

## CHAPTER THREE: BACKGROUND AND INFLUENCES

### *3.1 Historical Context*

#### **3.1.1 Socio-Political conditions**

The nineteenth century Russia was not a place of political or religious freedom. As Peter I in the beginning of the eighteenth century opened Russia's windows on the West, Nicholas I (1825-1855) wanted to close them. It was during his reign that Count Uvarov summarised a principle of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality". However, Russia's defeat in the Crimean war fought between Russia on one side and Turkey, France, Sardinia, and Britain on the other (1853-56) showed that Nicholas' political strategy, both foreign and domestic, had failed.

The epoch of the great reforms (1860-1870s), the greatest of which was the emancipation of serfs, and slight liberation in society allowed all classes to feel the new winds. But the era of reform ended with the life of the tsar-reformer Alexander II, who was assassinated on March 1, 1881. His time was followed by a period of reaction (1881-1905) when the nation was supposed to consolidate around an old program of Uvarov's which guided the policies of Alexander III and Nicholas II, the last two Russian tsars. This was also a favourite principle of Konstantin Pobedonostsev, procurator of the Holy Synod from 1880 to 1905, a layman appointed by the tsar and the *de facto* ruler of the church (Walters 1999:40).

The hierarchy of the Orthodox Church was too compromised with its subordination to the State. It lacked both the energy and desire to lead Russia to a spiritual reformation that could have saved her from the upcoming destruction caused by quickly spreading Marxists ideas. Both Church and State did everything possible to suppress the political and spiritual discontent among the population in the country. The means of suppression chosen against revolutionaries and other dissidents, including religious schismatics, were mostly of an oppressive nature which did not make either the Church or the State more popular in the eyes of the people, but the authorities were driven by

fear before the growing revolutionary movement. “All of society grew increasingly restless. . . Between 1900 and 1904 the regime managed to alienate virtually every group in society” (Freeze 1983:468-469).

It was Bloody Sunday that “sounded the start of revolution in 1905” when a priest, Georgiy Gapon, led the workers in St. Petersburg on a march to the tsar on the ninth of January (Freeze 1983:469). The Edict of the Freedom of Conscience and Legalization of the Evangelical Groups of April 17, 1905, the so-called Law of Tolerance, issued on the tide of the first Russian revolution, granted religious freedom to non-Orthodox denominations.<sup>14</sup> It introduced a brief period of political liberalization lasting a couple of years. It was then that the “renovationists” (*obnovlentsy*), whose history can be traced back to 1905, started demanding fundamental reform in the Church. “Although authorities eventually suppressed both the Revolution and the renovational movement in the clergy... it was hardly possible to stamp out the movement itself” (Freeze 1983:470-471).

So, gradually, by the time of the outbreak of World War I, freedoms were being curtailed and national and religious chauvinism was showing itself again. According to Walters, typical was a pamphlet published in 1911 with a cartoon depicting rival faiths as agents of the devil attempting to steal lambs from Christ's flock, and identifying Adventists and Baptists as two of the most dangerous and aggressive of these faiths (Walters 1999:41).

Unfortunately, the law of Tolerance as well as the introduction of Russian parliamentarianism were belated measures. The revolutionary movement, reinforced by the losses and fatigue caused by World War I, erupted anew. The February Revolution of 1917, applauded by all classes of Russian society including clergy, put an end to the monarchy. The October Revolution in the same year brought victory to the radical “left” Bolshevik party headed by Lenin.

---

<sup>14</sup> More specifically, the law granted Russians the right to depart from the Orthodox Church, the right of parents who departed from Orthodoxy to raise their children in a new religion, the right of persons previously considered Orthodox against their will not to be so classified, the right of people raising abandoned children to baptize them according to their own faith, the right to Old Believers and Christian sectarians to have houses of worship, to own property, to organize their own elementary schools that would provide religious instruction. Also there were provisions to adherents of foreign Christian denominations to build churches and to provide religious education for children (Berman 1999:267-268).

Economically this meant nationalization of banks, factories, land, and real estate. Politically this meant the termination of Russia's participation in World War I at any cost while hoping that "world revolution" was at the door.

Religiously this meant the course towards state atheism. As Berman rightly noticed, "Soviet atheism was derived in part from Marxist theory, but for Marx atheism was primary a philosophical tenet... whereas for Lenin and his Russian followers atheism was a militant faith, a revolt against God, with deep roots in Russian anarchism" (Berman 1999:268). By late 1917, the Bolshevik seizure of power had a "sobering effect" on Orthodox priests (Freeze 1983:472).

The policy of the Soviet government towards religion was laid down in January 1918, in the first law on the subject called "On the separation of the Church from the State and of the School from the Church". Within a socialist system of the Soviet type it meant that "churches, mosques, and synagogues were deprived of almost all activities except the conduct of worship services. Moreover, schools were not merely to avoid the teaching of religion; they were actively to promote the teaching of atheism" (Berman 1999:269). Besides, following the old Roman strategy of "divide-and-conquer", Soviet government first made war against the Orthodox Church<sup>15</sup> as the bigger and stronger enemy, which allowed evangelicals to experience a period of "golden age".

However, the cards fully came into the open in the 1929 Law on Religious Associations that remained the basic legislation on the subject until the late 1980s. There was a formal freedom of religious worship within registered church buildings which were being rapidly closed one after another to the point when few remained. Very soon believers were not able to exercise even the right of assembly. Churches were forbidden to provide material aid to their members or charity of any kind, to hold any special meetings for children, youth, and women, to carry meetings for religious study, to open libraries, or to

---

<sup>15</sup> The Soviets were "dividing and conquering" within the body of the Orthodox Church as well using priests who were more loyal to the authorities against more "stubborn" ones. In the early 1920s finally came the "apotheosis of clerical liberalism" in the "Living Church" (*Zhivaya tserkov*), when clerical liberals "rose against episcopal authority" seeking friendship with the Bolsheviks. Their "Program of Church Reform", adopted in May 1922, proclaimed "the justice of social revolution and world-wide unification of workers to defend the rights of the toiling and the exploited". So, while some "red priests" played into the hands of the Bolsheviks, many others were imprisoned and killed (Freeze 1983:472).

publish religious literature (Berman 1999:269). The practical result of the law was “savage and prolonged persecution throughout the 1930s” (Walters 1999:42).

The socio-political background of the evangelical movement in Russia is beautifully summarised by E. Payne: “four difficult decades before dissent from the Russian Orthodox Church secured legal recognition in 1905; then ten years of uncertainty, followed after the revolution of 1917 by ten years of promise; next, very bitter experiences from the launching of the anti-God movement” (Payne 1987:566).

### **3.1.2 The monopoly of the Russian Orthodox Church**

The Russian Orthodox Church, the established church of the Russian Empire, for centuries had a virtual monopoly in spiritual matters as well as in ceremonial aspects: birth, marriage, and death. This monopoly would not be possible without the backing of state power. Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the Tsar was virtually the head of the Church. For centuries “relations between Church and State in Russia and their interdependence have had a long and tortuous history” (Kazemzadeh 1999:227), as both were fighting for supreme political power. The Church lost the battle during the reign of Peter I, but kept its power in the spiritual realm. It seems important to review some of the major building stones of those relations in order to understand how the religious situation developed historically. Kazemzadeh provides a number of helpful insights into this process.

Imported into Kievan Russ in the ninth century from Byzantine, “where the emperors reigned supreme” (as opposed to Rome, where the popes reigned supreme), Orthodox Christianity had no tradition of autonomy from the secular power (Kazemzadeh 1999:227). By the second quarter of the fourteenth century the symbiosis of Church and State was firmly established (Kazemzadeh 1999:229). For example, the founder of a monastery at Volokolamsk, Joseph Volokolamskiy, believed that heresy was a crime against both the Church and the state, that “heresy was treason and treason was heresy” (Kazemzadeh 1999:230). “His religious formalism and ritualism, his glorification of the power of the prince, his hatred of heretics and of all outsiders, and his defence of ecclesiastical wealth became the norm of the official Church” (Kazemzadeh 1999:231).

The fall of Constantinople to the Muslim Turks in 1453 shook Orthodox Christianity to its foundations (Kazemzadeh 1999:229) and allowed Moscow to take the initiative. The monk Filofey of Pskov in his famous doctrine presented the ideology of the supremacy of Moscow and its rulers (Pospelovsky 1996:68; Kazemzadeh 1999:231). Filofey's famous proclamation of Moscow as the "third Rome" penetrated the nation's mentality: "Perceive, pious Tsar, how all the Christian realms have converted into yours alone. Two Romes have fallen, and the third stands, and the fourth there shall not be".<sup>16</sup> Ivan IV, known as Ivan the Terrible, dramatically demonstrated both in theory and in practice the total power of the tsar over the Church. Metropolitan Philip, who dared to confront the tsar, was killed and succeeded by perfectly obedient metropolitans (Pospelovsky 1996:81-82). In his writings, Ivan assumed the primacy of secular power and barred any interference by the clergy with the tsar's will. In practice, he treated the Church as the inferior that it was (Kazemzadeh 1999:232). According to Fedotov, "The mid-sixteenth century became a crucial landmark... The year 1547, the date of Ivan the Terrible's coronation, divided Russian spiritual life into two spheres, the era of Holy Russia from the era of the Orthodox empire" (Fedotov (II) 1975:391).

Taking advantage of the financial and political needs of the ecumenical patriarchs, new Russian tsar Boris Godunov persuaded them to elevate the Metropolitan of Moscow to the rank of Patriarch, making him the fifth Patriarch of the Orthodox Church (Pospelovsky 1996:82-83; Kazemzadeh 1999:233). However, the position of the Church inside Russia did not become stronger (Pospelovsky 1996:83).

The last attempt by the Church to dominate the State came during the reign of Aleksey Mikhaylovich and his Patriarch Nikon, whose position for a time was equal to that of the tsar (Pospelovsky 1996:86-87). Increased acquaintance with Greek theological literature stimulated the desire to correct sacred texts that had been improperly translated into Russian, while exposure to Catholic thought produced doubts as to the legitimacy of the subordination of the Church to the state (Kazemzadeh 1999:234). However, a large number of priests and monks (who would be called Old Believers) opposed Nikon's reforms. The

---

<sup>16</sup> George Vernadsky, ed., *A Source Book for Russian History from Early Times to 1917*, 3 vols. (New Haven, 1972), 1:156, in Kazemzadeh 1999:232.

matter was further complicated by Nikon's expressed conviction that the Church was not subject to secular power but superior to it, as the sun is superior to the moon (Pospelovsky 1996:89; Kazemzadeh 1999:234). Nikon wrote, "It is clear that the tsar must be lower than the prelate and obedient to him, for I also say that the clergy are chosen people and anointed by the Holy Ghost".<sup>17</sup> In the end, Nikon's encounter with the state served only to increase the power of the monarch. The official Church was now facing a major rebellion in its own ranks because of the schism of the Old Believers – the Great Schism of the seventeenth century that was followed by almost one third of the whole population (Pospelovsky 1996:90). "In its zeal to extirpate Old Belief, the Church once again invoked the power of the State and bowed to its supremacy" (Kazemzadeh 1999:135). The official Church did it before and would do so many times after that.

Aleksey's son Peter, crowned as Peter I, who made St. Petersburg Russia's capital for the next two centuries, favoured foreigners. The conservative Church called upon the state to save Holy Russ, but it was powerless to prevent Russia from succumbing to growing influence of western beliefs, attitudes, and manners, an influence that was encouraged and promoted by the monarchy (Kazemzadeh 1999:236). It was in vain that Patriarch Joachim in 1690 called upon co-tsars Ivan and Peter to defend the faith, and stated the position of the church concerning foreign influences.

The Patriarch pleaded with the tsars "never to allow any orthodox Christian in their realm to entertain any close friendly relations with heretics and dissenters – with Latins, Lutherans, Calvinists, and godless Tatars... but let them be avoided as enemies of God and defamers of the church". The Patriarch wanted the tsars to decree "that men of foreign creeds who come here to this pious realm shall under no circumstances preach their religion, disparage our faith in any conversations, or introduce their alien customs derived from their heresies for the temptations of Christians; they should be forbidden to do all this on pain of severe punishment".<sup>18</sup> In a postscript Patriarch Joachim added that under no circumstances must the tsars allow "the heretics and dissenters to build Roman temples, Lutheran kirks, or Tatar mosques anywhere in your realm

---

<sup>17</sup> Vernadsky, *A Source Book*, 1:256, in Kazemzadeh 1999:235.

<sup>18</sup> Vernadsky, 2:362, in Kazemzadeh 1999:236.

or dominions, nor to bring any new Latin and alien customs, nor to introduce the wearing of foreign dress: for it is not through such practices that piety will spread in a Christian realm or faith in our Lord will grow". Kazemzadeh concludes that, "Such was the position of the Muscovite Church at the close of the seventeenth century and such, in essence, it has remained" (Kazemzadeh 1999:236).

Joachim did not live to see Peter become the sole tsar and promote reforms that "opened not just a window, but gates to the West" (Kazemzadeh 1999:236). The last Russian Patriarch died in 1700. In place of the patriarchate Peter I decided to establish a committee, the Holiest Governing Synod, which functioned under a set of rules written by Prokopovich and edited by Peter I himself (Kazemzadeh 1999:237; Pospelovsky 1996:132). The Synod was organised like any other governing department under the direct authority of the tsar who appointed one of its officers with foreign title of *ober-prokuror*, a layman representing the authority of the tsar.

The establishment of the Synod signalled the total abolition of ecclesiastical autonomy. Because of this ecclesiastic reform, which included many more humiliating actions limiting the Church's power and possessions, Peter I remained one of the most hated tsars of the Orthodox Church, the Antichrist (Cunningham 1981:36; Pospelovsky 1996:138). The Church hierarchy did not, and could not, protest this outright takeover of the Church. It had no tradition of independence, no moral strength to withstand the overwhelming might of the autocracy, because with the Old Believers it had lost its most determined and fanatical members (Kazemzadeh 1999:237; Pospelovsky 1996:91).

Even when the masses "boiled with rage at the impious tsar", the official Church continued faithfully to serve the state and showed only insignificant opposition (Kazemzadeh 1999:237; Fedotov (II) 1975:392). So it happened, according to Fedorov, that "at the dawn of her existence, Ancient Russia had preferred the road of holiness to the road of culture", however, when "it proudly asserted that it was holy and the only Christian land... the living holiness had abandoned it. Peter the Great destroyed only the outworn shell of Holy Russia" (Fedotov (II) 1975:392).

For almost two centuries after Peter's rule, the Church acted as an arm of the State (Pospelovsky 1996:129), teaching obedience to the government,

glorifying absolutism, and serving as a spiritual police force. The process of turning the Church into a fully subordinated department, started by Peter I, was finished under Nicholas I: the borders of dioceses followed the borders of the provinces, priests were granted the same medals and orders as laymen, and the tradition of choosing candidates to become priests totally died out (Pospelovsky 1996:167). The Holy Synod was run by laymen, usually of the most conservative bent. It is enough to mention just one of them, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, a tutor of both Alexander III and Nicholas II, the last tsar (Kazemzadeh 1999:237; Pospelovsky 1996:197-198). Pobedonostsev is especially ill-remembered by Russian evangelicals, as his dark shadow hovered over twenty-five years of the early period of evangelical history causing these non-conformists much suffering and pain.

However, by and large, the Church leadership was satisfied with this arrangement. The tsars never intervene into the domain of doctrine and let the Church remain in its frozen attitudes and ideas, fearing innovation, and mistreating the West. The Church was grateful to the state for its protection, for fighting against Old Believers, for limits imposed on Catholics and Protestants, for severe restrictions placed on foreign and domestic sects. No wonder a conservative statesman such as Count S. Uvarov proposed the tripartite formula of Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality as a safeguard against the spread of "destructive" ideas that, in his view, had caused great harm in Western Europe. As already mentioned, Uvarov's formula was eagerly embraced by tsars Alexander III and Nicholas II and became a central element of the Russian official ideology for the most of the nineteenth century until at least 1905 (Kazemzadeh 1999:237-238).

Never mind that the empire was inhabited with over a hundred nationalities that professed different religions! The three pillars of state ideology – the autocracy of the tsar, Orthodox belief, and Russian nationalism – naturally clashed those people groups (as well as individuals professing something different from Russian Orthodoxy) with the Church-State conglomerate leading to unavoidable problems and the persecution of those who were persistent. For instance, in the nineteenth century no marriage was legally valid, except those of Jews and Germans, unless solemnised by the Church. And although burial according to other rites in private grounds was legitimate, the established Church possessed the sole right of interment in parish graveyards. For

centuries it was considered a violation of law for a person baptised into the Orthodox faith to convert to Protestantism. This changed only after the Edict of Toleration of 1905; still, for all but the last few years of imperial Russia, traditional Protestant evangelistic outreach and foreign missionaries were almost always legally proscribed (Elliot & Deyneka 1999:197). Thus, the religious monopoly of the established Church in the nineteenth century did not develop overnight. It took centuries to develop.

In people's perception, to be a Russian meant to be Orthodox and vice versa. This phenomenon has been noted by many and is true even today. "It is, indeed, a tenet of traditional Russian Orthodox theology, and of Eastern Orthodox Christianity generally, that religious affiliation is closely connected with ethnicity and, to a lesser extent, with territory – with blood and with soil" (Berman 1999:267). "To be a member of the Church is to be a member of the people. A man who is unfaithful to the Church is also unfaithful to his nation" (Brandenburg 1977:3). However, being as powerful in the spiritual realm and as much integrated into national mentality as it was, the established Church did not provide sufficient care for the spiritual needs of people.

Fountain compares the spiritual condition of the Orthodox Church in Russia in the 1870s to that of the Church of England in the 1730s before the Methodist Awakening. In his opinion "the Orthodox Church had become thoroughly worldly and had almost lost all respect among the populace" (Fountain 1988:17). Still, it was blindly accepted that Russian Orthodoxy was the only true religion: "Not Popists, not Protestants, not Englishmen. . . have the genuine, pure, and complete truth of God. It is found only in the true Orthodox Church" (Feofan 1880:5). Regarding theological hermeneutics, Pobedonostsev officially declared in 1880 that "the *church* alone possesses the full, clean, catholic understanding of the whole text" (Pobedonostsev 1880:1).

It must be mentioned that scriptural interpretation and preaching were never a strong point in Russian Orthodoxy. It was always geared more towards mysticism. Brandenburg brings up some interesting insights into traditional Russian (or Orthodox) piety, which are important to this research because the evangelical movement that sprang up among Russians was very much about piety and the concept of Orthodox piety made important contributions into the movement's pietistic profile. "It was the Orthodox form of piety which was nurtured and cultivated . . . The great mass of the people acquired a piety of the

emotion. Thus it was in church 'one felt as if in heaven'; outside was hell" (Brandenburg 1977:13). A typical statement of Orthodox piety would be, "Prayer is more important than preaching" (Brandenburg 1977:13). Brandenburg rightly pointed out,

One might say that whereas the Reformation introduced a dynamic piety, Orthodoxy maintained a static one. The confession 'I am a great sinner' comes easily from the lips of a pious Orthodox. But the confession 'I am a forgiven sinner' would be considered as unpardonable presumption (Brandenburg 1977:14).

Needless to say, the young evangelical movement was born in a rather unfavourable religious climate. The established Church of the nineteenth century had official laws against proselytizing and reigned in the minds of people as the sole authority in all matters of faith. It possessed the key to scriptural interpretation. It mixed national identity with religious practices. Being enslaved by the state, it had the state's "sword" at hand to deal with its disobedient "sons" and "daughters". Unfortunately, it did not care much for the spiritual well being of its subjects which caused those "subjects" to look for spiritual "food" elsewhere. No wonder different branches of the evangelical movement sprang up in several corners of the great empire independently and even unaware of each other. Carrying Orthodoxy as a part of their original identity, the dissenters brought some features, especially a piety of emotion, love for prayer, and mystical spirituality into the newly formed evangelical movement.

"The failings of parish clergy, long a concern for both Church and state, became an object of continual reform in the nineteenth century" (Freeze 1983:449). "Even Pobedonostsev, who so admired the piety of the 'simple Russian soul', admitted the laity's abysmally low level of religious knowledge: 'Many who call themselves Christian have no comprehension of Jesus and do not even recognize his image on the icon'.<sup>19</sup> The formation of large parishes "only weakened the Church's infrastructure, inviting penetration by such adversaries as Old Believers, sectarians, and other confessions" (Freeze 1983:460). Similar thought is expressed by Cunningham, who points out that in 1869-1872 many small parishes were closed in the southern and western provinces, "and their closing had permitted an increase in successful

---

<sup>19</sup> IVO (1884), pp. 92-93, in Freeze 1983:458.

proselytizing by Stundists and Catholics” (Cunningham 1981:281-282). This way, “the whole experience from the 1820s to the 1880s showed that society *would* not and that authorities *could* not achieve fundamental reform in the Church” (Freeze 1983:466).

Thus, the Orthodox Church in Russia for centuries acted in close connection with the State, most of the time as a subordinate body. This explains the very painful downfall of the established Church after the Revolution. It simply could not exist independently of the State in the known format. It was with the state that she rose and fell.

However, during her “subordinated” phase, the connection with the State provided certain privileges. For example, the State came in very handy when dealing with dissenters. Nevertheless, in spite of all united Church-State forces, Russian ecclesiastical history witnesses an unending succession of schisms, usually labelled as sects and heresies, which deserve more attention than has been paid to them by historians thus far. The major movement, of course, was that of the old belief who became fertile ground to other “sects” such as Dukhobors. The Dukhobors in their turn gave birth to Molokans, who later became the forerunners of Russian Baptists.

A few words must be added concerning some peculiarities of the Russian religious mind that developed in the context of Orthodox Christianity. Inherited from Byzantine Russian Christianity was not a stiff replica of Byzantine Christianity. It was fresh, creative, and dynamic, especially in the beginning. There are numerous volumes written on this topic and I will not even begin to research this field. I will limit myself to mentioning a couple of features based on Fedotov’s work. It is important for the present study because one needs a description, at least a very brief one, of the soil onto which the seeds of evangelicalism were thrown. It will also help explain why these particular “seeds” took root in Russian “soil”.

There is an eschatological trend, “a particular eschatological interest in Russia” (Fedotov (I) 1975:385). However, it was not so much “fear of the End” and “Terrible Judgment” as “the last fulfilling event of history, the coming of Christ... the end of the suffering of the innocent” (Fedotov (I) 1975:386).

In a way this eschatological trend directed preaching “along the line of repentance” (Fedotov (I) 1975:386). For a Russian believer, “repentance is also the most serious thing: there is nothing of optimistic joyfulness or cloudless

serenity about him” (Fedotov (I) 1975:392). Penitential tears are also highly appreciated as “an external token of a true repentance” (Fedotov (I) 1975:392).

Another trend is asceticism, but “the Russian type is marked by relative moderation” (Fedotov (I) 1975:387). Ascetic extremes were “much admired but little imitated” (Fedotov (I) 1975:388).

Fedotov also mentions mysticism and ethical emphasis that “goes through all the religious literature of Russia” (Fedotov (I) 1975:388). “The main problem was: how to live and what to do for one’s salvation? That the answer was sought in the way of moral life more than in sacramental sanctification, constitutes a notable difference between the Russian and Byzantine religious minds” (Fedotov (I) 1975:388-389). Further on, Fedotov sees charity as “the dominant ancient Russian ethical attitude” (Fedotov (I) 1975:389).

If the author had to choose one word to describe the religious aspirations of the soul of Russian Christians, the word would be *blagochestie* “piety”. “Russian holiness”, “Holy Russ”... These aspirations left their mark even in terminology. It should not, however, be mistaken for “Pietism”, as the latter is used in connection with specific movements discussed below.

### **3.1.3 Publishing the Bible in Russian Vernacular**

Around the world and through the ages, spiritual revivals would be unthinkable without the Bible being read by masses in an understandable language. “The place and time of various evangelical revivals are directly linked to the availability of a contemporary translation of the Bible” (Nichols 1991:xiv). For instance, it is difficult to imagine the European Reformation without the Bible being translated into national languages.

The historians of Russian evangelical revival repeatedly pointed to this connection. According to Brandenburg, “The Bible translation into Russian vernacular holds great significance for the evangelical movement, for it has always been a bible movement” (Brandenburg 1977:104) and Russian Stundism is simply unthinkable without it (Brandenburg 1977:29). Prokhanov eagerly pointed out that, “Russian Bible, Russian New Testament is the main forefather of all newest religious movement in Russia” (Prokhanov 1915:19). Heier states that, “the history of the Russian Bible translation is closely linked with the religious revival of the 1870s” (Heier 2002:47-48).

I will start with reviewing the main stages of this history. The Bible used by the Orthodox Church in the nineteenth century was in Old Church Slavonic, a translation completed in the ninth century. This almost 1000-year-old translation could not be understood without special training. A new translation of the Bible into Russian vernacular was undertaken in 1813 during the reign of Alexander I. The whole process took over sixty years and greatly depended on the favour of the tsar on the throne.

Tsar Alexander I (1801-25) was attracted to German pietism and mysticism. In the early part of his reign he had liberalising inclinations and was open to non-Orthodox initiatives (Walters 1999:37). According to Brandenburg, in the year 1812, when Napoleon marched towards Moscow Alexander I experienced a religious awakening through his childhood friend Prince Alexander Golitsyn. In the beginning of the reign of Alexander I, Golitsyn was appointed as Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod and seemed to have experienced spiritual awakening and showed interest in the biblical gospel. For the first time in his life Golitsyn immersed himself in the New Testament and withdrew from social pleasures (Brandenburg 1977:25-27). Golitsyn called himself “a universal Christian” and accepted only that kind of religion that is based on the “spiritual experience of the heart”, hence his interest in the “sects preaching the second birth and experiences of spiritual awakening” (Pospelovsky 1996:158).

After the establishment of the British and Foreign Bible Society in London in 1804, which was one of the “societies” formed in the time of religious renewal inspired by Methodism and the Pietism of the Moravian Brethren (Darby 1972:131), Bible societies were founded in almost every protestant country. In December 1812, Alexander I signed the decree for the establishing of St. Petersburg’s Bible Society (later the name was changed into the Russian Bible Society) and appointed Golitsyn as its president (Brandenburg 1977:28; Ellis & Jones 1996:39). St. Petersburg Bible Society was modelled on the London-based BFBS (Urry 1987:214). The tsar and his two brothers became patrons of the society (Ellis & Jones 1996:39). The tsar made generous offerings for the needs of the society (Mitrokhin 1997:247). One of the active members of the Russian Bible Society from the first day of its existence was Prince K. K. Lieven who belonged to the “sect” of the Moravian brothers (Pospelovsky 1996:160).

A few years later the tsar expressed the wish that there should be a modern translation of the Bible, because many Russians could no longer understand Old Church Slavonic. The Holy Synod set to work to fulfil the emperor's wish (Brandenburg 1977:29). The New Testament translation into modern Russian was completed in 1819. By 1823 the Psalms and complete Bibles (as well as portions) were translated into a number of languages spoken across the vast territories of the empire: Finnish, Karelian, Estonian, Georgian, Armenian, Turkish, Samoyed, Cheremis, Chuvash, Persian, Kalmyk, Buryat, Tatar, and Bulgarian, etc. (Ellis & Jones 1996:39; Brandenburg 1977:29). During the reign of Alexander I, nearly one million Bibles in about thirty languages were circulated (Fountain 1988:20).

From the very beginning there was strong opposition to the Bible translation movement, because "to the pious and conservative educated Russian, Church Slavonic was sacred. The word of God could only be read and heard in that language" (Brandenburg 1977:30), an argument that is very familiar to a church historian. The Orthodox worried that the Russian Bible Society was promoting "the pietistic faith of the heart" regardless of confession (Pospelovsky 1996:160).

Under Alexander's successor Nicholas I (1825-55), "the pendulum swung decisively back" because Nicholas I wanted to close Russia's "windows" on the West (Walters 1999:37). The work of the Russian Bible society was interrupted when in 1826 Nicholas I closed the society, saying, that, "enough bibles had now been printed" (Brandenburg 1977:29). Shishkov, a new minister of education, felt that a translation of Scripture into people's "dialect" would disparage the Scripture making it available in every home; pages of the holy book will be used as cartridge paper, and disrespect will lead to the spreading of heresies and atheism (Pospelovsky 1996:160). However, even under the intolerant Nicholas I, the translation of the Old Testament into modern Russian continued. The work was successfully carried on by Professor Pavsky and Archimandrite Makariy, who have been described as "friends of the Bible" (Brandenburg 1977:104).

Only in 1856 Alexander II (1855-81) issued an edict calling for the translation of the whole Scriptures into modern Russian. In 1858 he reopened the Russian Bible Society, and in 1863 he permitted the British and Foreign Bible Society to continue its work in Russia again. It was during his reign that in

1867 the whole Old Testament was finally translated into modern Russian (Brandenburg 1977:30; Ellis & Jones 1996:39-41). The Bible society was functioning until 1917 when it was finally closed by the revolutionaries (Brandenburg 1977:30).

Naturally, literacy was a precondition for reading the Bible. By the 1800s only a small percentage of Russia's population was literate. The desire to study the Bible accustomed people to reading and helped to overcome illiteracy. Besides, the same people who sponsored printing the Bibles also promoted elementary education. Some estate owners from among the Pashkovites provided schools for their peasants. The Bible had become a textbook for many people who had to learn how to read because they were motivated by a great desire to read Scripture (Brandenburg 1977:85).

However, it was one thing to translate and print the Bibles, but it was another thing to get them into the hands of people who lived over the immensely stretched territories of the empire. This was being accomplished by an essential ministry of *knigonoshi* or colportage. These people literally walked thousands of miles distributing Bibles. As a matter of fact, their work went far beyond distribution of the books. When possible they preached the gospel and led Bible studies. Of the many colporteurs, I should mention two outstanding persons who prepared the way for the evangelical awakening.

John Melville was a Scot and a strict Calvinist Puritan who for sixty years was a colporteur far into the Caucasus almost till his death in 1886 (Ellis & Jones 1996:40). Melville used to gather those who were especially interested in religious things and simply explain to them the Word of God. He did not promote any specific church or denomination. He brought nothing other than the Bible and quoted only from that. If he was a witness to argument concerning, say, baptism or doctrines of the last events, he would close his eyes, as if it had nothing to do with him. According to Brandenburg, it is impossible to measure how far he prepared the way for the subsequent Stundist movement (Brandenburg 1977:59-60).

Another colporteur, Kasha Yagub (Delyakov) from Persia, had been evangelized by American Presbyterian missionaries<sup>20</sup> and in his turn carried on his missionary work for thirty years on extremely small support and travelled as

---

<sup>20</sup> Delyakov graduated from the Moody Bible school (AUCECB 1989:524).

far as Sakhalin (the Far East). He gained entry into the Molokan community and through his testimony he brought about the renewal of several settlements. This was the origin of the New Molokans, who later joined the Stundist movement. While travelling he offered Bibles to the peasants. Wherever he found open doors, he also held meetings (Brandenburg 1977:61-62). According to Pritzkau, Delyakov was a pioneer of Russian pietism and Stundism in the South of Russia.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, by the end of 1860s both the New and the Old Testaments were translated into modern Russian language, printed, and distributed across the Russian territories. With literacy increasing, more and more people were able to read Scripture. Once people started searching Scripture for themselves, nothing remained the same. It was for good reasons that ecclesiastical authorities were worried about putting the Book into the hands of lay people. It meant losing control over scriptural interpretation. Even more so, during this time the pattern of evangelical groups was being established as colporteurs held simple Bible studies and emphasised reading the text over theological system or doctrines. This way, “a climate was created which nourished the evangelical awakening in Russia” (Ellis & Jones 1996:41).

### **3.1.4 Evangelical movements in nineteenth century Russia**

There is an ongoing quest concerning the origin of Russian evangelicalism. Any historian would agree that Baptist doctrines and practices were brought to Russia from abroad. But then there were domestic evangelical trends like Molokans. Some tend to overemphasise the former, others the latter. How great was the role of foreign religious influences on the development of Russian evangelicalism? Or, rather, how did foreign evangelical tradition get assimilated in the Russian context? Answering this question, at least partly, is another goal of this work. Again, Kargel provides a great example, as a half-German with the German language as his mother tongue became one of the most prominent among Russian evangelical theologians.

---

<sup>21</sup> Pritzkau J., *Geschichte der Baptisten in Süd Russland*. Odessa, 1914, S. 39-53, in AUCECB 1989:38.

There is quite a debate concerning the issue of how genuine Russian evangelical theology is. To what extent is it genuinely Russian and what was imported from abroad? Some ask if there is Russian evangelical theology at all.

The author will quote the two most authoritative sources.

Aleksii represented a commonly accepted among the Orthodox writers' view that Russian evangelicalism was mostly a result of foreign influences.

We have come to the conclusion that the religious-rationalistic movement that sprang in the south of Russia in the beginning of 1850s and in the beginning of 1880s already spread almost the whole south and penetrated into the central regions and gubernias along the Volga river, is a Baptist movement (neobaptism) that was initiated by German missionaries... The first and main workers were Germans-neobaptists (Wieler, Unger, Nejfeldt, Berg, etc.) with a founder Oncken at the head (Aleksii 1908:II).

Those who see this movement as originally Russian, created by the efforts of the Russian religious thought, are wrong, though in the life of Russian people was something that prepared favourable soil for the distribution of the sectarianism (Aleksii 1908:II-III).

The official history of Evangelical Christian-Baptists categorically disagrees with this point of view. The evangelical revival that sprang up in the 1860s "cannot be seen as something foreign, brought from outside . . . this conception, supported by the Orthodox scholars, have long outlived itself" (All-Union Congress of Evangelical Christians-Baptists 1989 = AUCECB 1989:52).

The author is not going to continue this rather fruitless argument which in a way parallels an argument of the origins of Russian State system. My personal opinion is that one (Russian evangelical movement) was impossible without the other (foreign evangelical influences), just as in order make a fire one needs both wood and matches. The author believes that foreign evangelical efforts in no way diminish the originality of Russian evangelical efforts. Russian evangelicalism has never been an exact replica of any foreign evangelical movement. Besides, among the Russian evangelical movements one can separate out a "pure" Russian one, that is, the Molokans.

The Molokans were those who independently (that is without foreign influence) dissented from the Russian Orthodox Church and possessed some evangelical features. This movement produced a number of prominent Christian leaders both among Baptists and Evangelical Christians. It was the Molokans who enriched the Russian Evangelical movement with such leaders as Pavlov,

the Mazaev brothers, Prokhanov, the Kazakovs', and others. This Molokan movement to some extent provided outward "forms" and "rules" for the developing Russian evangelicalism.

I have to agree that the Evangelical movement in Russia adopted Western theology and integrated it into Russian context (Samoilenkov 2001:61).

### **3.1.4.1 Molokans**

The Molokans – those Quakers of Russia (Latimer 1908:17) – came out of the Dukhobor movement, which makes them genuinely Russian nonconformists (Savinsky 1999:48), and, in a way, forerunners of Russian Baptists (Karetnikova 1999:66). The name of the movement is derived from the Russian word *moloko* "milk". This has two possible explanations: they were first called so by the Orthodox clergy in Tambov in 1785 because in spite of the Orthodox restrictions they drank milk during the fasts; according to Molokans' explanation, they adopted the name because of their love for the "milk" of the Word of God (1 Pet 2:2), but they preferred to call themselves "truly spiritual Christians" (Savinsky 1999:49; Butkevich 1909:2). However, according to Butkevich, even in the seventeenth century all sectarians who rejected Orthodox fasts were called Molokans (Butkevich 1909:1).

The very reason they broke with the Dukhobors was the differences in their attitude towards the Bible (Savinsky, 1999, 48). In the second half of the eighteenth century, the Dukhobors started placing so-called "inward enlightenment" over scriptural authority. According to the Dukhobors, "salvation comes from the Spirit and not from the printed book" (Karetnikova 1999:67). This attitude escalated to the point where Pobirikhin, one of the Dukhobor leaders, even forbade reading the Bible as a "dangerous" book (Savinsky 1999:48). The Molokans broke from the Dukhobors under the leadership of Semen Uklein, who insisted on checking the "inward enlightenment" or "inner light" against the Bible (Savinsky 1999:48). Reading and studying the Bible as well as putting its truths into practice became the basis of the Molokans' services and life itself (Karetnikova, 1999:72). Indeed, Molokans, especially those from the Caucasus, were known for their great thirst for the Word of God as the source of salvation. They studied the Bible carefully and prayerfully (Savinsky 1999:67; Karev 1999:112-113).

The Molokans revived the missionary spirit of the early Dukhobors. Their teaching began spreading widely especially when Semen Uklein went to Tambov for open preaching during the 1870s. The Molokan groups were widely dispersed throughout the Russian Empire in areas such as the Don River, the Caucasus, Siberia, Kurskaya, Kharkovskaya, Ryazanskaya, Penzenskaya, Nizhegorodskaya, and Simbirskaya provinces (Karetnikova 1999:68).

The author will only briefly mention that the Molokan movement is complex, differing among itself in the area of religious practices (mostly due to the measure of mysticism in the beliefs of a particular group), as well as in theology, which is well reflected in their confessions of faith. For instance, in the late 1840s some Molokans in Baku province came to the conviction that they should perform water baptism and breaking of bread. Those were called “water Molokans” (AUCECB 1989:42).

The Molokans came very close to the central theme of evangelicalism – conversionism – but they did not fully grasp it. They did not consider the second birth of the Word and the Spirit. In this respect they cannot be considered evangelicals (Karetnikova 1999:71). However, Molokans did become very fruitful soil for Baptist preaching and they would join the Baptist movement by the thousands.

The Molokans’ main point was that the Bible is the guide to salvation. They did not recognise any rituals, icons, relic worship, fasts, or temples. God should be worshiped in spirit and truth. The main duty of a Christian is doing good works (Prokhanov 1993:24).

The Molokans’ worship was very simple. It included Bible reading, prayer, psalm singing, and even the singing monotonously of chapter after chapter of scripture (Kutepov 1891:37, 39). In 1805, Tsar Alexander I gave them official permission to worship according to their conscience (Butkevich 1909:5). In 1821 they were granted a piece of land on *Molochnye Vody* next to the Mennonite colonies. There Molokans built villages Novovasil’evka, Astrakhanka, and Novospassk, with up to 3000 inhabitants by 1833 (Butkevich 1909:5-6). Even more Molokans lived in Astrakhanskaya and Saratovskaya provinces (Butkevich 1909:6).

Molokans ... recognized neither minister nor preacher, giving every member of the congregation the right to preach and making the focal point the reading and exposition of the Bible... They were hard-working,

clean, sober separatists, who rejected all worldliness, theatre-going, and pleasure-seeking (Brandenburg 1977:62).

Unlike the Dukhobors who prefer oral traditions, the Molokans put a great emphasis on studying the written Word and had completed a number of creeds (Butkevich 1909:6-7). The following are some extracts concerning the Scripture from *Verouchenie dukhovnykh khristian, obyknovenno nazyvaemykh molokanami* [Doctrines of Spiritual Christians usually called Molokans] that was circulating in the beginning of the twentieth century:

“Learning the Word of God is a true spiritual baptism” (Butkevich 1909:16).

“Reading of the Holy Scripture is a true partaking in the body and blood of our Jesus Christ” (Butkevich 1909:18).

“More than anything else one should study the Word of God itself which was given to us in the books of the Old and the New Testament . . . to know the Holy Scriptures is the holy duty of every Christian, but especially of a pastor and presbyter of the church” (Butkevich 1909:23-24).

In Molokan teaching, *pokayanie* (repentance) had to be done when a believer confesses his/her sins before God or before each other (Kutepov 1891:32). Molokans rejected relics, the sign of the cross, icons, and temples (Kutepov 1891:33). They forbade the usage of tobacco, playing cards, dancing, music, bad language (Kutepov 1891:33). Sometimes they refused to pay taxes and to provide recruits (Kutepov 1891:34). They practiced long services with sometimes reading over twenty Psalms, to which they listened on their knees or standing on their feet (Kutepov 1891:37). In the end they greeted each other with kisses (Kutepov 1891:37-38). They had an elaborate ceremony of performing marriages (Kutepov 1891:32). This way, even a cursory look at the Molokan practices hints that modern Evangelical-Baptists in Russia inherited many of their forms of religious service: marriage ceremony, a particular order of breaking of bread, the way of greeting each other. They also inherited a certain degree of antagonism toward officials, army service, and a number of prohibitions.

As for the biblical hermeneutics, starting from Uklein himself, the Molokans believed that “the Bible, or the books of the Holy Scripture of Old and the New Testament, is the only source of Christian doctrine. There is no way to salvation beyond the Holy Scripture” (Kutepov 1891:30). Their interpretation of

Scripture and resulting practice were at times very literal. For instance, there was a Molokan gathering where believers were seated in between singing girls in order to conform with Psalm 68:25, “In the midst of the maidens beating tambourines” (Kutepov 1891:37).

### **3.1.4.2 Stundists**

Whereas the Molokans were a truly Russian “brand” of evangelicalism, the others – mainly Stundists, Baptists, and Pashkovites – appeared not without foreign influences.

Stundism is a rather vague movement to define. It was not a separate confession by any means; there could be Stundists from among Lutherans, Mennonite Brethren, or Russian Orthodox. Anyone who gathered for Bible reading and prayer at homes at certain hours (from the German *Stunde*) could be considered a Stundist. Indeed, it was “a complicated movement united by a phenomenon of holding *Stunde* – a special time set for gathering with the main goal of Bible reading” (Brandenburg 1977:71). *Stunde* were initiated by the representatives of various unconnected denominations. For example, the Reformed started holding *Stunde* in Rohrbach, Polish Catholics in Nikolaevskiy (Kherson) area, and Baptists in Karlovka (Elizavetgrad, presently Kirovograd area) (Brandenburg 1977:71-72, 81).

The roots of Stundism are traced back to Philipp J. Spener (1635-1705), who initiated the organisation of certain groups in Germany that were seeking to understand the depths of the Christian faith by reading and interpreting the Scriptures, praying, and singing hymns. Since they gathered at certain hour (*Stunde*), the gatherings acquired the name “meetings of *Stunde*” or “brotherhood of *Stunde*” (Kushnev 1916:10; Kutepov 1891:58-59). These Russian Orthodox writers were quite right. Indeed, Spener “proclaimed the necessity of conversion and holy living, and in 1670 set up a conventicler (*collegia pietatis*) within the church where pastors and laymen met to study the Bible and pray together for mutual edification” (Pierard 1978). Those gatherings were held in addition to the main church services (AUCECB 1989:39). Modern scholars add nothing new saying that original Stundism had nothing to do with Russian reality; it was an exclusively Lutheran tradition founded by the German theologian Spener (Yarygin 2004:28).

It is well known that since the reign of Elisaveta Petrovna (1741-1761) and especially during the reign of Catherine the Great (1762-1796) Germanic settlers were invited to develop the South Russian steppes under the condition of not proselytizing the native population.<sup>22</sup> The “tradition” to invite German Mennonite, Reformed, and Lutheran colonists continued during the following reigns of Paul I and Alexander I.<sup>23</sup> Thus, according to Wardin, evangelicalism entered Russia three hundred years ago as a pietistic movement. “Pietism, in turn, helped to give rise in the nineteenth century to stundism . . . , an evangelical movement whose adherents engaged in prayer and Bible study during their devotional hours” (Wardin 1994:50).

However, the time came when the descendants of those first settlers could not help evangelizing their Slavic neighbours. Thus, the colonists played “an important role in the origins of the two main branches of Evangelical movement in Russia – the Baptists and the Stundists” (Ivanov 2002:28). The revival, which originated among the German population of the Ukraine, Saratov and Samara regions, soon became indigenous in Russia as the Ukrainians and Russians started similar Bible studies in their homes among their countrymen and this way the movement spread (Karev 1999:89).

By the end of the 1870s, this movement reached the Kiev area and there appeared some villages with no Orthodox left – everybody was a Stundist (Karev 1999:92). At the beginning of the 1880s, Stundism spread even further, beyond the southern and south-western provinces of Bessarabia, Kherson, Ekaterinoslav, Kiev, Podolia, Volhynia, Minsk, Mogilev, Chernigov, and Poltava; to northern Russian areas, as far as Oryol and Tver, and along the Don River as far as the Caucasus (Brandenburg 1977:93). The rapid spreading of the movement is strong evidence of the active attitude of Stundists in preaching the gospel. The authorities got alarmed when Stundism began quickly spreading

---

<sup>22</sup> Moving to Russia the colonists acquired the right to get exemptions from military service. Actually, the possibility of not bearing arms was one of the reasons for their emigration from Europe. It seems that Russian Stundists inherited the desire to avoid army service, court trials, and giving oaths (Kushnev 1916:9, 21).

<sup>23</sup> In 1817 Wurttemberg Germans brought the ideas of Stundism to Russia. These ideas found a warm welcome among the colonists (Kushnev 1916:21).

among Russian peasants.<sup>24</sup> Being free, unlimited, and unstructured, the movement seemed especially dangerous to the Establishment, even more so than the Baptist movement.

Brandenburg, an expert in Stundism, points out that Stundism was one of the main sources from which the evangelical movement in Russia was stemming. In Rohrbach Reformed congregation (Kherson gubernia), this Bible movement developed under the twenty-four-year ministry (until 1848) of Johannes Bonekemper, the “father of Stundism” (Brandenburg 1977:48-54). The Reformed and partly Lutheran Stundists were following the principles of so-called old pietism, which strove to isolate the believers from the “sinful influence of the world”, and to organize a society without “conditions for sinful life”. The representatives of the “old pietism” were deeply interested in prophecies and expected Christ’s return in 1836 (AUCECB 1989:53, 39-40).

Bonekemper’s son Karl, who knew the Russian language, held *Stunde* for the Russian harvesters while he was a pastor in Rohrbach.. It was Karl who distributed copies of the New Testament in Russian among his Orthodox neighbours, advising them to read and study them (Kutepov 1891:59). The Ukrainians at Karl’s meetings began their own *Stunde* in the neighbouring village of Osnova and other villages around 1860 (Brandenburg 1977:65). From these *Stunden* came several men who later became leaders in Russian Stundism (Brandenburg 1977:54). Stundists in the Ukraine were the forerunners of Ukrainian Baptists the same way Molokans in the Caucasus and Crimea were forerunners for Caucasian Baptists (Karetnikova 1999:72).

The phenomenon of Russian *Stunde* was a “result of peasants’ pondering upon the Word of God” (Karetnikova 1999:75), which by this time became available in the Russian vernacular. Many illiterate peasants taught themselves to read being motivated by the desire to read the Bible. It seems true that “power of Stundism was in being literate” (Karetnikova 1999:74). The centre of the Christian life of Stundists was Christ and Scripture, not any kind of organization (Karetnikova 1999:75).

The Russians and Ukrainians who became involved in Stundism did not intend to break with the Orthodox Church. They did not aim to be anything but a

---

<sup>24</sup> The first official publication mentioning the word “Stundism” appeared in Odessa in 1868 (Karev 1999:91).

pietistic movement within the Church (Brandenburg 1977:47). It was persecutions that forced them develop an identity of their own (Nichols 1991:3). At first Russian Stundists hoped to remain within the Established Church, but this hope was “cruelly shattered” (Brandenburg 1977:xii). Fierce persecutions on behalf the state Church speeded their complete break with the Church.<sup>25</sup> The answer of Stundists to their persecutors was, “I’d rather lay my life down than stop reading and interpreting the Word of God” (Karetnikova 1999:75). Biblicism was the very core of the movement.

As the Orthodox Church expelled the Stundists from its fold (Brandenburg 1977:89), they were left without church, and had to find a way of faith that was independent of priests and sacraments and based solely on the Bible (Brandenburg 1977:89). They tried to model their congregations on those of the early Christians, putting an elder and a deacon at the head of each local congregation (Brandenburg 1977:93). Their meetings had no strict structure, but consisted of reading the Scripture, interpretation, and singing hymns using popular national melodies (Kushnev 1916:11).

Studying the Word brought forward a striking change in the style of life of those converted peasants. This phenomenon puzzled those who watched them. Ushinskiy, an Orthodox priest, noted, “The most mysterious thing is a moral change in the views and the way of life of our corrupted peasants. They suddenly break with such national tradition as drunkenness, which is flesh and blood of our country population, and in no time along with new beliefs adopt completely new traditions, attitudes and rules of life” (Karetnikova 1999:74). They did not have a developed doctrinal system; however, it was well known that Stundists did not drink alcohol, did not smoke, did not swear, did not offend others, and did not take oaths (Kushnev 1916:11).

A couple of trials of Stundists, retold by Karev, could well validate this point. One Stundist testified in the court: “I felt a new heart and became a new

---

<sup>25</sup> Kushnev divides the history of Russian Stundism into four periods: the first period lasted until 1870s before Stundists broke with the Church; until the mid-1880s was the period of their “blooming” when like a fire they captured the South of Russia, converting thousands of the Orthodox believers; then Stundism lost some of its influence. A law of July 4, 1894 labelled this “sect” as “especially harmful” for the Church and the state, and forbade all meetings; finally after the law of April, 17, 1905 Stundists regained some freedom. In order to avoid persecutions, Stundists sometimes called themselves Baptists (Kushnev 1916:24).

man... Before that I lived a debauched life and was a blasphemer. I realized that this was a sin . . .” Another Stundist, Lopata by name, said, “I was a bad man, used to drink, fight, blaspheme. I heard my boy reading the Gospel and felt that I should stop doing unrighteous things and live according to the truth” (Karev 1999:105). Indeed, Stundists advocated personal conversion and a strict personal morality (Wardin 1994:50).

Ratushnyy<sup>26</sup>, a Stundist leader, declared in court that they did not accept members into their churches unless they repented of their sins, got born again, and lived only for righteousness and holiness (Karev 1999:105). Thus, ecclesiastical structures developed gradually. Some Stundist leaders accepted water baptism by immersion, which eventually resulted in a tendency to merge with the Russian Baptists (Ellis & Jones 1996:70), although at first Stundists baptised infants as well as adults (Kutepov 1891:61).

According to the Orthodox writers, Stundists firmly stood on the principles of equality and brotherhood, and did not allow any hierarchy. They managed to keep these principles for several decades (Kushnev 1916:134). As a matter of fact, teaching about ordinances Baptists violated the main principle of Russian sectarians, that is, their understanding of God being the Spirit who should be worshiped in spirit without any forms or rituals (Kushnev 1916:134-135). Besides, many Stundists rose against Baptist teaching concerning taking oath. For Stundists it meant profanation of the gospel and deserting from the original ideals of Russian Stundism (Kushnev 1916:137).

Brandenburg gives a detailed and orderly account of how Stundists were gradually integrated into the Baptist movement. “They shared the same fate, and this was a uniting factor” (Brandenburg 1977:90). “These young bible Christians had no complicated theology. Yet the Baptists were prepared to suffer with the Stundists, and to dare with them. It is not surprising, then, that the Stundists in their search for new church forms pricked up their ears!” (Brandenburg 1977:90). However, heated debates continued among Stundists for decades between those who baptized infants and those who baptized only adult believers (Brandenburg 1977:92).

---

<sup>26</sup> Mikhail Ratushnyy, the first preacher of Stundism in the Osnova village, was Bonekemper’s helper in spreading the movement (Kutepov 1891:60).

The prominent Baptist leader Pavlov took up contact with the leading Stundists in the Ukraine; at this point the Stundist and Baptist movements flowed into one another (Brandenburg 1977:101). According to Wardin, most Russian Stundists eventually became Russian Baptists (Wardin 1994:51). Thus, the movement which started, in the words of Bishop Alexii of Odessa, as “merely pietist circles for mutual edification” (Brandenburg 1977:70), got assimilated within the better organized and more viable Baptist movement.

In the 1870s a new movement called *Mladostundisty* (Young Stundists or Spiritual Stundists) separated from the main stream of Stundism. The adherents of *Mladostundisty* refused any Christian ordinances including water baptism and the Lord’s Supper. They were similar to Molokans who understood the reading of the Word as partaking in the flesh and blood of Christ. They also refused the office of elders; their groups were led by all members, including women (Kushnev 1916:20; Kutepov 1891:67-68).

It seems that no evangelical movement in Russia was more Bible-centred than Stundism. Very characteristic was a dispute that took place between an Orthodox missionary and a group of Stundists in the village of Petrovskoe. The Stundists insisted that the Word of God (that is, Holy Scripture) contains everything needed for Christians, while the Orthodox missionary argued that not everything needed for salvation is clearly and fully written in the Scriptures (Bogolyubov 1902:3).

As for Stundist hermeneutics, an Orthodox critic pointed out that the Stundist interpretation of the Holy Scripture was carried out “according to inspiration from the Holy Spirit” without any external or visible guide (Ayvazov 1915:57). According to another Orthodox writer, Stundists consider the books of the Old and New Testaments as the only source of the knowledge of God and “offer to any follower of their sect an unlimited freedom on understanding and interpreting of the Holy Scripture” (Kushnev 1916:11). A very important guide in matters of faith was “inner illumination”, which meant that God gave each of them the “true understanding of the Holy Scripture” (Kushnev 1916:16). Stundists taught that every believer has God’s grace which gives him/her the right to interpret the Holy Scripture (Kushnev 1916:25).

Brandenburg also emphasises that the essence of Stundism can be defined as a Bible movement, which is “not concerned with questions of church organization or theological problems . . . rather with living faith and practical

Christianity” (Brandenburg 1977:76). Even the atheist writer Mitrokhin noticed that Stundists were characterized by “free interpretation of the Bible”, meaning free from religious dogmas (Mitrokhin 1997:220).

### **3.1.4.3 Baptists**

The second major thrust of Russian evangelicalism was the German Baptist movement, with personal input by Johann Gerhard Oncken, the father of the continental Baptists. Like other continental evangelists, he was attracted by both eighteenth-century Pietism and the nineteenth-century Awakening, and stressed a more personal, devotional, Bible-centred life. Like other travelling Baptist evangelists, Oncken organised Bible study and prayer groups.<sup>27</sup>

The Russian Baptist movement was “the inevitable result of the German Baptist presence in Russia” (Ellis & Jones 1996:70). This movement started independently among Molokans in the Caucasus and among Stundists in the Ukraine,<sup>28</sup> both regions being parts of the Russian Empire at that time.

In South Russia (Ukraine) Unger baptised Tsymbal; Tsymbal baptised Ryaboshapka, the first Russian propagator of baptism. By the end of the 1860s the Baptist movement was swiftly spreading in the Kherson, Ekaterinoslav, and Kiev gubernia (Bondar 1911:19). The most active Baptist workers among the Orthodox population in southern Russia were Ryaboshapka and Ratushnyy (Karev 1999:98). They both represented South Russian Baptists at the united Congress in St. Petersburg in 1884 called by Pashkov and Korff.

A parallel movement sprang in Tiflis (Tbilisi) where the first Slavic Baptist congregation appeared. Evangelical awakening in the Caucasus started independently from Ukrainian German Stundism. It was prepared by the Molokans who were searching Scripture for themselves (Savinsky 1999:130). In 1867, Molokan leader Nikita Voronin met colporteur Delyakov, who introduced him to German Baptist Kalweit, a messenger of Oncken. Kalweit baptized Voronin by immersion in the Kura River near Tiflis (the capital of Georgia). The

---

<sup>27</sup> *We Baptists* by Study and Research Division, Baptist World Alliance, (Franklin Tn, Providence House Pub., 1999) pp 11-13. Online. (25 September 2005).

<sup>28</sup> Besides Oncken, other German Baptists (Pritzkau, Ondra) and “new-mennonites” (Wieler, Unger) preached there (Bondar 1911:18).

date of Voronin's baptism – August 20, 1867 (Old Style)<sup>29</sup> – is considered the official birth date of Russian Baptists (Rashbrook 1999:187).

Voronin baptized a few other Molokans. Soon six Molokans including Voronin separated from a Molokan congregation and formed a Baptist group.<sup>30</sup> Three years later, a Baptist church in Tiflis included 78 baptised members with Voronin as a presbyter (AUCECB 1989:521-522; Karev 1999:110).

Among those baptised by Voronin in 1871 was sixteen-year-old V. G. Pavlov, who later became one of the leading figures in the movement (Bondar 1911:19; Savinsky 1999:133). At about the same time, Kalweit's group joined the Russian Baptists (Savinsky 1999:133). In 1875 Kalweit suggested sending Pavlov to study in Hamburg at a Baptist seminary<sup>31</sup> which was being organized by Oncken (Savinsky 1999:135). This training institute, created for lay evangelists, later evolved into a seminary.<sup>32</sup> As for the character of the school, it must have been determined by the personality of Oncken who "had no place among scholarly but had a widespread influence for true godliness" (Houghton 1980:240). Pavlov spent one year in Hamburg under Oncken's close supervision (Savinsky 1999:135). This was the same school where Kargel also studied for some time.

The Tiflis congregation accepted the Hamburg Baptist confession of faith as its creed, translated into Russian by Pavlov. In addition, the Tiflis congregation worked out a number of rules concerning its meetings, the Lord's Supper, marriage ceremonies, etc. Those rules were later accepted by other Evangelical-Baptist churches across Russia (Savinsky 1999:138). It is important to remember that "of the three streams which went to make up the Russian

---

<sup>29</sup> Sawatsky sees this date as the beginning of the Russian Evangelical movement (Sawatsky 1995:24). Actually, Russian Stundists in the South of Russia (in Kherson area) started to be baptised by immersion a few years earlier, in 1862 (Karev 1999:93). Thus, the Russian Baptist movement is older than that. Besides, since adult baptism by immersion is not a condition for calling a movement "evangelical", Russian evangelicalism is even older.

<sup>30</sup> Those baptized believers called themselves "Christians baptized by faith". Only later, seeing the similarities between themselves and German Baptists, they adopted the name Baptist (Savinsky 1999:132).

<sup>31</sup> Oncken's Baptist seminary functioned on a regular basis beginning after 1881. Until then, he led five-six month theological courses (Bondar 1911:15).

<sup>32</sup> *We Baptists* by Study and Research Division, Baptist World Alliance, (Franklin Tn, Providence House Pub., 1999) pp 11-13. Online. (25 September 2005).

Evangelical movement . . . only the Baptists had from the beginning a definite denominational character (Brandenburg 1977:xii).

Some “traditions” are still being followed in Evangelical-Baptists churches today. For instance, during the Lord’s Supper (otherwise called “the remembrance of the Lord’s sufferings” or “breaking of the bread”), a presbyter prays over a loaf of bread, then breaks it into pieces, and passes to the deacons who distribute it among those gathered. The same way with the cup: a presbyter prays over the cup of wine, drinks a little bit, and passes it to the deacons who offer the cup to other church members. This ritual is accompanied by reading certain passages from the Gospels and the Epistle to Corinthians (Kutepov 1891:63-64; Kushnev 1916:71-72). Only those who were baptized “as adults by faith” are invited to take part in the Lord’s Supper (Kushnev 1916:142).

Marriage is performed with the express consent of the couple and their parents. A presbyter lays hands upon the heads of the bride and bridegroom who are kneeling; they both pray, then the presbyter prays over them. In the end he joins their hands and pronounces them husband and wife saying that they are united by God and may not be separated (Kutepov 1891:64; Kushnev 1916:72; 141-142). Some of the same songs are still being sung at the occasion, like *Dve ruki* “Two hands” (Kushnev 1916:142).

Baptists are known for strict church discipline. A church member who is persistent in his/her sinful conduct is excommunicated (Kushnev 1916:74). Baptists forbid drinking vodka, playing cards, dancing, singing secular songs, and swearing (Kushnev 1916:75).

Having adopted a “hierarchy” of presbyters and deacons, Baptists in a way violated the original and jealously-kept Russian Stundist principle of having only one Teacher, Jesus Christ, with all believers being equal brothers (Kushnev 1916:134). There were other “misunderstandings” with Stundists, including issues of oaths and serving in the army; in these political matters the Baptists were more tolerant and law-abiding (Kushnev 1916:136-137).

Both streams of the Baptist movement (in the Ukraine and the Caucasus) carried on independently until the 1870s. After they merged in the 1870s, the movement spread very quickly and by 1891 could be found in thirty provinces (Bondar 1911:19). By the end of the Civil War (1921), there were 100,000

Baptists (Sawatsky 1995:23). Evidently the Russians seriously adopted Oncken's famous slogan, "every Baptist a missionary".

In 1879 the Tsarist government granted legal recognition to Baptists, allowing them to preach and form congregations. Their births, marriages, and deaths could finally be registered by civil authorities. Although this law was not equally followed everywhere in the Russian Empire, in Tiflis, V. G. Pavlov, chosen as a presbyter in 1880, was confirmed to this ministry by a local governor (AUCECB 1989:88-89). Baptists maintained close ties with Hamburg; Oncken even visited them twice.<sup>33</sup>

Regarding conversion, Baptists believe that when a person receives the preaching of the Gospel, recognizes himself/herself as a sinner, repents and believes in the saving merits of Christ, he/she is born again. Only a regenerated person can be baptized (by immersion) and become a church member (Kutepov 1891:62; Kushnev 1916:70).

Reacting against the Orthodox worship of the cross, Russian Baptists used to speak of the cross as an instrument of execution. However, with time they started to preach much more about cross as the symbol of the atonement (Kushnev 1916:81).<sup>34</sup>

The very first paragraph of Pavlov's confession of faith states that "the Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith and practice" (Pavlov 1999:263). Further in the "Baptist principles" he included a longer statement on scriptural authority:

The Bible is the divine revelation, given by God to people; it is a full and infallible guide and authority in all matters of religion and morality. One should believe all that it teaches and obey all that it requires; consider all that it suggests as being right and good; avoid all that it condemns as being inaccurate and harmful. However, one should not impose upon another's conscience as a religious obligation the things that are not commanded or taught.

The New Testament is a constitution for a Christian, a charter of freedom, the only authoritative code of laws, a guarantee and a justification of all Christian ascertainments (Pavlov 1999:266).

The fact that the only source of Christian doctrine recognized by Baptisto-Stundists was the canonical books of the Old and the New Testament,

---

<sup>33</sup> *We Baptists* by Study and Research Division, Baptist World Alliance, (Franklin Tn, Providence House Pub., 1999) pp 11-13. Online. (25 September 2005).

and that holy tradition was denied by them was recognized even by their Orthodox opponents (Kutepov 1891:62; Kushnev 1916:70).

There were some Baptist leaders (e. g. a delegate S. Stepanov at All-Russia Baptist Congress) who even in 1910 insisted that the Word of God was their confession of faith and there was no need in any other statements. On the other hand, G. Mazaev argued that they needed a “confession” as a platform uniting Baptists in doctrinal issues (Bogolyubov 1912:38).

#### **3.1.4.4 Pashkovites**

The third source of the Russian evangelical movement was St. Petersburg’s awakening that started through the ministry of Radstock, Müller, and Baedeker, who belonged to the Open Brethren (Brandenburg 1977:47-48). Whereas the Molokans, Stundists, and Baptists were mostly coming from the southern part of the country, the movement of Radstockists-Pashkovites originated in the north, in St. Petersburg, a city which came to be “the window to the West” and a centre for foreign religions in the Russian Empire. The movement emerged in 1874 and eventually grew into a union of churches officially called Evangelical Christians.<sup>35</sup> I will deal with the history of this movement in greater detail in Chapter 4. Here I will only briefly mention a few characteristics showing that Pashkovites fully qualified to be called evangelicals.

It was under the gospel preaching of Lord Radstock that evangelicalism penetrated high society of the Russian capital. A number of the Russian elite came to faith during the spring of 1874.<sup>36</sup> A few months later V. A. Pashkov, a

---

<sup>34</sup> An unregistered Evangelical Christian Baptist church in Leningrad for decades had the scripture passage “We preach Christ crucified” in the front. This emphasis can be seen in Russian Evangelical-Baptist churches up to this day.

<sup>35</sup> There is confusion and overlap when it comes to the names of different evangelical groups in Russia. For instance, Pashkovites were first known as Radstockists and then from the middle of the 1890s as Evangelical Christians. In the beginning they preferred not to use any specific name to identify themselves and saw themselves as “believers” or “Christians only” (Savinsky 1999:244; Ellis & Jones 1996:85,108). Sophia Liven wrote in her memoirs, that they were first called Radstockists, then Pashkovites, in the Baltics they were thought to be Baptists, later they accepted the name of the Evangelical Christians (Lieven 1967:8).

<sup>36</sup> Two active Pashkovites, E. I. Chertkova and N. F. Lieven, experienced regeneration prior to Radstock’s visit in St. Petersburg (AUCECB 1989:52).

colonel of the imperial guard, underwent a similar experience of forgiveness. Soon he began gathering mixed class audiences and preaching the message that salvation could be attained right then. The numbers of hearers increased rapidly. Although Pashkov was not the only labourer spreading the gospel in St. Petersburg, it was due to his outstanding energy, effort, and contribution that the local group of believers became known as Pashkovites.

For about twenty years Pashkovites did not have a formal church organization. The name “evangelical” was first mentioned in a written manuscript circulating among St. Petersburg believers in the second half of the 1890s, containing the confession of “evangelical” faith (Savinsky 1999:244; Pashkovshchina 1897:3).

The message of Lord Radstock and his followers was indeed very simple, “too simple” and “too easy” for an Orthodox ear: Christ had done all that was needed to achieve salvation, in order to be saved one must only believe and accept forgiveness of sins (Bogolyubov 1912:7). “It was easier to be saved than not to be saved!” exclaimed Archpriest Sakharov (Sakharov 1897:16). An unknown opponent summarised it well:

Instead of a Church with God-established hierarchy and God-set sacraments, both teachers [Radstock and Pashkov] preach salvation through the recognition of one’s sins before the Lord and faith in Christ, the only Mediator before God. Recognize your sins, believe in Christ, and you are Christ’s, you will become a partaker of new life (Sect of Pashkovites 1895:5).

The neglecting of teaching about “good works”, the greatest fault of the Pashkovites from the Orthodox point of view, did not stop Pashkovites from doing those “good works” in abundance. They helped the needy, visited the sick and those in prisons. The change of life of converted people was too striking to remain unnoticed. For instance, Pashkov himself “stopped gambling, dropped expensive recreations with horses and hunting, stopped going to theatres and even smoking . . .” (Zhivotov 1891:34). Similar changes in other Pashkovites could not go unnoticed either, even by those who were far from being sympathetic with the movement. Dostoyevsky, in his letter to Suvorin, rebuked him for publishing articles in defence of Pashkov and the Pashkovites in *Novoe Vremya* [New Time] in May, 1880 (Dostoyevsky 1959:143). Nevertheless, according to Dostoyevsky’s earlier remark, Radstock “does produce

extraordinary conversions and inspires the hearts of his followers to magnanimous sentiments” (Dostoyevsky 1981:99).

Surprised, Zhivotov noted,

I could have named a number of countesses and duchesses comprising the ‘cream of the crop’ in society whom I saw wandering in the outskirts, markets, and in the middle of nowhere preaching the turning to Christ. And what a strange thing! People preach faith without works, and at the same time they base all their activity on charity and help the poor with an open hand (Zhivotov 1891:22).

Now, instead of taking part in secular pleasures, Pashkovites demonstrated a striking desire for the conversion of others, because “for the followers of Radstock, spiritual renewal... was the goal” (Ellis & Jones 1996:85). Meetings were started in every home where the owner was converted (Korff, Vospominaniya, in Karev 1999:125). Indeed, “the Russians were natural and instant missionaries when their faith was stirred” (Ellis & Jones 1996:96).

According to Bebbington, the Bible was always held in high esteem by all Protestants, but the Evangelicals especially devoted themselves to personally searching Scripture (Bebbington 1989:3). This was certainly true about evangelicals in St. Petersburg who referred to Scripture constantly and “sought deeper understanding of the word of God” (Ellis & Jones 1996:85). S. Liven remembered that according to Lord Radstock’s own testimony during his second visit to St. Petersburg he saw the necessity of getting believers more deeply rooted in Holy Scripture, in understanding of what is a renewed Christian life, and also pointing out their responsibility before God and the world (Lieven 1967:31-32).

Some thirty years later Countess Shuvalova with great appreciation remembered how Lord Radstock had opened to them, “spiritual babies”, the richness and depth of the whole Scripture, not just some passages or verses (Lieven 1967:32). “This way Russian evangelical believers from the very first days got strongly rooted in the Word of God, which helped them to stand during the times of persecutions and to resist false teachings” (Lieven 1967:32). Zhivotov could not believe that Ephim, a simple locksmith, quoted whole chapters from Scripture in a debate with an Orthodox missionary, or that Malan’ya, an Alexandrovsky market-woman, knew all the favourite Pashkovite passages by heart and interpreted (by herself!) the Holy Scripture (Zhivotov 1891:43).

The extent of publishing the Old and New Testaments in modern Russian through the Pashkovite Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading was truly unprecedented. “The only readily available reading materials were the Bible and the brochures of the Pashkovite Society. True, the Holy Synod’s Bible had been published in 1878, but not so available and was sold at enormous cost, whereas the Pashkovite literature was mostly free” (Heier 2002:128-129).

A devotion to crucicentrism is clearly seen in the preaching of Dr. Baedeker, one of the most influential foreign teachers among Pashkovites. Baedeker’s biographer points out that Dr. Baedeker had only “one theme ‘Jesus Christ and Him crucified’ under whatever title it was announced” (Latimer 1908:57).

Thus, the Pashkovite movement that sprang up in St. Petersburg was truly evangelical in nature. All main features of evangelicalism (according to Bebbington) are present and well developed. It is not surprising when knowing that its roots go into English evangelicalism due to the ministry of Lord Radstock, whose influence was strong even after his removal from the Russian mission field. According to Nichols, an expert in “Pashkovism”, this “third pietistic stream” was different from other contributories to Russian evangelicalism in several ways. First, it was the least formally organized. Second, its leadership was comprised of aristocracy and as such had greater means for spreading across the country. Then, it endured persecution better than the others (Nichols 1991:5), not to mention that it was the least persecuted.

#### **3.1.4.5 Mennonite Brethren**

Although the appearance of Mennonite Brethren was a result of an evangelical awakening among German colonists (that is, not among Russian people), they must be also mentioned because of their strong links with other evangelical groups within the Russian Empire and later Soviet Russia. Their influence upon the Russian evangelical movement was quite significant. Besides, one must not forget the missionary zeal of Mennonite Brethren among the Slavic population, which made them another “secret source of Stundism” (Brandenburg 1977:23).

Mennonite history goes back to Menno Simons, who gathered Anabaptists in the sixteenth century and founded a chain of fellowships from Amsterdam to Danzig (Fast 1986). The Anabaptist theological position with some variations was characterised by allegiance to believers' baptism, separation of state and church, a sense of living in the last days, church discipline, and spiritualizing of the biblical text "existing alongside biblicism" (Fast 1986).

Mennonites were invited to Russia due to the tsarist programme of colonisation of the southern Russian territories. Having the Anabaptist heritage, Mennonites rejected military service on principle. When promised complete exemption from military and civil service, they were ready to respond to the invitation to go east (Payne 1961:53; Brandenburg 1977:23). In 1788 Mennonite families from the area of Danzig accepted an official Russian invitation to settle in Ukraine and within the next eighty years some ten thousand Mennonites moved there.<sup>37</sup>

According to Brandenburg, the first group of Mennonites came to Russia in 1789-1796 and settled in Khortitsa (Ekaterinoslav); the second group came in 1802-1809 and settled along the Molochna; those who came after 1860 settled in the north of the Caucasus, in the Urals, and Siberia (Brandenburg 1977:23). After the massive migration of 1803-1805 few Mennonites came to Russia. However, between 1818 and 1820 at least 242 families migrated to Molochna (Urry 1987:220). Altogether, by 1917 there were 120,000 Mennonites in Russia (Payne 1961:54).

Mennonites in general refused giving oaths and occupying of government positions. They were characterized by simplicity of life, avoidance of luxuries, and adherence to strict moral principles (Kushnev 1916:169). Mennonite congregations are characterised by "Biblical piety" (Payne 1961:55), especially Mennonites in Germany who are "on the whole of a pietistic temper" (Payne 1961:53). The tradition of holding *Stunde* was brought by new German settlers to German Mennonite colonies in the south of Russia in 1817 (Kutepov 1891:59).

---

<sup>37</sup> "Not only Mennonites rushed to Russia, but also German Lutherans and Reformed, particularly from among the Pietists despised in Germany" (Karev A. V. "Evangelical Christian-Baptists and the Mennonites" *Bratskiy Vestnik* 3/68: 11-15, in Sawatsky 1976:237).

Mennonite Brethren communities had come into being in 1860 through the activity of Eduard Wuest, a Lutheran who found a warm welcome among the Mennonite colonists of Southern Russia (Payne 1961:39; Brandenburg 1977:48). A revival took place which led to forming a new body called “Mennonite Brethren Church”. “With copies of the New Testaments in hands they visited colonists’ homes” arguing that “Mennonites went astray from the pure evangelical teaching” (Kushnev 1916:170). For reasons of conscience, its evangelists could no longer consider themselves bound by the governmental decree forbidding proselytism among the Russians (Brandenburg 1977:23). Some of those colonists who were touched by the revival began hosting home Bible studies, to which they invited their Ukrainian and Russian summer workers, *batraki*, and neighbours (Karetnikova 1999:73-74; Karev 1999:87, 89).

Wuest was a representative of “new pietism” stressing an individual mystical piety. “New pietists” believed in inner regeneration of the human heart; their goal was the awakening of a sinner, and repentance from sinful ways to the holy and new life (AUCECB 1989:40-41). While Bonekemper believed that Stundists could remain in officially recognised churches influencing them for good, Wuest held to the idea of forming a congregation that would consist only of “true” believers, that is, those who repented, and were regenerate (AUCECB 1989:41-42). Those “new pietists” called themselves “Wuest Brotherhood” and most of them lived along the Molochnye Vody (AUCECB 1989:53).

The revival at the time of Eduard Wuest led to a new baptismal form among the Mennonite Brethren, the blessing of infants, with believer’s baptism at a later date. This led to a serious conflict between the older Mennonites and the Mennonite Brethren (Brandenburg 1977:91). The conflict between the Older Mennonites and Mennonite Brethren was over the issue of baptism: Mennonite Brethren blessed infants and adopted the doctrine of believers’ baptism by immersion (Payne 1961:236; Brandenburg 1977:91), which points to Baptist influence (Payne 1961:54). Actually, baptism by immersion and closed communion (only for those baptised as adults) became obligatory among Brethren Mennonites only in 1862-1863 under the influence of Unger who received a written explanation of the issue from Oncken (AUCECB 1898:55). Thus, Mennonite Brethren were formed due to “Oncken’s influence, combined with the classic Pietistic preaching of the Mennonite communities” (Nichols 2007:77).

Along with Baptists, Mennonite Brethren supported Stundists

(Brandenburg 1977:90) and encouraged them to baptise adults. For example, the Mennonite G. Wieler<sup>38</sup> from Molochna colony taught believers' baptism among Ukrainian Stundists. Thus, the Mennonite movement should be seen as an important factor in the development of Stundism into a Baptist community (Brandenburg 1977:93). On the other hand, "the influence of Mennonites on Russian Baptists may be seen perhaps in the tendency which the latter have shown at various times towards pacifism" (Payne 1961:54).

However, the relationships between Baptists and Mennonites were not always easy going. The Mennonites with their longer history did not want to be allied with Baptists. They held firmly to their conviction of refusing armed service, while the Baptists were more tolerant in this issue. The Mennonites banned the use of tobacco, while Baptists did not (Brandenburg 1977:91). For their Confession of faith (compiled by Unger in 1876) they used as a basis Oncken's Hamburg confession of faith with an addition pointing to some differences between Baptists and Mennonite Brethren: unlike Baptists they firmly rejected military service, refused to take oaths, and practised foot washing.<sup>39</sup>

In other matters, such as church organization, excommunication, and adult baptism they were identical (AUCECB 1989:55). "Their cult, church organisation, ways of propaganda, and the spirit of proselytising is the same as among Stundo-baptists" (Kushnev 1916:170). Besides, they had consensus in such important matters as regeneration and their attitude towards Scripture. "Neither Baptist nor Mennonite could deny that the new birth is essential and that theology must be biblicist" (Sawatsky 1976:234).

Eventually Mennonite pietism blended into the work of the Baptists (Nichols 1991:3) and after the World War II joined the AUCECB.

### 3.1.5 Conclusion

Thus, in the mid-nineteenth century one could witness the "almost simultaneous appearance" of German Baptists, Mennonite Brethren, and

---

<sup>38</sup> He was the chairman at the Russian Baptist conference in Novovasil'evka on April 30, 1884 (Brandenburg 1977:94).

<sup>39</sup> These differences became issues of disputes and disagreements for decades ahead.

Russian Stundists. “Adherents of these bodies formed their own congregations outside the legally established churches – Lutheran, Old Mennonite, or Orthodox. Still later other evangelical bodies appeared – the Evangelical Christians, coming from the Pashkovite movement which originated among the aristocracy of St. Petersburg” (Wardin 1994:51). “The emergence of a new stream of Pietism and Evangelical renewal in the 1860s precipitated a religious ferment not only among isolated colonists but their Slavic neighbours as well” (Ivanov 2002:28). Kushnev complained that by 1916 one could hardly find a village where, in one way or another, the propaganda of Baptism, Pashkovism, Stundism, etc., was not seen (Kushnev 1916:3).

An Orthodox scholar attributed the fast spread of Baptism-Stundism among Russian peasants to the emancipation of the serfs, distribution of the Holy Scripture being freely interpreted, abstention of the “sectarians” from vodka and fornication, and their mutual help (Kutepov 1891:61). Thus, searching Scripture for themselves was considered one of the main causes for the growth of the Evangelical movement in Russia, even from the Orthodox point of view. Sawatsky points to similar main factors that in the 1860s initiated the emergence of the evangelical movement in Russia: pietism, the sect of Molokans, and the publication of the Bible in vernacular (Sawatsky 1995:27).

All five groups discussed above show deep devotion to the Bible as the highest authority in all matters of faith and life. According to bishop Aleksii, the main tenets of these movements in the second half of the nineteenth century were justification by faith alone and the Bible as the only source of belief (Aleksii 1908:II). They appealed to it constantly. This feature stands out as their main priority. The main difference between them and most Orthodox Christians was that the evangelicals actually read Scripture and stood for the right to interpret it on their own. Besides, they took it very seriously, putting it into practice to the best of their understanding. The entire Evangelical movement (including Baptists) was a Bible-based, pietistic Christianity, which used the epistemology of Scottish Common Sense Realism (Nichols 1991:5). “The evangelical movement in Russia was and still is today a Bible movement” (Brandenburg 1977:60). “In the homes of Molokans, Stundists and Evangelical-Baptists the Bible became ‘the table book’ eagerly read and studied” (Karev 1999:113).

Orthodox writers more than once expressed a sense of intimidation about ungoverned and free interpretation of Scripture performed by different

“sectarians” as they accept Scripture as being the only source of true doctrine. In Orthodoxy the interpretation is governed by the Church. If any and every believer can interpret the Scripture for himself/herself, what can come of it? Where are the borders of an interpreter’s fantasies?

What guides Molokans, Stundists, Baptists, Adventists, “Evangelicals” and other sectarians in the process of interpretation of the Holy Scripture besides their own mind?! Is it not from their «false knowledge» that *mutual contradictions* spring among them just like among any others who had refused oral apostolic tradition? There is no wonder, however, because everyone of them tells what it seems right to him and presents an arbitrary personal interpretation of the Scripture for the truth of God . . . While true understanding is preserved in that “teaching” (2 Tim 3, 14) which the Apostles had passed orally to their disciples, and they to their successors, and which was later written down and became known under the *written Holy Tradition*. It is this Tradition that should be addressed by anyone who reads and wants to understand the written by the Apostles the Word of God (Ayvazov 1914:11-12).

So, what guided Russian evangelicals in their interpretation of the Bible? It was their hermeneutical principles, which I am going to discuss in the last chapter of my thesis.

The next outstanding feature of various evangelical groups was the importance of repentance, conversion, and, as a result, a changed way of life. Considering that the Russian evangelical laboured under very severe disadvantages, such as mockery, the deprivation of rights, and open persecution to the point of death, there was no reason for the evangelicals to suffer unless they were very serious and sincere about their beliefs.

Fast growth of the movement is the best evidence that Russian Evangelicals were spreading their faith to others. And again, the cost for “proselytizing” was great. However, no measures taken by the state or the Church could stop them. The movement was steadily growing in numbers among both the high society and common folk.

It is important to note that almost from the beginning these groups were aware of each other. In 1884 in St. Petersburg at the famous gathering initiated and sponsored by Pashkov and Korff there were representatives from Molokans, Baptists, Dukhobors, Stundists, Mennonites, and other separated groups from Tiflis (Heier 2002:144). One of the main issues on the agenda was bringing all these groups into one union. Although formal union proved to be

impossible, one of the greatest achievements of the congress was that representatives of different trends got to know each other.

Indeed, historically these contributories were sharing a lot of common features. Both Baptists and Mennonites were coming from the left wing of the Reformation. Pashkovites, Russian Stundists, Mennonite Brethren, and even Oncken's Baptists were born out of pietism and revivalism. Still, there were a number of differences in forms and even such doctrines as baptism or communion. However, their commitment to personal Bible study, regenerated life style, and evangelism was greater than their differences in rules, rituals, and church organisation. They did not unite officially under one name, but they did overcome smaller differences and find unity in mutual ministry and fellowship.

Nichols makes a strong point saying that pietism was a common feature of all three generally recognized main flows to a wider stream of Russian Evangelicalism. "It is the combination of the Bible and pietistic doctrine which forms the various tributaries of Russian Evangelicalism. In Ukraine Edward Wuest brought Pietism to the Mennonites. In the Caucasus Martin Kalweit baptized Molokans and led them into a deeper Christian life. In St. Petersburg Lord Radstock and Colonel Pashkov preached pietism by word and example" (Nichols 1991:xvi). Brandenburg also says that "it is important to note that not only St. Petersburg, but also the Ukraine maintained relations with Halle, the town of August Hermann Franke. Pietism was not wholly foreign to the Ukrainians" (Brandenburg 1977:58). Pietism appealed to the Russians: German pietism in the South, and British pietism in the North. After all, "the despised pietists knew how to work, as well as to pray" (Brandenburg 1977:23-24).

### ***3.2 Foreign Evangelical Influences***

#### **3.2.1 Movements**

Protestant ideas began to enter Russia almost simultaneously with their expansion in Europe. Even during Martin Luther's life some protestant congregations were established right in Moscow. During the rule of Prince Vasiliy Ivanovich (1524-1533), many "luthors" (as Martin Luther's followers were called in Russia) arrived in Moscow working as doctors, pharmacists, merchants, and artists (Butkevich 1913:1).

Before the 1917 Revolution St. Petersburg had “the strongest concentration of the Protestant element” (Brandenburg 1977:18). By the 1890s there were two Episcopal churches, two Reformed churches, one Dutch church, and eight Lutheran churches in St. Petersburg (Zhivotov 1891:118-119). Around the year 1900 there were up to 100,000 Protestants in St. Petersburg, that is, ten percent of the city’s population (Brandenburg 1977:19). However, German Protestants did not play a large role in the awakening at the time of Alexander I when the Russian Bible Society was established, since the Protestant Church in St. Petersburg was then “gripped by an arid rationalism”. But this changed in the course of the century (Brandenburg 1977:103).

Besides, for a long time in those Protestant churches there was a permanent ban on preaching sermons in the Russian language (Brandenburg 1977:19). Protestants were not allowed to proselytise among the Orthodox population and for the most part they obeyed that requirement. Up to 1873 Protestant and Reformed preaching was conducted in all European languages except Russian. Only in 1873 A. Mazing, a Lutheran pastor, received permission to preach in Russian (Zhivotov 1891:119). So, because of that ban there was not much influence of the officially recognised Protestant denominations upon the Russian evangelical movement. It was the ministry of itinerant foreign preachers-evangelists that had “profound influence on the lives and teaching of the enthusiastic believers” (Corrado 2000:112).<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Actually there had been evangelical preaching in St. Petersburg which brought forth a “mini-revival” prior to Lord Radstock, whose ministry is sometimes called “the second revival” in St. Petersburg (Karev 1999:118). It would not do justice to the study of Russian evangelicalism if I do not mention Gossner’s input. When Alexander I was faced with the necessity of calling a Catholic priest to the Maltese church in St. Petersburg, he wanted to find a man who, despite his affiliation to the Catholic Church, preached an evangelical gospel. The priest found was J. Gossner. He spent in St. Petersburg only four years (1820-1824) (Karetnikova 2001:9-10), but his influence was amazing. Gossner wrote to his friends in Germany, “A wide door for the gospel has been opened to me here”. Every Sunday a mass was followed by an evangelical sermon (Brandenburg 1977:34-35). He also held Bible discussions in private homes and taught religious classes for young people and children (Brandenburg 1977:36, 39). Gossner’s nondenominational Christianity, as it was classified by Brandenburg (Brandenburg 1977:39), was an important trend that was picked up later by the Pashkovite group. Thus, the way was prepared for the arrival of evangelical preachers like Radstock, Baedeker, Müller, etc.

Lord G. W. Radstock (an Open Brethren preacher) was among the relatively few effective Evangelical missionaries who promoted the growth of Protestantism among Russians in the last quarter of the nineteenth century (Elliot & Deyneka 1999:197). Other foreign guests who influenced the evangelical movement in St. Petersburg included members of the Evangelical Alliance such as Friedrich Baedeker; representatives of the Holiness Movement such as Jessie Penn-Lewis, Otto Stockmayer, and H. Grattan Guinness; interdenominational student leaders such as John Mott; and social workers such as George Müller and Mildred Duff of the Salvation Army (Nichols 2007:83).

Most of these missionaries came from the British Isles and continental Europe. Since they were the ones who influenced the most the initial stage of Evangelical movement (Pashkovites) in St. Petersburg, it seems important to review the theological background of these people as well as a broader background of English evangelicalism in the second half of the nineteenth century, especially up to the mid 1870s, when Radstock started his ministry in Russia.

I want to find out exactly where foreign evangelical movements could have influenced the Pashkovites. In order to accomplish this task I will first briefly look into the history and theology of these movements, especially concentrating on those aspects that were paralleled in the Pashkovite congregation. Second, I will provide more details on the individual missionaries and preachers who laboured in St. Petersburg. Third, when discussing the local key figures of St. Petersburg's revival I will attempt to draw connections between theology and practice brought from outside and the results that were produced in St. Petersburg.

### **3.2.1.1 General tendencies in British evangelicalism by 1870s**

The hundred years prior to World War I are defined by Bebbington "the Evangelical century" (Bebbington 1989:149). According to *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, on the one hand, the evangelical movement "may be equivalent of 'pietistic', 'revival confessing', or 'biblical-reformational'; on the other, it may be the opposite of 'liberal', 'ecumenical', or 'historicocritical'" (Geldbach 1986). Its roots go into German Pietism, Methodism, and the Great Awakening in the American colonies of the eighteenth century (Geldbach 1986). This movement

is responsible for organizing Bible and missionary societies, for producing such Nonconformist as C. H. Spurgeon, the Salvation Army with William Booth, the China Inland Mission with Hudson Taylor, the Keswick Movement, the Evangelical Alliance (1846), the Holiness movement, and dispensational premillennialists represented by the *Scofield Reference Bible* (Geldbach 1986).

*The Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* defines evangelicalism as “the movement in modern Christianity, transcending denominational and confessional boundaries, that emphasises conformity to the basic tenets of the faith and a missionary outreach of compassion and urgency” (Pierard 1984). This definition is a very broad one and can be applied to different periods of evangelical history. However, the movement was far from being static. Therefore I am going to concentrate on a specific stage of British evangelicalism of the time when it was “imported” to Russia.

Beside sharing the main Protestant doctrines, evangelicals have some characteristics of their own which I briefly mentioned above under “the scope” of my work. Now I am going to look at some details. “Heralding the Word of God” has always been an important landmark of evangelicalism (Pierard 1984). According to Bebbington,<sup>41</sup> one of the most important trends in British Evangelicalism of the second half of the nineteenth century was a stress on missions both at home and abroad which was more important than denominational boundaries and scholarship. Then, in the 1870s the arrival of “the enormously influential undenominational evangelists Moody and Sankey” marked the beginning of “a fresh phase in organised evangelism” (Bebbington 1989:117). Preaching the Gospel was considered much more important than scholarship. After all, “the acquisition of human wisdom would not bring a person to heaven”. It might even be dangerous to Christian truth, especially if it comes from Germany (Bebbington 1989:137).

The time of the believers had “other calls upon it” (Bebbington 1989:137). Evangelicals had more immediate duties: “the Christian minister who can, in the present day, spend much time in the field of literature and science, must either be ignorant of the dangers by which the flock is threatened, or heedless of the responsibilities by which he himself is bound” (Bebbington 1989:138).

From the 1870s onwards, Evangelicalism was deeply influenced by a new holiness movement. It “ushered in a new phase in Evangelical history. There was . . . between 1870 and 1876 a change of religious climate . . . The fresh spirituality revitalised congregations and induced many to offer for missionary service . . . it blurred ecclesiastical boundaries and softened the doctrinal inheritance” (Bebbington 1989:179). Terms like “consecration of ourselves to God” and “entire sanctification” came into use already in the 1860s, during the Evangelical Alliance week of prayer and then, in the 1870s, were employed in the new teaching (Bebbington 1989:162).

Advocates of this teaching urged that Christians should aim for holiness, a “second decisive experience beyond conversion”. The Reformation settled the struggle between two doctrines: sanctification by faith and sanctification by works. The Reformation principle was that salvation is the gift of God to the person who trusted Christ. The advocates of holiness “were simply pressing the principle further. . . God is willing to give holiness, as he is to confer salvation” (Bebbington 1989:150). The holiness movement offered what many late nineteenth century Evangelicals wanted: a means of coping with challenges of their era (Bebbington 1989:152).

In general, evangelicals view Scripture as “the divinely inspired record of God’s revelation, the infallible, authoritative guide for faith and practice” (Pierard 1984). However, “inspiration is not mechanical dictation; rather, the Holy Spirit has guided the various biblical authors in their selection of words and meanings” (Pierard 1984). In the area of interpretation, “the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit is required to bring out the divine meaning embedded in the text and to apply it to our lives” (Pierard 1984).

By the early 1870s “Evangelicalism was on its ebb... Vital religion seemed threatened at the same time by the twin foes of rationalism and ritualism” (Bebbington 1989:152). The Evangelical world was moving towards the split over the status of the Bible, however, the division between liberal and conservative was not complete until the 1920s. The conservatives made the Bible central, and, although they differed in their views on the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture, they were united in treating it as uniquely trustworthy

---

<sup>41</sup> For a review of British evangelicalism I will mainly rely upon Bebbington’s study of the subject: Bebbington, D W 1989. *Evangelicalism in modern Britain: A history from the 1730s to*

and authoritative. Many spoke of the verbal inspiration of the Bible and stressed its literal interpretation (Bebbington 1989:182). Liberals wished to modify received theology in the light of current thought. Biblical inspiration, for example, was reinterpreted as the uplifting power of the arts (Bebbington 1989:183). The development of modern biblical criticism was sharply challenged in the Down Grade Controversy of 1887-1888. C. H. Spurgeon, pastor of the Baptist Metropolitan Tabernacle and the most popular preacher of the day, severely condemned emerging liberal tendencies (Johnson 1984; Bebbington 1989:145-146).

In their eschatology evangelicals “look for the visible, personal return of Jesus Christ to set up his kingdom of righteousness, a new heaven and earth” and believe in the final judgement over the world (Pierard 1984). Eschatology became another reason for the Evangelical division that was going to take place in 1920s. More precisely, it was the rise of premillennialism (Bebbington 1989:191), the eschatological theory that had been around since the 1830s (Coad 1976:129-134). The dispensationalism of J. N. Darby (1800-1882), “the most systematic brand of futurism” (its advocates argued that all predictions of Daniel and Revelation were still to be fulfilled) taught about a coming rapture of the church. Furthermore, those who believed in the imminence of the Second Advent, “the decisive divine entry into history”, were attracted by the idea that the power of God could already break into human lives. And when Christ returned, he would surely expect his people to be pure (Bebbington 1989:152).

This way, the background tendencies were the following: undenominationalism, evangelism, downplaying scholarship, holiness teaching, controversy over the status of the Bible (since those who ministered in St. Petersburg came from the conservative wing of English Evangelicalism, the Bible was presented as uniquely trustworthy and absolutely authoritative), dispensationalism, and premillennialism. These will be also found in Russian Evangelicalism: evangelism being more important than denominational affiliation or theological scholarship, hope for the imminent rapture, stress upon holiness, and a strong belief in biblical authority.

As for practical life of the believers, some ministry methods of British evangelicalism of the period look almost like carbon copies of those among the

St. Petersburg evangelicals. For now I will only name a few described by Bebbington. Evangelicals did not wait for people to come to their places of worship; they went to people. Second, female ministry, justified as an exceptional measure for exceptional times, became more common. Third, evangelical meetings included domestic servants. Fourth, evening services could be followed by a prayer meeting or after-meeting conversations where a significant proportion of conversions would take place (Bebbington 1989:117-118).

Beyond Sunday gatherings there was “a battery” of other activities: weekly prayer meetings (two or three individuals might be asked to lead in the prayer, or else free prayer might be permitted); Bible classes were held for special sections of the congregation: female servants, mothers from the working classes, working men, ladies, etc; other gatherings such as sewing meetings for the poor could subserve spiritual purposes (Bebbington 1989:118). These common Evangelical practices in England were found in St. Petersburg. It remains a question to what extent they were adopted or invented, but whatever the case, early St. Petersburg evangelicals were ministering in “English style”.

### **3.2.1.2 *The Brethren movement***

Among the various evangelical developments that Great Britain and continental Europe witnessed during the nineteenth century, the Brethren movement seems to be the most influential in regard to the theology and practice of St. Petersburg’s Pashkovites. After all, the Pashkovites came into existence due to Radstock’s ministry, “an evangelical Anglican layman who mixed freely with Brethren and was a favourite speaker at many of their meetings” (Coad 1976:195). Brandenburg points out that Lord Radstock actually belonged to the Open Brethren, as did George Müller and Dr. Baedeker, two men of German origin who followed Radstock’s footsteps to Russia (Brandenburg 1977:105) after his banishment from the country.

In the words of Brock, the Plymouth Brethren were “among the many fruits of the evangelical piety within British Protestantism” (Brock 1984:30). Generally speaking, the Brethren were “part of the main stream of Victorian evangelicalism” (McDowell 1983:211), and “in the wake of the 1859-60 revival the Brethren were expanding in numbers and seemed to be the avant-garde of keen Evangelicalism” (Bebbington 1989:159). So, their theological accents are

expected to be similar to British evangelical ones. However, there were some peculiarities inherent to the Brethren that must be mentioned before I turn to look at Kargel's teaching in the second part of my work in order to determine the extent to which it reflects Brethren teaching.

A condensed version of Brethren history includes the following facts. The first congregation of Plymouth Brethren was formed in Plymouth in 1831 with "a desire to return to the simplicity of apostolic days and worship, and to break down the walls that divided Christians" (Howley 1978). The movement was a reaction against "deadness, formalism, and sectarianism" in Christianity of the early nineteenth century (Howley 1978). The group, including J. N. Darby<sup>42</sup> (1880-1882), met in a private house for weekly Scripture reading, the breaking of bread, and prayer (Coad 1976:83; Howley 1978). The Christians whom Darby met in Dublin, and who gathered during the week to read the Bible and to pray, came from various ecclesiastical backgrounds (Darby 1972:133). This was basically a British version of *Stunde*.

According to Randall, the "primary liturgical focus" of the Brethren reflected evangelical priorities and "was crucicentric" (Randall 1999:144). Free celebration of the Lord's Supper, their Sunday morning breaking of bread service (Randall 1999:144), was "their most prized and persistent liberty" (Coad 1976:207). According to their own testimony it was the main feature that distinguished Brethren from established denominations. "At the Lord's Supper Brethren were, they believed, doing more than simply remembering Christ"; they felt "a special *realisation* of His presence" (Randall 1999:157).

The Brethren were growing quickly in numbers, especially among the English and Irish, and particularly in their upper classes (Coad 1976:84). Their zeal for evangelism and readiness to evangelize at all times is well presented in Ironside's words:

Preaching in barns, public halls, theatres, on village greens, the street corners, by the seaside, at race-tracks and in all other places where the public could be gathered together. It was with amazement that people listened to uneducated men from the humbler walks of life, and cultured gentlemen from the highest society, even titled personages at times, all preaching with fervour and the holy enthusiasm.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Darby, the theoretical genius of Plymouth Brethren, had left behind him some fifteen hundred churches and over forty "ample volumes" of writings (Coad 1976:107).

Unfortunately, Brethrenism, which began as protest against divisions within the Church, did not escape schisms. Some fifteen years after its emergence divisions started to take place leading to appearance of two distinct groups: a larger group of Open Brethren (including Bethesda Chapel in Bristol with George Müller as a pastor) and Exclusive Brethren (the Darbyist group). By 1850 the Brethren movement was “irremediably divided” (Coad 1976:165). The Darbyist Brethren were developing centralized church government and took the position of separation from other Christian groups (Howley 1978). As the years passed they became more and more “introverted and mystical” (Coad 1976:165).

Open Brethren<sup>44</sup>, the group mainly organized and led by G. Müller, were opposed to the mutual excommunication which Darby and Newton pronounced upon each other (Nichols 1991:7). They maintained their original “open” principles<sup>45</sup> towards other Christian groups (Howley 1978; Randall 1999:142). They did not have powerful central leadership and adopted the Congregationalist principle where each local church was free to run its own affairs (Darby 1972:134). As the two groups parted over the issue of separatism, most of their theology continued to be shared. I will go over some of their emphases pointing to the differences between “Open” and “Exclusive” only when necessary.

In the area of Brethren bibliology and interpretation, the place of the Bible was classically Protestant. They approached Scripture “from within a very strict framework of traditional Protestant orthodoxy”, fully accepting the basic Protestant understanding of the authority of Scripture (Coad 1976:254-255). The Brethren believed that “the Bible is the infallible and sufficient guide” for believers (Coad 1976:224). For them “it was axiomatic that study of the Bible was the way to spiritual growth” (Randall 1999:145).

All early Brethren leaders regarded the Scriptures as the final court of appeal in doctrinal matters as well as in practical matters of Christian living (Coad 1976:254). H. Craik summed up the Brethren view on Biblical authority in

---

<sup>43</sup> Ironside, *A Historical Sketch*, p. 27, in Hagan 1975:349.

<sup>44</sup> It was this Open Brethren group that Radstock was associated with, while Baedeker and Müller were prominent figures in it.

<sup>45</sup> Open Brethren did not move towards more formal terms in the matters of the Lord’s Supper, baptism, and church government until the 1880s (Howley 1978).

the following way: “What we mean by the authority of the Bible, is the authority of the Bible when rightly read, correctly translated, and judiciously expounded and applied”.<sup>46</sup> Recognizing the power of presuppositions in the matter of interpretation, Groves, one of the earliest Brethren leaders, wrote,

Brethren came to the consideration of things in the Divine word with hearts pre-occupied by a ready-made decision, more in union with the worldly system, by which we are pressed on every side. And, against all this overwhelming influence, there is but one remedy, to read the word of God with a single view to know His will, by whom it was inspired.<sup>47</sup>

With *Sola scriptura* as their “motto”, the Brethren “went further than many others who had adopted this slogan” (Brock 1984:31). For them *Sola scriptura* meant radical separation from the world, rejection of paid clergy, a simple form of service around the Lord’s Supper with the Breaking of the Bread, withdrawal from politics, simple living, and a playing down of class distinctions (Brock 1984:31). According to Rowdon, the Brethren teaching “was essentially an attempt to take the Protestant stress on the authority of scripture seriously” (Rowdon 1990:101).

Hagan sees “strong biblicism” as one of their main emphases (Hagan 1975:348). “They were often called ‘walking Bibles’ because of their familiarity with and constant reference to both Old and New Testaments” (Hagan 1975:348). Rowdon calls the Brethren “people of the book” who can be “scrupulously literalistic in their interpretation of New Testament passages” (Rowdon 1990:95). Even the order of words could play an important role in the process of interpretation (Rowdon 1990:95).

Besides, “the Brethren . . . formed a continuing citadel of the stronger view of inspiration” (Bebbington 1989:188). Bebbington points to a tight link between the premillennialism movement and the defence of the Bible, which was interpreted literally (Bebbington 1989:190). Literalism and verbal inspiration “had grown up together during the nineteenth century” (Bebbington 1989:190). The Brethren fellowship was “of such a character that modernism could not be tolerated among them without destroying their assemblies” (Ehlert 1957:66).

---

<sup>46</sup> *The Authority of Scripture Considered in Relation to Christian Union*, p.17, in Coad 1976:261.

<sup>47</sup> Groves Mrs (ed) 1857:10-11 *Memoirs of the Late Anthony Norris Groves*, in Coad 1976:255.

The second emphasis was a return to the “supposedly less institutional and more charismatic worship of the New Testament Church” (Hagan 1975:347). “Like Luther, Darby believed in a priesthood of all Christians without any distinction by class or ability” (Hagan 1975:347). Connected to this belief was another important emphasis of Brethren, the place of lay preachers (Hagan 1975:347). Formal training for the ministry was not considered obligatory (Hagan 1975:352). There were two or three preaching in a single meeting (Hagan 1975:359). A person would preach much as a layman before going into full-time ministry, rather than choose the ministry as a profession before having much opportunity to preach (Hagan 1975:361).

Randall<sup>48</sup> provides a detailed description of Brethren services that distinguished Brethren from other conservative evangelicals:

At their main weekly service the Brethren’s stated objective was not to listen to preaching but to focus on the crucified Christ . . . There was an expectation of the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit in the service . . . . By acknowledging the necessity of the Spirit, Brethren services embodied an evangelical ideal common to Keswick, Wesleyanism and Pentecostalism, but Brethren practice was distinctive. There was no presidency or pre-arranged order and any male member could pray, announce a hymn or read scripture. A typical one-hour service might include five hymns, five prayers, three readings, communion as the central act, and a short address. It was suggested that there should be no prior preparation since the Spirit’s direction was known (Randall 1999:144).

It has already been emphasised that “serious engagement with the Bible was a marked feature of Brethren spirituality” (Randall 1999:145). “Prayer meetings were also stressed” (Randall 1999:145) and “spontaneous prayer was prized” (Randall 1999:157). “Yet Brethren freedom was limited. Women played no public part, and William Hoste was not untypical in believing they should not even pray audibly in meetings of Sunday school teachers” (Randall 1999:157).

As for the “dangers” of ungoverned interpretation of Scripture by laymen, Darby believed that “there might even be value in varying interpretations of the Scriptures, as long as they are within the scope of basically correct doctrine” (Hagan 1975:358). He held that “divine truth is of such vast extent, and is so

---

<sup>48</sup> Far from idealising the movement, Randall treats it critically. Unfortunately, he rarely specifies whether he means Open or Exclusive Brethren, a distinction crucial to this research. Besides, he is more interested in the later developments of the movement when it was about a hundred years old. Nevertheless, Randall’s insights into Brethren spirituality deserve attention.

many-sided . . . on all points the truth may be looked at in many ways, and one fills up the gap left by others”.<sup>49</sup> Rowdon makes an interesting observation – Brethren “horror of systematization” – “the impossibility of encapsulating scriptural teaching in systematic theology” (Rowdon 1990:101). This, I think, is typical for any free Bible movements. Pietistic approach to theology is well summarised in the words of a young solicitor who desired to become a pastor, “There are many who preach Christ, but not so many who live Christ: my great aim will be to live Christ” (Coad 1976:70).

Actually, Darby was building a completely new system of Biblical interpretation<sup>50</sup> known as dispensationalism (MacLeod 1996:156) with dispensations as “different tests of mankind that result in human failure and divine judgement” (Blaising 1988:264). This theory sprang up on the methodological level, that is, in the realm of hermeneutics. Ryrie explains the dispensational approach as an attempt to practice consistently literal (not to be confused with literalistic) or plain interpretation of the Scriptures.<sup>51</sup> Promises for Israel were to be literally fulfilled on earth during the Millennium and the eternal state, but the church was not to participate in their fulfilment (Spencer 1986 vol 1). Darby literalized the prophetic portions of Scripture and accepted no other form of interpretation (Quebedeaux 1974:8).

It was this new hermeneutical approach that to a large extent shaped Brethren doctrines on the church and the future. This is where they differed mostly from the classic Protestant theology. As for the future of the Church, dispensationalism implies a belief in a secret coming of Christ to rapture the Church for a seven-year period of Great Tribulation prior to His coming in glory (Quebedeaux 1974:77-78). Hence, “getting ready for the rapture becomes the all-embracing concern of the Church” (Quebedeaux 1974:79). Dispensationalism also includes periodization of history, and a belief in the apostate nature of Christendom (Quebedeaux 1974:80). Coad recognises that at Plymouth,

---

<sup>49</sup> *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby*, in Hagan 1975:358.

<sup>50</sup> The classical Reformed approach “maintained the unity of God’s dealing with mankind, insisting that redemption was accomplished by the work of Christ on the basis of the covenant of faith which went back to Abraham” (Coad 1976:132).

<sup>51</sup> Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today*, p. 46, 87, in Blaising 1988:264.

The tenor of the teaching was strongly apocalyptic, calling out Christians from a world and from churches that were under imminent judgement, into a fellowship of simple devotion. Yet this emphasis was matched by an intense devotedness and sincerity, and attracted people in large numbers (Coad 1976:67).

As for the present of the Church, in Darby's view,

The present dispensation was fallen . . . The promise of the presence of Christ whenever two or three were present in His name was still valid . . . There was promise and power for such meetings, but none at all for those who sought to set up churches. To choose presidents or pastors is to organize a church, and even the appointment of elders is now impossible. The only government of the church was the acknowledgment of the Spirit of God (Coad 1976:128).

However, Darby's teaching on ecclesiology was "diametrically opposed to all that was being done at Bristol and at Barnstaple" (Coad 1976:128). In the matter of eldership and discipline Müller and Craik considered that "it was the mind of God that there should be recognized elders within the church" (Coad 1976:155). "The Bristol leaders shared neither his [Darby's] militant anti-clericalism, nor his dramatic expectations concerning the Second Advent" (Coad 1976:156). Thus, the Plymouth leaders' attitude towards other churches was much more aggressive than had been the case at Dublin, and certainly at Bristol (Coad 1976:67).

On the other hand, in the issue of believer's baptism, Darbyists were more tolerant than Open Brethren. Darby never adopted Baptist views, and to this day his more extreme followers practice a modified form of infant baptism (Coad 1976:124). In the other camp, believer's baptism was taught by Müller and Craik "as the duty of all disciples, and it has continued to be a cardinal point in the doctrine of Open (or independent) Brethren" (Coad 1976:125). However with time, they "moved from making believer's baptism a condition of fellowship to a more open position" (Coad 1976:155). It was not unusual to do without a baptistery and to baptize in the river (Coad 1976:72).

Ideally the chief aim of the Brethren was to exhibit "the common brotherhood of all believers", as William Collingwood wrote at the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>52</sup> They recognized no special membership. "That they belonged to Christ was the only term of communion . . . In principle, it embraced

---

<sup>52</sup> Collingwood Wm 1899:9 *The Brethren – A Historical Sketch*, in Coad 1976:255.

all whose faith and walk showed that they had spiritual life”.<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, for the Brethren, with their noted attention to ecclesiology, “belonging to churches . . . constituted an essential element of spirituality, not an optional extra” (Randall 1999:153).

Randall classifies Brethren spirituality as separatist (Randall 1999:142-173). According to him, Brethren spirituality was shaped to a large extent by convictions about the importance of separation from what was “doctrinally, ecclesiologically and spiritually ‘unclean’” (Randall 1999:142). He finds separation “a spiritual *motif*”, even among the less sectarian Brethren (Randall 1999:142).

In theory Open Brethren welcomed to communion all believers who were ‘born again, sound in faith and godly in life’, whereas the various subdivisions or ‘parties within Exclusivism received only those in their own circle. But even in the Open Brethren it was normally expected that visitors would come with a letter of commendation from another Brethren ‘assembly’ (Randall 1999:144).

It was true to the point that “if a person moved to a town without a Brethren assembly it was preferable to stay at home on Sundays rather than attend an existing church” (Randall 1999:155). “It was Keswick, with its message that believers were ‘All One in Christ Jesus’, which was to pose a particular challenge to Brethren spirituality” (Randall 1999:155). “No special membership” and requirements of “letters of recommendation” sounds like a contradiction. In fact, a church without written lists of members can be more demanding of loyalty from its people than the one that has formal membership. The Brethren desired fellowship with “all saints”, not with just anybody.

The Brethren in general were “zealous students of prophecy” (Bebbington 1993:197). Due to this interest among their writers, books of Daniel and Revelation “have come in for very extensive treatment” (Ehlert 1957:61). In the 1830s and 1840s Darby developed two distinctive additions to his futurist thinking: (1) the church age was a “parenthesis” between the 69<sup>th</sup> and 70<sup>th</sup> “weeks” of years in the book of Daniel 9:25-27, and (2) a rapture of believers from the earth to heaven by Christ will take place before the 70<sup>th</sup> week of Daniel 9 (Spencer 1986 vol 1). Juke’s writings during his time with the Brethren – *The Law of the Offerings* and *The Types of Genesis* – also had a great and lasting influence on Biblical interpretation, and (together with Soltau’s works on the

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

Tabernacle) were responsible for the typology which later became “second nature” to the Brethren (Coad 1976:80). In other words, expectation of the last events which is “one of the chief tendencies of Darbyite piety” leads to “the importance attributed to the interpretation of prophetic passages of Scripture, both in the Old Testament and the New” (Darby 1972:136).

According to McDowell, throughout the Victorian period Plymouth Brethren were characterized by strong emphasis upon conversion and evidence of new life in Christ (McDowell 1983:212). Darby had plenty to write about sanctification. So did the other Brethren writers, among whom was Darby’s “more lucid interpreter” William Kelly (Rowdon 1990:92, 94). C. H. Mackintosh popularized the doctrine in a tract *Sanctification: what is it?* The Brethren were surprised that such an important doctrine has been ignored in Christendom for seventeen centuries (Rowdon 1990:96). They were pointing out that *all* believers are called “saints” in Scripture; that they must be “separated to God”; and that without holiness none is “fit for heaven” (Rowdon 1990:97, 99). Open Brethren writers (e. g. W. E. Vine, C. F. Hogg, G. Harpur) have also shown a lot of interest in the matter. However, while Exclusive Brethren were stressing the positional aspect of sanctification, Open Brethren smoothed some “rough edges” and had more to say on its progressive aspect (Rowdon 1990:94-100).

The Brethren succeeded in breaking some of the social barriers. The affluent among them cultivated a deliberate simplicity of life, so that nothing might stand in the way of fellowship with the poorer members (Coad 1976:67). For instance, on occasion Lord Congleton would invite his coachman or one of his servants to dine and Sir Alexander Campbell insisted on his servants’ sitting down with him at table (Coad 1976:67). Chapman’s church in Barnstaple was engaged in the social needs of the surrounding community: Sunday schools, a soup kitchen, and other ventures being started, things in which women actively participated (Coad 1976:73). “Social barriers between fellow members of local congregations were explicitly refused . . . The nobility and the working classes met on a common footing as brethren and sisters” (McDowell 1983:213). “Many ‘Brethren’ possessed hearts large enough to break out of dogmatic separatism and to take part in social action” (McDowell 1983:220).

According to Grove, the idea of rejecting believers’ participation in wars “became a fixed tenet” (Brock 1984:32). “Resist not evil” and “Blessed are the peacemakers” became key passages for Brethren (Brock 1984:37). For a long

time army and navy officers resigned their commissions after conversion (Brock 1984:38-39). In a tract called *Discipleship*, the only Brethren work dedicated exclusively to the issues of nonresistance, the sword was forbidden even as a means of self-defence (Brock 1984:39). Thus, at least in the beginning, “the peace testimony of the Plymouth Brethren . . . was almost exact replica of the doctrine of nonresistance among the Anabaptists and Mennonites on the Continent” (Brock 1984:44). In matters of politics, the Plymouth Brethren, like the Mennonites, strove to live “as a strictly separated people, obeying the powers . . . but not participating in worldly activities” (Brock 1984:44).

The mission minded Brethren quickly spread and popularized their ideas. They “have exerted wide influence in personal ministry outside Brethren circles” (Ehlert 1957:66). Dr. Baedeker and his famous friend George Müller, whose visits to Russia are frequently mentioned in literature, were not the only members of the Open Brethren who showed an active interest in Russian ministry. Together with General G. Von Viebahn, Dr. Baedeker took part in the founding of the Wiedenest Bible School in Germany (previously in Berlin). This was an Open Brethren school where many Russian Christians were trained. Those who worked there had recognized that “sound biblical teaching is decisive help in any revival movement” (Brandenburg 1977:145).

Coad seems to be describing the same Bible School (the Allianz-Bibelschule) founded in 1905, at the height of the Russian persecution of evangelicals by a group of aristocrats associated with Fräulein von Blücher. It was established in Berlin “for the preparation of teachers and evangelists for Eastern Europe, including in the early days many Russians, not a few of whom died for their faith in Siberian prisons”. In 1919 the school was transferred to Wiedenest, near Gummersbach. Later the school became the teaching centre of the honoured Erich Sauer (Coad 1976:197-198).

The author will have to agree with Coad that the Brethren movement gave focus to several of the tendencies which had been present in all the developments since Wycliffe. It brought together an insistence upon high standards of personal conduct and asceticism, with the direct appeal to the Scripture over the head of all existing authority; the rejection of ministerial prerogatives with the freeing of the gifts of all members of the congregation (or, at least, of all male members – they were children of their day); and the concept of the church as a fellowship and unity of all believers, to which outward forms were, as to its essence, irrelevant (Coad 1976:104).

Thus general trademarks of Brethren were the following: opposition to the rationalistic philosophy of the time and a belief in the absolute authority of Scripture; keen interest in the prophetic portions of the Bible and looking forward to the imminent return of the Lord; the belief that mainstream church structures had fallen into apostasy; simplicity of meetings held in private houses, non-clericalism; a belief in all-believers priesthood, practice of “breaking the bread”, loosening denominational distinctions, evangelism, and missions.

Coad, an expert in Brethrenism, points out the similarity between the Brethren and evangelicals in Slavic countries of Eastern Europe (Baptists, Stundists, and Mennonites) calling them “Brethren-type” movements. Somehow he does not mention the Pashkovites who actually were the most Brethren-type movement among Russian evangelicals.

Baptist or Brethren-type movement (their description often depends upon one’s point of view!) like the Stundists and the Mennonites have found widespread following. The basic ideals of such movements are almost indistinguishable from those of Brethren, and a natural link of kinship has formed between many such congregations and teachers from Brethren churches in Britain and Germany. One of three earliest and most noteworthy of such travellers was Friedrich Wilhelm Baedeker (Coad 1976:194).

It is not difficult to notice certain similarities between Russian evangelical and Brethren practice: downplaying education, two or three sermons in a single meeting, lay preaching with no salaries, letters of recommendation when a church member moves to a new place. Darby’s special emphases can be still found in Russian evangelical churches, where gift is more important than office; piety and direction of the Holy Spirit are more important than eloquence in preaching; personal, informal study of the Scriptures is more important than formal education; ministry by several is better than by just one (Hagan 1975:361). Russia evangelicals even nowadays continue to call one another “brothers” and “sisters”, and church services are called “gatherings”, just as members Plymouth and Open Brethren among themselves are called “brethren” and speak of their communities as “assemblies” (Darby 1972:130).

### **3.2.1.3 Keswick influence**

Another important foreign influence, which I am going to mention briefly, was that of Keswick. It was transmitted through Lord Radstock and Dr.

Baedeker, as well as a few others like Penn-Lewis and Stockmayer, who travelled to St. Petersburg later. At times it is difficult to distinguish which influences were coming from Brethrenism and which from Keswick. Actually, it is not very important, because they had a number of common features.

The first convention at Keswick took place in 1875 in the Lake District, “the focal point of the new spirituality” (Bebbington 1989:151). The 1870s and 1880s were characterised at Keswick as “the heady revivalistic days” (Randall 1999:33). The Keswick movement was otherwise known as the Deeper Life or Victorious Life movement. The keynote was the message of victory over sin (Bebbington 1989:156). Keswick emphasised sanctification through faith in Christ not by works, that is, “holiness by faith” (Randall 1999:14). However unlike Brethren, who “placed the crucial stage of sanctification at conversion, Keswick put it at a subsequent state of ‘full surrender’” (Bebbington 1989:158).

Keswick’s task was promoting practical holiness, which was “the persistent hallmark of Keswick teaching” (Randall 1999:23, 38). With time “the holiness experience became less intense” (Randall 1999:27). Whereas in the 1870s Keswick had spoken of the ‘higher Christian life’, by the end of the nineteenth century it became more like ‘the normal Christian life’ (Randall 1999:27).

Keswick’s holiness legacy had a long lasting influence. As late as 1933 Scroggie preached from Keswick’s radio broadcast that, “The trouble and tragedy is that the church has been content to live between Easter and Pentecost, on the right side of justification, but on the wrong side of sanctification; on the right side of pardon but on the wrong side of power” (Randall 1999:33). Thus, “Keswick shaped the prevailing pattern of Evangelical piety for much of the twentieth century” (Bebbington 1989:151).

Keswick’s theology was conservative and even “strictly orthodox” (Randall 1999:15, 22, 37). The convention “distinguished itself from liberal evangelicalism by its stand for classical Christian teaching” (Randall 1999:37). Keswick stood for “a trustworthy Bible and an infallible Christ” (Randall 1999:22). The pressures of liberal theology were rejected by Keswick “in favour of a widely acceptable presentation of orthodox doctrine” (Randall 1999:15).

Besides a non-critical approach to the Bible, Keswick promoted premillennialism, believed in a coming rapture of the church, and held faith mission principles (Bebbington 1989:179, 192, 195). All of this made the

Brethren feel at home at the convention. Besides, the members of the Brethren “must have felt themselves in the familiar atmosphere of the breaking of the bread” (Randall 1999:37). Like Brethren, Keswick was committed to non-clericalism and the “priesthood of the laity” (Randall 1999:15-16).

Another feature shared by the Brethren and Keswick was devotion to Christ. At Keswick “any expression of Romantic devotion to God” was accepted, as well as “any version of intense piety” (Bebbington 1989:171). Music that helped to create a devotional atmosphere was given “unprecedented prominence” (Bebbington 1989:174).

This way, “by shifting the fulcrum of Christianity from the head to the heart, it blurred ecclesiastical boundaries” and set “the undenominational tone” for twentieth century Evangelicalism (Bebbington 1989:179). In the words of Randall, the convention had “the leading transdenominational repository of conservative evangelical spirituality” (Randall 1999:16). Keswick showed great ability to draw conservative evangelicals together in worship (Randall 1999:37). The convention’s motto was “All One in Jesus”, but in practice Anglicans predominated (Randall 1999:14).

Although Keswick’s message was not centred around evangelism or foreign missions, it was customary to call for dedication to overseas missions at the end of the convention (Randall 1999:35). By the twentieth century, world mission became a recognised part of Keswick’s identity (Randall 1999:35).

Keswick also became “a landmark in the emancipation of women, at least in the religious sphere”. Actually precedents had been created at the Mildmay Conferences (the forerunners to Keswick) starting in 1862 when separate ladies’ meetings were held as well as “the growth of female preaching in the revivalist atmosphere of the 1860s” (Bebbington 1989:175).

In conclusion, it should be noted that Keswick emphasised individual experience in salvation, prayer, and Christ’s indwelling in the heart of the Christian (Randall 1999:18-20). Its main emphasis was on holiness obtained by faith and revealed in practice, non-denominationalism, non-clericalism, and conservative classical Christian teaching including conservative views towards biblical inspiration and authority.

S. Lieven recalled that foreign preachers, who stayed at her mother’s palace and worked among St. Petersburg’s believers, emphasised “not only redemption, but also sanctification” (Lieven 1967:69). Corrado attributes this

emphasis “possibly to the Keswick teaching”, in which Stockmayer, Baedeker and Penn-Lewis had all participated (Corrado 2000:113). Sanctification was one of Kargel’s favourite topics.

The Pashkovites loved and respected Christian workers like Radstock, Müller, Baedeker, as their spiritual teachers. They considered men like Spurgeon and Moody as master preachers. This fact alone says something about the convictions and values of the St. Petersburg believers. The popular saying in Russia, “Tell me who your friends are and I will tell you who you are” is often translated, “A man is known by the company he keeps”.

Actually, these Christian workers who shaped the theology and practice of the Pashkovites to a great extent came from related circles and similar backgrounds. In fact, they had significant ties with each other. For instance, in 1867 D. L. Moody visited Great Britain for the first time as a private person with a great desire to hear C. H. Spurgeon and G. Müller (Coad 1976:188). Moorhouse of the Brethren influenced Moody’s preaching style, which was “perhaps the most spectacular indirect result of the work of a Brethren evangelist” (Coad 1976:189). Darby’s dispensationalism was given leadership by faculty and graduates of newly established Bible schools including the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago (Quebedeaux 1974:8). Dr. Baedeker went through his salvation experience due to Radstock’s ministry. Müller prayed over Dr. Baedeker, blessing him for his missionary work in Russia. The list goes on, but now I will proceed with a more detailed study of individuals who laboured in St. Petersburg.

### **3.2.2 Preachers and Missionaries, their Theological Roots and Influences**

#### **3.2.2.1 Lord Radstock (1833-1913)**

Lord Radstock was the person who initiated the evangelistic movement in St. Petersburg of 1870s. “In St. Petersburg he was the sole instrument, to begin with. Those who followed him copied his example so that he put his stamp on the whole revival” (Fountain 1988:14). In Russia the name Radstock became known in many parts of the country, and his religious teaching provoked much talk. Even those who could not pronounce his name correctly

(they called him *Krestock* which means “little cross”) discussed his teaching (Leskov 1877:2).

Granville Augustus William Waldegrave was born in 1833 and inherited the title Lord Radstock from his father at the age of 27. He received double honours from Oxford University in History and Science. In 1855 he travelled to the Crimea as a military officer. Although the Crimean war was over he nearly died in Russia from fever. It was there that he decided to commit his life to Christ. Upon his return to London he started his ministry visiting a hospital, reading aloud and praying with the sick and dying. He and his wife held small Bible readings in their home for a group of other officers. His work was “directly linked to the pietistic revivals, which were sweeping England” (Nichols 1991:6, 8).

Having returned to England Radstock, according to Kovalenko, started attending meetings “of the Darbyists or Open Brethren” (Kovalenko 1996:69). Apparently, Kovalenko does not distinguish between these two groups, although the split among Brethren was finalised by then. Nichols mentions that Radstock had been a member of the Plymouth Brethren, but he severed all connections with this fellowship before his arrival in Russia (Nichols 1991:103). On another occasion Nichols states that Radstock became a member of the Open Brethren Church (Nichols 1991:7).

Concerning Radstock’s break with the Brethren<sup>54</sup>, Nichols points out that Radstock did not share their belief in their exclusiveness and apostasy of all other forms of Christianity (Nichols 1991:7-8). Another reason for Radstock’s separation from the Plymouth Brethren may have been the issue of eternal punishment, which was not a strong point in Radstock’s theology (Nichols 1991:89).

Coad makes a general statement saying that Radstock “mixed freely with Brethren and was a favourite speaker<sup>55</sup> at many of their meetings” (Coad 1976:195). According to Fountain, many of Radstock’s servants attended Brethren meetings, and two were elders. He did not, however, identify himself with any particular denomination. Since he was “evangelical” he was “happy to be with the Lord’s’ people” whoever they were. He had a close association with

---

<sup>54</sup> At this point Nichols must have meant the Darbyite Brethren.

the Brethren for much of his life, though his family attended the local parish church at Weston (Fountain 1988:58-59). To summarise, it seems that by the time of Radstock's arrival in St. Petersburg he was much closer to the Open Brethren position than that of the Darbyists.

Generally speaking, Radstock promoted pietistic theology, which called believers to a life of holiness. According to holiness teaching, the true church was entered through faith, not by membership in a local church (Nichols 1991:8). In 1865 Radstock joined the Evangelical Alliance<sup>56</sup> which served the needs of those pietists who were left without a church (Nichols 1991:8-9). A year later he abandoned his command of the West Middlesex Volunteers in order to preach the gospel full time.<sup>57</sup> That year he began to preach in the London suburb of Weston-Super-Mare, the place where under his preaching Dr. Baedeker dedicated his life to Christ (Nichols 1991:9).

In 1868 Radstock preached in Paris, in 1872 in Switzerland (Nichols 1991:10). According to Fountain, Lord Radstock was invited to Russia by "a certain Grand Duchess" whom he had met in Paris and also by Madame Chertkova whom he had met in Switzerland (Fountain 1988:17). He accepted Madame Chertkova's invitation to come to Russia as the answer to the prayer that he had been praying for ten years (Kovalenko 1996:70).

The most common version is that Radstock arrived on the banks of the Neva during "Holy Week" of the spring of 1874 and spent six months there (Fountain 1988:17; Nichols 1991:11). He started preaching in the American or Anglo-American Chapel on Pochtamt'skaya [Post Office] Street, which was used by German Lutheran and Congregationalist Churches. He also preached at the Reformed Church of German pastor Hermann Dalton (Nichols 1991:12;

---

<sup>55</sup> Besides Brethren meetings, he spoke at Baptist, Independent, Nonconformist, and Quaker meetings (Leskov 1877:130).

<sup>56</sup> Not being a "member" of a particular local church, Radstock was a member of the Evangelical Alliance. This trans-confessional organization was to meet the need for fellowship among pietists who had left the organized churches. It held views similar to Brethrenism, except for exclusivism and local church membership: anti-rationalism, evangelism, mission, and pietistic spirituality. Established in 1846, it was a support structure for the Mildmay mission, Keswick, and international pietistic missionaries (Nichols 1991:103-104). Radstock supported the local religious life as well, for instance, the Salvation Army (Fountain 1988:58).

<sup>57</sup> Nichols traces the character of his activity of that period to early Methodism (Nichols 1991:10).

Corrado 2000:71-72). A preaching lord was certainly a novelty for the St. Petersburg public and stirred people's curiosity.

Early meetings did not gather many people (Corrado 2000:72). The results of Radstock's ministry became more impressive after he moved his meetings into the drawing halls of his friends from among St. Petersburg's aristocracy. His zealous helper was Madame Chertkova who introduced him into the homes of St. Petersburg aristocracy (Karev 1999:130). Radstock had experience with similar meetings in England and France and it was not long before drawing room meetings became extremely popular. Radstock, a high-energy person, spoke at least twice a day to large groups of listeners. The rest of his time was filled with personal appointments, which proved to be very fruitful.

According to the Orthodox writers, the soil for Radstock's preaching in 1870s was prepared by "many years of unbelief, formality and coldness in the matters of faith" – this was the attitude of aristocracy after being entrained by nihilistic teachings (Ornatsky 1903:4). "Our society having got tired of denial and unbelief of 1860s was eager to hear a new word giving soul piece, comfort and calm" (Sakharov 1897:16).

Radstock's meetings were similar to the drawing-room meetings for Bible reading and prayer common in England at the time with reading and explaining a portion of the Bible, singing a hymn, prayer, and greetings (Corrado 2000:72). Radstock would begin each service with a silent prayer for guidance, usually on his knees. Then he would ask those present to join him in a "standing" prayer in his own words, which was followed by Scripture reading and an improvised exposition of the passage. Services lasted about an hour. His central theme was the fundamentals of the Gospel, namely that salvation comes through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, who died on the cross for atonement, and that a believer can know that he/she has been forgiven. He would conclude with another improvised prayer and a hymn. He also invited all those who "were touched by the Word of God" and wanted to "find Christ" to call on him later or stay over (Leskov 1877:114-119; Fountain 1988:25; Kovalenko 1996:70). He ended his meetings encouraging believers to gather on certain days for common prayer and Bible reading (Leskov 1877:119), basically to hold *Stunde*.

Nichols points to the pietistic nature of Radstock's preaching: "This spontaneous commentary was typical of pietistic speakers and their revivalistic

works which focused on the Holy Spirit's ability to convict listeners of sin and call them to a holy life" (Nichols 1991:13). Princess Galitsina wrote of her experience staying with the Radstock family. When dealing with people, Radstock, "leads them with great ardour to the feet of the Lord but, once there, the servant of the Lord withdraws entirely that the work of the Holy Spirit may be carried on without any human interference" (Fountain 1988:51-52).

The success of Radstock's preaching was not due to his style of preaching and ministry, which must have somewhat seemed rude and primitive to cultivated nobles raised Orthodox. His speech was characterised by a lack of eloquence, his French was imperfect, his habit of kneeling facing the opposite direction of the speaker was considered impolite, and his manner of talking to God in prayer was very unusual (Leskov 1877:112-114, 120, 196-197). Yet those meetings kept growing in popularity and "many, especially from among high society, were attached to these meetings fanatically seeking to find some new revelation of faith" (Pobedonostsev 1880:2). Among the factors contributing to Radstock's popularity, Corrado mentions his "simplicity, sincerity, and conviction", his assurance of his own salvation, being a layman-preacher, and his "unpretentious lifestyle" for someone who was an English lord (Corrado 2000:74).

Radstock himself was surprised by the effect of his work. Later he commented that when he started, several of his Russian friends had thought that he had better not go.<sup>58</sup> Heier summarised Radstock's evangelistic efforts:

Both friends and foes had to admit that there was certainly nothing in Radstock himself to account for the effect that was produced by his preaching. Yet his evangelical message, without outward intellectual shine, without theological fineness, in imperfect French, was eagerly welcomed by the Orthodox barons, princes, counts, and generals as a fresh revelation of Christian truth (Heier 2002:56).

By the end of his six-month stay in St. Petersburg a core of capable people who could carry on Radstock's meetings appeared: Colonel Pashkov, Count Korff, Count Bobrinskiy, Princess Lieven, Princess Gagarina, and others. Although Radstock saw his special calling to evangelise the nobility (Fountain 1988:55), he did not limit himself to the nobility. Mrs. Edward Trotter, Radstock's biographer, commented that "not the least fruitful part of his life-work lay in the links which he formed between the West End and the East End with its need.

He had a peculiar talent for drawing together extremes in society” (Fountain 1988:62). He was ready to speak of his Master to both a beggar in the street and a member of a royal family (Fountain 1988:70).

This talent proved to be very useful in St. Petersburg, a city of social extremes. When walking from one speaking appointment to another (Radstock rarely took cabs), he handed out New Testaments to people on the street. N. Leskov wrote about him in *Great Schism*, "He likes to stop people and talk to them... Silently and with tenderness in the eyes he hands a New Testament to a passer-by and goes on to make the same present to the next one... When he is back his pockets are empty" (Leskov 1877:91-94). Pointing to Radstock's religious romanticism, Leskov calls him "the knight of the Rueful Countenance of preaching" (Leskov 1877:248). According to Leskov, "This man is in love with Christ . . . he lives always remembering that He whom he loves dearly is watching from above" (Leskov 1877:47, 248). Thus, Radstock's devotion was recognized by a person who was not an admirer.

Radstock returned to Russia with his family in 1875 and 1878 and found that the work was deepening: ballrooms were turned into prayer halls filled by nobility, their servants, city craftsmen, officers, and students. Following Radstock's example, many began to help the poor, both spiritually and materially, and to intercede for those who had problems with authorities. They initiated visitation among the poor in factories, hospitals, and prisons. They built hospitals and schools on their country estates, and lodging houses and inexpensive tea-rooms for the poor in the capital (Heier 2002:58). During his second trip to Russia in 1875-1876, Radstock concentrated mostly on working with his followers, and his ministry became something like a Bible School (Brandenburg 1977:108). He taught them the foundations of the faith and they spread the gospel across the country (Nichols 1991:15). On his second and third trips, Radstock's improved proficiency in Russian helped him communicate with common people (Nichols 1991:14).

It was at that time that the two greatest Russian writers of the period, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, got intrigued with Radstock and the new movement. In March 1876 Tolstoy wrote to his aunt asking whether she knew Radstock

---

<sup>58</sup> Masters, 56, in Fountain 1988:23.

personally and what impression had he made upon her. Countess Tolstaya answered,

I have known Radstock quite well for the last three years, and I like him very much because of his extraordinary forthrightness and sincere love. He is fully devoted to a single cause and follows a chosen path without turning to left or right. The words of Apostle Paul can almost be applied to him. 'I do not wish to know anything but the crucified Christ' . . . What devotion to Christ, what warmth, what boundless sincerity! His messages here sound like a bell, and he awakened many who never before thought of Christ and their salvation.<sup>59</sup>

The Countess also noted some "weak spots", from her point of view, that included a simplistic answer to problems of human depravity, his emphasis on "sudden" conversion, and a danger for those of his followers who become teachers too soon (Heier 2002:93-94).

It was also in March 1876 that F. M. Dostoevsky made some remarks in his diary,

It is said that just at this moment Lord Radstock is in St. Petersburg, the same one who some three years ago had been preaching here all winter and also had founded at the time a kind of a new sect. At that time I happened to hear him preach in a certain 'hall', and, as I recall, I found nothing special about him; he spoke neither particularly cleverly nor in a particularly dull manner. Yet meanwhile he performs miracles over the hearts of people; they cling to him; many are astounded: they are looking for the poor in order to, as quickly as possible, bestow benefits upon them; they are almost ready to give away their fortunes. However, it is possible only here, in Russia; he is not so outstanding abroad . . . I heard only that Lord Radstock teaches peculiarly about "descending of grace" and that, as somebody mentioned, the lord has 'Christ in a pocket', that is, he treats Christ and grace exceedingly easy (Dostoyevsky 1981:98-99).

The attitude of the established church and press towards Radstock changed after 1876 (Kovalenko 1996:71). It was then that Prince V. Meshchersky's mocking novel *Lord-apostol v bol'shom peterburgskom svete* [Lord-Apostle in high Petersburg's society] was published. In his open *Pis'mo k lordu Redstoku* [Letter to Lord Radstock] Meshchersky accused Radstock's teaching of being contrary to that of the Orthodox Church and called upon the Holy Synod to banish this "English Pharisee" from Russia (Heier 2002:57).

---

<sup>59</sup> Perepiska L. N. Tolstogo s grafiney A. A. Tolstoy (1852-1903): Tolstovskiy muzey [Correspondence of L. N. Tolstoy and Countess A. A. Tolstoy (1852-1903): Tolstoy museum] (S.-Petersburg, 1911), pp. 267-268, in Heier 2002:93.

However, the novel and multiple hostile periodical publications (especially in *Grazhdanin*) did not adversely affect Radstock but only made him more popular (Heier 2002:57).

The Orthodox Church was mostly alarmed with the main point of his teaching, which was justification by faith in the atoning death of Jesus Christ. The Church feared that his converts were given permission for a sinful life style (Leskov 1877:144, 186,174). It is true that Radstock did not preach much about good works which he believed resulted from salvation. Nevertheless, he instructed his listeners to take the “narrow path”, to live for others and not for themselves (Leskov 1877:174). He caused Russian society women to “talk and think of Christ and out of love to Christ to do good to their neighbours” (Leskov 1877:160). However, his proclamation of “free grace” was not the main cause of Radstock’s banishment. The Orthodox got truly worried when the movement spread beyond the upper class.

Radstock left Russia in 1876 hoping his absence would benefit the movement. And so it did. After his departure his followers started to preach in Russian which drew a broader circle of listeners. While out of the country Radstock wrote an open letter to the citizens of Russia, but it did not change the attitude of the Orthodox toward him. On the contrary, it caused resentment. Radstock underestimated Russians’ “deep warm feelings towards the church”. “He held no high view for the local church and could not understand why others would” (Nichols 1991:16).

However, despite bad press on behalf of the Orthodox and Slavyanophiles, Radstock’s popularity continued to grow among those who got to know him personally. Butkevich, an Orthodox priest, said of St. Petersburg society of the late 1870’s, when the movement was at its height, that “not to be a Radstockist meant to lower oneself in the eyes of society...” (Heier 2002:62). There were no less than forty aristocratic homes opened to Radstockist meetings (Fountain 1988:28).

In 1878 Radstock came to Russia for the third time hoping to “win” Moscow the way he had “won” St. Petersburg. Moscow, the ancient Russian capital, however, was not as westernised as St. Petersburg and Radstock did not find the same response there. After visiting Moscow Radstock stopped travelling to Russia (Kovalenko 1996:71). Leskov was not sure if Radstock was banished from the country or left of his own free will (Leskov 1877:3). Fountain,

Karev, Savinsky all write that Radstock was expelled from Russia at the height of the revival (Fountain 1988:38; Karev 1999:132; Savinsky 1999:361). It is known for a fact that Pobedonostsev in 1880 personally recommended that the tsar forbid Lord Radstock from entering Russia again (Pobedonostsev 1880:4). According to Trotter, Radstock left due to a much needed rest and was officially banished from the country only two years later when ministering in Finland.<sup>60</sup>

For the rest of his life Radstock continued to travel extensively and to evangelize. For example, from 1880 to 1910 he visited India seven times (Kovalenko 1996:71). Not long before he died he had arranged another visit to Russia. Many friends had invited him, "the doors were opened", but his trip did not work out. Radstock died on 8 December 1913 in Paris (Fountain 1988:63-64, 67).

According to *British Weekly*, Radstock "was, indeed, the grand old man of personal dealing... Without profession of asceticism, he lived one of the severest, simplest, and the most controlled of Christian lives" (Fountain 1988:70). Radstock's personality in general appealed to the Russian people, both rich and poor. He was sincere, humble, dedicated to the cause, charitable, and ascetic. These were the classical qualities historically considered "Christian" virtues in Russia. Radstock and his wife, who fully supported her husband, were known for their works of charity, which was part of Radstock's legacy to his Russian followers. For instance, in order to give to mission work, he sold his horses and carriages; his wife also made a personal sacrifice selling her books, which meant a lot for her (Fountain 1988:53).

However Radstock could also be outspoken and straightforward to the point of being rude. This lack of politeness was acceptable in Russia, but not in England. Fountain observed that Radstock "was very much his own man, and his unusual manner of life and outspoken views made it difficult for him to fit into a local church" (Fountain 1988:62). Fountain, who otherwise speaks very highly of Radstock, admits, that he was "a man of strong views and domineering personality," who could be "severe and judgmental" (Fountain 1988:65). On one occasion, Radstock shared with a lady his grief that few in England's upper class would listen to his preaching. This gave her an opportunity to point out that at times he could be extremely tactless (Fountain 1988:65).

---

<sup>60</sup> Trotter, 211, 231-233, in Corrado 2000:74-75.

It has been already noted that Radstock had very little interest in any kind of theologising. He tried to stay free of any doctrinal controversies. He valued peace and harmony over exact theological definitions. Korff remembered that Radstock

did not engage himself in doctrinal theology, but knew the Bible thoroughly and loved it as a letter of a beloved friend. His simple childlike love for Christ and for the Word of God amazed everyone. His whole personality was penetrated by full and deep trust in the Saviour. He obeyed the Word of God as a little child obeys his parents. I have never met another believer who with such love would try to convince me on the basis of Scripture that with His atoning blood Christ saved me from everlasting destruction.<sup>61</sup>

On one occasion Radstock reportedly said to Vasil'ev, a priest, "I do not know anything but the Bible, and therefore I cannot enter doctrinal discussions" (Leskov 1877:135). Leskov's assessment of Radstock was, "a bad theologian but seemingly a very good man" (Leskov 1877:181).

Actually, Radstock purposely never criticised any denominations including the Orthodox,

he did not try to understand the Orthodox Church . . . He was not a student of theology because it was unimportant to him. His primary goal was to cause people to begin a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. Their denominational affiliation was of little concern (Nichols 1991:15).

Radstock did not address the "lower questions" of doctrine and liturgy. He firmly believed in the headship of Christ, which presided over all Christians regardless of their denominational affiliations (Nichols 1991:104). When people attempted to make him express his opinion of the doctrines of various churches, he either remained silent or said that he could only explain the Word of God (Leskov 1877:71-72). Radstock also did not concern himself with the results of archaeological, linguistic, or exegetical studies, saying that his whole education was the Bible (Leskov 1877:95). Evidently his immediate followers continued in the same manner. Still, it is important to determine what exactly was Radstock's "no theology" theological position.

It has been already mentioned that Radstock participated in revival meetings within the framework of the Brethren movement. His theology and practice had much in common with the Brethren. He must have picked up their premillennialism, early non-denominationalism, homes meetings for Bible study,

---

<sup>61</sup> Korff, *Moi vospominaniya*, in Kovalenko 1996:71.

etc. Although closer to Open Brethren, Radstock shared Darby's more open view towards believer's baptism although, unlike Darby, he did not call to separate from the established church. There was nothing of exclusivist in Radstock.

Unlike the Brethren, Radstock did not structure his meetings around the Lord's Table. Recognising baptism and the Eucharist as ordinances he never concentrated on them (Leskov 1877:153). Baptism, according to Radstock, was a public confession of a believer's desire to enter the flock of Christ; the Eucharist was a remembrance of our redemption by the blood of Christ (Leskov 1877:153). Radstock never conducted the Lord's Supper himself, at least not while in Russia (Leskov 1877:98, 128). Personally, he was ready to participate in the Lord's Supper anywhere except Catholic and Russian Orthodox churches (Leskov 1877:128). However, the AUCECB's "History" states that "open" "breaking of bread" was introduced by Radstock (AUCECB 1989:87).

Concerning the issue of eternal punishment, Radstock, according to one of his listeners, "never threatens with sufferings in hell, but reveals great love of God . . . He makes us come to inner realisation of our base ungratefulness thereby touching the noblest feelings of his listeners" (Leskov 1877:114-115). Nevertheless, Radstock believed in a literal, eternal hell (Leskov 1877:220). One can find extensive proof of that in his sermons (Radstock 2004:12, 21).

Nichols looks for Radstock's theological roots in Wesley's revivals and in Mildmay and Keswick conferences. Radstock was active in the Mildmay Conferences in London. His activity in London corresponded to the Mildmay outreaches. Besides the Mildmay Conference, Radstock participated in a number of other conferences which stressed the social problems and the belief in the imminent return of Jesus Christ. Beginning in 1880, Radstock regularly attended conferences of the Keswick Movement; he was part of the developing Keswick community in England and used its holiness language. His message was filled with challenges asking his audience to continually be filled by Christ. "He was solidly established as a perfect example of the theological system of traditional British piety", which was "flavored by his background in the Open Brethren Church, his involvement in the Evangelical Alliance and the romanticism of the Victorian era in England" (Nichols 1991:79, 82-84).

So, there is no wonder that Radstock spoke of the need to progress in one's Christian life to a deeper life in the Spirit. The theology he had learnt at

Mildmay and Keswick trained him to challenge believers to seek “a higher plane of Christianity” through full consecration and the filling of the Holy Spirit (Nichols 1991:98). He taught that believers ought to be in constant fellowship with Christ, and should “move from the initial conversion experiences to the second work of God, that of sanctification” (Nichols 2007:79). In Nichols’ opinion, this belief did not get passed on to the St. Petersburg congregation (Nichols 1991:102), at least not during Radstock’s time there.

As with any Protestant evangelist, Radstock’s soteriology was the core of his theological system. He believed that salvation was given by God through Christ, offered to all, and had to be accepted by faith (Nichols 1991:98). He strongly preached regeneration to all people including those who considered themselves religious and hoped to get to heaven (Radstock 1870:24). The *British Weekly* reported that, “He was never better pleased than when he was expounding the Epistle to the Romans, which he interpreted precisely as Luther interpreted it, and with the same large and liberating effect” (Fountain 1988:70).

Good works were of no value in acquiring salvation. Fountain quotes from one of Radstock’s sermons, “We were incapable of doing anything to merit forgiveness: salvation was a free gift, but good works were the expression of gratitude for that free gift and the proof that we had received it” (Fountain 1988:25). Radstock avoided any subject that would distract his audience from “the simple theme of the Gospel” (Fountain 1988:25-27). He also preached the assurance of salvation<sup>62</sup> through faith, which was shocking to an Orthodox ear (Nichols 1991:97). Radstock believed and preached eternal security: “God, seeing the utter ruin of man, did not tell him to stand upright, but brought in an external power, Himself. And the question of falling depends not on the power of man, but on the Almighty” (Fountain 1988:44).

On the other hand, in the area of anthropology Radstock was not very Calvinistic and placed a heavy dependence on the ability of man to decide for himself concerning his/her salvation, although later in his life he “shifted from human will to Divine love being an ultimate factor” (Nichols 1991:88). While in Russia during the first “naive days” of the Russian revival he strongly emphasised the free choice of man and often asked his hearers, “Have you got

---

<sup>62</sup> Actually this doctrine never gained popularity among Russian evangelicals.

Christ?” “Have you found Christ?” “Do you want to give yourself to Christ?” (Leskov 1877:236, 229, 64-65, 118).

Keeping in mind the main goal of analysing Russian Evangelical hermeneutics and its sources, the author will pay special attention to Radstock’s bibliology. Throughout the history of the Evangelical Christian movement in Russia, “one belief has never changed”, and that is, “the Bible is considered verbally inspired and exclusively authoritative”, which Nichols attributes to Radstock’s influence (Nichols 1991:86). Radstock believed that all canonical books of the Bible were breathed by God and he ruled away apocryphal books and tradition (Leskov 1877:149-150). In the words of Trotter, Radstock “firmly held to the old view of verbal inspiration”.<sup>63</sup> Korff commented later in his life, “I was struck by his devotion to Christ and full conviction of the Bible’s inspiration”.<sup>64</sup> Radstock used to say that he blindly accepted everything written in the Scripture as a child, without arguing (Leskov 1877:143). Leskov, who could never fully understand Radstock’s attention to the biblical text, pitied him. “Poor Radstock was buried in the texts . . . he is a terrible literalist” (Leskov 1877:158).

In one of his sermons Radstock hinted about his attitude towards liberalism, “While many are doubting the inspiration of Holy Scripture, multitudes in many lands have, for eighteen hundred years, found by experience that in proportion as they are obedient to the Divine Revelation, not one jot or tittle has failed of the promises of God to those who believe His Word” (Fountain 1988:73). Arguing with a rationalist, Radstock did not try to explain the “difficult” passages in the Bible. In Radstock’s opinion, Scripture could not be understood without the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit because “a natural man does not understand the things of God”. In his own words, “once you receive the Spirit of God, who teaches us deep truths about God, you will understand. The knowledge of God cannot be reached by a man; it should come from heaven as a gift of God” (Radstock 1870:32). Although Radstock believed that the Holy Spirit gave him insight into deeper truths of Scripture, history, and nature, and spent hours in meditation, contemplating and communing with God (Nichols 1991:92), he recognized that there were still

---

<sup>63</sup> Trotter, *Lord Radstock*, 102, in Nichols 1991:86.

<sup>64</sup> Korff, *Moi vospominaniya*, in Kovalenko 1996:77.

passages in the Bible that he could not understand and therefore would not try to interpret them. In these cases he used to say that the Lord did not will to reveal to him the meaning of such passages (Leskov 1877:150).

Nichols presents the following good summary of Radstock's bibliology:

Radstock incorporated Scripture into his language patterns. The Bible, for him, was not only a source of personal solace but a supernatural power in counselling. He believed the Bible carried a deeper reality behind its words. Truth was found in the words but real truth was found behind the words. His drawing room discussions were always centred around Biblical passages. The Bible was for Radstock a guidebook for all situations in life (Nichols 1991:86).

Interest in the end times was a trademark of the Mildmay and Keswick revivals as well as of the Brethren movement, and it affected Radstock's eschatology. It has been mentioned that the Plymouth Brethren, through the leadership of John N. Darby, produced an eschatological system which later developed into dispensationalism, but the extent of Radstock's use of this system is unclear (Nichols 1991:94-95). It is known, however, that Radstock's eschatology was premillennial (Nichols 1991:95). Every day he expected the Second Coming of the Lord, but he did not insist that others hold the same view as this issue was irrelevant to the salvation of souls (Leskov 1877:146).

Pietists normally believe that formal church membership does not guarantee membership into the true Body of Christ (Nichols 1991:102-103). This idea was strongly preached by the Brethren. Radstock's notion of local church membership was basically nonexistent; the only true church for him was the Universal Church (Nichols 1991:103). However, for many years he preached at Eccleston Hall in London, which he built in 1884. He didn't want it to become a church in the traditional sense, but rather a centre where all Christians could meet (Fountain 1988:62).

In personal interviews Radstock positioned himself as a member of the church of Christ "in general", rather than of any denomination (Fountain 1988:25; Nichols 1991:14). Like the Brethren, he strongly preached the priesthood of all believers, "Every child of God is a minister" (Radstock 1870:1). So, undenominationalism became the trademark of Radstock's theology of the Church. Leskov admits that "Radstock is not an enemy of churches . . . and all churches have their strong and weak points" (Leskov 1877:127). Radstock avoided being critical about denominations and never spoke against the Russian Orthodox Church (Leskov 1877:133). Once he commented in his letter

that Russian clergy have little energy and zeal for God's glory, and too much fear (Leskov 1877:133). When speaking about the Roman Catholic Church, Radstock said that any church which forbids reading the Word of God is not Christ's church.<sup>65</sup>

Reportedly, Radstock's preaching style reminds one of Spurgeon's (Fountain 1988:49). Radstock's sermons were devotional and evangelistic, calling sinners to repent and believers to consecrate their lives fully to God. Here are a few extracts. "Believe Jesus – a Man and the Son of God! Do not believe either teachings or interpretations but His Word. And He says that He came to find and to save the lost" (Radstock 1870:9). "Unless you respond to God's call, it will become quieter" (Radstock 1870:17). "Lo, God is waiting! He is waiting in silence. He has already sent us His last message from heaven: 'In the last days He speaks through the Son'. And this was His very last message before the day of judgment" (Radstock 1870:36). It was not atypical for him to start a sermon with a mystical<sup>66</sup> statement, such as, "God has laid upon my heart . . ." (Radstock 1870:14), which is still a commonly used cliché among Russian evangelicals.

Although the author did not come across any cases of Radstock's healings in St. Petersburg, it seems that he was not a stranger in this area of Christian experience.<sup>67</sup> Nichols points out that Radstock's theology of the Holy Spirit was "interlocked" with his mystical view of the world. He believed that the Holy Spirit gave him insight into deeper truths of Scripture, history, and nature. He spent hours in meditation, contemplating and communing with God, and healing became a significant part of his ministry (Nichols 1991:92, 8). Radstock, when writing to *The Christian* concerning his work in Sweden, sends reports of several instances of healing in answer to prayer:

One interesting feature of the Lord's grace in Stockholm is the obedience of faith with which several pastors and elder brethren have accepted their privilege of anointing the sick and praying over them in the name of the Lord. There have been many remarkable instances of God's gracious healing. I enclose details of a few cases, that God's children may be encouraged to see that God has not withdrawn the promise in James 5:

---

<sup>65</sup> The *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* (III) p. 306 in Terletsky 1891:20; Leskov 1877:128-129.

<sup>66</sup> Radstock's mysticism was also revealed in healing, which became a significant part of his ministry (Nichols 1991:8). Reportedly, Kargel exercised healing as well.

<sup>67</sup> This is important to keep in mind in view of a future encounter of Russian evangelicals in general, and Kargel in particular, with Pentecostalism.

15, and that it is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man.<sup>68</sup>

Nichols sees Radstock as “a major promoter of the Pietistic movement throughout the world” (Nichols 1991:6). Whether or not he was “a major promoter” in the world, he certainly was the person whose preaching marked the beginning of, and influenced to a large extent, the third stream of Russian evangelicalism which originated in St. Petersburg. Though he shared many beliefs with the Brethren (in some of which he was closer to Darby, in others to Open Brethren), Mildmay and Keswick conferences, Radstock, however, was his own man, very independent in his thinking and in his way of doing ministry. He was too “open” even for the Open Brethren.

Radstock’s ecclesiastical “loneliness” did not seem to bother him. It was this freedom of belief and worship that he left as legacy to his St. Petersburg followers. For the St. Petersburg group of believers, these were the early days of being “simply Christian” without having any specific identity. Creating a “sect” certainly was not a part of Radstock’s plan or the plan of his followers’.

### **3.2.2.2 Dr. Baedeker (1823-1906)**

Dr. F. Baedeker was a prominent travelling evangelist in late nineteenth century Russia, highly respected by the evangelical group in St. Petersburg and elsewhere among the evangelicals in Russia. He was a contemporary and friend of Lord Radstock, converted under his preaching and introduced by him to the evangelical group in St. Petersburg. During his prison ministry in Siberia, Baedeker worked closely with Kargel who was greatly obliged to Baedeker’s influence for his spiritual formation. Dr. Baedeker picked up where Radstock had left off. Being a distinctly Open Brethren preacher, he directed the young evangelical movement in St. Petersburg towards more Brethren forms in the issues of ordinances and church organization.

Born in 1823, Baedeker was a son of a Westphalian naturalist. He lived a “roving life for his first thirty-five years”, travelling around Tasmania and Australia and then returning to Europe. While in Germany he studied at Bonn University (Latimer 1908:24). He possessed a Doctor of Philology degree and

---

<sup>68</sup> Gordon. Online. 25 June 2009.

became a Doctor of Philosophy of Freiburg University (Kovalenko 1996:79; Coad 1976:195).

Baedeker went to England in 1859 (Latimer 1908:11). His conversion took place seven years later at a salon meeting arranged by Lord Cavan in Weston-Super-Mare, at which Lord Radstock was the preacher.<sup>69</sup> Radstock addressed him in his typical manner, “My man, God has a message through me for you tonight“(Latimer 1908:26). Baedeker later remembered that he “went in a proud German infidel, and came out a humble, believing disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ” (Latimer 1908:27). While in England Dr. Baedeker worked with the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Evangelical Alliance, and the Protestant Alliance (Latimer 1908:209).

Lord Radstock also opened a “wide door and effectual” for the Baedeker’s ministry on the continent (Latimer 1908:29). From the time of his conversion Baedeker lived “the life of a wanderer in foreign lands“(Latimer 1908:11). He travelled “from the banks of Rhine... to the last desperate penal settlement of Saghalien, beyond the Gulf of Tartary in farthest Asia; and from the princely homes of devout nobles in Stockholm, to the rough and bare settlements of stundist exiles in the Caucasus at the foot of Mount Ararat” (Latimer 1908:16). Later in his life he wrote, “England has no need of me. There are too many preachers and teachers there” (Latimer 1908:215).

Baedeker’s ministry in Russia, begun in 1875 when he was introduced to high society by Radstock (Latimer 1908:29; Corrado 2000:109), lasted for some forty years. In 1877 Baedeker moved to Russia with his wife and an adopted daughter for three years with the goal of serving as an itinerant evangelist among the German-speaking population of Western Russia and the Baltics (Corrado 2000:109). That year Count Korff happened to be a member of the St. Petersburg prison committee and Madame Chertkova was a member of the women’s committee of prison visitation, which allowed Baedeker to begin prison ministry right away (Kovalenko 1996:80). They needed Scripture, tracts, and printed sermons to follow up gospel conversations with prisoners, and the materials printed by the Society for the Encouragement of Spiritual and Ethical Reading were very useful.

---

<sup>69</sup> Latimer 1908:26; Coad 1976:195; Corrado 2000:109.

For eighteen years, in spite of Pobedonostsev's rule, Baedeker enjoyed the unique privilege of free access to every Russian prison (Latimer 1908:44), the ministry for which Baedeker is most remembered. S. Lieven recalled that "Dr Baedeker had a way with Russian authorities and gained the government's trust . . . Our believers, some of whom had considerable means, supplied him with money. They gave generously without limitations or conditions" (Lieven 1967:81). Baedeker was truly single-minded in his prison ministry. "It is happy service to carry His message from ward to ward... I do not hide anything; but openly declare that the gospel of God's grace is for all men" (Latimer 1908:97). He is especially famous for his two trans-Siberian journeys. Kargel accompanied him on his first trip across Siberia in 1890 (Corrado 2000:110). In letters to his wife Baedeker mentioned what a great help and comfort Kargel was to him (Latimer 1908:113, 143). During the first journey about twelve thousand copies of Scripture were distributed among prisoners (Latimer 1908:162).

While travelling, Baedeker made a special point of remembering "the Lord's death in the breaking of bread with the whole company of the redeemed" (Latimer 1908:143). In letters to his wife he did not forget to mention it; "We also joined you and the Church of God in remembering the Lord's death in the breaking of bread" (Latimer 1908:149). Thus, he was faithfully keeping the Open Brethren tradition.

During his residence in Bristol he became a close friend of G. Müller; their friendship lasted until Müller's death (Latimer 1908:24). In 1892 in Vienna George Müller, at the age of 86, laid his hands on Dr. Baedeker, "then a comparative youth of only 68 summers," and "separated him to the special ministry to the banished brethren" (Latimer 1908:189). Besides evangelism, his goal of visiting prisons was to extend spiritual and financial help to the exiled brothers and their families in Siberia and the Caucasus, especially in Giryusy. He visited Giryusy twice, the second time accompanied by Kargel (Kovalenko 1996:81).<sup>70</sup> This ministry certainly helped to strengthen the ties between the Pashkovites and other evangelicals. Baedeker also laboured among the

---

<sup>70</sup> Kargel was not Baedeker's only translator in Russia. Sometimes Baedeker was accompanied by a dedicated young Pashkovite, Count Shcherbinin (Heier 2002:107-108). During his second journey across Russia Baedeker was accompanied by Patkavan Tarayants (Karev 1999:133).

Molokans and admired their devotion to anti-military principles (Latimer 1908:17).

Baedeker spent quite a lot of time in St. Petersburg, lodging in Princess Lieven's Malachite Hall where he made a number of high ranking acquaintances (Corrado 2000:110). He held "Bible readings" (not services, not liturgies, not meetings, but Bible readings) in Lieven's White Hall, as well as in the home of Count Bobrinskiy. At times he preached at the Congregationalist Church (Corrado 2000:110). S. Lieven recalled that Baedeker's favourite words which he learnt in Russian were 'God is love'. He often greeted the gatherings with these words (Lieven 1967:82). He and other believers gathered to pray at the home of Princess of V. Gagarina in St. Petersburg in 1884 when Count Korff met with government officials who were attempting to force him to abandon his ministry. However, "he never placed aristocracy above his ministry to prisoners" and it must have been due to his influence that some Pashkovite ladies became active in his St. Petersburg prison ministry (Corrado 2000:110).

Dr. Baedeker actively participated in the first united congress of various Russian evangelical groups called by Pashkov and Korff in St. Petersburg in the spring of 1884. He was one of those who compiled the program of the congress. His and Mrs. Baedeker's tickets were numbers one and two (Kovalenko 1996:81).

While visiting Moscow, Baedeker met with L. Tolstoy and used this opportunity to talk to him about saving faith in Christ. Baedeker told Tolstoy that every believer should be a missionary and preach the Word of God, and that it is not enough to "be the light of the world" just by doing good works (Heier 2002:107). In his novel *Voskresenie* [Resurrection], Tolstoy portrayed Baedeker as two distinct characters, Kiezewetter and the Englishman.

Dr. Baedeker used to tell of a conversation he had with Count Tolstoy in his Moscow apartment (Latimer 1908:206-207). When Tolstoy inquired, "What is your errand to Russia?" Baedeker replied, "To preach the gospel of Christ in the Russian prisons". When Tolstoy opined that there ought not to be any prisons or sin if people were properly taught, Baedeker argued that,

There is a stronger one than we – the Evil One – against whom our natural armour of resolution and of moral codes is useless. My message to the prisoners of Russia, and to all sinners everywhere, is, that there is a still Stronger One, Who is able to deliver the captives and slaves of Satan, and to transform them into the holy and beloved children of the Eternal and Holy God (Latimer 1908:207).

After Dr. Baedeker left Russia in 1895 (Kovalenko 1996:82), his prison ministry was carried on by Kargel and Nikolai. Besides Russia he ministered in England, Germany, Switzerland, Australia, Italy, Turkey and some Slavic countries (Kovalenko 1996:82).

Baedeker believed the Bible was verbally inspired and exclusively authoritative. Once early in his preaching career Baedeker was almost beaten up by university students in Zürich when instead of hearing a lecture attacking the Bible, they heard something completely different (Latimer 1908:58). As with Radstock, theological discussions did not seem very important to Baedeker. He wished that “men might be ready and willing to do the work of an evangelist in such places as this [Asia], instead of splitting hairs in religious discussions in England” (Latimer 1908:215).

The running theme of Baedeker’s preaching was that, “He is able to save, even to the uttermost. The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth from all sin. Let the wicked forsake his way, and return, and He will abundantly pardon” (Latimer 1908:99). He repeatedly preached repentance and spiritual rebirth, “His abundant pardon of every sin to those who repent and accept Christ” (Latimer 1908:107), and was overjoyed when it took place, “It has been a full and fruitful day [in Prague]; souls have been born for eternal life” (Latimer 1908:215).

Baedeker was known for his crucicentrism. When preaching he had only one theme: “Jesus Christ and Him crucified” under whatever title it was announced, whether “The Bible”, “Prayer”, “Sin and Salvation”, or “Redemption through His Blood” (Latimer 1908:57-70, 220).

In general Baedeker did not highly esteem traditional denominations, claiming that the “Greeks, and Lutherans, and Romans have shifted God’s ancient landmark putting ceremonies and sacraments, instead of the Blood” (Latimer 1908:221). He believed that “poor people need the gospel; and they do not get it either in the Lutheran or in the Greek Church” (Latimer 1908:72 from a letter to Mrs. Baedeker).

In Baedeker’s words,

It is so easy to say, parrot-like, ‘All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.’ Does it not seem a mockery, when the awful tyranny of sin is enslaving them, that people should hold a costly and beautiful prayer-book in their hands, and say, ‘We are miserable offenders’ . . . There is

something so utterly wrong in our forms of religion (Latimer 1908:218-219).

Baedeker talked about “many millions of heathen who bear the name of Christians” (Latimer 1908:219). In one of his letters Baedeker wrote harshly, “The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is the shroud in which lies the corpse of the religious life of Germany” (Latimer 1908:25), the position which corresponded to Open Brethren views on the subject.

Baedeker was nondenominational in the Brethren sense. He was ready to have fellowship with all true Christians regardless of their denominational affiliations. During his first trans-Siberian journey he met an Orthodox priest who was sent as a missionary to Kamchatka. Baedeker admitted that “he seems to be a real Christian” (Latimer 1908:147). He really believed that true Christians could be found in all of these churches, that true Christianity was crossing denominational borders. He wrote about “a very happy three days’ conference at Constanta with brethren of different nations and denominations” (Latimer 1908:216).

Baedeker called believers from regeneration to separation from the world of sin and to a life of holiness,

Neither baptism, nor the Lord’s Supper, nor conformity to certain rules of worship, nor profession of any kind, could make a sinner a saint; only living faith in Jesus, an entire separation from the world unto the Lord with singleness of purpose, could effect the manifestation of a Christian life, and make us meet for the Master’s use (Latimer 1908:184).

On 9 October 1906, at the age of 83, Baedeker “went to see the King in His Beauty”, as the inscription on his gravestone reads (Latimer 1908:212). Lord Radstock was present at his funeral (Latimer 1908:211).

Other Brethren pioneers followed Baedeker’s steps and worked among simple Christian communities in Eastern Europe and Russia, although those men did not have “the advantage of his gifts or social opportunities” (Coad 1976:195). Among them Coad names another German, Johannes Warns; Edmund Hamer Broadbent from Suffolk in England, who in the early years of the twentieth century travelled widely in eastern Europe and in Russia; James Lees, an Ayrshire minister, who travelled to the Baltic States and then to the Slavic countries (Coad 1976:195).

Baedeker’s influence on the Pashkovite group is generally underestimated. Everybody knows who Radstock was and what he did, and in

his grand shadow Baedeker, a prison preacher, often gets lost. However, compared to Radstock, Baedeker spent much more time in St. Petersburg and in Russia in general. He had very distinctive Open Brethren views, including all the practicalities of running local church affairs. After 1884, when St. Petersburg's main male evangelical leaders, Pashkov and Korff, were in exile, Baedeker naturally filled that vacuum during his stays in Russian capital. His influence was long-lasting. It was during Baedeker's ministry that the St. Petersburg Pashkovite "group" was shaped into something more like a "congregation".

### **3.2.2.3 Otto Stockmayer (1838-1917)**

Although Radstock and Baedeker were the main foreign evangelical guests in the homes of the Pashkovites, they were not the only ones. Among those who influenced St. Petersburg believers was the well-known teacher Otto Stockmayer, a Baptist pastor from Switzerland (in his early years), a regular speaker at the annual Keswick convention, and an advocate of the doctrine of divine healing.<sup>71</sup>

Soon after Stockmayer's conversion in 1862 he began "to earnestly seek God for the fullness of grace and life". In 1867 Stockmayer had a mystical experience which he described as "the feeling of cleansing waters flowing over his soul". That same year in Mannedorf, Switzerland, he was healed from a serious health problem after Samuel Zeller prayed for him. After that he strongly believed in Jesus "as his only physician" and became interested in studying healing ministries. Some years later he opened his own faith-healing home in Switzerland, where he used the methods he had learnt at Mannedorf in praying over the ones who desired to be healed. Stockmayer popularized his beliefs about faith healing worldwide with his book "Sickness and the Gospel" and active participation in several early Keswick conferences, as well as other European and American religious gatherings.<sup>72</sup>

A. J. Gordon called him "the theologian of the doctrine of healing by faith". Stockmayer insisted that salvation and sanctification should not stop with regeneration, and stressed the relationship between sin and sickness. He pointed out passages of Scripture which proclaim that Christ "healed all that

---

<sup>71</sup> McGee. Online. 25 June 2009; Moreshead. Online. 25 June 2009.

<sup>72</sup> Healing and Revival. Online. 25 June 2009; Longman. Online. 25 June 2009.

were sick” and “Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses”.<sup>73</sup>

Stockmayer’s doctrine on divine healing is well summarised in his own words,

Once understanding that it is not the will of God that His children should be sick (James 5: 14-18), and that Christ has redeemed us from our sickness as from our sins (Matt. 8: 16, 17), we can no longer look upon healing as a right which it would be lawful for us to renounce. It is no longer a question whether we wish to be healed: God’s will must be fulfilled in our bodies as well as in our souls. Our beloved Lord must not be robbed of a part of the heritage of His agony.

It is by virtue of a Divine will that the offering of the body of Jesus Christ has sanctified us (Heb. 10: 10), which means that Christ by His death has withdrawn the members of our body, with our entire being, from every sacrilegious end or use. He has regained and consecrated them for His own exclusive and direct use.

Wrested by Christ’s ransom from all foreign power, from the power of sin or of sickness or of the devil, our members must remain intact, surrendered to Him who has redeemed them.

‘Let my people go,’ was God’s word to Pharaoh; and such is God’s command to sin and sickness, and to Satan: ‘Let my people go that they may serve me.’

Thus God’s children must not seek the healing of the body without taking at the same time, by faith, all the new position which Christ’s redemption gives us – and which is expressed in these words of Moses to Pharaoh; or better still in Paul’s words (2 Cor. 5: 14, 15), which amount to this – Nothing more for self, but all for Christ. Before seeking freedom from sickness we must lay hold of the moral freedom which the Redemption of Christ has obtained for us, and by which we are cut off from any self-seeking: from the seeking of our own will, our own life, our own interests, or our own glory. Our members are henceforth Christ’s, and neither for ourselves nor for our members, but for Christ and for His members, we desire health. We knew none other but Christ.”<sup>74</sup>

However, Stockmayer conceded that God could use temporary sickness in order to purify or humble Christians. Besides, healing, from his point of view, was also an evangelistic tool.<sup>75</sup> Along with the teaching of divine healing, Stockmayer had great interest in the area of “things to come”.<sup>76</sup> The fact that he was a regular Keswick speaker allows one to assume that he was promoting Keswick’s spirituality and holiness, as briefly discussed above. He also challenged believers to a “high standard of Christian living”.<sup>77</sup> Ada von

---

<sup>73</sup> Gordon. Online. 25 June 2009.

<sup>74</sup> Stockmayer, *Sickness and the Gospel*, Partridge and Co., in Gordon. Online. 25 June 2009.

<sup>75</sup> Healing and Revival. Online. 25 June 2009.

<sup>76</sup> Moreshead. Online. 25 June 2009.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

Krusenstjerna described Stockmayer's style of ministry saying that "he feared nothing more than attracting men to himself rather than to God. He awakened in people a yearning for complete self-knowledge, a longing to uncover any vanity, that new life would be built on a new foundation".<sup>78</sup>

This was the person who in 1880 was invited to St. Petersburg "to expound on the Bible" (Corrado 2000:110-111). Korff remembered later that "in the first love we fearlessly testified about Christ, but we were babies in the knowledge of the Word. That was the reason why we invited to Petersburg a well known in Christian circles Pastor Stockmayer from Switzerland." For a few weeks he held talks about sanctification (AUCECB 1989:87). However, the author thinks that it was not only "sanctification" that he talked about with inexperienced St. Petersburg believers. Reportedly both Pashkov and Korff had the gift of healing. S. Lieven remembered from her childhood that Pashkov visited hospitals and prisons and sometimes patients were healed by faith (Lieven 1967:19). Kargel also practiced healing (Turchaninov 2009:68). Stockmayer's influence may have been partly responsible for future problems with excessive mysticism and Pentecostalism among Russian evangelicals.

Chronologically Stockmayer's visit took place prior to that of Müller's. Müller picked up the work among the Pashkovite believers where Stockmayer left off (AUCECB 1989:87).

#### **3.2.2.4 George Müller (1805-1898)**

George Müller of Bristol, "a prototype 'Open Brethren' person" (McDowell 1983:217), was well known in England for his outstanding work with orphans. He was another foreign teacher who contributed to the spiritual and practical formation of the Pashkovite group. Because his life and preaching served as an example for many evangelical believers in Russia, he deserves a closer look.

Müller, a German, had been trained for the Lutheran ministry, but "had led a dissolute and profligate life" until in 1825, while at Halle University, he had been "quietly and suddenly converted" during the course of a prayer meeting in a private home (Coad 1976:37). His friendship with Craik brought him into contact with the teaching of Groves. Gradually he developed views similar to

---

<sup>78</sup> Krusenstjerna, *Im Kreuz*, 182, in Corrado 2000:111.

those of Groves<sup>79</sup> whose ideas were coming from personal “passionate” Bible study (Coad 1976:37, 15-24).

Studying the New Testament changed Müller’s previous views on baptism, and he accepted believer’s baptism. He also started to celebrate the Lord’s Supper weekly, and adopted the principle of freedom to speak at church meetings. He and his wife decided to renounce a regular salary and rely upon the voluntary giving of their congregation for support. In 1832 they moved to Bristol and along with Craik took turns preaching at Bethesda Chapel (Coad 1976:38, 42-43). Their work at Bristol was revolving around building up the believers under their pastoral care and helping needy people. So, they “spared little time for the luxury of theological debate”. “They were glad to recognize the kinship of all whose hearts were with them in their concern for the work of God: the apocalyptic presages of disaster that loom so large in Darby’s thinking are absent from their work” (Coad 1976:115).

In 1835 Müller formed the “Scriptural Knowledge Institution for Home and Abroad” to assist day and Sunday schools, to circulate Bibles, and to aid foreign missions (McDowell 1983:215). Müller and his “Institution” were in the background of much of the Brethren movement’s expansion (Coad 1976:245). It is interesting to note that the “Institution” was a mainstay of Hudson Taylor’s China Inland Mission in its earliest days, as he was a member of a Brethren congregation in Tottenham for a short time before he left for China (Coad 1976:53, 77). This “adherent of Brethren” took up Müller’s principle of living faith and made it the basis of his China Inland Mission in 1865 (Bebbington 1989:94).

---

<sup>79</sup> The root of Grove’s ideas was in personal piety (Coad 1976:17). Groves’ “problems” with the established church started with military issues, because he held strong pacifist views (Coad 1976:15). Further development of his views took him even farther away from the Church of England. He came to view believers as free to “break bread” together in their meetings (Coad 1976:20). On one occasion Groves wrote, “I . . . am ready to break the bread and drink the cup of holy joy with all who love the Lord . . . Oh! When will the day come, when the love of Christ will have more power to unite than our foolish regulations have to divide the family of God” (Coad 1976:23). When in 1834 Groves returned to England from his mission field and visited various congregations. Regarding the Brethren at Plymouth he found that, “their original bond of union in the truth as it is in Jesus, had been changed for a united testimony against all who differed from them” (Coad 1976:122).

Müller's personal attitude to the Scriptures was characterized by reverence, dependence on the Author for insight into its mysteries, belief in the relevance of the book, and was paralleled by self-searching and evaluating his daily life against the examples and patterns shown in the Word (Pierson 1902:139). Müller believed that the Word of God was the only true standard, and the Holy Spirit was the only teacher (Pierson 1902:462). His call to his listeners was pietistic in nature: "carefully to form and maintain godly habits of systematic Bible study and prayer, holy living and consecrated giving" (Pierson 1902:257). Like other Brethren, Müller based his pacifism on the Sermon on the Mount, taken literally, and other parts of the New Testament which preach nonresistance (Brock 1984:33).

Reading about August Francke's life – an early advocate of Pietism who in his time helped to make Halle a centre of piety and missionary enthusiasm – revived Müller's earlier desire of establishing an orphan house (Clouse 1978; Coad 1976:48-49). This desire grew into life-long work for which he became most famous. Müller established an orphanage in Bristol on the principle of entire dependence on God: whenever money was exhausted, he resorted to prayer and faith. By the time of Müller's death in 1898, over ten thousand orphans had passed through these homes, and about a million pounds sterling had been spent on them. In addition, over a hundred thousand children had attended the day schools and Sunday schools of the "Scriptural Knowledge Institution" (McDowell 1983:215). Thus, part of Müller's inspiration was derived from the example of Franke, but part was drawn from "the atmosphere of radical devotion to God" that Müller discovered in Grove's circles that were developing into the Brethren movement (Bebbington 1989:93).

Thus, Müller brought to England the methods of "practical Christian philanthropy he had learned in Germany, from the labors among needy children" and "took back to the Continent that message of simple evangelical religion he had learned at the feet of Earl Cavan and Lord Radstock in England" (Latimer 1908:13). Müller's influence among the Brethren was very powerful, especially in the financial aspects of the work (Coad 1976:56). According to Coad, the reluctance of Brethren to provide a regular salary for their ministers is often traced back to Müller, although "one cause is their fear of the creation of a ministerial caste among themselves" (Coad 1976:56).

Müller's missionary tours through Europe, America, Asia, Africa, and Australia occupied the later years of his life, from 1875 to 1892. He visited forty-two countries and travelled over two hundred thousand miles (Pierson 1902:246, 257). During his first tour he preached at Metropolitan Tabernacle at Spurgeon's request and spoke at the Mildmay Conference (Pierson 1902:248). On his second tour Müller did a follow up of Moody and Sankey's revival work in England, Ireland, and Scotland (Pierson 1902:248-249).

The main reason for these tours was "to preach the Gospel in the simplest way possible" (Warne 1898:102). Besides Müller wanted:

to bring believers back to the Scriptures, to search the Word and to find its hidden treasures . . . to translate it into daily obedience . . . to help all who love and trust one Lord to rise above narrow sectarian prejudices, and barriers to fellowship. . . to fix the hope of the disciples on the blessed coming of our Lord Jesus . . . to instruct them as to the true character and object of the present dispensation, and the relation of the church to the world in this period of the outgathering of the Bride of Christ (Pierson 1902:246-247).

The ninth tour, from 8 August 1882 to 1 June 1883, included Russia (Pierson 1902:254-255). Mr. and Mrs. Müller stayed in St. Petersburg from January through March of 1883 at the home of Princess Lieven (Corrado 2005:105). This was after Radstock had left Russia for good but before the banishment of Pashkov and Korff.

Normally Müller preferred to stay in hotels in order to have as much rest and time for himself as possible. However, in St. Petersburg after two days at a hotel Müller gave in to Princess N. Lieven's persistent invitation to lodge at her palace. This gave him many unexpected opportunities to develop relationships and hold conversations in the company of Lieven and her upper class associates, "whom I [Müller] sought to benefit spiritually" and through them "many others in the vast empire" (Müller, 545 in Corrado 2000:108).

While in St. Petersburg Müller also began to hold meetings in the house of Colonel Pashkov, but one day a policeman "broke up the meeting and dispersed the little company" (Pierson 1902:254-255). Müller was "somewhat startled by a visit from the police, bearing a summons for him to appear before the authorities on a charge of having held meetings, with translation into Russ, for which no permission had been granted by the Minister of the Interior" (Warne 1898:108). Actually he had been granted some kind of permission from the Minister of Interior to preach outside the Protestant churches which had no

connection with the state. However, the police director claimed Müller had overstepped his boundaries, and those meetings had to be given up (Corrado 2000:107).

Korff's home was another place where Müller held German-language Bible studies each week. These meetings were private and participants were free to ask questions. Later Korff recalled, "We were not ashamed to ask when we did not understand, because we wanted to be obedient children of God and live according to the Holy Scripture".<sup>80</sup> In spite of opposition from the Russian Orthodox Church, Müller spoke (in English or German) at 112 meetings, some of which were held in Pastor Dalton's German Reformed Church, a Moravian Church, and a Congregationalist Church. However, the majority of meetings were held specifically for the purpose of teaching Christian workers (Müller 544-547, in Corrado 2000:107). His sermon, which made a strong impression on a visitor named Ignatev, was called "The Second Advent of Jesus Christ",<sup>81</sup> one of the favourite Brethren topics.

Both Müller and Baedeker had been baptized as believers, although they viewed baptism as a personal decision which should not divide Christians (Corrado 2000:113). In 1882 Müller reportedly baptized four Pashkovite believers among whom were Colonel Pashkov and Princess N. Lieven.<sup>82</sup> According to Waldemar Gutsche, a Polish Baptist emigrant, it was likely due to the teaching of George Müller that believers began gathering each Sunday for Communion.<sup>83</sup> Yet Müller being an Open Brethren did not object to breaking bread and being in fellowship with believers who were not baptized (Pierson 1902:413). As for the frequency of participating in the Lord's Supper, Müller felt that this ordinance should be observed every Lord's day (Pierson 1902:423). By the time of Penn-Lewis' 1897 visit, communion was still commonly practiced on Sunday mornings at the Lieven palace.<sup>84</sup>

Another possible result of Müller's influence, according to Corrado, was voluntary Christian service among Pashkovites. Pashkov and other high-society

---

<sup>80</sup> Korff, *Am Zarenhof*, 31, in Corrado 2000:108.

<sup>81</sup> Ignatev, 187, in Corrado 2000:107.

<sup>82</sup> Gutsche W, *Westliche Quellen des Russischen Stundismus*, S. 60 with a reference to Pierson A. T. George Mueller of Bristol. London, 1901, p. 65-71, in AUCECB 1989:87.

<sup>83</sup> Gutsche, 60, in Corrado 2000:114.

<sup>84</sup> Penn-Lewis, 10, in Corrado 2000:114.

Pashkovites employed literally thousands of people in their homes and on their estates, many of whom were or became believers. Yet there is no record of any of them being financially rewarded for preaching, literature distribution, or participation in other forms of Christian ministry (Corrado 2000:113).

It seems obvious that Müller played a decisive role in effecting in the Pashkovite group a more distinct church structure, a structure that was recognizably Brethren. It also seems that before Müller's St. Petersburg visit communion was not mentioned as a part of Pashkovite services. However, from that time on gatherings around the breaking of bread became common practice. Although Radstock recognized believer's baptism as an ordinance, he never emphasised it. It was Müller who baptized a few leading St. Petersburg evangelicals almost ten years after the beginning of the revival. In the area of philanthropy Müller himself was a living example. His ways of "doing ministry" certainly left a deep impression upon newly saved and enthusiastic believers.

Müller highly valued the opportunity to minister in St. Petersburg. "So precious was all this work, and so manifestly owned by God, that I could only admire Him for allowing me to labor as I was allowed to do".<sup>85</sup>

### **3.2.2.5 Reginald Radcliffe**

An Englishman Reginald Radcliffe, a Liverpool lawyer and one of the well-known revivalists of the mid-nineteenth century, was an honoured guest at the United Congress in St. Petersburg called by Pashkov and Korff in 1884. He was also the one who paved "the way" for Radstock in Paris (Nichols 1991:10).

Radcliffe was one of a trio sometimes called "the gentlemen-evangelists", a person "remarkably used of God". In 1858 he started his evangelistic work in Aberdeen where one service followed another and great crowds gathered. Churches were crammed and people of all kinds repented of their sins. The work touched both professors and students, ministers and lay people. Radcliffe and other evangelists preached in the churches and halls of Dundee, Greenock, Perth, and Edinburgh "until nearly all Scotland felt the impact".<sup>86</sup>

A similar awakening spread in England. After Radcliffe's remarkable work in Scotland he was invited to London. There he began, with others, to hold a number of meetings in different parts of London and in the provinces at which

---

<sup>85</sup> Müller, 545, in Corrado 2000:108.

<sup>86</sup> Poole-Connor. Online. 27 June 2009.

“the same remarkable results were often witnessed”. F. H. White, pastor of the Talbot Tabernacle in London, wrote:

One Lord’s Day afternoon I heard him address a large number of young business men in the Marlborough Rooms. He began by saying, ‘I will speak for five minutes, and then converse with any in soul-anxiety.’ He did speak, literally, for five minutes. .

When he finished the hall was a very Bochim, full of men with many tears seeking the way of salvation. I have been with him at the same place at early ‘before-breakfast’ meetings for young men, when the floor of the room would be literally covered with broken-hearted inquirers, and one had to step among them with holy carefulness, like a surgeon on the battlefield.<sup>87</sup>

Mrs Radcliffe remembered that when Radcliffe and Baptist Noel were speakers in Bristol, “the building was packed to suffocation, nearly half the congregation stayed for the inquirers’ meeting”. In her words, “Many of these were utterly inconsolable . . . They made great efforts to restrain their feelings, but it was impossible; the floodgates of their anguish burst forth in groans and weeping.” Similar scenes were taking place all over the United Kingdom.<sup>88</sup>

Spurgeon wrote about the Revival in which Radcliffe played an important role in the following way:

The times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord have at last dawned upon our land. Everywhere there are signs of aroused activity and increased earnestness. A spirit of prayer is visiting our churches and its paths are dropping fatness. The first breath of the rushing mighty wind is already discerned, while on rising evangelists the tongues of fire have evidently descended.<sup>89</sup>

An experienced evangelist, Radcliffe preached both in halls as well as in the open-air, right “on the village green”. With his arrival “the regular pattern of village life was temporarily disturbed”. Once Radcliffe was imprisoned for preaching in the open-air.<sup>90</sup> In Bebbington’s words, he “combined devotional intensity with remarkable energy” (Bebbington 1989:161). Along with Lord Radstock and others, Reginald Radcliffe was a regular speaker at annual Mildmay conferences promoting Christian fellowship and holiness.<sup>91</sup> As for

---

<sup>87</sup> White F H, in Poole-Connor. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>88</sup> Poole-Connor. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>89</sup> Spurgeon, Preface to Volume V of the New Park Street Pulpit, 1860, in Poole-Connor. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>90</sup> Toon and Smout. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

Radcliffe's views on conversion, he held that it was "an instantaneous work" (Bebbington 1989:8).

Like Müller, Radcliffe defended the idea of sacrificial Christian service. At the 1884 United Congress he warned Russian believers "not to commit the same error which English and German Christians have committed, that is, to pay their preachers-elders", but proposed that they must work with their own hands (Pavlov 1884?:29). He also spoke against women speaking at the meetings, for which he was afterwards confronted by Pavlov (Pavlov 1884?:29).

### **3.2.2.6 Jessie Penn-Lewis (1861-1927)**

In January 1897 another talented and popular Keswick speaker and Christian author, Englishwoman Jessie Penn-Lewis, visited St. Petersburg at the invitation of a Russian woman in London.

Penn-Lewis, the daughter of a Calvinist Methodist minister, was influenced among others by the reformed South African writer Andrew Murray, whom she quoted and referred to in her books.<sup>92</sup> According to Randall, Jessie Penn-Lewis was Keswick's "most formidable female speaker in the 1890s" (Randall 1999:29). Bebbington calls her "the most accomplished lady speaker associated with Keswick" (Bebbington 1989:175). Frank Buchman, the founder of the Oxford Group, credits Penn-Lewis with helping him come out of depression when he heard her speak at a Keswick Convention.<sup>93</sup> Bebbington points out that the ideas "of Christ as 'dear Master', combining sentiment with submission" became popular at Keswick convention life in the late nineteenth century. According to Bebbington, it was a "romantic sentiment of purity and love" that attracted women to the Keswick convention; "the call to total surrender undoubtedly had attraction in the age when female submission was axiomatic" (Bebbington 1989:175). Besides Keswick, Penn-Lewis was a frequent speaker at large conferences such as Mildmay and Llandrindod Wells.<sup>94</sup> Jessie Penn-Lewis certainly played her part in making feminine spirituality discussed.

Being "an early twentieth-century holiness advocate" Penn-Lewis taught about "crucifixion of the self" (Bebbington 1989:16). On her twenty-third birthday

---

<sup>92</sup> Wikipedia, "Jessie Penn-Lewis". Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Garrard. Online. 27 June 2009.

Jessie Penn-Lewis wrote, "All that I have, all that I am, all that I may be is Thine, wholly, absolutely, and unreservedly, and I do believe that Thou dost take me, and that Thou wilt work in me to will and to do Thy good pleasure. Day by day draw me nearer." Some time later she went through the experience of baptism by the Holy Spirit and started spreading the message of the spiritual growth of Christians and "full deliverance from the self-life through the power of Christ's cross". She wrote, "Calvary precedes Pentecost. Death with Christ precedes the fullness of the Holy Spirit. Power! Yes, God's children need power, but God does not give power to the old creation, or to the uncrucified soul. . . Satan will give power to the 'Old Adam,' but God will not".<sup>95</sup>

Penn-Lewis travelled worldwide, taking her message to people in Russia, Scandinavia, Canada, Switzerland, the USA, and India.<sup>96</sup> During her stay in St. Petersburg in 1897 she managed to hold twenty-eight meetings in spite of her poor health and severe religious persecution. She spoke in the Congregationalist Church, in drawing room of Princess N. Lieven, and in the suburbs, "in places where the windows were closely veiled, that not a chink of light might get out" for fear of arrest.

Her message was concentrated upon her favourite topic, a believer's crucifixion with Christ, "for Christ to live and move and work in me". As a genuine evangelical she saw "the key to the fullness of the Holy Ghost. . . in the knowledge of the Cross",<sup>97</sup> the themes preached and taught by Kargel. When in St. Petersburg, Penn-Lewis fell seriously ill. Later she recalled that four Pashkovite ladies "spent ten days and nights on their knees with an open Bible" at her side until her life was spared".<sup>98</sup> Penn-Lewis must have felt very much at home among active Pashkovite women in St. Petersburg. On the other hand, her example must have been a great encouragement for those Pashkovite ladies.

In 1904-1905 Penn-Lewis was involved in the Welsh Revival, one of the largest Christian revivals ever held. After the Revival failed Penn-Lewis declared the failure to be the work of Satan. Along with Roberts, she wrote a

---

<sup>95</sup> Garrard. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>96</sup> Wikipedia, "Jessie Penn-Lewis". Online. 27 June 2009; Garrard. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>97</sup> Penn-Lewis, 10, in Corrado 2000:112.

<sup>98</sup> Penn-Lewis, 10-11, in Corrado 2000:111.

work on spiritual warfare against Satan called *War on the Saints*, in which she tried to show the work of demons, another theme for which she was well-known.<sup>99</sup> The proposed “remedy for the assault of deceiving spirits on the children of God was to be found in the Baptism of the Holy Spirit” (Bebbington 1989:196). However, in 1907 she was warning against the Pentecostal movement in Calcutta.<sup>100</sup>

By 1908 Penn-Lewis was alarmed that Keswick was “setting its face against women speakers” (Randall 1999:29). The following year she withdrew from Keswick and established her own Overcomer League and a magazine called “The Overcomer.” The policy of the League was to draw believers closer to Christ but not away from their local churches (Bebbington 1989:196, 178). In the 1920s Penn-Lewis continued pursuing her message of personal crucifixion with Christ and of spiritual warfare against Satan through her own “Overcomer Testimony” rather than through Keswick (Randall 1999:29).

After the 1917 Revolution in Russia, Penn-Lewis remained closely connected with her Russian friends. She became a vice-president of the Southbourne Missionary and Conference Centre of the Russian Missionary Society “Slavanka” located in England. This became the home of Madame E. Chertkova, who had been one of Penn-Lewis’ hosts twenty-five years earlier.<sup>101</sup>

### 3.2.3 Conclusion

So, what were the theological background and main influences on Russian evangelicalism? It appears that the foreign evangelists discussed above, who influenced the beginning and the development of the Russian Evangelical stream in St. Petersburg, were coming from close circles in England (mostly Brethren and Keswick), preaching similar ideas and setting forward very similar examples.

The most prominent influence, however, was that of Open Brethren. Lord Radstock, who did not formally belong to an Open Brethren assembly, was preaching within the lines of Brethren theology. But in the beginning, due to Radstock’s independent personality and his passion for evangelism, the Open

---

<sup>99</sup> Wikipedia, “Jessie Penn-Lewis”. Online. 27 June 2009.

<sup>100</sup> McGee. Online. 25 June 2009.

<sup>101</sup> Fetler, *How I discovered...*, 35, 39, in Corrado 2000:112.

Brethren influence transmitted through Radstock lacked the distinctive Brethren ecclesiology (church order, ordinances, exclusiveness). Radstock mostly concentrated on home Bible studies, conversion, and regeneration with the resulting change of life. Nevertheless, it was also Radstock who introduced the Pashkovites to Baedeker and Müller, two leading Open Brethren. During his long ministry in Russia Dr. Baedeker taught the Pashkovites the importance of breaking of the bread being open to all genuine Christian. Müller laid the foundation of believer's baptism, and he personally baptised a few leading figures among the St. Petersburg Pashkovites. All three were very strong on Biblicism, active evangelism, and charity.

Radcliffe, a very experienced evangelist and revivalist, must have served as a living example of "doing" the work of evangelism.

The connection to Keswick through Radstock, Baedeker, Stockmayer, and Penn-Lewis provided insights into the best of British conservative Evangelicalism of that era with its denominational openness and emphasis upon spirituality through faith and a life of personal holiness. However, Stockmayer's and Penn-Lewis' influence can be considered rather controversial because they must have introduced the Pashkovites into the mystical sphere of "deeper spiritual life", baptism by the Holy Spirit, faith healing, and spiritual warfare with Satan and deceiving spirits.

Overall, all these influences fall under the category of conservative pietism.