circumstance in human experience has its place in a divine plan. I agree with Nash that "the universe is an open system to intervention from outside the system, that is Creator of the system, God. The transcendent God can intervene in the physical universe" (Nash 1984:80). Human history is a linear process beginning in the Garden of Eden and culminating at the great white throne of God when there will be no time any more. I agree with Fedotov who said that "for a Christian, history is not an endless circle of repeated developments, as it was for Aristotle or Polybius, nor is it an endless straight line of progress, as it is for the moderns, but a finite and closed process having both a beginning and an end" (Fedotov (I) 1975:385).

Third, God's perfect and good will does not eliminate human will, choice, and a certain degree of freedom as well as responsibility for one's actions in the process of history. Human beings are not puppets on the divine stage.

Fourth, there is room for causation in historical process. Individuals, groups of people, even whole empires reap what they sow, although there is a

chance of escaping consequences through repentance and change of one's actions.

Fifth, God who created time has been revealing Himself to human beings gradually through time by the means of general revelation and special revelation (the Scripture), parts of which are a record of human past. He created human beings with an innate ability to remember the past and desire to know the past. There are also numerous calls in the Scriptures to remember and learn from the past. This is one of the reasons for studying history.

Sixth, all extra-biblical knowledge of history should be strengthened, modified, or abandoned in the light of one's experience applying the ordinary criteria of credibility discussed in the previous section.

Once Lev Tolstoy was asked why his novel "Anna Karenina" ended with Anna committing suicide. His answer was that he had no idea why she did it. So it is with my research. I do not want to discover what I want to discover. May my research surprise me with the results. And may the results mould and change my starting hypotheses. The attitude "I know the truth, do not confuse me with facts" is incompatible with genuine historical research.

And finally, why do I study history? Is there any use in "writing stories" about the past? Someone said that "history teaches", which is true. But it does not only teach, it can punish. It punishes those who do not take pains to find out how it all was and continue to repeat old mistakes.

2.2 Hermeneutics

Now I have to answer another important question. What is hermeneutics? In the original sense of the word it is philosophy and the love of wisdom, the search for an understanding of human existence. However, with time the discipline of hermeneutics took on a more specific meaning as "the discipline that considers the theory of interpretation" (Rogerson 1992:433). Hermeneutics, though still "a vogue word today" is "the science of reflecting on how a word or event in the past time and culture may be understood... in our present situation" (Braaten 1968:131).

Although hermeneutics began as a legal and theological methodology governing the application of civil and canon law, and the interpretation of Scripture, it developed into a general theory of human understanding through the work of F. Schleiermacher, W. Dilthey, M. Heidegger, H. G. Gadamer, P.

Ricoeur, and others. Thus, modern hermeneutics, that is the hermeneutics since Schleiermacher, has a rather abstract character. It shows little interest in concrete problems of interpretation. This has led to the development of "text hermeneutics", the discipline that is concerned with text interpretation proper.

Now, Biblical hermeneutics addresses the question of how the meaning of biblical texts can be interpreted and communicated, and seeks to develop criteria for the interpretations of texts (Sauter & Phillips 1986:537). In short, biblical hermeneutics is the theory of biblical interpretation. More specifically, if I seek to formulate Kargel's hermeneutics, I have to find out what principles in Kargel's mind did he apply when approaching a biblical text. It is well known that "every act of text understanding operates, consciously or unconsciously, with a number of presuppositions" (Rogerson 1992:433). An interpreter has certain expectations of the text. He/she attributes a certain degree of authority, trust, or even sacredness to the text, or, on the contrary, has suspicions about the text's claims (Rogerson 1992:433-434).

When trying to formulate his/her hermeneutical position towards the biblical text, it is important to understand what questions shaped his/her hermeneutical perspective.

For Origen, one of the main questions was: "How to unlock the hidden sense of the text so far as this was possible at all?" (Rogerson 1992:435).

For Augustine of Hippo the question was: "How can I study the best way in order to decode what the signs constituting the biblical texts wish to say?" This is what he claimed. However, unlike the Antiochene interpreters, Augustine in his own hermeneutical enterprise presupposed the Christological content, the canonical integrity of the biblical texts, and the ecclesial rootedness of the interpreter (Rogerson 1992:436).

For Gregory the Great the question was, "What is the deeper sense of the text, because only in that disclosure do we gain insight into God's act of revelation in Christ" (Rogerson 1992:437).

For Martin Luther, one of the most important questions was, "What does this particular text reveal me about Christ?" He also presupposed that in order to understand the text one must believe in God's saving act in Jesus Christ (Rogerson 1992:438).

F. Schleiermacher tried to understand, "What would the biblical text mean when treated as not a divinely inspired text?" (Rogerson 1992:439).

M. Heidegger was coming from a standpoint that all human understanding was subjective. In order to avoid this subjectivism a person must allow the text to challenge his/her previous understanding and ask further questions of it (Sauter & Phillips 1986:538). So, his question seemed to be, “How can I get rid of my old presuppositions concerning the Bible?”

For K. Barth the question was, “What is the Word of God (not to be confused with the canonical Scripture) and who am I in relationship to God’s Word?” (Rogerson 1992:440).

R. Bultman’s goal was to find out, “What is mythological in the Bible, primarily, in the New Testament?”

E. Fuchs approached the biblical texts (again, primarily the New Testament) through this existentialist quest, so his was mostly concerned with the “Who am I?” question (Anchor 441).

The author’s goal is to find out and formulate the main hermeneutical questions in the area of biblical interpretation for I. Kargel.